Writing the Opposition: Power, Coercion, Legitimacy and the Press in Pinochet's Chile

A dissertation presented to

the faculty of

the College of Arts and Sciences of Ohio University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Brad T. Eidahl

December 2017

This dissertation titled

Writing the Opposition: Power, Coercion, Legitimacy and the Press in Pinochet's Chile

by

BRAD T. EIDAHL

has been approved for

the Department of History

and the College of Arts and Sciences by

Patrick M. Barr-Melej

Professor of History

Robert Frank

Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

ABSTRACT

EIDAHL, BRAD T., Ph.D., December 2017, History

Writing the Opposition: Power, Coercion, Legitimacy and the Press in Pinochet's Chile

Director of Dissertation: Patrick M. Barr-Melej

This dissertation examines the struggle between Chile's opposition press and the dictatorial regime of Augusto Pinochet Ugarte (1973-1990). It argues that due to Chile's tradition of a pluralistic press and other factors, and in bids to strengthen the regime's legitimacy, Pinochet and his top officials periodically demonstrated considerable flexibility in terms of the opposition media's ability to publish and distribute its products. However, the regime, when sensing that its grip on power was slipping, reverted to repressive measures in its dealings with opposition-media outlets. Meanwhile, opposition journalists challenged the very legitimacy Pinochet sought and further widened the scope of acceptable opposition under difficult circumstances. Ultimately, such resistance contributed to Pinochet's defeat in the 1988 plebiscite, initiating the return of democracy. Historians have paid relatively little attention to the relationship between the dictatorship and the opposition press, the critical role opposition journalism played during the Pinochet years, and the importance of opposition journalists in the successful "No" campaign in the 1988 plebiscite. This dissertation makes clear that the opposition media—and opposition newsmagazines in particular—together played a vital role during the period.

DEDICATION

For Whitney and Owen, who have patiently supported me through this endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION

> A country that did not have journalism—as it happened in Chile in 1973— was not a country worth existing.
>
> -Arturo Navarro Ceardi, Chilean Journalist

In February 1987, Chile's National Press Association reprinted the inaugural issue of the landmark newspaper *La Aurora de Chile*, founded in 1812, to commemorate the publication's 175th anniversary. In that first issue, Father Camilo Henríquez, a dissident priest and Chilean independence figure, wrote, "Oh, if *La Aurora de Chile* could contribute in any way to the enlightenment of my compatriots! If it were the dawn of more abundant lights, heralding writers better endowed by nature!"[1] Writing as the Spanish king remained Napoleon's prisoner, and inspired by independence movements sweeping through Latin America, he went on to cheer that Spain's colonial restrictions on many freedoms had effectively ended. Henríquez declared, "The destructive monopoly has ceased; our ports are open to all nations. The books, the machines, the instruments of sciences, and arts go in without the old obstacles."[2] At first glance, the re-release seems innocuous. However, the press association found in Henríquez's words an effective but guarded way to reference the repressive policies toward the press that were enacted and enforced by the dictatorial regime of General Augusto Pinochet Ugarte (1973-1990).

In its statement about the re-release of the particular issue of *La Aurora de Chile*, the association explained, "The legacy of Camilo Henríquez, which is his love of

---

[1] Camilo Henríquez, "Libertad, educación, y el rol de *la Aurora de Chile*," *La Aurora de Chile,* February 13, 1812, Accessed on 5/1/2017, http://www.auroradechile.cl/newtenberg/681/article-3339.html.
[2] Camilo Henríquez, "Prospecto," *La Aurora de Chile,* February 1812, Accessed on 5/1/2017, http://www.auroradechile.cl/newtenberg/681/article-2418.html.

freedom and service to the community, should always be present in our press."[3] Without directly mentioning the Pinochet regime, the association continued, "Whatever has been the circumstances, whoever governs us, whatever the situation, [the press] has tried to champion the right of Chileans to be informed, to inform, and as we have argued, renouncing them would mean renouncing our very existence…Understanding that this objective is above and beyond the natural ideological differences or doctrines of diverse publications that should exist in a pluralistic society."[4] The statement pointed to Chile's democratic culture and the essential nature of a free press for the common good of the nation. Clearly, the press association chose to reprint *La Aurora de Chile* as both a reminder of the country's long republican tradition of freedom of press and as a critique of Pinochet's military government. Indeed, beginning with *La Aurora de Chile*, newspapers and newsmagazines played a vital role in both shaping and reflecting the peculiar political culture of Chile's republic.[5]

This dissertation examines the opposition press under the Pinochet dictatorship. It argues that due to Chile's tradition of a pluralistic press, which Chileans valued strongly as a hallmark of the nation's pluralistic political culture, Pinochet allowed space in which the opposition press could operate. Far from constituting an altruistic or humanitarian measure, Pinochet's approach grew from his conviction that doing so would perpetuate the notion he was a legitimate president. In what was a dialectical process, opposition

---

[3]Asociación Nacional de la Prensa, "Declaración de la Asociación Nacional de la Prensa," *Hoy,* No. 500, February 16, 1987, 52.
[4] Ibid.
[5] I find great value in the definition of "political culture" provided by political scientists John Booth and Patricia Richard. They describe it as "a learned set of attitudes, norms, expectations and values concerning the political environment that shapes the political behavior of citizens." John Booth and Patricia Richard, *Latin American Political Culture: Public Opinion and Democracy* (Los Angeles: Sage, 2015), pp. 6-7.

journalists challenged that very legitimacy and further widened the scope of acceptable opposition. Ultimately, this process contributed to Pinochet's defeat in the 1988 plebiscite and to the return of democracy in 1990. The relationship between the dictatorship and the opposition press shows us a side of the dictatorship that is often left unexamined in the current political analysis and scholarship on the dictatorship. Pinochet and his ministers demonstrated a great degree of flexibility alongside rigid control in their dealings with opposition media outlets. Furthermore, both scholarship and politicians of the period have minimized the critical role that the opposition press played in the opposition movement against the dictatorship. This dissertation seeks to make clear the vital role opposition newsmagazines played in the process that ended the dictatorship.

Social Change and the Free Press

Throughout the nineteenth century, oligarchic elites governed Chile, and the major newspapers of the period, *El Mercurio* and *El Ferrocarril,* reflected their conservative views. During the early decades of the twentieth century, as readership expanded dramatically, many who populated the country's expanding middle class took over and professionalized journalism. After the Great Depression, representatives of the Radical Party, a firmly middle-class party that sought to improve the working and living condition of the working class through reform to avoid revolution, and other politicians, including President Arturo Alessandri Palma, greatly expanded public education, leading to higher literacy rates, especially among the working classes.[6] Efforts to expand literacy

[6] Radical politicians like Pedro Aguirre Cerda, president from 1938 to 1941, sought to reform Chile's laws to address the inequalities suffered by the working class to avoid revolution. Public education became a major part of their policy goals. See, Patrick Barr-Melej, *Reforming Chile: Cultural Politics, Nationalism, and the Rise of the Middle Class,* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).

bore substantial fruit by the middle of the twentieth century. Behind only its neighbor Argentina, Chile was the second-most literate country in Latin America during the latter half of the twentieth century. In 1950, 79 percent of Chileans could read. By 1970, that percentage rose to 88 percent, reaching a high of 94 percent in 1988.[7] The country's high levels of literacy made a free press and an informed citizenry more important to its democratic culture. Social change and literacy led to a greater desire for participation in politics among the middling and working classes. Nitrate workers, for example, demanded greater influence in national affairs. Worker activism sparked a constitutional crisis, leading to the creation of the Constitution of 1925, which allowed for broader participation in politics. The constitution placed substantial power in the hands of the executive branch by using direct election. In theory, this system would limit the power of congress to obstruct the executive from making necessary changes for the public good. By allowing congress fewer checks on the power of the executive, the constitution opened up the possibility for the working-class men to gain political control or at least influence political matters. If the working class banded together and supported a presidential candidate that candidate would likely win, because the working class potentially had the greatest number of voters. Once elected, the president would be able to do more to help the working class without the interference of oligarchic elites in congress. The press changed to reflect the new political landscape. Championing the

[7] MOxLAD, "Chile illiteracy graph," Accessed on 5/1/2017, https://moxlad-staging.herokuapp.com/home/en#tabs-graficar

goals of new political actors, centrist and leftist newsmagazines and newspapers, including *Topaze* and *Ercilla*, appeared alongside the elite's publications.[8]

The Constitution of 1925 guaranteed freedom of the press and gave political parties the right to form their own partisan publications. Additionally, the government was the largest purchaser of advertising space. As a result, Chile's press never achieved full economic independence from either political parties or the government. However, the plurality of political positions led to a vibrant press that reported the news from most every possible viewpoint, doing so with little threat of censorship. In the mid-twentieth century, there were few instances of press restriction, and most publications reported the news with biases in line with the ideologies and political commitments of their owners. By the 1960s, new laws requiring people register to vote in order to receive certain social benefits led to higher electoral participation by working- and middle-class Chileans and boosted the influence of leftist and centrist parties. The number of political parties on the Left and Center also increased, especially by 1970, as such new parties like the Popular Unitary Action Movement (MAPU) and the Christian Left (IC) joined Socialist Salvador Allende's Popular Unity coalition (UP).[9]

As society and politics became increasingly diverse in the late sixties and early seventies, the number of newspapers and magazines in circulation boomed concomitant with an ever-increasing number of political parties. The expansion of the press, and the intensification of political warfare in and through it, led the democratically elected

---

[8] *Topaze* was a satirical leftist newsmagazine and *Ercilla* began as a literary magazine, but soon moved into coverage of the news with a Center-Left bent.

[9] Additionally, by 1973, the Radical Party had split into three different parties: the center-left Radical Party, the rightist Radical Democracy Party, and the leftist Radical Left Party.

governments of the era to consider some limits on press freedoms. Such efforts were grounded—rhetorically, at least—in the idea that freedom of the press was vital to democracy. Most proposals centered on modernizing press laws to factor in radio and television or efforts to punish libel and other excesses rather than doing away with the free press altogether. It was only under Pinochet's military dictatorship that a free and pluralistic press faced real harm. Immediately following the military coup that overthrew Allende in 1973, the dictatorship restricted publication to only two newspapers, which the regime ordered to submit articles for censorship prior to publication. In the entirety of the nation's history, no executive had ever completely shut down the press and dictated who could publish as Pinochet did in 1973. The government also closed or took control of all leftist media outlets.

Policing the Press

Pinochet and leaders of the other branches of Chile's military came to power in a coup that toppled Allende's government on September 11, 1973.[10] The Allende years were marked by a heightening sense of crisis, with centrist and rightist politicians questioning Allende's leadership and focusing their criticisms on his Marxist ideology and the country's economic collapse. In 1971, Christian Democratic Party (PDC) members, who held the majority in congress, joined forces with rightist parties and together began

[10] For more information about Salvador Allende and his downfall see: Ricardo Israel Zipper, *Politics and Ideology in Allende's Chile*, (Tempe: Arizona State University, 1989) ; Nathaniel Davis, *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende,* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985); Margaret Power, *Right-wing Women in Chile: Feminine Power and the Struggle Against Allende*, (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002) ; Peter Winn, *Weavers of Revolution: The Yarur Workers and Chile's Road to Socialism,* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986) ; and Joaquín Fermandois, *La revolución inconclusa: La izquierda y el gobierno de la Unidad Popular*, (Santiago: Centro de Estudios Públicos, 2013).

blocking Allende's economic and political proposals as the sociopolitical landscape polarized. Anti-Allende press outlets were on the front lines of the conflict. In response, the Socialist argued that the unfavorable press was simply a tool of a bourgeoisie desperate to maintain power. For Allende, a truly free press could only be achieved if workers who operated printing presses also owned them, at the expense of moneyed elites like the Edwards family, who owned the powerful and conservative *El Mercurio* and its subsidiaries. Despite his disdain for "bourgeois" press outlets, Allende did not opt for repression as a means of dealing with such opposition—a position in line with UP's expressed commitment to democracy and pluralism. Instead, Allende steered government-related advertising toward sympathetic news outlets, hoping to financially asphyxiate newspapers and magazines that opposed his "Chilean Road to Socialism."

The military's overthrow of the Allende government began a new era in the relationship between the press and the government. Pinochet became the first head of a governing junta, in what was supposed to be a rotating position.[11] However, he soon consolidated his power by eliminating the junta as an executive body and ruling through a retooled "presidency." He remained in charge until 1990. To ensure his grasp on power, Pinochet relied initially on brutal and blatant repression. To suppress opposition and

---

[11] On the Pinochet regime, consult: Hugh O'Shaughnessy, *Pinochet: The Politics of Torture.* (New York: New York University Press, 2000) ; Patricia Verdugo, *Chile, Pinochet, and the Caravan of Death.* Trans. Marcelo Montecino (Coral Gables, FL: North-South Center Press, 2001); Mark Ensalaco, *Chile under Pinochet: Recovering the Truth*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000); Pablo Policzer, *The Rise and Fall of Repression in Chile*, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009); Carlos Huneeus. *The Pinochet Regime*, trans. Lake Sagaris, (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2007); Genaro Arriagada, *Por La Razón o La Fuerza: Chile Bajo Pinochet*, (Santiago de Chile: Editorial Sudamericana Chilena, 1998); Genaro Arriagada, *Pinochet: The Politics of Power*, Trans. Nancy Morris (Boston: Unwyn Hyman, Inc., 1988); Pamela Constable and Arturo Valenzuela, *A Nation of Enemies: Chile under Pinochet*, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1991); and Paul Sigmund, *The Overthrow of Allende and the Politics of Chile, 1964-1976* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1977).

destroy parties and unions, the regime committed human-rights violations on a scale unprecedented in Chilean history, with the military killing over 3,000 citizens and subjecting tens of thousands more to detention and torture. Pinochet also used nonviolent means, including media censorship, to silence his foes. The regime immediately set up a censorship apparatus that would control the press for the remainder of the dictatorship. The regime also crafted a new constitution in 1980 that officially bestowed the presidency on Pinochet. The Constitution of 1980 was part of a broader plan by Pinochet and his associates to create an authoritarian or "protected democracy" that would not be plagued by the political chaos of the early 1970s and under which political parties and congress would be subordinate to an even stronger executive branch.

In the coup's immediate wake, journalists had their freedoms of speech and press restricted, and the regime required all new publications to secure permission in order to publish. Once approved, a publication would go through an initial stage where the regime employed a policy of prior censorship, which required the press to submit drafts of articles to the censorship office for approval. Later in the 1970s, the regime expected the press to practice self-censorship (*autocensura*) to control content. Under self-censorship, editors censored their own papers because they risked fines and imprisonment for printing information, including reports of human-rights violations, which the regime deemed slanderous or inflammatory. Within this otherwise repressive framework, Pinochet allowed for some opposition press outlets to function, including newsmagazines at the center of this study: *Advertising Agency Information Services (APSI), Hoy, Análisis,* and *Cauce.*

Hegemony, Legitimacy and Coercion

Pinochet sought to remake Chile into a society less susceptible to what he deemed were the excesses of democracy. Things like political manipulation, putting the interests of party above the interests of the state, and parties that in their program sought to damage the state (i.e., Marxist-Leninist parties) had to cease. Pinochet's project represented a monumental task for which violent coercion alone would not be enough. Chile's long history as a relatively stable democratic state—when compared to its South American neighbors—created a society where democracy and its trappings, including the rule of law, legitimized the government. When seeking to understand what amounted to Pinochet's hegemonic project, Italian Marxist thinker Antonio Gramsci's discussion of hegemony and coercion provides some initial clues, as do German sociologist Max Weber and Spanish sociologist Juan José Linz's discussions on legitimacy.

Gramsci's conception of coercion includes not just repressive coercive acts, but the quotidian types of coercion common to all hegemonic processes. [12] Prior to 1973, Chileans primarily experienced quotidian forms of coercion, including lawmaking and law enforcement. To understand how the dictatorship broke with this tradition, we need to take a closer look at Gramsci's theories on the relationship between hegemonic power and coercion. According to Gramsci, civil society creates, and the state permits, a wide array of ideological positions, which include those in opposition to the state's projects, as

---

[12] Historian Florencia Mallon argues, "Hegemony is a set of nested, continuous processes through which power and meaning are contested, legitimated, and redefined at all levels of society…hegemony is hegemonic process: it can exist everywhere and at all times." Mallon, *Peasant and Nation: The Making of Post-Colonial Mexico and Peru,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995) 6. Philosopher Michel Foucault has extensively in his work examined the everyday types of coercion employed by the state. Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, trans. Alan Sheridan, (New York: Vintage Books, 1977).

people join in "particular alliances" that reflect their position in society.[13] For Gramsci, the wide array of ideological positions and alliances permitted to work within and alongside the state creates the illusion of shared power without threatening the security of the state, thus reducing the need for repressive coercion. Certainly, Chile's democratic culture, with its myriad of political parties and long history of pluralism, fit this description. Parties working within and alongside the power structure led to little repressive coercion under the democratic governments of the 1960s and 1970s. However, the economic and political crisis of the Allende presidency created a justification for the military to seize control of the state, and to maintain its grasp on power, the military relied initially on repressive violent coercion.

As Gramsci argued, in times of crisis, one group claims dominant authority over other groups using the crisis as justification. Independent groups join the dominant authority believing the seizure of power necessary to solve the crisis, creating a narrow-thinking cultural consensus. The dominant group, then, initiates a period of repressive coercion to eliminate or punish dissident groups that do not join the cultural consensus of the hegemon. Groups outside the new hegemony can be forced out or outlawed. The use of coercion to silence dissenting voices to maintain hegemony is justified as the necessary solution to the crisis. [14] In the case of Chile, the military claimed dominant authority, and immediately following the coup, political parties on the Center and the Right expressed their support. Pinochet then used coercion to eliminate leftist parties with

[13] Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from a Prison Notebook,* trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffery Nowell Smith, (New York: International Publisher, 1999) 126.
[14] Ibid., 182.

Marxist-Leninist ideologies, which were in no mood to be cooperative, to say the least. Pinochet pointed to the economic crisis under Allende and the (mostly fabricated) threat of civil war between Marxists and the state as justification for his use of repressive coercive force and to establish hegemony. However, to justify a lengthy stay in power (something that some supporters of the coup, including many centrists of the PDC, did not initially expect in light of the country's democratic pedigree), the regime would need to provide positive arguments to solidify and legitimize its position. Pinochet moved to cast the dictatorship as a savior that would remake society.

On October 11, 1973, Pinochet stated, "To rebuild is always slower and more arduous than to destroy. Because of this, we know our mission will not be as temporary as we would have liked, and thus we provide no deadlines and set no dates. Only when the country has achieved the social peace necessary for the true economic development and progress to which it is entitled and Chile shows no faces with reflections of hatred will our mission have ended."[15] Later, as Pinochet's efforts to stabilize the economy bore fruit and civil war did not materialize, many Chileans who had initially supported the coup began to question whether the regime should remain in power. Without the crisis of 1973, some regime supporters, especially centrists, withdrew their support from the regime whose repression was increasingly at odds with Chile's democratic culture. The use of coercion, then, weakened Pinochet's position over time, which is clearly evinced by the mounting political opposition to his regime from the Center and, eventually, some on the Right. By 1976, it was clear to Pinochet that Chileans would not respect him as the

[15] Augusto Pinochet in Carlos Huneuus, *The Pinochet Regime,* trans. Lake Sagaris, (Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiner Publishers, 2007) 141.

legitimate president if he relied on coercion alone. He seemingly understood what Gramsci had described a half-century earlier on another continent: that hegemony does not merely rely on coercion through top-down impositions. Rather, hegemony is created, maintained, and challenged deeply throughout and across the economic, cultural, social, and political realms, with consent constituting a critical aspect of any hegemonic order.

Hegemony is intimately tied to the notion of legitimacy, and German sociologist Max Weber's approach to legitimacy is instructive here. For Weber, willingness to comply with a system of rule and to obey commands evinces that system's legitimacy. If we take Gramsci and Weber together, then, legitimacy—sought after, bestowed, and used—functions as a relationship in which citizens are more likely to grant a (hegemonic) power consent to carry out its programs without it needing to rely on coercive repression. For this reason, it is no surprise that Weber postulated that every "system of authority attempts to establish and to cultivate belief in its legitimacy."[16] Weber, moreover, identified three sources of legitimacy: tradition, legality, and charisma. Tradition draws on the past, or "the way things have always been," convincing people to grant consent to the government. Legality is the force of law. Those in charge are appointed or elected through legal procedures in line with commonly held principles (a political culture, essentially). Finally, charisma elicits legitimacy for leaders who show they possess the right to lead by magical powers, prophecies, and/or heroism, ruling through the force of their personalities. These elements, Weber explains, interact and together contribute to the overall authority of a government.[17] Building on Weber's approach, Linz argues that

[16] Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* (New York: Free Press, 1947) 325.
[17] Max Weber, *Economy and Society,* vols. 1 & 2 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013).

a government's ability to solve socioeconomic problems should also be considered as a source of legitimacy.[18]

Approaching the Chilean Case

Borrowing from Weber and Linz, this study focuses on three main linchpins of legitimacy—legal-institutional legitimacy, legitimacy derived from economic performance, and legitimacy rooted in tradition—that more effectively address Chile's historical idiosyncrasies and the particular challenges and opportunities the Pinochet regime encountered.[19] Though effective in securing the regime's power initially between 1973 and 1976, repressive coercion brought condemnation from much of the international community, leading to economic sanctions imposed by many European countries and eventually the United States, slowing the rate of Chile's economic recovery from the collapse of 1973. Pinochet could and did rely on repressive coercion to eliminate Marxists, depoliticize society, and strengthen executive authority. However, doing so undermined the legitimacy he sought. Securing legitimacy ultimately proved critical to Pinochet's ability to exercise hegemonic power.[20] It made it possible for Pinochet to reduce the amount of attention and resources the regime directed toward repressive coercion, including torture, imprisonment, disappearance, threats, arrest, fines, and exile. Indeed, legitimacy worked to strengthen Pinochet's hegemonic position and made it more likely the regime's policies would be effectively implemented.

---

[18] Juan José Linz, *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1978).

[19] Though charismatic legitimation was not present, the regime did have strong elements of personalization of power in the figure of Pinochet. However, he lacked the qualities and appeal that would have granted this type of legitimation. He had a high nasally voice and was not an accomplished orator.

[20] Much of my thoughts on the utility of legitimacy for Pinochet are based on Huneuus, *The Pinochet Regime,* 139-168. In which he lays out the basic framework for what I present here.

Legal-institutional legitimacy was paramount to Pinochet's rule in light of the historical weight of law and legality in Chile's civil society and political culture.[21] Pinochet saw law and legality as important cornerstones to governance and sought to rest his regime on both, giving at least the appearance of legality to his actions. In so doing, Pinochet gained not only legal-institutional legitimacy, but also the legitimacy derived from the legalistic tradition of Chile's democratic culture. Thusly, he sought adherence to regime policies from not only the Right (his natural constituency), but also broad segments of the law-abiding population.

An important initial source of legal-institutional legitimacy for the regime, "The Chamber of Deputies Agreement on the Severe Breach of Constitutional and Legal Order of the Republic," was a congressional statement issued in August 1973 that demanded Allende to cease pursuit of his Marxist agenda. Centrist and rightist politicians signed the document, which specifically addressed the country's economic and political crisis. More importantly, it obliquely called for the military to intervene if Allende refused to heed the warning. Indeed, after the coup, the regime and the Right argued the "Agreement" was in fact a call by congress for the military to overthrow Allende and UP, thus providing the military conspirators with the cover of legal-institutional legitimacy. In 1978, Pinochet sought to further strengthen his legitimacy through a plebiscite, which asked citizens to simply vote "yes" or "no" on the legitimacy of the government. The ballot read, "Faced with international aggression launched against our fatherland, I support President

[21] In Santiago today, as has been the case since well before the dictatorship, reprints of published laws dangle from street-corner kiosks, pinned up alongside popular magazines and newspapers. Such a common sight evinces popular demand for the texts, and vendors see it as profitable enough to take up limited sale and display space with the documents.

Pinochet in his defense of the dignity of Chile and reaffirm the legitimacy of the government."[22] Such "international aggression" was a United Nations resolution that condemned the Pinochet government for human-rights violations. The government reported in the final tally that "yes" received 75 percent of the votes.[23] Despite the fact that the regime conducted the vote, the victory of the "yes" vote provided some citizens with enough evidence to continue to consent to the regime's rule. With that vote in hand, the dictator and his collaborators moved to craft a new constitution: the aforementioned Constitution of 1980. That document was also put to a government-run plebiscite, resulting in another "yes" victory (69 percent) for the regime. The ability to vote on the constitution, even if that vote was conducted shadily by the regime (there were no voter rolls, for instance), lent a measure of legitimacy to the process in the eyes of many Chileans.[24] The Constitution of 1980 established decision-making bodies and set up the structure of a new political order that would govern the country after the military left power: an authoritarian or "protected" democracy. It also guaranteed Pinochet would remain in power until at least 1990, and possibly until 1996.

The regime also sought legitimacy through economic success, given that the crisis that precipitated the military coup was both political and economic. Though the economy initially showed significant growth in the months following UP's victory, Allende's economic plan—complicated by economic pressure exerted by the United States and the effects of a global recession—resulted in hyperinflation, product shortages, and economic

[22] Constable and Valenzuela, *A Nation of Enemies*, 68.
[23] The Americas Watch Committee, *Chile: Human Rights and the plebiscite*, 19.
[24] Ibid., 19.

contraction between 1972 and 1973. When the military took over in late 1973, it began to unravel Allende's socialist policies but struggled to settle on a comprehensive economic plan to replace them. By 1975, the dictatorship had turned to the neoliberal policies of the Chicago Boys, a group of Chilean economists who studied at the University of Chicago with Milton Freeman and others. The Chicago Boys emerged as the regime's economic brain trust, propelling a series of radical neoliberal reforms that withdrew the state from major economic sectors through the privatization of industries, implemented tariff reductions, and slashed public spending. Resting on the premise that the economy would boom if relieved of the burden of state intervention, the new regimen left Chilean businesses open to success or failure based on their own merits in a globalized and free marketplace. The regime promised its embrace of a market-based model would eliminate poverty and realize significant economic development.[25] Initially, neoliberalism produced almost miraculous results. The gross domestic product increased, posting gains above 7 percent until 1980.[26] Furthermore, inflation, at 343 percent in 1975, shrank to 9 percent by 1981. The success of the Chicago Boys' strategies strengthened the government's position, allowing Pinochet to claim the military dictatorship was necessary for the country's economic survival and growth. In 1980, Pinochet spoke in glowing terms about what his project would accomplish, stating, "There will be a million new jobs; a million new sources of work; in this period nine hundred thousand housing units will be built…We also visualize that in this period, at the end of it one in every ten Chileans will

[25] Peter Winn, *Victims of the Chilean Miracle*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).
[26] Arriagada, *Por la Razón o Por la Fuerza,* 75.

have a car."[27] When the economy nearly collapsed amid a global recession in 1981, the regime abandoned some of its neoliberal principles and used the state's authority to intervene in banking and monetary policy. Overall, between 1981 and 1984, the economic downturn negatively affected the regime's legitimacy, and the regime again turned to repression to maintain order. By 1985, the economy had stabilized and continued to show growth for the remainder of the dictatorship, and Pinochet pointed to such economic growth to bolster the regime's legitimacy.

Tradition as a source of legitimacy was also important during the Pinochet years, as it had been for much of the country's post-colonial history. Chilean scholars have long argued the country's history of stability and democracy is exceptional in Latin America.[28] Politicians seized (and continue to seize) on the notion. For instance, in his 1972 speech to the UN General Assembly, Allende explained, "I come from Chile… A country with its working class united in a single trade union organization, where universal and secret suffrage is the vehicle of determination of a multiparty regime, with a Parliament that has been operating constantly since it was created 160 years ago; where the courts of justice are independent of the executive and where the constitution has only been changed once since 1833, and has almost always been in effect."[29] Pinochet also emphasized Chile's history of political stability but obviously did not embrace the actors that Allende

---

[27] Augusto Pinochet in Huneeus, *The Pinochet Regime,* 397.
[28] Some of the earliest foundations of this idea come from Diego Barros Arana, *Un Decenio de la Historia de Chile (1841-1851*) (New York: Forgotten Books, 2015) and Alberto Edwards, *La fronda aristocratica en Chile*, (Santiago de Chile: Editorial Universitaria, 2015). Later works like Francisco A. Encina, *Historia de Chile: desde prehistoria hasta 1891*, tomo 1-20, (Santiago: Editorial Nascimento, 1941) built upon the earlier framework. Other scholars who have advanced this theory include, but are not limited to Mario Góngora del Campo, Jaime Eyzaguirre, and Bernardino Bravo Lira.
[29] Salvador Allende, "Speech to the United Nations, December 4, 1972," (accessed on 8/26/2017), https://www.marxists.org/archive/allende/1972/december/04.htm.

mentioned at the UN. The regime pointed to the Portalian Republic (1831-1891), a period with a strong executive dominated by oligarchic elites (and named after one if its chief architects, the wealth trader Diego Portales). For Pinochet, who was obsessed with Portales, Chile was greatest in the century following its founding. It had since lost its way—an evolution greatly accelerated by Allende. The regime would often point back to the political chaos of the Allende government and claim that by fixing that chaos and returning stability—if not democracy—Pinochet had earned the right to govern. In 1974, Ismael Huerta, a naval officer who took part in the coup against Allende, responded to Soviet criticism of Pinochet in the UN General Assembly by noting, "What occurred in Chile was not a fascist coup d'état, which would be totally foreign to our traditions and political heritage, but rather the failure of a Soviet plan, a failure which is now a sore point with that country."[30]

In Chile, a free press, if not one completely independent from political parties or the government, lent traditional legitimacy to democratically elected governments since the early decades of the twentieth century. Pinochet also saw "freedom of the press" as an appealing source of legitimacy for his regime, however restricted such freedom would actually be. He provided a very limited space for an opposition press by 1976, and, by the end of 1977, three major opposition newsmagazines were up and running: *APSI, Hoy,* and *Análisis*. An additional voice of the opposition, *Cauce*, began publication in 1983. Historian and journalism expert David Paul Nord argues that, "the fundamental purpose

[30] United Nations, "United Nations General Assembly-Twenty-ninth Session-Plenary Meetings, September 24, 1974," 146.

of mass communications, and especially journalism, is the exercise of power."[31] The mobilizing potential of ideas is critical to establishing and supporting hegemony, and opposition journalists were in the thick of it all. As historian James Cane argues, "Power is not wielded by disembodied journalists through institutions above the social order, but by real people embedded in the real social conflicts of institutions themselves embedded in the broader social order."[32] Opposition journalists, then, worked against the broader social and political order imposed by the dictatorship to broaden the scope of acceptable opposition to the military regime. Pinochet's tolerance of the opposition press fluctuated based on the strength of his other sources of legitimacy at any given moment during the dictatorship.

By exploring the dialectic between the opposition press and the military dictatorship, this study underscores the important role the Chilean press played in politics—an aspect of the Pinochet government that has been minimalized or left out of the current scholarship, which focuses on the Pinochet dictatorship's violent and repressive actions. Journalism historian Daniel C. Hallin's work on the U.S. media during the Vietnam War proves particularly useful here. Hallin divides the world of political discourse into three concentric spheres: consensus, legitimate controversy, and deviance. Consensus involves those topics on which there is widespread agreement about shared values and beliefs (a political culture). Topics within the sphere of legitimate controversy are those that can be publicly debated by rational and informed people. The sphere of

---

[31] David Paul Nord, "A Plea for Journalism History," *Journalism History* 15, (Spring 1988): 8-15.
[32] James Cane, *The Fourth Enemy*: *Journalism and Power in the Making of Peronist Argentina, 1930-1955,* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2011) 9.

deviance pertains to positions that are taboo, unfounded, or of trivial consequence.[33] For utilization in Pinochet's Chile, Hallin's spheres require adjustment to the reality of the dictatorship's control over media. Through censorship, the regime forced a wide range of topics that in liberal democracies operate in the spheres of legitimate controversy and consensus, such as freedom of the press and human rights violations, into the sphere of deviance. Journalists strove to use what little space Pinochet allotted them to expand the sphere of legitimate controversy and stimulate public debate on the merits of the dictatorship.

Pinochet initially allowed some space for an opposition press that otherwise was tightly controlled and subject to censorship. Beginning in 1976 and continuing until 1988, there was back and forth between the opposition press and the dictatorship as the former pushed to expand beyond the limits set for it by the latter. The regime would then try to reassert control—ceding some ground to the opposition media for criticism—only to have the press once again expand beyond the new limits. Each time the opposition press expanded its bounds, Pinochet was unable or unwilling to completely close it down due to the loss of traditional legitimacy such action would cause his regime. Instead, he resorted first to closures and to restricting topics of articles, though eventually even these tactics became too damaging to his image. He then had editorial directors arrested, but also allowed the outlets to continue publishing. By 1988, the regime could no longer afford to arrest the magazine directors without hurting Pinochet's image, and the government shifted to imposing heavy fines for offending reports.

---

[33] Daniel C. Hallin, The Uncensored War: The Media and Vietnam, (Berkley: University of California Press, 1989).

The Regime, the Press, and Historiography

Many scholars have overlooked or glossed over the history of the opposition press during the Pinochet years. The majority of works on the period between 1970 and 1990 focus primarily on events leading up to the 1973 coup, the repressive legal apparatus Pinochet's regime set up, human-rights abuses, and the economic policies of the military regime.[34] This dissertation breaks with this strictly top-down approach to the dictatorship by focusing on opposition journalism—that of *APSI, Hoy, Análisis,* and *Cauce*—and the role the press played during this crucial period in Chilean history. What is more, previous studies on journalism under the regime often divorce the press from its historical context. Guillermo Sunkel's work on Chile's largest newspaper, the conservative *El Mercurio*, analyzes the content of articles before and after the military coup. He finds that during the Allende years, the newspaper functioned as the main source of opposition to Allende's policies within the media, while after the coup the newspaper became a tool wielded by the regime to explain and defend its economic policies.[35] Sunkel's analysis does not describe or explain how the coup changed the press and provides no analysis of what the rest of the Chilean press was doing under the dictatorship.

---

[34] Hugh, O'Shaughnessy, *Pinochet: The Politics of Torture.* (New York: New York University Press, 2000); Patricia Verdugo, *Chile, Pinochet, and the Caravan of Death.* Trans. Marcelo Montecino (Coral Gables, FL: North-South Center Press, 2001). ; Mark Ensalaco, *Chile under Pinochet: Recovering the Truth*. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000) ; Pablo Policzer, *The Rise and Fall of Repression in Chile*, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009) ; Carlos Huneeus. *The Pinochet Regime*, trans. Lake Sagaris, (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2007); Genaro Arriagada, *Por La Razón o La Fuerza: Chile Bajo Pinochet*, (Santiago de Chile: Editorial Sudamericana Chilena, 1998); Genaro Arriagada, *Pinochet: The Politics of Power*, Trans. Nancy Morris, (Boston: Unwyn Hyman Inc, 1988); Pamela Constable and Arturo Valenzuela, *A Nation of Enemies: Chile under Pinochet*, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1991); Paul Sigmund, *The Overthrow of Allende and the Politics of Chile, 1964-1976*, (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1977).

[35] Guillermo Sunkel, *El Mercurio: 10 años de Educación Política.* (Mexico City: Instituto Latinoamericano de Estudios Transnacional, 1983).

Another scholar who examines the press under the dictatorship, Luis Torres, focuses broadly on the opposition press but only offers a categorical analysis of what types of articles its outlets printed.[36] The work neither connects that content to the regime's policies and mechanisms of power nor does it explain how those publications operated within and affected Chilean society. Francisca Araya Jofre's work on the first opposition magazine, *APSI,* describes what happened to the magazine during the dictatorship, but does not connect its brief narrative to the broader historical processes involved with publishing an opposition newsmagazine under a dictatorship.[37] One noteworthy exception that places the media within its historical context is the volume of essays *El Diario de Agustín: Cinco Estudios de Casos sobre El Mercurio y los Derechos Humanos (1973-1990)*. The study demonstrates that *El Mercurio* was more than just reporting on the news, but was an active participant in Chilean politics under the military dictatorship and showed how the regime's actions affected the newspaper and vice versa.[38]

Though historical scholarship on Chile's press remains light and fragmented, there exists a growing body of scholarship focused on the press in other Latin American countries. Two general trends have emerged in that historiography. The first is a focus on an idealized standard for freedom of the press. Generally, this involves treating "freedom of the press" as an absolute—based on a North American understanding of the concept—

---

[36] Luis Torres, in *Investigación sobre la Prensa en Chile* (1974-1984), ed. Fernando Reyes Matta et al. (Santiago: Badal Ltda., 1986), 161.
[37] Francisca Araya Jofré*, Historia de la Revista APSI: El que se Ríe se Va al Cuartel (Pico Para Pinochet)*, (Santiago: LOM Ediciones, 2007).
[38] Paulette Dougnac et al., *El Diario de Agustín: Cinco Estudios de Casos sobre El Mercurio y los Derechos Humanos (1973-1990)*, (Santiago: LOM Ediciones, 2009).

that is either present or not in any given context. Sergio Waisbord's *Watchdog Journalism in South America,* for example, argues that the press in Latin America is not free or independent of the government.[39] In so doing, such studies downplay local historical contexts by holding "freedom of the press" and journalism to ideal types.

The second trend—and the one to which this study contributes—seeks to position journalism within the contexts of Latin American mediatic and political cultures. Bryan McCann's "A View from the Corner Bar," which examines the Brazilian journalist and satirist Sergio Porto, argues that by creating fictional characters and writing from their prospective, Porto could criticize Brazil's elite, military, and government during that country's brutal dictatorships of the 1960s.[40] Porto's use of humor and satire relates closely to the opposition press in Chile, which also employed satire to criticize the regime. In *Beyond the Barricades*, Adam Jones examines the role the official press organ of the Sandinista National Liberation Front, *La Barricada (The Barricade),* played in helping the former guerilla group rule the country and cultivate support.[41] Cane's *The Fourth Enemy* situates the press firmly within Argentina's struggle between civilian and military leaders from 1930s to the 1950s. The situation of the press in Argentina in the

---

[39] Despite embracing this trend, all of these works have important things to say about the media landscape in Latin America. Sergio Waisbord, *Watchdog Journalism in South America: News, Accountability, and Democracy,* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000). ; Chappel Lawson, *Building the Fourth Estate: Democratization and the Rise of a Free Press in Mexico,* (Berkley: University of California Press, 2002) ; Kim Quale Hill and Patricia Hurley, "Freedom of the Press in Latin America: A Thirty Year Survey, *Latin American Research Review*, 15, (Spring 1980): 212-218 ; Murray Fromson, "Mexico's Struggle for a Free Press," in Richard Cole ed., *Communications in Latin America: Journalism, Mass Media, and Society,* (Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources, 1996) 115-137.

[40] Bryan McCann, "A View from the Corner Bar: Sérgio Porto's Satirical *Crônicas* and the *Democradura" in Hispanic American Historical Review* (2012) 92(3): 507-535.

[41] Adam Jones, *Beyond the Barricades: Nicaragua and the Struggle for the Sandinista Press, 1979-1998,* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2002).

mid-twentieth century was in many ways unique. The literate population of Argentina far outnumbered that of any other South American country, and unlike the Chilean case, Argentina's press had long prided itself on taking a nonpartisan stance. He argues Argentina's press constituted a true independent commercial press in that it did not rely on political parties or the government for funding. Cane shows that despite this history, Perón relatively easily gained control of the press and used it to reinforce his populist message.[42]

The first two chapters of this dissertation focus on freedom of the press as a vital part of Chile's political culture. Chapter One examines the period between 1958 and 1973, during which three consecutive and democratically elected governments wrestled with the definition of and limits for a free press in Chile. The conservative coalition of parties that supported Jorge Alessandri Rodríguez (1958-1964) broadly defined itself as economically liberal but socially conservative. With the support of the Radical Party—traditionally a centrist reformist party, but by 1950 was bereft of any specific policy goals—Alessandri passed a law so restrictive the press deemed it the ""Gag Law"." President Eduardo Frei Montalva, a Christian Democrat, made repealing the "Gag Law" a key point in his election campaign, following through with the promise upon his victory in the presidential election of 1964. Allende's government subsequently sought to redefine press freedom in terms of economic relationships, broadly challenging previous conceptions of the idea. Chapter Two approaches freedom of the press from the perspective of journalists and news outlets. It focuses on Chile's oldest newsmagazine,

---

[42] James Cane, *The Fourth Enemy*: *Journalism and Power in the Making of Peronist Argentina, 1930-1955,* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2011).

Ercilla, the leftwing daily *Clarín*, and the rightist National Party's newspaper, *La Tribuna*. The chapter also focuses on the independent US journalist John Dinges and his experiences both under Allende and Pinochet. Dinges and his friends founded the first opposition newsmagazine *APSI*, followed by the staff of *Ercilla,* which founded *Hoy*. The regime targeted the staff of *Clarín* for repression and arrested many of its journalists. Whereas *La Tribuna'*s owner Sergio Onofre Jarpa served as an important civilian collaborator to the dictatorship.

Chapter Three examines the Pinochet regime's ideas about freedom of the press and the conditions under which it can operate. The dictator's belief that a "free press" would lend the regime legitimacy led him to grant limited space to opposition journalists. Chapter four examines government policies toward the press and political opposition advocated by two important regime collaborators: Sergio Onofre Jarpa and Francisco Javier Cuadra. It also examines press's attempts to successfully navigate the period between 1981 and 1984. Chapter Five begins with the end of the State of Siege the government imposed in 1984. When Pinochet lifted the siege in June 1985, Cuadra was firmly in charge. During his tenure, any challenge to the government's legitimacy was harshly suppressed. Under Cuadra, opposition media experienced successive waves of repression. However, Pinochet forced Cuadra to leave his post in 1987, prior to the 1988 plebiscite on Pinochet's rule. As the government moved into full campaign mode in 1988, it struggled to maintain control over the press without hurting Pinochet's image. Ultimately, the opposition media weathered the government's attempts to control it and provided important support for the victorious "No" campaign. Concluding this study is an

epilogue that addresses the end of the opposition press following the return to democracy. One by one the now formerly opposition media outlets closed and were unable to survive democracy's return.

CHAPTER ONE: CONTESTING VISIONS OF FREEDOM OF THE PRESS IN THE ERA OF MASS POLITICS

> Journalism is the art of making people believe what the government regards as good to believe.
>
> - Heinrich von Kleist, German Dramatist

On June 11, 1964, President Jorge Alessandri Rodríguez's government published the Abuses of Publication Law in *El Diario Oficial*. For many press outlets, the law represented significant restrictions on freedom of the press, quickly gaining the moniker "Gag Law" The Christian Democratic periodical *Flecha Roja* commemorated the law with an issue titled "Requiem for the Press," while the Communist *Vistazo* pictured the tools of a journalist's trade on its cover, including a press pass featuring the gagged mouth of the journalist. The independent leftist tabloid *Clarín*, meanwhile, published a blank first page in anticipation the inevitable censorship the law would bring.[1] The staff at *Clarín* felt a special connection to the "Gag Law," later claiming—with pride—that their daily had been the motivating factor behind it. *Clarín* had recently published an article that publicly exposed Minister of Justice Enrique Ortúzar Escobar's dalliance with a mistress. The tabloid reported Ortúzar's wife had discovered them together, grabbed the mistress' purse, and began hitting the minister. It soon became a recurring joke in the magazine to depict Ortúzar as a man constantly being hit by purses. The minster took personal offense and developed a strong hatred for *Clarín*, and Enrique Gutierrez, a *Clarín* journalist, later claimed the "Gag Law" had been born of the hatred Ortúzar had

[1] Ben G. Burnett, *Political Groups in Chile: The Dialogue between Order and Change*, (Austin, University of Texas Press: 2015) 38.

for the tabloid.[2] Gutierrez's position seemed to be supported by Ortúzar as he made the case for the new law. In 1963 on a televised forum at Chile's Pontifical Catholic University (PUC), Ortúzar held up an editorial from *Clarín* and stated it represented an "unprecedented attack on both himself and Chile's government."[3] However, the impetus behind the legislation went far beyond a scuffle over a mistress.

Though the Constitution of 1925 guaranteed the freedom of the press, each political party had a different conception of what it meant. This chapter examines the debates surrounding the attempts to update the Abuses of Publication Law, which occurred under the successive presidencies of Jorge Alessandri and Eduardo Frei Montalva in the 1960s.[4] It then traces the consequences of that ideological struggle forward through the presidency of Salvador Allende Gossens (1970-73) and the first three years of the subsequent military dictatorship. Generally, rightists believed that the press could be "free" only when subordinate to the interests of the state; the press could publish as it wished within limits so as not to damage politicians, the military, or the government's interests in general. Progressive reformers, generally represented by Frei and the Christian Democratic Party, believed in a much more expansive reading of freedom of the press, with very few limits. The Left, represented by Allende's Popular Unity coalition in 1970 and the Popular Action Front before it (1956-69), believed that the press in Chile had never truly been free because capitalism denied the working-class

---

[2] Enrique Gutierrez in Francisca Skoknic, "La vida al límite de Darío Sainte Marie, creador de Clarín," http://ciperchile.cl/2008/04/30/la-vida-al-limite-del-creador-de-clarin/, (Accessed on 8/24/2016)
[3] Camara de Diputados Legislatura Extrodinaria, "Sesion 12a, en martes 25 de Junio de 1963," 888.
[4] Eduardo Frei Montalva and his son Eduardo Frei Ruiz-Tagle both were active within the Christian Democratic Party and both served as Chile's president. In this dissertation, Frei will always refer to Eduardo Frei Montalva.

access to publishing enjoyed by the middle and upper classes. Once in power, Popular Unity worked to remedy the situation through the nationalization of Editorial Zig-Zag, creation of the Quimantú National Publishing Company and foundation of numerous ideologically based publications. This study argues that Popular Unity sought to gain control of the press, while allowing for broad liberty in the scope of content, thus mirroring actions taken by Frei's government to control the press and operating well within the bounds of the Constitution of 1925. In 1973, the military coup that overthrew Allende ended UP's project and ended freedom of the press in Chile as defined by the Constitution of 1925. The military government enforced new press laws based on the long-held conservative position on freedom of the press, but to a much more extreme extent.

The Right, Freedom of the Press, and the "Gag Law"

Chilean politicians created the Constitution of 1925 in response to labor unrest. In the early years of the twentieth century, the working class had begun to organize in response to the ups and downs of the nitrate industry, which was the country's main source of export wealth. The increasingly organized working class began to pressure Chile's oligarchic elite and middle-class reformers to address the plight of the poor and implement social reform. The situation only worsened with the economic disaster and social consequences of the Great Depression. Chile's parliamentary system, dominated by wealthy elites, broadly ignored the needs of the working classes. Though reform-minded parties won in both the presidential and congressional elections in the early 1920s, the proto-populist President Arturo Alessandri Palma could not accomplish

reform. In his frustration, he increasingly blamed the oligarchic liberal elites in congress, many of whom were in his own party (Liberal) or the Conservative Party, for the lack of movement on a variety of social issues, such as workers' rights and the creation of a social safety net. In response to the working class's increasing unrest, young military officers rose up against the government in support of reform in 1924. Initially, Alessandri sought to use the movement to his advantage, but could not control it and resigned the presidency leaving Chile for exile in Italy.[5] Young military officers within the government again overthrew the it and called for the return of Alessandri to lead in the creation of a new constitution in 1925. The new Constitution of 1925 placed a primacy of power within the executive branch of the government by implementing direct election. In theory, this system would limit the power of congress to obstruct the executive from making necessary changes for the public good. By giving the executive more power over congress, it opened up the possibility for the working-class men to gain political control or at least influence matters because they potentially had the greatest number of voters in a presidential election. Diverse political parties representing numerous ideologies formed to represent the expanding electorate. In addition to increased participation of the working class, women came into the national electorate in the 1940s, and the voting age was lowered from 21 to 18 in 1970. As a result, voter registration and the actual voting trend upward while the Constitution of 1925 remained in force (1925-1973).[6]

---

[5] Both Arturo Alessandri Palma and his son Jorge Alessandri Rodríguez were active politicians in Chile. Both men served as Chile's president. In this dissertation Alessandri will always be used to refer to Arturo Alessandri Palma.

[6] The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, "Voter Turnout Data for Chile," http://www.idea.int/vt/countryview.cfm?id=45 (accessed on 8/14/2016)

The Constitution of 1925 guaranteed freedom of the press. However, in 1925, Alessandri issued Decree-Law 425, which prohibited libel, slander, the printing of seditious material, and publication under certain military states of exception, such as states of siege or states of emergencies after natural disasters. At the same time, the Constitution of 1925 created the conditions for the proliferation political parties and viewpoints, which increased the ideological variety and number of publications in print. It also granted political parties the right to own publications and press outlets. As a result, press outlets independent of political-party influence remained rare, while the partisan press expanded. Not all new publications operated within the supposed bounds of decency set out in Decree-Law 425. During his second presidency, between 1932 and 1938, Alessandri took offense to a caricature of him in the satirical magazine *Topaze.* His government confiscated and destroyed copies of issue no. 285, and arrested its owner for violations of Decree Law 425.[7] Alessandri also ordered the arrest of the directors of *frentista* papers *La Hora*, *Hoy*, *La Opinion*, and *Frente Popular,* as well as the director of the National Socialist paper *Trabajo,* for unfavorable treatment of his government. Another major challenge to the freedom of the press occurred a little over a decade later, when President Gabriel Gonzalez Videla outlawed the Communist Party in 1948. As a result, the state shut down all of the party's associated publications. Decree-Law 425 remained in force until 1964.

Upon winning the presidential election of 1958, Jorge Alessandri Rodríguez, a conservative with no party affiliation and son of Arturo Alessandri, tasked his ministers

[7] "La Prensa Libre…Bajo Fianza," *Topaze*, no. 287, January 28, 1938, 3.

with updating Decree-Law 425. The younger Alessandri argued the new law would simply update the older version to include both radio and television. The amendments were immediately unpopular with the press. Jorge Alessandri's administration had left incredibly broad the legal definitions of libel, publication of false information, and insulting public officials. In addition, the law punished violators with lengthy prison sentences. As noted above, the press immediately dubbed the new law the "*Ley Mordaza*" or "Gag Law." The satirical and populistic magazine *Topaze* compared the law to the press laws in Francisco Franco's Spain, Anastasio Somoza's dictatorship in Nicaragua, and Rafael Trujillo's brutal dictatorship in the Dominican Republic. According to *Topaze,* none of them could compare to the repressive power Jorge Alessandri wielded. The article continued, "Surely, France, England, and the United States are dying of envy."[8] *Topaze* hoped to put the oppressive nature of the law into context by facetiously implying the like did not exist in the exemplar Western democracies of France, England, and the United States. Conservatives defended the law as necessary for protection of the moral wellbeing of the nation, and to punish irresponsible or bad journalism.

Rightist politicians conceptualized freedom of the press not as an absolute, but rather contingent upon the press fulfilling its supposed moral and journalistic obligations. Jorge Alessandri's government defined those standards broadly, but specifically rejected pornography, depictions of drug use, sensationalized crime reporting, and yellow journalism—the definition for which is subjective and thus created a moving target for

[8] ¡¡Viva La Mordaza!!" *Topaze*, XXXIII, no. 1634, February 14, 1964, 17.

journalistic standards. The pursuit of profit over the pursuit of truth also separated a good journalist from a bad one. For Jorge Alessandri's government, updating the press law allowed them to legislate these moral obligations into the law of the land. According to the aforementioned Ortúzar, Alessandri's Minister of Justice who was the target of a public outing regarding his mistress, the Abuses of Publication Law "constitutes the triumph of liberty over license; of truth over the lie; honesty over blackmail; of the dignity and honor of persons over insult and defamation; and of decency over pornography and outrage to all spiritual values."[9]

When Alessandri proposed the creation of the Abuses of Publication Law, Chile's congress became embroiled in debate about its merits. In January 1964, supporters of the Alessandri government and its legal project in the Chamber of Deputies argued for the law's necessity. Deputy Raúl Morales Adriasola, member of the Radical Party, argued the ongoing campaign by certain members of the press claiming the new law restricted freedom of the press was nothing more than disinformation. The law, he said, only slightly adjusted the categories for punishment created under Arturo Alessandri's Decree-Law 425. The new law would not hurt freedom of the press, because it would only come into force in cases of, "calumny, libel, defamation, undermining morality, and other cases laid out in the law," Morales argued.[10] He held that journalists who met their moral obligations to the nation would have complete freedom of the press and the law was meant to only punish journalists who committed infractions.

---

[9] Enrique Ortúzar Escobar in Ben G. Burnett, *Political Groups in Chile: The Dialogue between Order and Change*, (Austin, University of Texas Press: 2015) 38.
[10]Camara de Diputados Legislatura Extrodinaria, "Sesion 40a, en martes 14 de Enero de 1964," 2974.

Conservative Party member and a founder of Chile's College of Journalists, Jorge Iván Hubner Gallo, further argued for the government's role in enforcing journalistic standards. When addressing the Chamber of Deputies, Hubner, who had been an editor of the rightist publications *El Estanquero* and *El Diario Ilustrado,* lamented that the law's opponents supported, "yellow journalism, which lives on the exploitation of human misery, scandal, and crime news."[11] He argued that while freedom of the press was a fundamental tenet of liberal democracy, "in order for this freedom not to devolve into something licentious and anarchic, it must be, as any other given right, duly protected by the law, and have a counterpart, which should punish crimes committed under this freedom."[12] Moreover, Ortúzar, argued the government proposed the law to "save our youth" and "to make the next generations better than the current one."[13] The Abuses of Publication Law would save the next generation from the creeping influence of immoral broadcast and print media by guaranteeing journalistic standards, he proclaimed. In another instance, Ortúzar elaborated on his view that the Abuses of Publication Law would protect the youth, noting, "The mothers of Chile can be certain that there is not going to be the daily penetration into their homes of the poison of sensationalist and morbid exploitation which, with motives of profit, certain publications bring out the lowest and most base acts of society, without concern for the grave damage that it causes to our youth."[14] What is more, Jorge Alessandri's administration maintained that the

---

[11]Ibid., 2994
[12] Ibid.
[13] Ibid., 2975.
[14] Enrique Ortúzar Escobar in Ben G. Burnett*, Political Groups in Chile: The Dialogue between Order and Change*, (Austin, University of Texas Press: 2015) 38.

Abuses of Publication Law was not about freedom of the press, but rather "how to punish the abuses, or better said the crimes committed during its exercise."[15] Liberal Party Deputy Hugo Zepeda Coll reiterated the point when he noted that journalism "is a profession of truth… But the people who make of scandal a profession, that exploit mercantile spirit with the baser human passions, and even go so far as trafficking in honor of honorable people, do not deserve the noble appellation of journalists."[16]

The Right and its allies in the Radical Party pushed the law through, despite opposition from both the Left and the PDC, which referred to it at the time as a tool for the repression of broad sectors of society.[17] Opponent's fears of the repressive nature of the reforms were not unfounded. Under Jorge Alessandri, many leftist journalists found themselves in jail for violating the new law, including the director of *Clarín*.

A Revolution in Liberty for the Press

The Christian Democrats represented a progressive-reformist segment of Chilean politics in the 1960s and 70s. Frei's "Revolution in Liberty" proposed reforms in key sectors to improve the conditions of the rural and urban working classes, and make a violent revolution—in the style of Cuba's, specifically—less likely to happen in Chile. In that vein, the PDC advocated for a much more expansive idea of freedom of the press. It believed all perspectives and views—not only those of the government or ruling elite, which had dominated the public sphere for much of the twentieth century—had the right to be represented in the press, though, as a Catholic party, the PDC supported some

[15]Camara de Diputados Legislatura Extrodinaria, "Sesion 40a, en martes 14 de Enero de 1964," 2999.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Ibid., 2974.

restrictions, based on moral grounds, in regard to pornography and crime reporting. As such, he made amending the Abuses of Publication Law one of his campaign promises. Specifically, the PDC proposed punishing media companies rather than individual journalists for infractions, and to allow more malleable definitions of what constituted violations of the law.

Early in his political career, Frei already understood both the value and the danger of the press. In his 1940 work, *La política y el espíritu*, Frei recognized the power of the press, radio, and films. He expounded upon the power of journalism to shape citizens' understanding of the world, explaining that in the press "myths are created, passions are aroused or stoked, feelings changed. The man in the street -the people- is subject to the monster of propaganda that can change all concepts, administer their news, create the event, regulate feelings and show through 'their' prism all the simultaneous universal events."[18] As evinced by the PDC's acquisitions of media outlets, the party placed a primacy on harnessing the power of the press. Beginning in 1960, Christian Democratic figures slowly began to purchase key components of the media, acquiring a controlling interest in the Zig-Zag publishing house, the single largest printing company in South America at the time, for around two million dollars.[19]

Frei also expressed his fear that liberal democracy, in the face of communism or fascism, could only "slowly deny democratic principles… censoring the press, restricting individual rights, declaring certain parties outside the law, which is obviously contrary to

[18] Eduardo Frei Montalva, *La política y el espíritu*, (Santiago, Ediciones Ercilla: 1940) 72.
[19] Diario de Sesiones del Senado, "Sesion 19a., En 8 de Noviembre de 1966," 1318.

its thesis of absolute equality."[20] It is exactly such an outcome, in part, that Frei hoped to prevent through his "Revolution in Liberty's" communitarianism. Some Christian Democrats believed strongly that private property should be used for the enrichment of the community, rather than just for the enrichment of the individual owner. Communitarianism would curb the greatest evils of the capitalist system—including exploitation for personal gain—but would maintain many of its benefits. To the PDC, a free press, with all ideologies on the political spectrum represented, would strengthen democracy rather than weaken or destabilize it as the Right argued.

PDC leaders believed restrictions on freedom of the press would disproportionally silence voices representing the working class, further fanning the flames of class conflict and social discord. In fact, Jorge Alessandri's government appeared to have done just that between 1958 and 1964, bringing more than seventy cases against journalists, of which thirty resulted in either fines or prison sentences. Those targeted for sanctions were primarily on the Left.[21] Jorge Alessandri had used the law to limit "the popular press, newspapers that are not compromised by monopolies, by imperialism, by ruling classes, they denounce social inequalities and point the way to the conquests of working-class rights," or so PDC representatives charged.[22] In the January 1964 debate surrounding the Abuses of Publication Law, Deputy Alberto Jerez repeatedly questioned whether the law was truly about morality. He stated that every press organization in Chile, including those

[20] Frei*, La política y el espíritu,* 183.
[21] Ben G. Burnett*, Political Groups in Chile: The Dialogue between Order and Change*, (Austin, University of Texas Press: 2015) 39.
[22] Diario de Sesiones del Senado, "Sesión 07, En 15 de Junio de 1966," 2871.

with religious affiliations "have opposed the enactment of this law."[23] He further pushed the subject by pointing out that he had never known Julio Durán Neumann, the Radical Party's presidential candidate in 1964, to be concerned with public morality; suddenly, however, Durán "demonstrated a huge interest in this problem and he expressed his overwhelming desire and absolute need for legislating a way to suppress abuse and pornography, saying that he viewed *Bim Bam Bum* that exhibited in kiosks portraits of dancers as a scandal."[24] (*Bim Bam Bum*, a burlesque magazine, published photos of beautiful dancers, with the famous nightclub of the same name constituting a popular entertainment locale for the middle class.) Instead, Jerez believed the morality issue was a straw man. PDC members like Jerez believed the legal "project is not to moralize, as it has been said, but to gag and to paralyze the press to remove it as an element for criticism and for judgment of the government and those who govern."[25]

In 1965, Frei granted "amnesty to all journalists who [were] currently on trial or [had] been convicted for violations of Law No. 15,576, of 11 June 1964."[26] The following year he instructed his Minister of Justice, Pedro Jesús Rodríguez González, to start the process of amending the Abuses of Publication Law, and Congress took up the task in 1966. Rodríguez laid out the problems with the current press law, and his directions to the Senate provide a window into the PDC's attitudes toward the press. Under the "Gag Law," punishments often resulted in incarceration for a short period of

---

[23] Ibid., 2982.
[24] Ibid., 2984.
[25] Ibid., 2871.
[26] Ministerio de Justicia, "Ley 16239," https://www.leychile.cl/Navegar?idNorma=28348&idVersion=1965-03-30 (accessed on 6/20/16).

time, but, according to Rodríguez, did not encourage more responsible journalism. Furthermore, the minister argued, "the poor conditions" of Chile's prison system should also be a factor in revising punishments. Moreover, Christian Democrats recognized journalism had changed since 1925 and the law did need to be updated, but did not believe Jorge Alessandri's law provided the answer.

Rodríguez correctly argued the new reality was such that behind journalistic organs stood large corporations, political parties, and commercial businesses. In 1965, much of Santiago's news media, for instance, was divided between the powerful Edwards family, which owned *El Mercurio,* and the Copesa group, which published *La Tercera*. The two groups accounted for well over half of all newspaper subscriptions. *El Mercurio* and *La Tercera* had a combined weekday circulation of 330,000 and a weekend circulation of 355,000. The next largest independent paper at the time, the conservative *El Diario Ilustrado,* could only boast 55,000 on weekdays and 64,000 on Sunday.[27] A year later in 1966, that advantage had only increased as weekday circulation for *La Tercera* and *El Mercurio* reached 350,000 and 470,000 on the weekend, while *El Diario Ilustrado's* subscriptions remained stable.[28] Thus, the PDC posited that imprisoning individual journalists who were part of broader organizations would be an insufficient deterrent to those above them. Rather, it would be more effective to fine the organizations or owners of media outlets.[29]

---

[27] *Editor and Publisher: International Yearbook,* (New York: Editor and Publisher Co., 1965).
[28] *Editor and Publisher: International Yearbook*, (New York: Editor and Publisher Co., 1966).
[29] Diario de Sesiones del Senado, "Sesión 07, En 15 de Junio de 1966," 704-706.

The PDC also believed the section of the law on the publication of false news, sensationalism, and defamation was too absolute. Room had to be left within the legal structure for journalists to speculate about events in order to provide faster coverage of the issues. Minister Rodríguez recommended that both the extent of any exaggeration and the intent of the publication be considered when determining illegality. Punishments, then, should only be administered if the journalist purposely sought to spread information that was objectively false and knowingly did so to cause harm.[30]

National Party politician Francisco Bulnes, known for his bombastic mannerisms in the Senate, offered a right-wing critique of the government's proposals. "I support amending the press law because maybe Alessandri's law was too broad in some areas, but on the whole I think this law is better than many laws that we have and I wish we would discuss some of the other ones, as this is a waste of time," he explained.[31] Furthermore, Bulnes said the proposed law would, "create a strange system whereby the author of an offending piece would never be punished."[32] He believed that if only the owners of a newspaper were punished, "the ownership would allow this sort of journalism as it may create a monetary windfall greater than the cost of the fine."[33] He also did not believe there was merit in redefining "spreading false news" because any journalist could argue that all information published was believed to be true and no harm was intended, therefore, no one would be punished for this act. The PDC's proposal, Bulnes believed,

[30]Diario de Sesiones del Senado "Sesión 07, En 15 de Junio de 1966," 704-706.
[31] Ibid., 712.
[32] Ibid., 713.
[33] Ibid.

amounted to a "free pass" [*chipe libre*] for journalists.[34] He argued that the so-called "Gag Law" had not resulted in mass censorship of the press and that it seemed to only be a problem for the leftist *Clarín*.[35] Bulnes's attack of *Clarín* was tantamount to attacking the views of a large segment of the population that Frei's "Revolution in Liberty" sought to incorporate more fully. In fact, the PDC had been working hard to sway *Clarín*'s support, or at least mitigate its opposition. Despite being counseled by the United States government not to loan money to *Clarín*, the State Bank loaned the daily money to purchase new printing presses from West Germany, for instance.[36]

In July 1967, Congress voted to pass modifications to Jorge Alessandri's Abuses of Publication Law. The changes more clearly defined what constituted a crime, and made penalties for crimes less onerous on individual journalists.[37] At a time when Frei's "Revolution in Liberty" faced criticism from both the Left and the Right, his government managed to amend the Abuses of Publication Law to promote greater freedom of the press. The PDC's modifications to the Abuses of Publication Law are an oft overlooked piece of his "Revolution in Liberty," but served as a critical lynchpin in creating a more inclusive democratic society. Frei further hoped to create a more level playing field by giving the executive branch the ability to control government advertising, and allocate and set the price for newsprint.[38] Frei's government was particularly concerned with the unfair allocation of newsprint, especially given that Jorge Alessandri owned the largest

---

[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid., 712.
[36] Ibid., 714.
[37] Ministerio de Justicia, "Ley 16636," http://bcn.cl/1wtab (accessed on 6/15/16).
[38] "Informational and Communist Cultural Developments under President Allende." National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), Record Group 306 (RG 306), United States Information Agency, Research Reports, 1960-1999, Box 36.

manufacturer of newsprint, Compañía Manufacturera de Papeles y Cartones, better known as La Papelera. Thus, the new law's first article prohibited private industry from discriminating arbitrarily against any media outlet with regards to the sale of paper.[39]

The PDC suffered setbacks and disappointments as the 1970 elections approached. Even though he passed the Agrarian Reform Law in 1967, Frei was not able to accomplish land reform to the extent that he had promised in his campaign. In May 1969, a youth movement within his party broke away and formed its own party (the Popular Unitary Action Movement, or MAPU), as it believed the PDC was too close to the United States and that more radical reform was necessary. MAPU then joined Socialist Salvador Allende's coalition Popular Unity. Meanwhile, the PDC nominated Radomiro Tomic Romero as their candidate for the elections. Tomic believed he could be the candidate to unite the Left and the Center and often took political positions to the left of Allende. National Party founder Sergio Onofre Jarpa Reyes aptly described the problem with Tomic: "Tomic was so brilliant, so intelligent, but so…how do you say? Insubstantial."[40] Tomic's positions alienated possible rightist supporters, did not win over followers of Allende, and alienated many of his fellow PDC members, especially the more conservative ones aligned with Frei. He placed third amongst the three candidates, behind Salvador Allende and Jorge Alessandri, despite receiving the support of the leftist daily *Clarín*. After he lost, Tomic threw his support behind Allende.

When it became clear, barring political maneuvering that bordered on the illegal, Allende would take office as the next president, the PDC took some important steps to

[39] Ministerio de Justicia, "Ley 16636."
[40] Sergio Onofre Jarpa Reyes, Interviewed by Patricia Arancibia and Isabel de la Meza, March 29, 2000.

ensure that democracy continued in Chile. Since Allende had won only a plurality of the vote, it fell to congress to confirm him. The PDC met and discussed two possible proposals to accomplish their goals. The first, proposed by former Minister of the Interior under Frei, Edmundo Peréz Zujovic, called for a policy of governing with Allende. In his plan, the PDC would vote in favor of confirming him if he named a certain number of Christian Democrats to his cabinet. Peréz Zujovic's plan never made it to a party wide vote. Instead, Christian Democracy voted to require Allende to sign a statute of constitutional guarantees to earn confirmation in the PDC-controlled congress. By signing the document, Allende promised that his UP coalition would not violate the Constitution of 1925 and, more importantly, that he would respect the constitutional reforms passed on October 22, 1970 to strengthen press freedoms, among other things. Furthermore, it explicitly sought to continue the freedom of the press that Frei had fought to create with statute 1b of the constitutional guarantees which read, "No journalist may be persecuted for reports that they deliver or ideas that they profess. All political parties, philosophical creeds, and religions shall have the right to their own mass media."[41] To further strengthen their position within the press, the PDC also purchased the popular newsmagazine *Ercilla*, in addition to founding an official party organ, *La Prensa*. The PDC also moved to purchase Radio Balmaceda and Radio Cooperativa, in addition to the party's official station Radio Santiago.

Freedom of the press was critical to Frei's conception of democracy. Frei and the Christian Democrats worked to create a democratic system that embraced all positions on

[41] Luis Hernandez Parker, "El Estatuo de Garantías," *Ercilla,* no. 1834, September 16, 1970, 9.

the ideological spectrum. As part of the "Revolution in Liberty," they modified the Abuses of Publication Law to create a freer press. The government also moved to protect press outlets by ensuring those with political bias in the private sector could not unfairly discriminate against any of them. Frei's government consolidated the power to allocate government advertising, set the price for newsprint, and control allocation of newsprint within the executive. Additionally, when a Socialist candidate won the presidency in 1970, the PDC moved to safeguard the future freedom of the press through the statute of constitutional guarantees. Indeed, Christian Democracy's understanding of freedom of the press differed radically from Popular Unity's interpretation.

The Chilean Road to Socialism and Freedom of the Press

Salvador Allende and the UP coalition of left-wing parties viewed press freedom not in terms of the absence of restrictions, but rather in terms of the overall representation of the working class within all media. The UP believed freedom of the press could only be obtained under a socialist system. A truly free press, as the UP envisioned it, would be worker-owned and would not include the Center or Right, because under the equality of a socialist system the classes those parties represented would no longer be present. The Left looked at the media landscape and saw *El Mercurio's* dominance in terms of sales and support for right-wing positions, including support for the "Gag Law"; Jorge Alessandri's ownership of the largest manufacturer of newsprint; Christian Democratic ownership of Editorial Zig-Zag; the Christian Democrat members' purchase of media outlets; and the PDC's courting of *Clarín* through bank loans. While their own publications, Communist daily *El Siglo* and Socialist daily *Las Noticias de Última Hora*

struggled to sell copies and remain economically viable. The Left believed it did not have the resources to control the number of successful media outlets needed for true freedom of the press, and it never would unless a socialist government was installed.

Initially, UP worked to rectify the situation within the bounds of the statute of constitutional guarantees by modeling their actions on the PDC's successes in gaining control of the media, but at an accelerated pace. Within three years, the UP nationalized Editorial Zig-Zag, founded magazines to reach a broader audience, wielded government advertising to make *El Siglo* and *Las Noticias de Última Hora* profitable endeavors, and sought to take paper production completely out of private hands through a campaign to nationalize La Papelera. Allende also orchestrated the purchase of the tabloid *Clarín* to ensure its ownership treated him favorably. UP lacked the time and resources of the PDC, which forced it to push the PDC's model further faster. Members of UP were not generally independently wealthy enough to purchase media outlets, forcing them to rely on government mechanisms and funding, rather than private investment as the PDC had done. The use of government mechanisms put a time limit on their plans. If they lost the presidency in 1976, they would likely lose control of all media outlets they acquired. The election created an imperative to win in 1976, and/or to transition the country to socialism before that date.

Chile's Left had harbored suspicions about the projects to remake press laws from their inceptions. Socialist senators had repeatedly referred to Jorge Alessandri's law as "monstrous." Furthermore, though Frei and the PDC seemed to be trying to rectify some of the worst aspects of the ""Gag Law"," they could not achieve freedom of the press in a

way that would satisfy many on the Left. In 1966, Socialist Party leader Raúl Ampuero Díaz, when summing up his party's position on the PDC's modifications to the Abuses of Publication Law, explained, "All the apparent struggle waged in recent months for the defense of a hypothetical freedom of the press and expression, pretended by the Christian Democratic government is a crude farce for those who have no real access to the media. Freedom of the press and expression is a fiction within bourgeois society. It only favors the giant economic and financial consortia who hold power and wealth."[42] For Ampuero and others on the Left, freedom of the press did not exist in a capitalist society. The media would represent the moneyed interests before it would represent those of the working class. He acknowledged that perhaps some progress had been made, but the interests of the masses would always be at an economic disadvantage under a capitalist system. "Surely no one is prohibited from establishing a newspaper or a radio station, but it is also true that in order to do so you have to have one or two million pesos. What man of the Left or workers' syndicate would be able to finance sums of this order?" he argued. [43] Ampuero estimated that Christian Democrats and the Right combined associated magazines weekly reached a readership of 1,860,000 as of 1966. Daily newspapers of the same group reached 2,465,200 and included *La Tercera*, *El Mercurio*, and *La Nación* among others. On the other hand, the two leftist dailies, *El Siglo* and *Las Noticias de Última Hora,* together had a readership of 55,000 and the Left's magazines reached only 15,000 weekly. Ampuero did not include *Clarín* amongst leftist publications, as it was

[42]Diario de Sesiones del Senado "Sesion 19a., En 8 de Noviembre de 1966," 1315.
[43] Ibid.

independent and seemed to be supporting Eduardo Frei, but estimated its daily circulation at 85,000. [44]

A major aspect of the problem was the cost to start and run a publication. If "a man of the left or workers' syndicate" could raise the money to start a publication, under a capitalist system dominated by the PDC and the Right, that publication would surely face an uphill battle to remain economically viable, Ampuero noted. There were no magazines or papers that survived based on sales alone. Viability depended on advertising revenue. The most successful example is *El Mercurio*, which received as much as 69 percent of all advertisements in the Chilean press during the latter 1960s.[45] What is more, the Chilean government was the single largest advertiser in the press during the 1960s and 70s. Under Frei, the PDC controlled allocation of government advertising and generally did not distribute it to leftist publications. Other major advertisers were business interests, which due to their capitalist nature generally shied away from advertising in the leftist press.[46]Additionally, publication quality for leftist media was much lower than that of the Center and Right, as they did not have access to high quality printing like that of the PDC member-owned Zig-Zag. When Allende won the presidency in 1970, the left-wing press was on the verge of economic collapse.

UP argued, Inequity within the press in favor of the PDC and Right produced a dangerous environment. According to Allende, "Propaganda had reached a level so intelligent that it could, through psychological pressure, through implacable tenacity,

---

[44] Ibid, 1320.
[45] "Informational and Communist Cultural Developments under President Allende."
[46] Ibid.

deform the truth and hide it absolutely."[47] He believed the PDC and the Right were "intentionally closing the information highway, to accentuate the wall that prevented popular movements from achieving power through the ballot box."[48] Allende and UP did not see the PDC's attempts to reach out to the Left and create a more inclusive press law as an effort to expand liberty. Instead, they viewed it as an attempt to expose the working class to the exploitative propaganda of the capitalist classes. In 1966, Allende pointed to the insidious nature of the PDC's press policies, arguing that "slowly and with deliberate attitude, the Christian Democrats, smarter, bolder and less modest, have tried to get the almost absolute monopoly over all sources of information."[49] The trend that Allende identified continued in the late- sixties and early seventies. As mentioned earlier, in 1969, the PDC purchased the magazine *Ercilla* and founded the daily *La Prensa* in 1970. During Allende's presidency, they also bought Radio Balmaceda and Radio Cooperativa, from right-wing interests looking to sell, because they feared Allende would nationalize the radio stations. In 1973, Radio Balmaceda and Radio Cooperativa were the two largest radio networks in Chile, broadcasting over twenty stations between them.

When Allende won the presidency, and signed the statute of constitutional guarantees put forward by the PDC, UP modified its planned approach to freedom of the press. It had initially planned to force the creation of workers' cooperatives at major publications. Instead, UP modeled its approach after arguably the most successful example in the last decade, a group Ampuero delighted in calling the *nouveau riche*: the

[47] Diario de Sesiones del Senado "Sesion 19a., En 8 de Noviembre de 1966," 1332.
[48] Ibid., 1333.
[49] Ibid.

Christian Democrats. However, despite being in control of the executive branch, the parties of UP did not control the legislative or judicial branches of the government and still lacked the economic power of the PDC or Right. Instead, the Allende government relied on a seldom-used law that allowed it to nationalize any business vital to the economy that did not meet rigid production standards. Furthermore, through the state's Production Development Corporation (CORFO), the Allende government could invest money to buy shares in important industries to promote economic growth. In practice, UP could use CORFO to buy controlling interest in anything from paper companies to Chile Films. Allende also benefited from the advertisement and paper distribution controls set up by Frei. Overall, whereas the PDC worked slowly over the course of two decades to gain their interests in the press, UP's use of mechanisms like CORFO allowed it to move quickly and aggressively, causing alarm and opposition from the Center and Right. Events involving Zig-Zag were particularly revealing.

Upon Allende's election, workers at Zig-Zag began to agitate for better wages. The UP government mediated the dispute and created for Zig-Zag's ownership a situation where they could not possibly pay the workers and continue to make a profit. With the company sinking, the UP government nationalized Zig-Zag in February 1971, creating the Quimantú National Publishing Company. UP used Quimantú to effect cultural change in support of Marxist-Leninist ideas and Allende's "Chilean road to socialism". UP had two goals for Quimantú: first, to make literature accessible to all Chileans by lowering production and selling costs; and second, to make of that literature an emancipatory element of revolutionary consciousness. Until the coup in 1973, Quimantú published over

twelve million copies of 258 different titles.[50] As part of its project, the UP published six left-wing magazines, including the magazine *Onda*, making the magazines more appealing by greatly increasing print quality and keeping newsstand prices low. No longer were the Left's magazines so poorly printed that it was difficult to tell the difference between pictures of women in bikinis and pictures of "the lumpy national dish called the empanada" as one U.S. diplomat had described.[51] Quimantú also provided UP with a method to reach out to youth through a collection of children's stories in a series called CUNCUNA, which focused on stories representative of Marxist values.[52] Moreover, Quimantú created the series "*Nosotros los chilenos*" ("We, the Chileans") in an attempt to redefine culturally what it meant to be Chilean.[53] "*Nosotros los chilenos*" focused on the concept of "the people" [*el pueblo*] as critical to the nation and included works written by authors strongly influenced by Marxist ideology. The sheer volume of all the UP's publications necessitated the creation of a completely new distribution system that included bookmobiles and new kiosks.[54]

Quimantú attracted young leftist intellectuals who wished to be involved in Allende's revolution. One was Arturo Navarro Ceardi. Navarro had always been interested in literature, but his skills made him better suited for journalism and sociology.

---

[50] Roberto Coreaga C, "Omar Saavedra: "La Gran Ciudad es una novela mayor del exilio chileno," http://www.latercera.com/noticia/cultura/2014/08/1453-589894-9-omar-saavedra-la-gran-ciudad-es-una-novela-mayor-del-exilio-chileno.shtml, (accessed on 7/12/16).
[51] "Informational and Communist Cultural Developments under President Allende."
[52] The CUNCUNA collection contained classic and new Chilean children's stories, which typically took place in the Chilean countryside and featured animals as their main characters.
[53] Juan Cristóbal Marinello, "Quién es Chile: la visión de lo nacional en la colección "Nosotros los chilenos" de la Editora Nacional Quimantú," in Seminario Simon Collier 2007, ed. Ana Maria Cruz Valdivieso (Santiago, Chile: LOM Ediciones, 2008), 10.
[54] Ibid., 14.

He went to college at the Pontifical Catholic University in pursuit of a sociology degree, given the climate of social change in the country in the latter 1960s. Midway through his sociology degree, he decided to also study journalism. As a student, Navarro had supported the presidential campaign of Salvador Allende. When Allende won, Navarro left the university to join the MAPU and remained a member until it split, at which point he followed Jaime Gazmuri Mujica into the new MAPU *Obrero y Campesino* (MAPU OC). Quimantú provided Navarro with his first journalistic experience, and, as a young leftist, he believed Quimantú was perfect for him. "It was important to collaborate in the process that Allende began. I settled on Quimantú as a place where my militancy could combine with my professional interests," Navarro recalled. [55]

At Quimantú, Navarro helped found CUNCUNA, a set of works meant to introduce Marxist-Leninist values to children in order to prepare the next generation of revolutionaries. In addition, he participated in Quimantú's internal governance and operation as part of production committees and as a member of the union, while remaining an active member of the MAPU/MAPU OC. "It was an intense life of work, activism, participation, I felt part of the process," he said.[56] However, frustration crept in, as political and ideology debates within UP often held up the publishing process. As a result, he left Quimantú in 1973—prior to the coup—and returned to his studies in journalism and sociology.

A publishing project of the magnitude of Quimantú required a large amount of paper. Allende, already had significant control of paper production. The Ministry of the

[55] Arturo Navarro Ceardi, Correspondence with Author, June 18, 2014.
[56] Ibid.

Economy had the power to both set the price for paper and control its distribution. Until 1970, the government had always authorized a small increase to the price of paper to coincide with the consumer price index. Beginning almost immediately in November 1970, the UP government froze the price of paper at an artificially low level. The prices forced the country's largest independent manufacturer of newsprint, Compañía Manufacturera de Papeles y Cartones, to operate at a loss. By October 1971, the company had consumed most of its available capital.[57] The Chilean state already had controlling interest in most paper production through CORFO by 1971. Only La Papelera remained in private hands, owned by former president Jorge Alessandri. Throughout the three years UP held power, they launched three separate legislative initiatives to take control of the powerful company. In 1971, UP proposed creating a National Institute of Paper to create a government monopoly over newsprint. In 1972, Popular Unity proposed reforms to the constitution that would make the production and sale of newsprint a right reserved only for the state. Finally, in 1973, the government decided that La Papelera should just be nationalized as a vital component of the economy.[58] All three initiatives met staunch opposition in Congress, and failed.

Socialist Deputy Mario Palestro explained Popular Unity's motivation for seeking control of La Papelera. According to Palestro, the UP needed to monopolize paper because, "a monopoly has existed for many years in the country." UP believed Jorge Alessandri controlled the production of paper and funneled it away from leftist publications, and Palestro argued UP's control would be different because they would not

[57] "70 Años de Historia de la Papelera," *Ingenieros*, July, 1991, 13.
[58] Camara de Diputados Legislatura Extraordinaria, "Sesion 7a, en Martes 11 de Abril de 1972," 376.

ration paper based on political ideology "like the monopoly directed by the clan of Mr. Alessandri."[59] Óscar Guillermo Garretón, Sub-secretary of the Economy under Allende, argued UP wanted to nationalize La Papelera because "paper was vital to the economy." He continued, "there was never any talk of withholding paper from the opposition in our meetings."[60] The UP could not convince Congress of its benevolent intentions and the majority of the body remained opposed to UP's plans to control paper. This opposition was based on fear that UP would follow historical examples of governmental monopolization of paper, use it to favor allies, and deprive opponents of publishing resources. It had happened under Perón in Argentina and in Czechoslovakia in 1948, as President of the Senate and PDC figure Patricio Aylwin Azócar argued.[61]

In the face of implacable legislative resistance, Popular Unity adopted a different approach. Since La Papelera had been operating at a loss throughout Allende's presidency, the values of its shares dropped. UP decided to use CORFO to begin purchasing shares in the paper company to gain a controlling interest. However, a campaign by the PDC and the Right, in opposition to CORFO's action, sought to convince stockholders not to sell their shares to the government. They used the slogan, "La Papelera NO!" In response to the opposition's campaign, UP planned and launched its own public-relations campaign to educate people on why state control of La Papelera was necessary.[62] UP's propaganda plan called for a two-pronged approach: the first,

---

[59] Ibid., 377.
[60] Óscar Guillermo Garretón Purcel, Interviewed by Author, 11/3/2014.
[61] Diario de Sesiones del Senado, "Sesion 3a, en 6 de Octubre de 1972," 322.
[62] "Publicidad Relacionada con area de Propeidad Social y Poderes Compradores Acciones," Archivo Nacional de la Administración, CORFO, Correlativo Oficios, Enero, 1973, V. 6550.

called “Vanguard,” was responsible for spreading the message through television and movies; the second, dubbed “Territory,” entailed printed media and radio. The plan had an initial operating budget of approximately 5,013,975.00 Chilean escudos (~$71,600.00 USD). At the same time, CORFO spent two million escudos (~$28,500.00 USD) on a similar campaign.[63] If given more time or resources, and had public opinion moved in UP’s favor, it would have nationalized the paper company, despite resistance in Congress.

UP did not succeed in nationalizing the La Papelera, but its efforts to gain control of paper production were similar to those carried out by Frei and the PDC. Frei had passed laws to provide the government with indirect control of paper production through setting prices and controlling its distribution. Allende and UP believed that was not enough to guarantee the Left would not suffer at the hands of businessmen. Ultimately, Allende’s government would have had to force the issue and nationalize the paper company without the support of Congress, but time ran out upon the military coup of September 1973.

Like Frei before him, Allende wielded government advertising as a powerful tool to shape the media landscape. At the time, the government was the single largest advertiser. *El Mercurio*, as the paper with the largest circulation, could guarantee the greatest circulation for government advertising and private industry. As stated earlier, at its height under the PDC, *El Mercurio* earned 69 percent of all advertising revenue in the country. Smaller readerships, combined with ideological differences within UP, had

[63] Ibid.

prevented *El Siglo* and *Las Noticias de la Última Hora* from gaining either significant government advertising or private advertisements. To tip the scale in favor of publications that supported its goals, UP withdrew government advertising from *El Mercurio* and other publications—symbols of the capitalist news media—and instead advertised in *Las Noticias de la Última Hora*. Without government advertising, *El Mercurio's* total percentage of ad revenue dropped by nearly half in the first year of Allende's presidency.[64] Without government classifieds as a draw, *El Mercurio* suffered a decline in readership throughout Allende's presidency, with a decline in daily circulation estimated at forty thousand in 1971.[65] It would continue to lose readership and advertising revenue as foreign companies withdrew from Chile for fear of the Marxist government. As *El Mercurio* declined in terms of ads and readers, *Las Noticias de la Última Hora* saw rapid expansion, climbing from a circulation of 35,000 in 1967 to 85,000 in 1970, and finally hitting its peak at 180,000 in 1973.[66] By 1972, *Las Noticias de la Última Hora* boasted a larger daily circulation than the venerable *El Mercurio*. The loss of advertising and readership caused *El Mercurio* great economic hardship. However, the paper survived, in part, because of its status as an established institution and, to an extent, due to the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency's delivery of $1.5 million worth of aid to *El Mercurio* between 1971 and 1973.[67] The U.S. government believed it

---

[64] "Informational and Communist Cultural Developments under President Allende."
[65] Ibid.
[66] *Editor and Publisher: International Yearbook*, (New York: Editor and Publisher Co., 1967). *; Editor and Publisher: International Yearbook*, (New York: Editor and Publisher Co., 1970). ; *Editor and Publisher: International Yearbook*, (New York: Editor and Publisher Co., 1973).
[67] Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, "Church Report: Covert Action in Chile 1963-1973," December 18, 1975, http://foia.state.gov/Reports/ChurchReport.asp (accessed February 8, 2010).

was important to keep strong opposition political voices afloat and that UP's tactics had cowed much of the rest of Chile's press by the end of its first year in power. *La Tercera*, for instance, reportedly dropped all opposition to Allende for fear of losing government advertising revenue.[68]

Allende also focused his attentions on the popular leftist tabloid *Clarín*. Frei's government has courted a loose alliance with the newspaper by approving a loan so that it could purchase new printing presses. While the relationships the PDC formed with *Clarín*'s ownership contributed to favorable coverage of Tomic in the election of 1970, Allende and *Clarín*'s owner Dario Sainte-Marie had a complicated relationship. The two men were close, but, given Sainte-Marie's history of shifting political allegiances, Allende feared that *Clarín* would turn against him. Allende pressured Sainte-Marie into selling *Clarín* to Víctor Pey Casado, a wealthy UP supporter and friend who liquidated his construction businesses to purchase the daily. Thus, the UP tied *Clarín* more closely to its interests, and ultimately connected it directly to Allende.

Despite complaints to the contrary by both the Center and the Right, the UP did not exert significant control or censorship power over the press. It operated within the bounds of the Constitution of 1925. The Right maintained a strong public presence and criticism of Allende during the UP government, by way of *La Segunda*, *La Tribuna*, *Que Pasa*, and *El Mercurio,* among other outlets. These newspapers and magazines often printed inflammatory stories in an attempt to create fear in the populace that the UP government was destroying Chile. The respectable *El Mercurio* mentioned UP attacks on

[68] "Informational and Communist Cultural Developments under President Allende."

democracy 355 times during the parliamentary campaign of 1973.[69] *La Tribuna,* a far-right tabloid run by the National Party, carried out numerous attacks against both the government and Allende but remained open and publishing throughout Allende's presidency. Furthermore, the PDC continued to expand its presence in the press throughout the Allende's years. *La Prensa*, for example, steadily increased in readership between 1970 and 1973. The PDC also maintained the majority in congress throughout this period and used its press outlets to push their views of Allende and the UP.

Frei believed Allende was not prepared to be president and knew nothing about how the world worked or about how the country was governed. As one PDC ally put it, Frei believed, "[Allende's] ignorance was beyond everybody's imagination."[70] Despite the Left's efforts to gain control of the press, all left-wing newspapers combined held only a quarter of the market in 1973.[71] Additionally, the climate of crisis stoked by the opposition press under Allende led the CIA to conclude that propaganda in *El Mercurio* and other newspapers and magazines "played a significant role in setting the stage for the military coup of September 11, 1973."[72] The crisis and opposition in Congress had reached a point where Allende believed the only option was to call a plebiscite to dissolve congress. According to Garréton, Allende planned to announce this plebiscite on September 11, 1973.[73]

---

[69] Claudio Durán and Arnold Rockman, "Análisis Psico-Histórico de la Propaganda de Agitación del Diaro El Mercurio en Chile 1972-1973," in *Investigacion sobre la Prensa en Chile (1974-1984),* ed. Fernando Reyes Matta et al. (Santiago: Badal ltda., 1986), 31.
[70] Edmundo Perez Yoma, interview by author, 10/27/14.
[71] Sebastian Brett, *The Limits of Tolerance: Freedom of Expression and the Public Debate in Chile* (New York: Human Rights Watch, 1998), 22.
[72] "Church Report: Covert Action in Chile 1963-1973"
[73] Óscar Guillermo Garretón

The UP modeled its press policies after those of the most successful political party of the 1960s: the Christian Democrats. UP benefited greatly from constitutional changes made by Frei's administration to strengthen the role of the executive in the enforcement of press-related laws. Despite gaining control of Editorial Zig-Zag and *Clarín*, while also using advertising and price fixing to weaken the opposition, the UP was unable to establish a press foothold similar to the PDC. Its failure can be explained by UP's conception of freedom of the press. Allende and the UP believed a press was not truly free unless it operated in a socialist system. It would not have been possible to liberate the press—in the way Allende and the UP intended—under the Constitution of 1925, which reflected the values of a capitalist political economy. Simply put, Allende would not have been able to realize his conception of press freedom while adhering to the statute of constitutional guarantees. In the end, the military coup made this a moot point.

The End of the Era of Mass Politics and Press Freedom

The military coup of September 11, 1973 abruptly and violently put an end to the era of mass politics. The military sought to regain control of an increasingly polarized society. To do so, it embarked upon a project of political and constitutional reform. The regime planned to end the political polarization of the era of mass politics by restricting civilian participation in the political processes of the state. An important aspect of the regime's plan was to end press freedoms. As a member of Allende's cabinet, Pinochet had direct experience with the press' power to destabilize a government. The military government's press policies had two foci: to ensure political stability in the face of internal enemies and to protect Chilean moral values that were in crisis. Between 1973

and 1976, the right-wing ideology of Jorge Alessandri's supporters and Gremialist leader Jaime Guzman Errázuriz shaped the way General Augusto Pinochet dealt with the press.

Political participation had steadily increased in Chile from 1925 until the military coup in 1973. In the 1973 parliamentary elections, 63.23 percent of eligible voters participated, whereas only 13.15 percent of eligible voters participated in the 1945 parliamentary elections.[74] Both the increase in political parties of the Left and diverse political publications accompanied this increase. During the twentieth century, the growth of the Chilean middle class, the expansion of literacy, and increasingly organized groups of laborers led to a proliferation of newspapers and presses representing the political Left and Center. Newspapers like the leftist *El Despertar* and the centrist *La Ley* became popular as the middle class took over the profession of journalism.[75] Likewise, the rise of mass politics created a large number of parties representing the spectrum of political sensibilities. Although *El Mercurio* continued to be the most widely read and respected example of Chilean journalism, the involvement of political parties from disparate social groups in the Chilean press ensured its heterogeneous nature. Every political party was either directly or ideologically linked to a news outlet. By the middle of the twentieth century, moreover, political parties played a large role in the daily life of Chileans. They were important to one's identity; leftist attended their own beaches and vacation spots whereas rightist attended different beaches and vacation spots.[76]

---

[74] The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, "Voter Turnout Data for Chile," http://www.idea.int/vt/countryview.cfm?id=45 (accessed on 8/14/2016).
[75] For more information about the expansion of literacy to the middle and lower classes see: Patrick Barr-Melej, Reforming Chile: Cultural Politics, Nationalism, and the Rise of the Middle Class, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001)
[76] Constable and Valenzuela, A Nation of Enemies, 21.

The military regime embraced the right-wing critique of Chilean democracy—put forth by Jaime Guzman and others—that the political crisis of the Allende years had been a result of societal polarization and "*politiquería*" ("politicking"). This word was used by Chileans for political manipulation that went against the will of the majority and the tendency of politicians to talk much, but accomplish little. Pinochet began to work these themes into his speeches as early as October 1973, while he consolidated his hold on the military government. Pinochet argued that only the military could reestablish order, and an important part of such order involved restricting participation in politics. To accomplish this, the military needed to reign in the highly politicized press.

The military's initial moves to gain control of the press evince the importance it placed on the power of the media to shape public opinion. Its initial measures would form the basis for interactions between journalists and the government for the rest of the dictatorship. On September 11, 1973, the armed forces issued two major edicts to control the press. The first, Edict 11, focused on restricting leftist media and clarified what the State of Siege meant for the press. It stipulated that only two newspapers, *El Mercurio* and *La Tercera*, would be allowed to publish the following day, but promised to slowly authorize other publications. It also established the Office of Press Censorship and required *El Mercurio* and *La Tercera* to submit their editions prior to publication for the purposes of censorship and approval. Edict 11 also cautioned all other publishers that if they printed without permission, their publications would be requisitioned and destroyed.[77] The second, Edict 12, warned that the publication of any information not

[77] Junta de Gobierno de Las Fuerzas Armadas y Carabineros de Chile, "Bando 11," September 11, 1973, in Lidia Baltra Montaner, *Atentados a la Libertad de información y a los Medios de Comunicación en Chile*

approved by the military government would cause the military to immediately intervene in the offending company and would subject that company to criminal liability for its actions.[78] The military occupied and closed the offices of the leftist newspapers *Clarín*, *El Siglo*, and *Noticias de la Última Hora*. The armed forces and Carabineros, Chile's state police force, also raided and occupied Quimantú. On September 15, as part of Decree-Law 5, the junta made publishing subversive propaganda or attacks against the Supreme Government a crime to be tried by "Wartime Military Tribunals."[79]

The regime also occupied major radio and television stations. Within several days, the military had gained almost complete control of the media. As noted above, the nascent regime allowed *El Mercurio* and *La Tercera* to publish (with prior censorship), believing (correctly) that the two papers would cover the coup favorably. Through those outlets, the military made it appear as though civil war was a real danger, thus building an even greater case for continued military intervention. In the first two weeks after the coup, for instance, *El Mercurio* reported four times on weapon stashes supposedly discovered by the military. At least some of those weapons were not real, according to Chilean filmmaker Pablo de la Barra, who, at the time of the coup, had been working on a film depicting a land seizure and the corresponding police actions. On September 9, the studio had filmed the final climatic battle scene that featured between eighty and one hundred realistic, but wooden, semiautomatic machine guns. The military raided the film studio on September 13 or 14 and reported that the guns were authentic and belonged to

---

1973-1987, (Santiago de Chile: CENECA, 1988), 10.
[78] Junta de Gobierno de Las Fuerzas Armadas y Carabineros de Chile, "Bando 12," September 11, 1973, in Baltra Montaner, *Atentados a la Libertad de información*, 9.
[79] Ibid., 12.

the Movement of the Revolutionary Left.[80] Censorship of the news media would have prevented any investigation into the veracity of the regime's claims, even if *El Mercurio* were inclined to look into it.

Christian Democrats reacted to the coup with mixed emotions. Edmundo Pérez Yoma, the son of assassinated PDC leader Edmundo Pérez Zujovic, had been managing the family's fisheries business in Iquique until his father's murder by leftist radicals in 1971. At that time, he moved to Santiago and became more involved with the PDC and became president of the board at Radio Cooperativa in 1972.[81] "We were quite happy" about the coup, he recalled, "Our first reaction was one of relief. We did not know what a dictatorship was. We had no idea."[82] He remembers speaking to the Army captain in charge of occupying Radio Cooperativa. Pérez Yoma asked him how long the military would stay in power. According to Pérez Yoma, the soldier responded, "As soon as this mess is sorted out we will go back to the barracks."[83] Another Christian Democrat, Genaro Arriagada, ran Radio Balmaceda at the time of the coup. He said his reaction the coup was "at first, nothing."[84] Though a small group of PDC members wrote a letter condemning the coup on September 13, for many of its members the reality of the new situation did not sink in until the military began to exile the party's leadership.

On October 13, 1973, the military government dissolved and prohibited all political "parties, entities, groups, factions, or movements which uphold Marxist doctrine

---

[80] Pablo de la Barra, in correspondence with John Dinges, 3/5/2016.
[81] Edmundo Pérez Yoma.
[82] Ibid.
[83] Ibid.
[84] Genaro Arriagada.

or which in their aims or the behavior of their adherents are substantially in agreement with the objectives of that doctrine."[85] The Junta also ordered that all property belonging to those parties be transferred to the state. All of Chile's leftist parties fell into this category, including the Radical Party, both sects of the MAPU, the Socialist Party, and the Communist Party. Four days later, the military government declared all political parties to be in recess and all their properties would be transferred to the state. In response to being forced into recess, the PDC legally transferred all party property to individual party members. In terms of press assets, Arriagada noted, "We had accumulated a large media presence and it was our primary goal to keep it and use it."[86] The party remained active through its media outlets and it would hold local-level neighborhood meetings at least once a month. As Arriagada put it, "There was never a time when there was no PDC. Nobody believed we were disbanded."[87] Pérez Yoma, Arriagada, and other PDC members even sought to further PDC media presence after the coup, establishing the publishing house Editorial Aconcagua.

A year after the coup, Pinochet told reporters that "freedom of the press in Chile has the same amplitude and the same limitations as other aspects of national life."[88] What he meant was that it was under tight control. On top of restrictions on content, journalists, like other members of Chilean society, feared being taken captive and killed by the military. This was not unrealistic. In 1974, the government detained and disappeared

---

[85] Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation. Report of the Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation, vol. 1, 77.
[86] Genaro Arriagada
[87] Edmundo Pérez Yoma
[88] US Embassy in Santiago, "Pinochet Comments on Press Freedom," November 4, 1974. http://aad.archives.gov/aad/createpdf?rid=177142&dt=2474&dl=1345. (accessed February 8, 2011).

Diana Aron, former employee of Quimantú and the editor of the magazine *Onda*.[89] The regime killed or disappeared a total of twenty-three journalists.[90]According to the Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation, between the time of the coup on September 11 and December 31, 1973, government agents or persons working for them committed nearly 1,500 "human rights violations that led to death or disappearance."[91] Given the initial brutality of the coup, relatively few journalists lost their lives. The regime recognized the risk of targeting journalist for violent repression and feared turning even friendly media outlet against the government. It calculated controlling the press through intimidation and censorship was less risky.

As Pinochet continued to strengthen his position as head of the Junta, he removed ministers who did not support his agenda and methods. In 1974, he replaced Gonzalo Prieto Gándara as Minister of Justice with Miguel Schweitzer Speisky because Prieto had expressed concerns about the regime's human rights violations.[92] Schweitzer, a criminal justice lawyer, had served as one of two Ministers of Justice under Jorge Alessandri and had been instrumental in the writing of Jorge Alessandri's Abuses of Publication Law. Under Pinochet, Schweitzer managed a system of press censorship without regard for the liberties guaranteed by the Constitution of 1925. Pinochet also formed a "Council of State" to help guide him on institutional matters. Jorge Alessandri served on the council,

---

[89] Baltra Montaner, *Atentados de la Libertad de información,* 13.
[90] Comisión Nacional sobre Prisión Política y Tortura, *Informe Valech*, http://memoriaviva.com/Tortura/Informe_Valech.pdf , 205. (accessed February 27, 2011)
[91] Genaro Arriagada, *Por La Razón o La Fuerza: Chile Bajo Pinochet,* (Santiago de Chile: Editorial Sudamericana Chilena, 1998), 23.
[92] Huneeus, *The Pinochet Regime*, 188.

but Pinochet did not often consult with the Council or Alessandri, who complained about how unimportant the council was.[93]

Jaime Guzmán, leader of the Gremialist political movement, also became an important early collaborator with the Pinochet government. Guzmán's Gremialists became an instrumental policy-making civilian group in the Pinochet government and its first major base of political support in the civilian population. Guzmán's *Gremialismo* combined the corporatist ideas of Franco's Spain with Catholic values, rejecting political parties in favor of strong personalized leadership. Guzmán and his Gremialist movement are considered the primary architects behind the first principles of governance released by the military regime. Guzmán hoped to form a broad-based and powerful right-wing movement, and he saw support of the military regime as a means to this end. He held various advisory positions in the Pinochet government, including one as the Secretary General of the government, and upon Guzmán's advice, Pinochet elevated the Secretary General to a ministerial position and gave it broad powers to control the media. Further, the position served at the pleasure of the executive (Pinochet) only, so other junta members could not replace the Secretary General.[94]

With the guidance of Schweitzer and Guzmán, Pinochet instituted a series of laws to bring the press more fully under control of the government. Despite the regime allowing most non-leftist presses to publish again with prior censorship by the end of 1974, the press remained subject to Decree Law 5. Furthermore, under the State of Siege, the military divided Chile into twelve occupation zones, each headed by a military

---

[93] Ibid. 190.
[94] Huneuus, Carlos. The Pinochet Regime, 229.

governor. In 1975, Pinochet gave governors the power to suspend the printing and distribution of magazines, newspapers, or other publications for up to six editions or days if the information they were publishing would create alarm or disgust within the public. Later that year, Decree-Law 1009 permitted the government to persecute journalists for political reasons. It also allowed the regime to suspend editions and confiscate printing material preemptively and before trial. [95] The law was so restrictive that Fredrick Willoughby, Pinochet's press secretary, resigned his post in February 1976, explaining that Decree-Law 1009 too strongly restricted the freedom of the press and made it difficult for him to perform his duties as press secretary.[96]

The new legal reality for the press completely reshaped the media landscape. Leftist publications ceased to exist. Many on the Right threw their support behind the dictatorship and did not have to submit to prior censorship. The PDC had mixed success maintaining and using its media outlets, with the daily *La Prensa* folding in 1974 due to economic asphyxiation.[97] The magazine *Ercilla* continued to publish under PDC affiliated ownership until 1975, when it sold the magazine after receiving fines from the government for criticizing its economic program. Radio Balmaceda, occupied immediately following the coup, maintained an oppositional line to the military government. The regime forced it to close in 1975. The PDC managed to keep Radio Cooperativa open under the leadership of Pérez Yoma and Arriagada, but took a much

---

[95] Baltra Montaner, *Atentados a la Libertad de información*, 14.
[96] CIA, "Resignation of Junta Press Secretary in Regards to Restriction of Freedoms of Press," January 12, 1976, http://foia.state.gov/documents/Pcia/9d03.pdf. (accessed March 16, 2011)
[97] Baltra Montaner, *Atentados a la Libertad de información*, 13.

more cautious line with its reporting, having learned from the case of Radio Balmaceda.[98] Radio Santiago primarily broadcast music and did not have problems with the regime.

In 1974, Arriagada, Renán Fuentealba Moena, and Jaime Castillo Velasco used Editorial Aconcagua to publish *Política y Espirítu* a magazine based on Christian Democratic principles. They received permission from the regime to publish and saw small circulation figures. Initially, it was subject to prior censorship, but after the first few issues the regime allowed its publication without such vetting. In 1975, *Política y Espirítu* published a story covering an attempt on PDC member Bernardo Leighton Gúzman's life, which was part of a broader campaign—known as Operation Condor—by the military government to silence political opposition abroad. In response to the story, the regime closed *Política y Espíritu* and exiled Castillo, who traveled to the United States. For Pérez Yoma, the closure brought to him full realization of the situation in Chile. "The full idea that we were in a dictatorship and a very cruel dictatorship and doing political work was dangerous did not sink in for a long time: not until Jaime Castillo was expelled," he explained.[99]

The regime solidified its initial institutional framework to control the press in 1976 with the creation of the National Social Communication Directorate (DINACOS), which took over the responsibilities of the Office of Press Censorship. All new media outlets were required to submit requests to DINACOS in order to begin publication. The military government also required all imported books and magazines to gain DINACOS

[98] Edmundo Pérez Yoma
[99] Ibid.

approval.[100] The Secretary General of the government had direct control over DINACOS and served as the body's head. In addition to censorship for political reasons, Pinochet also charged DINACOS with maintaining morals in the media, which he believed had declined under Allende. DINACOS commissioned a study of morals in Chilean popular culture, which examined the proliferation of pornographic magazines, the salaciousness of crime reporting, live "porno-shows," the press' exaltation of poor role models for youths, and "disco" clubs that admitted minors, among many other matters. The report concluded the government needed to create a comprehensive psychological plan to force the media to represent Chile as a grand nation, "giving importance to true values that they are currently disrupting."[101]

By early 1976, Pinochet had solidified his power as head of the military junta and gained control of the press, placing primacy on maintaining political and moral order. The military coup ended the era of mass politics and restricted civilian participation in government by eliminating political parties and freedom of the press. Initially, the regime accomplished control of the press through emergency edicts, but under the guidance of Schweitzer and Guzmán, it established laws and government institutions to control the press. It accomplished its task so thoroughly that by January 1976, no concerted opposition to the regime in Chile's media existed.

The Constitution of 1925 created the conditions for the proliferation of partisan press. By late sixties and early seventies, the number of newspapers and magazines in circulation boomed along with what seemed like an ever-increasing number of political

---

[100] Baltra Montaner, *Atentados a la Libertad de información*, 14.
[101] "Acción contra la pornografía," ARNAD, Ministerio de Justicia, 1979, tomo 2, V. 28443.

parties. The expansion of the press, and the intensification of political warfare waged in and through it, led the democratically elected governments of the era to consider some limits on press freedoms. Most proposals centered on modernizing press laws to factor in radio and television or efforts to punish libel and other excesses rather than doing away with the free press altogether. It was only under Pinochet's military dictatorship that a free and pluralistic press ceased to exist. The dictatorship restricted publication to only two newspapers requiring each to submit articles for censorship prior to publication. The government also closed or took control of all leftist media outlets. In the entirety of the nation's history, no executive had ever completely shut down the press and dictated who could publish as Pinochet did in 1973.

The following chapter will examine three publications: *Clarín*, *La Tribuna*, and *Ercilla*, as well as follow the path of American journalist John Dinges. It will trace their trajectory through the era of mass politics and into the first three years of the dictatorship. *Clarín*, a tabloid with a long and twisted history of shifting political alliances, rose to prominence in the latter half the 20th century only to be occupied and closed by the military government in 1973. Conversely, the rightist tabloid *La Tribuna* took an editorial line bordering on rightwing fanaticism to criticize Allende's government. It would also close in 1973, though voluntarily to support the military dictatorship. Finally, *Ercilla* was one of Chile's oldest and most respected newsmagazines. Its staff quit in 1976 to found one of the first major opposition magazines: *Hoy*. Dinges arrived in Chile during Allende's presidency and remained after the coup. He and his friends founded the first

opposition magazine: *APSI*. Both *Hoy* and *APSI* represented a middle-class centrist opposition to the military government.

CHAPTER TWO: THE GOSPEL OF ACCURACY AND THE POWER OF TABLOID

> We subtracted 10% from all figures, because if you tell a dictator he has killed ten and he has killed ten, he feels hurt, but if you tell him he has killed eleven. He feels outraged.
>
> -José Zalaquett Daher, Human Rights Lawyer

One of the most powerful tools a journalist has is accuracy. It is through accurate reporting of events that journalists and their media outlets gain positive reputations. Facts must be verified in pursuit of objective truth. On the opposite end of the spectrum is the sensationalism often practiced by tabloids. Sensationalist journalists over emphasize certain events or aspects of a story to paint a much more biased and often more entertaining version for readers. Chile's print media and journalists often used sensationalism to draw readers during the tumultuous political period between 1960 and 1973. Despite political opposition to this sort of tactic, politicians during this period operated within Chile's democratic political culture and all attempts to control the press were at least rhetorically based in the ideas of the freedom of the press. The Constitution of 1925 had provided the legal-political landscape for the proliferation of political parties that represented diverse ideological viewpoints, and it contributed to the making of an equally diverse press that represented protagonists in a more crowded political arena. The press was at the height of its ideological diversity on September 10, 1973: among many others on the Left were the Communist paper *El Siglo*, Leftist *Clarín*, Socialist *Las Noticias de Última Hora*, the Popular Unitary Action Movement's (MAPU) *De Frente*, and *Punto Final* of the Guevarist Movement of the Revolutionary Left (MIR). The Christian Democrat's *La Prensa,* and *Ercilla* championed the Centrist position. On the Right were the venerable *El Mercurio*, *La Tercera*, the pro-National Party (PN) *La*

Tribuna, the gremialist *Qué Pasa,* and many others. The following day, the military coup completely changed the face of both the political scene and the press. On September 12, 1973, only *El Mercurio* and *La Tercera* rolled off the presses, and the emergent regime subjected the content of each paper to prior censorship, with the military enforcing strict control of the press and leaving little room for opposition to official government positions. The most repressive period lasted from 1973 to 1976, when the regime relaxed its control enough to allow for the founding of the first opposition news magazines.

This chapter examines three major publications of the Left, Center, and Right from their foundations until 1976; the end of the dictatorship's most repressive period. It will also examine the role of independent journalists who became advocates for human rights during the dictatorship. It does so to show how partisan press operated and flourished under the liberal democratic Constitution of 1925, despite various government attempts to bring the press in line with their own political viewpoints. It does so by tracing the political maneuverings of the leftist tabloid *Clarín*, the rise of the National Party's tabloid *La Tribuna*, and the evolution of *Ercilla* from a Socialist literature magazine to the centrist mouth piece of the Christian Democrat Party, praised for its fair coverage of political events. The staff at *Ercilla* would go on to play a critical role in opposition journalism under the Pinochet dictatorship, when they left the magazine to found the opposition publication *Hoy*. The owner of *La Tribuna*, Sergio Onofre Jarpa, also became an important actor under the dictatorship, when he assumed the role of Minister of the Interior. Finally, this chapter will explore the experiences of John Dinges and other journalists involved in human rights under the dictatorship, to provide context

for the rise of the opposition press. Dinges and his associates would work together to form the first opposition newsmagazine *APSI*. Throughout this chapter, a narrative line is charted through the dynamic period in Chilean history from the 1960s until 1976, which connects political, social, and biographical analysis of the press.

Political Presses under the Constitution of 1925

Seventeenth-century playwright Ben Jonson's most famous work, "Volpone," tells the tale of a rich Venetian nobleman who deceived his friends and family in an attempt to cheat them out of their most prized possessions. Volpone ("the fox") pretended he was on his deathbed and, through his servant, Mosca, offered his inheritance to three of his wealthy friends if they did something to help him regain his health. Volpone tricked one of his friends into making him the sole heir to his friend's own substantial fortune. Another, believing that Volpone's illness made the dying man impotent, offered Volpone his beautiful wife to revive the nobleman's health in order to gain the inheritance. When he fails to seduce her, he convinces the third friend to frame her for a crime, and in return he would grant the third friend his inheritance. Eventually, Volpone disguised himself and faked his death. His friends were shocked and angered to find that Volpone had not bequeath his fortune to them, but rather to his servant and partner in crime, Mosca. The fun over, Volpone wanted to quietly return to his fortune, but Mosca refused to give up his new wealth, forcing Volpone to reveal the deception in order to regain his fortune.

Almost 350 years later, Darío Sainte-Marie Soruco took on the pseudonym Volpone, based on Ben Jonson's character. He sought to represent himself as

mischievous trickster and hoped that the persona would help sell papers. Few journalists were more adept at negotiating the political climate of the 1960s and 1970s than Volpone. *Clarín* gained a large readership and tied itself to multiple political parties and candidates to curry the favor of politicians. However, its success was also its downfall, as it became a target of the Pinochet dictatorship following the 1973 coup.

Volpone, born in 1906, grew up in Valparaíso and pursued a career in law at the University of Chile, where he was active in student politics and ran for president of the Center for Law Students. However, at a rally, he was shouted down and accused of being a Bolivian, having been born in the Andean country. Embarrassed and hurt by the situation, Volpone resolved never to expose himself in such a way again.[1] After university, he became tied to dictator Carlos Ibáñez del Campo in the turbulent late-1920s, first serving as Minister of Finance and eventually becoming a trusted advisor of the military man. Following Ibáñez's short-lived government, Volpone served as director of Editorial Zig-Zag and as an editor for the Associated Press in the U.S. He also traveled widely throughout Latin America and wrote several statistical volumes on behalf of Cuba's Fulgencio Batista, the Dominican Republic's Rafael Leonidas Trujillo, and Argentina's Juan Domingo Perón.[2]

In the 1950s, Volpone returned to Chile with his friend and associate Carlos Ibáñez del Campo running for president as a populist, anti-politiquería candidate in 1952. Yet, Volpone supported the more conservative candidate Arturo Matte Larraín instead.

---

[1] Francisca Skoknic, "La vida al límite de Darío Sainte Marie, creador de Clarín," http://ciperchile.cl/2008/04/30/la-vida-al-limite-del-creador-de-clarin/, (accessed on 5/16/2016)
[2] Ibid.

Ibáñez won the presidency handily, and did not hold a grudge against his former advisor, making Volpone his chief advisor on issues of staffing and Volpone was able to convince Ibáñez to make his brother, Osvaldo Sainte-Marie, Minister of Foreign Affairs.[3] Between 1952 and 1959, Volpone amassed significant personal wealth. How exactly he became wealthy is mysterious, especially when he claimed to be broke in 1952. Many questioned the legitimacy of his wealth, and it was widely believed he participated in criminal activities.[4] In 1954, Ibáñez put him in charge of the government-owned and operated newspaper *La Nación*. Concurrently, Volpone convinced Ibáñez to allow him to create his own newspaper: *Clarín*. The two became partners in the new journalistic venture, with Ibáñez's involvement remaining a secret. The association between *La Nación* and *Clarín* was quite evident, however, as *Clarín* shared the offices of *La Nación* during Ibañez's presidency. *Clarín* initially struggled to sell copies, but Volpone committed himself to making it a success. He adopted the *nom de plume* "Volpone" and wrote scathing editorials. By the 1960s, *Clarín* sold over 150,000 copies daily.

Over the course of his administration, Ibáñez moved toward the political left in a failed attempt to emulate something akin to Peronism. In 1958, Ibáñez decided to support Socialist Salvador Allende (running as the candidate of the leftists' Popular Action Front coalition, or FRAP). Ibáñez tasked Volpone with throwing the weight of both *La Nación* and *Clarín* behind the FRAP. Personal ties also played a role in Volpone's support of Allende. While Volpone and future President Jorge Alessandri Rodríguez had both

---

[3] Ibid.
[4] Diario de Sesiones del Senado, "Sesión 17., en martes 8 de julio de 1958," http://historiapolitica.bcn.cl/historia_legislativa/visorPdf?id=10221.3/36027, (accessed on 6/12/16), 731-732.

supported Matte's candidacy in 1952, Volpone and Allende had personally known each other for more than 30 years. The conservative candidate in 1958, Alessandri, who was close with Matte, could have reasonably expected *Clarín*'s support, but Volpone, showed his willingness to approach politics flexibly, following Ibáñez's instructions he instead threw the weight of both the government newspaper *La Nación* and *Clarín* behind Allende. As part of *Clarín's* onslaught against Alessandri, it dubbed him "La Señora" and questioned his sexuality and masculinity. *Clarín's* assault began to get to Alessandri, and news outlets supporting the candidate of the Liberal and Conservative parties began to target not only Allende, but also Volpone, linking the two men to a massacre committed by Communists in Hungary.[5] Animosity escalated, resulting in an argument between the two candidates on the Senate floor just two months prior to the election. Allende argued that he could not be held accountable for *Clarín* in the same way Alessandri could not be held accountable for what appeared in *El Mercurio*, which was harshly critical of the FRAP candidate.[6]

After winning the 1958 election by a small margin, Alessandri continued to hold a grudge against Volpone and *Clarín*, forcing the publication out of the offices it shared with the government's *La Nación*. Following its ouster, *Clarín* eventually found a new home and bought antique flat-bed presses at scrap-metal prices. Angrily, the sensationalist tabloid continued its criticisms of Alessandri, labeling his government a

---

[5] "1958: De la Fuga de Kelly a la Función de fray Catapilco," *APSI Extra: Allende Candidato en Campana*, September 3, 1987, 13.
[6] Diario de Sesiones del Senado, "Sesión 17., en martes 8 de julio de 1958," http://historiapolitica.bcn.cl/historia_legislativa/visorPdf?id=10221.3/36027, (accessed on 6/12/16), 731-732.

"circus" and his ministers its "greatest clowns."[7] *Clarín* also identified itself as a main reason behind the ""Gag Law"" (or Ley Mordaza) of 1964, having published a story about Alessandri's Minister of the Justice, Enrique Ortúzar Escobar, being caught with a mistress (see Chapter 1). *Clarín*'s campaign included caricatures depicting the minister being beaten by Ortúzar's spouse, just as she had purportedly assaulted the minister when his affair became known.[8] Motivated by revenge or not, the government arrested the tabloid's director Alberto "El Gato" Gamboa, found him guilty of violating the law, and sent him to prison.

Clarín refrained from attacking Eduardo Frei when the Christian Democrat ran for president in 1964. Though the paper officially supported Allende for the presidency (the Socialist's third stab at it), Volpone had become close with Frei, as they ran in similar social circles and their wives were friendly. Volpone and *Clarín* spared Frei the insults they hurled at other candidates, and when Frei won the election, he reciprocated the fair treatment and loaned *Clarín* the money necessary to buy a new printing press, despite being urged by the United States government not to.[9] He also tasked Congress with amending the "Gag Law", which it did in 1967. Despite their long friendship, things between Allende and Volpone were much rockier than Volpone's dealings with Frei.

Volpone's relationship with Allende was far more complicated. The two men had a fiery friendship. Reportedly, they would have intense political and ideological arguments until one of the men became so angry the two would stop speaking. Yet, they

[7] "La vida al límite de Darío Sainte Marie, creador de Clarín,"
[8] Ibid.
[9] Diario de Sesiones del Senado "Sesión 07, En 15 de Junio de 1966," 714.

remained close. Volpone, who had a reputation as a stylish dresser, purchased much of his wardrobe in Europe, and Allende would often show up unannounced at the journalist's home to "borrow" clothing. Allende would take anything from a few shirts to whole dressers full of clothes. It reached a point where if Volpone got word Allende was on his way, he would try to hastily hide as many clothes as possible.[10]

In the 1970 election, *Clarín* supported both the Christian Democrat Radomiro Tomic and Allende, and it virulently opposed the old enemy, Alessandri. According to historian Joaquín Fermandois, Volpone's was not motivated by a Center-Left political viewpoint but rather the "non plus ultra of opportunism and dark maneuvers."[11] The paper initially supported Tomic, but when Allende showed up at Volpone's house with a suitcase to say he had come to stay for a week, Volpone promised to devote equal space to both men.[12] Supporting both men may seem like playing the odds, but the ideological divide between the political programs of Tomic and Allende was very small. In fact, in some instances Tomic's proposed policies were further left of Allende's. Tomic hoped to be the candidate that could unite the Center and the Left, as Frei had been the candidate to unite the Center and the Right. When Allende won, *Clarín* threw its full support behind him. Volpone believed the Socialist would not have won without his support, given the fact that Allende had so narrowly beaten Alessandri. Volpone expected to be

[10] "La vida al límite de Darío Sainte Marie, creador de Clarín,"
[11] Joaquín Fermandois, *La Revolución Inconclusa: La Izquierda Chilena y el Gobierno de la Unidad Popular*, (Santiago: Centro de Estudios Públicos, 2013) 225.
[12] "La vida al límite de Darío Sainte Marie, creador de Clarín,"

properly thanked for that support. However, after the election, Allende largely ignored *Clarín* and took for granted its support of the Popular Unity (UP) government.[13]

When news of Volpone's dissatisfaction reached Allende, the president pressured the journalist into selling *Clarín* to a group of buyers headed by the Spaniard Víctor Pey Casado, whose loyalty and closeness to Allende could not be disputed. Allende feared that if he left Volpone in charge of *Clarín* it was likely Volpone would betray him, as Allende believed Volpone had done with Matte and Alessandri in the 1950s.[14] The exact mechanism Pey used to acquire the funds for *Clarín's* purchase have often been called into question. Some suggest Fidel Castro funded the acquisition, while others hint Allende illegally used government money to do so. However, after a thorough investigation in 1974, the government found little evidence to support those rumors.[15]

The military regime closed *Clarín* in 1973 and expropriated its properties without compensation, as the magazine was owned by Marxist-Leninists. After selling the paper to Pey, Volpone moved to Spain, where he lived the rest of his life. Many of the journalists who worked for *Clarín* became victims of the regime's repression and were subjected to torture. *Clarín*'s director Alberto Gamboa was arrested shortly after the coup and spent the next four years of his life in secret detention centers as a victim of torture.[16] Many of *Clarín's* journalists were either arrested or left the country in 1973. However,

---

[13] Ibid.
[14] Fermandois, *La Revolución Inconclusa*, 225.
[15] "de Presidente del consejo de defense del estado al Señor General, Ministro de Tierras y Colonización: Estudio sobre Proyecto de decreto ley," 27 Septiembre 1974, ARNAD, Ministerio de Interior, Oficios, 1975, V. 17711.
[16] For more information on Alberto Gamboa's experiences under the dictatorship see: Alberto Gamboa, *Un viaje por el infierno*, (Santiago: Editorial Forja, 2010) ; Alberto Gamboa, *Las siete vidas del Gato Gamboa*, conversaciones de Francisco Mouat con el Gato, (Santiago: Lolita Editores, 2012).

those who did not—and those who returned—would eventually find a place writing for the opposition press after 1976. Most notable among those was the satirist Hernán Millas Correa, who worked for *Hoy.*

Volpone's ideological flexibility, scathing, and often humorous political critiques allowed him to build a daily tabloid that, at its height, competed with Chile's largest newspaper, *El Mercurio*, in terms of circulation. Volpone's political opportunism linked *Clarín* to those in government who could help the magazine thrive—a fact made most evident by its support of both the PDC and UP candidates in 1970. Ironically, Volpone's success also made *Clarín* a target of Alessandri's government, Allende's UP, and the military dictatorship. Alessandri pointed to *Clarín as an example of the worst type of journalism,* whereas Allende feared losing *Clarín*'s support and therefore acted to bring it closer to UP by forcing its sale, and the Pinochet regime targeted *Clarín* as a source of Marxist propaganda immediately after the coup. Despite the paper's end, its success inspired the creation of *La Tribuna*, a right-wing tabloid modeled on *Clarín*. *La Tribuna's* founder looked at the media landscape and saw that the Right did not have a paper that could match *Clarín*'s satirical appeal and so sought to remedy that.

Some of the fiercest opposition to Allende came from the PN, founded in 1966 by right-wing politicians, including Sergio Onofre Jarpa, who would serve as the party's president from 1970 to 1973. As part of the PN's fierce political opposition to UP, Jarpa founded the tabloid *La Tribuna.* Its goal was to counter the popular influence of *Clarín*, which was the top selling tabloid paper at the time. According to Jarpa, *La Tribuna* served two main functions: to make the political ideas of the PN and right-wing leader

Jorge Alessandri known to the masses, and to oppose UP policies.[17] As a tabloid, *La Tribuna* provided the Right with a vehicle to oppose the UP government without having to concern itself with facts or a sense of impartiality, which resembled *Clarín* role on the Left. During Allende's presidency, the tabloid's criticism of UP was virulently anticommunist. Following the coup, *La Tribuna* and the National Party dissolved in support of the Pinochet dictatorship. Jarpa would go on to hold important positions in the Pinochet government.

From a landowning family, Jarpa grew up outside of the capital. He attended the University of Chile in Santiago, where he obtained a degree in agricultural economics. After university, he spent some time as a banker, managing his family's businesses, and eventually entered politics through the rightist Agrarian Labor Party (PAL). In 1966, he became one of the founders of the PN, which brought together the Liberal and Conservative parties, and would serve as its president from 1970 to 1973. It was during the Frei years that he gained vital experience in politics, working with Socialists on agrarian political issues. He saw them as amiable, non-doctrinal, and able to be worked with.[18] His impression of the Socialist Salvador Allende was not one of a dangerous Marxist but rather "a cheery type, nice, fun, and full of stories of Viña."[19] Despite the fact that his party's paper, *La Tribuna,* took an anti-Allende line that could be described as right-wing fanaticism, Jarpa believed that at least the part of the Left that believed in Allende's incrementalism, was willing to negotiate.

---

[17] Sergio Onofre Jarpa, Interviewed by Patricia Arancibia Clavel et al. CIDOC Santiago, Chile. May 29, 2000.
[18] Sergio Onofre Jarpa. Interviewed by Alvaro Bardón et al. CIDOC Santiago, Chile. 9/5/1999.
[19] Ibid.

In 1970, Salvador Allende reached out to Jarpa the PN patriarch to write a letter to the U.S. government urging it to work with UP in order to avert conflict. In a later interview, Jarpa stated that he did not send the letter.[20] However, Jarpa did travel to Washington D.C. in December 1970 and spoke to Charles Meyer, the Assistant Secretary of Inter-American Affairs. Meyer summarized his conversation with Jarpa thusly: "Don't abandon Allende as a man and as the President of Chile. Cut him out of the political herd that delivered his plurality. Work with him and the moderate Left of which he is intuitively a member, remembering that Chile is and will be left of center."[21] Jarpa's visit demonstrated his willingness—at least privately—to work with Allende. Publicly, Jarpa worked tirelessly to oppose Allende's initiatives and used his paper to stoke the flames of panic and crisis in Chile. Possibly because, Jarpa and the PN distrusted the more extreme elements of the Popular Unity coalition, represented by more radical leftists like Carlos Altamirano.

One of Jarpa's political role models was nationalist politician Jorge Prat. In the 1940s, Prat founded a corporatist political group called the Estanqueros, based on the ideas of Spain's fascist dictator, Francisco Franco. Prat believed that the best form of government—one he called "Portalianist" (after early-nineteenth-century conservative statesman Diego Portales)—would feature a strong, charismatic executive and a ruling class of educated elites. Between 1949 and 1954, Prat published a weekly newspaper

---

[20] Ibid.

[21] Memorandum of Conversation, Charles Meyer (Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs) – Sergio Jarpa (President of the Chilean Partido Nacional), 8 December 1970, National Archives and Records Administration, Records of the Department of State (Record Group 59), Central Foreign Policy Files, 1970-1973, Political and Defense, Box 2193.

called *Estanquero* in which he laid out his political ideas and criticized what he saw as the country's growing political polarization.[22] Jarpa first became associated with Prat through the PAL, with the former seeing the latter as a hard worker dedicated to informing the public through journalism. Jarpa admired Prat's commitment to publishing *Estanquero* and the fact that Prat wrote columns weekly for another paper, *Campesino*, which was published by the National Agriculture Society. In 1966 when Jarpa founded the PN, Prat refused to join because he had given up on democratic politics and instead tried and failed to build an anti-democracy right-wing coalition. He died in 1971. Jarpa would not give up on the democratic process. Instead he worked to found and advance the aims of the PN. His admiration for Prat influenced Jarpa's decision to found *La Tribuna* and to write frequently for the paper both under various pseudonyms and as himself. Jarpa described Prat as "an extraordinary man, a patriot, intelligent, and a good person,"[23] who understood Chilean politics better than most participants when he observed "there would come a day when only the armed forces could be the saviors of Chile and the political parties here will be consumed by ideas, procedures, and political techniques of Marxist groups."[24] In 1970, it appeared to Jarpa that time was approaching.

When Jarpa observed the political landscape following the election of Allende, he saw the popularity of *Clarín* and recognized the anti-communist Right had no such press

---

[22] Mario Arnello, *Proceso a una Democracia: Pensamiento Político de Jorge Prat*, 1965, http://historiapolitica.bcn.cl/buscador/buscar?busqueda=Jorge+Prat&submit=Buscar&pagina=1&mindate=&maxdate=&sort=Relevance&minrelevance=30&MP_Personajes=true&MP_Partidos_Politicos=true&MP_Publicaciones_de_Memoria_Politica=true&MP_Parlamentarios=true&MP_Junta_de_Gobierno=true&MP_Legislacion=true&MP_Labor_Parlamentaria=true&MP_Diarios_de_Sesiones=true&MP_Resenas_Efemerides=true&cantidadresultados=10, (accessed on 2/23/2016,)

[23] Sergio Onofre Jarpa. Interviewed by Alvaro Bardón et al. CIDOC Santiago, Chile. 9/5/1999.

[24] Ibid.

outlet. To remedy the situation, he used his own money and that of PN associates, who he invited to take part in as a "journalistic adventure."[25] In 1971, his new publishing company was able to raise enough funds to purchase an old, disused linotype printing press from a natural ally, the daily *El Mercurio*. Without the revenue of UP-controlled government advertising and with resistance from vendors who supported UP, the publishers of *La Tribuna* found it difficult to both fund the production of and sell the paper.[26] Eventually, Jarpa and associates solved their sales problem by having the PN's youth sell the paper on the street by standing on corners and shouting "*La Tribuna*!"[27]

Raúl González Alfaro, who Jarpa believed was a very good journalist, directed the nascent *La Tribuna*. He was given freedom to hire his own staff, which consisted primarily of his friends. Meanwhile, the new publication kept a close relationship with the National Society for Agriculture's *Radio Agricultura.* During the UP years, *La Tribuna* dedicated its editorial line to opposing the Marxist government. In doing so, the paper paid little attention to actual fact, preferring instead to sensationalize the issues. One of Jarpa's favorite headlines from that time came in response to a story in the Communist Party newspaper *El Siglo*, which claimed the CIA had sent assassins to kill Allende. *La Tribuna*'s headline the next day read, "We have discovered the North American Agent that will Assassinate Allende. His Name: Johnny Walker."[28] A picture of Allende holding a glass of whisky was positioned beneath the headline. It was well

[25] Sergio Onofre Jarpa, Interviewed by Patricia Arancibia Clavel et al. CIDOC Santiago, Chile. May 29, 2000.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Ibid.

known at the time that Allende was a heavy drinker who preferred whisky. However, anyone who knew Allende would have been skeptical, as the man from Viña preferred Chivas Regal. Another example of *La Tribuna's* sensationalism occurred during Fidel Castro's 1971 visit to Chile. On November 4, *its* front cover featured a large picture of a man kneeling before a priest, with a firing squad in the background. The subtitle read, "A priest gives the last rights to a Cuban sentenced to the firing squad by the sinister peoples' tribunals created by Fidel Castro, guest of honor of the Popular Unity government. The Communists long for this system as a solution for Chile."[29] The obvious purpose of such stories was to incite fear of the government and create a heightened sense of national crisis. *La Tribuna* also attempted to emasculate Allende as *Clarín* had done with Alessandri. It used the length of Fidel Castro's stay to make the argument that Allende and Castro were engaged in a secret homosexual love affair.[30]

Despite the paper's strong anti-Marxist stance and its harsh criticisms of the government, *La Tribuna* faced little persecution under the Allende government, although the government temporarily closed the paper twice. The first instance occurred in 1972 when the state shuttered *La Tribuna* for a procedural error involving the publication of a PN statement that had already been published by *El Mercurio.* The other, in 1973, involved insulting the armed forces—a crime in Chile—when General Carlos Prats, Commander-in-Chief of the Army, accepted a position in Allende's cabinet as Defense Minister. That closure, which lasted one day, came at the hands of, General Augusto

[29] Quoted in Patricio Dooner, *Periodismo y Politica: La Prensa de Derecha e Izquierda 1970-1973* (Chile: Andante, 1989), 35.
[30] Fermandois, *La Revolución Inconclusa*, 505.

Pinochet, the leader of the Army's Santiago garrison, who without being instructed to do so by the UP government, took the task upon himself in defense of military honor.[31] It is clear that well before September 1973, Pinochet was sensitive to what appeared in the press.

On September 11, 1973, *La Tribuna* did not publish. It began operating again several days later with the permission of the dictatorship. In a November 24, 1973 editorial, Jarpa laid out the position of *La Tribuna* and his own thoughts on the dictatorship. In the editorial, he addressed how long the military would remain in control of the country. He wrote, "The Marxist government was not the origin of the ills of Chile; it was only the final stage of a long period of decadence that originated in diverse factors."[32] According to Jarpa, those factors included foreign political influence, the loss of nationalism, and sectarianism. "It is necessary to begin a second age with the historical task of reorganizing state institutions," he argued. "When we are asked: how much time should the military government rule? We answer: as much time as necessary."[33] *La Tribuna* continued to publish for a short time, but dissolved by the end of 1973, along with the National Party. The paper had suffered criticism from the Pinochet government despite its support thereof because the paper's tone did not reflect the seriousness of national reconstruction. The Right had long criticized the sensationalism of papers like *Clarín,* and since *La Tribuna* was similar in tone, it caused a problem of hypocrisy. Jarpa explained that the publication closed not because of the criticism it faced, but because it

[31] Sergio Onofre Jarpa, Interviewed by Patricia Arancibia Clavel et al. CIDOC Santiago, Chile. May 29, 2000.
[32] Sergio Onofre Jarpa. "Cuantos Anos Durara la Junta." *La Tribuna*. No. 828, November, 24 1973.
[33] Ibid.

was a paper created to oppose Marxists in government, and the coup eliminated them. *La Tribuna* no longer had a reason to exist.[34]

The brief existence of Jarpa's *La Tribuna* demonstrates it was not only the Center and the Left that recognized the value of the press for disseminating a political message. Jarpa evaluated the media market and modeled a paper after the successful leftist tabloid *Clarín*. Despite its virulent opposition to the Allende government, *La Tribuna* faced practically no censorship from UP. *Clarín* would not fare so well under Pinochet. Despite the fact that both papers came to an end early in the Pinochet dictatorship, *La Tribuna* folded by choice, having accomplished its mission. Jarpa would go on to play various critical roles as a collaborator to the regime. For the purposes of this study, his role in relations between the opposition press and the Pinochet dictatorship as Pinochet's Minister of the Interior will be most important. Not all publications followed the sensationalist model put forward by *Clarín*. The centrist *Ercilla* gained its fame and readership from being a respected long publishing professional journalistic endeavor.

When it became clear that Allende would assume the presidency in 1970, the PDC began to look for press outlets to continue to reach the public with its political viewpoint, even if UP took steps to head them off. Due to its long history of journalistic activity and a devoted middle-class readership, *Ercilla* was the PDC's choice. Unlike *Clarín* and *La Tribuna*, both relative newcomers on the journalistic scene in the 1970s, *Ercilla* was one of Chile's oldest and most trusted newsmagazines. First published in April 1933, *Ercilla* began as an infrequently released literary newsletter. Over the course

[34] Sergio Onofre Jarpa, Interviewed by Patricia Arancibia Clavel et al. CIDOC Santiago, Chile. May 29, 2000.

of the next two years, *Ercilla* morphed into a weekly newsmagazine that covered national and international current events, and it solidified its place as a respected newsmagazine in 1936 with exclusive photos and special reports about the horrors unfolding in the Spanish Civil War. Between its founding and 1973, the weekly *Ercilla* published 2,000 issues, covering topics such as politics, economics, science, art, philosophy, and literature. The magazine went through three major phases in development.

Ercilla began as a joint venture involving Luis Figueroa Novoas, owner of a pedal powered printing press, and Laureano Rodrigo Sabala, the proprietor of a bookstore. Originally conceived as a literary newsletter to inform Rodrigo's customers about potential new purchases, *Ercilla*—named after Alonso de Ercilla, the Spanish poet who wrote the epic *La Araucana* about his experiences fighting the Mapuche between 1556 and 1563—focused specifically on those works published by the newly formed Editorial Ercilla. The first issue contained sixteen pages and featured, among other things, a portrait of Lenin on its cover, a literary critique of *El Advenimiento de Portales* (originally published as a serial in the newspaper *El Mercurio*), and information about Editorial Ercilla's books.[35] The small bulletin caught the attention of Ismael Edwards Matte, owner and director of a competing literary magazine. In early 1936, the men combined their efforts and created La Sociedad Anónima Editorial de Ercilla and released stocks in the new publishing company. Edwards Matte purchased the controlling share of stocks. Rodrigo and Figueroa remained involved, but as minority partners. Edwards Matte hoped to create, with *Ercilla* as his flagship, a publication empire to "shake the

[35] "Desde aquella vieja imprenta pedal" in *Ercilla Extra 2.000 Semanas*, (Santiago, La Editora Nacional Gabriella Mistral, 1973) 199.

unshakeable company Zig-Zag."[36] The magazine remained limited in circulation during its early years, typically only selling a few hundred copies per issue. It was not until 1935—when José Maria Souvirón and his successor Manuel Seoane Coralle took over the directorship—that *Ercilla*'s future was assured.

Souvirón shifted the focus of the magazine away from literature and toward international news stories, including those related to the Spanish Civil War. He also provided photos and covered topics that would appeal to broad segments of the population, such as women in bikinis, the history of gangsters, and unconventional artists.[37] Seoane, a Peruvian national and a member of the American Popular Revolutionary Alliance (APRA) in his home country, had founded and ran that party's official newspaper. He also represented Lima in the Peruvian Congress before his arrest and exile in February 1932. Preferring to stay close to his native Peru, Seoane took up residence in Santiago and accepted the position of director after Souvirón and *Ercilla*'s owners had a falling out over the direction of the magazine. Seoane oversaw the publication briefly before returning to Peru, only to be exiled once more in 1937. He then returned to Santiago and set about the task of transforming *Ercilla* into a news source that could compete with the most popular newsmagazine of the day, *Hoy*.

Already with a reputation for international reporting, Seoane sought to increase coverage of domestic Chilean news. As part of his new initiative, the Peruvian hired talented professional journalists, including Julio Lanzarotti Rivera and Lenka Franulic Zlata and instituted a policy of sending reporters out to cover important events in person.

---

[36] Ibid., 201.
[37] Ibid.

Reporters would then mail in special reports from the scene. At the time, no other Chilean publication was engaging in this form of coverage, and *Ercilla* became known as the first on the scene to cover the dramatic events of the day. The strategy paid off. The magazine's special report on the Seguro Obrero Massacre, a failed attempt by Chile's Nazi Party to overthrow the government of Arturo Alessandri in 1938 and install Carlos Ibáñez del Campo, sold over 600,000 copies.[38] Seoane closely aligned the magazine with the Popular Front, a coalition of the Center and Left parties. Seoane was a close personal friend of Allende and Oscar Schnake Vergara, two of the founders of Chile's Socialist Party. The effects of the magazine's closeness to the Popular Front on its editorial line can be seen in a moving special tribute to *frentista* President Pedro Aguirre Cerda upon the leader's untimely death in 1941.

As the Popular Front garnered working-class votes for middle-class politicians, rarely benefitting its left-wing members, so too did it gain the support of *Ercilla* and Seoane himself shifting both's political ideology toward the center-left of middle-class politicians. The magazine's line was clearly evident in *Ercilla's* pledge in November 1941 to continue to work to further the policies of Aguirre Cerda, a member of the reformist Radical Party. An eight-page edition featured a front-page photo of the president's grieving widow and contained numerous pictures of Aguirre's funeral. The president had fallen ill and died of tuberculosis shortly after stepping down, due to declining health, in favor of his vice president. The edition contained a moving eulogy titled "To Govern is To Educate." The author noted, "It was [Aguirre Cerda's] motto, and

[38] Ibid., 203.

it deserves to be his only epitaph, because he was born of hope and served as a teacher."[39] The eulogy closed by declaring it "would be a tribute to Don Pedrito that would accompany him forever and ever" if Chile and *Ercilla* were to continue the fight for the proposals and values espoused by Aguirre Cerda and his partners.[40]

Seoane remained the director of the magazine until 1945, when he returned to Peru to pursue a seat in its senate. The next director to advance and change the publication was 27-year-old Julio Lanzarotti, who assumed control in 1946. He shifted the magazine's focus once more to emphasize national politics, international news, and general interest stories. *Ercilla,* under Lanzarotti, became a massive success, with many of its journalists receiving national prizes for journalism. In 1952, *Time* named *Ercilla* as one of the 28 best magazines in the world.[41] A year later, Carlos Ibáñez del Campo canceled *Ercilla*'s printing contract with *La Nación*, the government's newspaper. It was an unsurprising move, considering *Ercilla*'s unfavorable coverage of Carlos Ibáñez since the Seguro Obrero Massacre of late 1938. Shortly thereafter, Edwards Matte died and Gustavo Helfmann, founder and owner of Editorial Zig-Zag, purchased the deceased's shares in Editorial Ercilla thus ending the 20-year competition between the two publishing houses. Along with the printing operation, Zig-Zag also purchased the magazine *Ercilla* and retained its staff. Lanzarotti left *Ercilla* in 1960 and Lenka Frenulic took up the directorship. She continued many of Lanzarotti's policies, but also added a focus on culture and art. Frenulic brought in many of Chile's best authors to write articles

[39] "Gobernar es Educar," *Suplomento Ercilla*, November 27, 1941, 1.
[40] Ibid.
[41] "Desde aquella vieja imprenta pedal", 204.

for the magazine. Among them was José Donoso Yáñez, a novelist and poet, who began to write travelogues for the magazine focusing more on the feel or atmosphere of a place rather than descriptions of travel activities. Following Frenulic, the magazine had several directors and seemed rudderless, losing much of its former respect and prestige as a result.

In 1968, the ownership decided to take *Ercilla* in a new direction and brought in journalist Emilio Filippi Muratto for the task. The ownership charged Filippi with completely reorganizing *Ercilla* into a modern newsmagazine modeled after *Time*, the West German *Der Spiegel*, and the French *L'Express*. They sought to make a magazine that was "modern, complete, easy to read, and adaptable to the new realities of the public."[42] One of these adaptations was to introduce the idea of regular columnists, who would comment on issues both national and international. *Ercilla* translated and reprinted the work foreign columnists including Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber (director of *L'Express*), Walter Lippman of *Newsweek*, and employed Pablo Neruda. In addition to the new columnists, *Ercilla* hired a large number of journalists with experiences working for other newsmagazines, with the goal of producing an informative newsmagazine format, unlike any publication Chileans had seen before.

International editor Abraham Santibáñez Martínez was one of those new journalists hired by *Ercilla*. From a middle-class background (his father was a foundry worker and his mother worked as a pharmacist) Santibáñez enrolled at the University of Chile, where he received his journalism degree. His first job in journalism was for the

[42] Emilio Filippi, "Cambio de Formato" *Ercilla*, no. 1714, April, 1968, 2.

Archbishopric of Santiago, working for its newsletter *La Voz,* followed by his work as an editor for another newsmagazine, *Vea*. The 30-year-old joined *Ercilla's* staff in 1968, energized by the possibility of creating something new. Santibáñez's work as international editor kept him extremely busy, as he constantly read foreign newspapers and frequented the National Library to gather background information for stories. He would later lament the fact that his job would have been made so much easier if the internet had existed.[43] Despite his workload, Santibáñez thoroughly enjoyed his early years at *Ercilla*, because it was an exciting time to be involved in journalism: President Eduardo Frei faced increasing opposition and the presidential elections approached. Santibáñez's passion and interest in his work paid off and he became subdirector of the magazine.

Christian Democrat Sergio Mujica purchased *Ercilla* in 1969. As the 1970 election approached, the PDC leadership feared if Allende were to be elected president, it would need a way to reach the public with its communitarian message and political plans. The PDC believed this would be especially critical if the Socialist candidate took the undemocratic step of disbanding congress. *Ercilla* was a natural choice for the party, despite more popular leanings in its early years, because the magazine had cultivated a large middle-class readership and had generally reported favorably on Frei's presidency. In explaining his reason for granting *Ercilla* an exclusive interview in 1970, Frei said *Ercilla* had presented his ideas permanently and continuously for 35 years.[44]Director Emilio Filippi was a member of the PDC, but the subdirector, Santibáñez, did not recall

[43] Abraham Santibáñez, interview by author, September 25, 2014.
[44] Emilio Filippi, "La Opinión de Frei," *Ercilla*, no. 1836, August 26, 1970, 8.

that Filippi's party affiliation, or that of its ownership, ever influenced the impartial nature of journalism.[45] In a January 1970 letter to the editor, the author echoed Frei's sentiment and lamented the political environment of Chile as the election approached and noted how all the news sources supported one candidate or another, and published the "most scandalous lies and propaganda." However, the writer said *Ercilla* "escaped that pattern and maintained its seriousness and objectivity." When addressing the staff, the letter writer declared, "Do not worry yourselves or be seduced by the political environment." *Ercilla*'s staff responded with a simple "no worries."[46]

Following Allende's victory in the popular vote, *Ercilla* took the same approach to the possibility of an Allende presidency as did the PDC. Frei believed Allende, though a capable senator, understood little of the complexities of managing an economy or keeping a government functioning.[47]The editorial line began to shift, focusing on the reaction to Allende's victory and PDC plans to mitigate any damage the Marxist may do to the country. *Ercilla* paid special attention to the statute of guarantees, including a guarantee that the freedom of the press would not be violated.[48] Throughout the rest of Allende's presidency, *Ercilla* remained skeptical of many of UP's policies. It broke the news of Allende's high-tech Project Cybersyn—a secret collaboration between UP and a British firm to utilize technology to control the economy from a Star Trek-like command center—describing it not as brilliant innovation, but something of which to be suspicious,

---

[45] Abraham Santibáñez
[46] Vincente Somavia R., Cartas, *Ercilla,* no. 1806, January 28, 1970, 5.
[47] Edmundo Pérez Yoma,
[48] Luis Hernandez Parker, "El Estatuto de Garantías," *Ercilla*, no. 1839, September 16, 1970, 9.

if not fearful.[49] Furthermore, *Ercilla* supported the campaign to prevent shareholders in La Papelera from selling to the government by running advertisements urging Chileans to keep their shares. Many feared if UP controlled the production of paper, including newsprint, a free press would cease to exist, as the previous chapter noted.

Ercilla was not unaffected by UP's forays into economic management. In the wake of rising production costs and workers' strikes, in 1971 UP nationalized Chile's largest printing company, Editorial Zig-Zag, which had been responsible for printing *Ercilla* since the 1940s. The PDC immediately began looking for other printing options. Editorial Lord Cochrane, owned by Jorge Alessandri (who also owned La Papelera), was one option, but *Ercilla*'s ownership negotiated with UP and the newly christened Quimantú National Publishing Company. Quimantú would print *Ercilla*, but under the auspices of a separate Editorial Zig-Zag, which retained the rights to some of its most lucrative properties including the comic *Condorito* and Walt Disney Company comics. Despite widespread accusations by other media outlets of Allende's violations of freedom of speech, subdirector Santibáñez did not recall feeling pressure to change stories or to report more favorably on the government. He understood the nationalization of Zig-Zag as the result of a strike energized by the election of a Marxist-Leninist, and, given the political climate, he saw UP's move as a natural outcome.[50] Even when paper shortages began to effect publication as early as 1971, *Ercilla*'s editorial staff was quick to point out that while the magazine was being printed on lesser quality paper, it was not a state-

[49] Eden Medina, *Cybernetic Revolutionaries: Technology and Politics in Allende's Chile*, (Cambridge, MIT Press: 2014), 175-176.
[50] Abraham Santibáñez

imposed punishment, but rather a reality of Chile's stumbling economy. Throughout Allende's presidency, *Ercilla* remained independent of UP despite being printed by Quimantú.

Ercilla remained closed for three weeks after the military coup in September 1973. Despite new restrictions made through military decrees, *Ercilla* soon began publishing again, first having to submit to prior censorship, but soon left to its own devices. During the remainder of 1973 and in 1974, *Ercilla* reported primarily on the economic and political situation in Chile. There were times when the magazine criticized government policy but did not see any direct intervention from the military regime. Santibáñez recalled the regime relied heavily on setting vague guidelines—and harsh penalties for breaking them—to produce an environment of self-censorship. Accordingly, the editorial staff at *Ercilla* tried to maintain distant, but good relations with the dictatorship. The former subdirector also had a sense that *Ercilla,* a moderate newsmagazine, was low on the regime's censorship priorities.

In 1975, the staff at *Ercilla* slowly began to insert more direct criticism of the government into its stories. According to Santibáñez, the reason for the increased criticism was twofold. First, the extent of the regime's human-rights violations had become increasingly clear and could not be ignored, creating an international public-relations problem for Pinochet. Second, the election of Jimmy Carter in the U.S. "would make Pinochet behave."[51] With increased criticism of the regime appearing on the newsmagazine's pages, the military began to pay closer attention. The regime fined and

[51] Ibid.

closed the magazine twice in 1975. In early December of that year, Sergio Mujica sold *Ercilla* to the right-wing Cruzat-Larraín group, which supported the dictatorship.[52] For the PDC and Mujica, it had become too risky to continue to fund the magazine. Santibáñez believed the director, Emilio Filippi, had been told about the sale, but none of the other staff had been informed. As a result, Santibáñez awoke one day to find the magazine had new ownership. Part of the sale involved retaining the staff. The old staff published a few more issues before Fillipi resigned, giving a farewell speech to the staff in which he urged them all to quit. According to Santibáñez, "Fillipi had a good skill to inspire people. He could convince them to follow him."[53] The majority of the staff, including Santibáñez, followed Filippi's lead and quit by the end of December. They left without a specific plan and found themselves without work or a clear path forward on New Year's Day 1976. *Ercilla* continued to publish with a new editorial direction and staff.

At the time of its sale in 1975, *Ercilla* was the oldest and most respected newsmagazine in Chile. It had from very early in its publication embraced a liberal ethos of professional journalism. Its editors sought to provide an impartial look at the news, untainted by the various political currents of the day. It was that professional liberal ethos

---

[52] The Cruzat-Larraín group was one of Chile's largest economic conglomerates. Headed by Manuel Cruzat Infante and Fernando Larraín Peña, the group acquired controlling shares in most of Chile's key industries during the early years of the dictatorship as the government divested itself of public enterprises. At its height, Cruzat-Larraín owned at least 109 companies and maintained a virtual monopoly on petroleum in Chile. The group collapsed along with the rest of Chile's economy in 1982 and declared bankruptcy. For more information on the economy and economic conglomerates under Pinochet see: Luis Arturo Fuentes, *Grandes grupos económicos en Chile y los modelos de propiedad en otros países*. (Santiago: Dolmen Ediciones, 1997) ; María Olivia Mönckeberg, *El saqueo de los grupos económicos al Estado chileno*, (Santiago: Ediciones B Grupo Zeta, 2001).

[53] Abraham Santibáñez.

and history that attracted the PDC to it in 1969. The magazine's sensibilities and support of liberal democracy aligned closely with the political beliefs of Christian Democracy. As the party came to believe liberal democracy was being threatened by Allende, the magazine's editorial line shifted closer to a focus on the PDC and challenged the policies of UP. Despite *Ercilla's* criticisms of Allende and UP, the magazine suffered no direct interventions by the Allende government. The staff at *Ercilla* not only espoused the rhetoric of professional journalism, but had devoted themselves to it. When Mujica sold the magazine to a right-wing group, the staff believed they would no longer be able to practice professional and impartial journalism, and thus followed Filippi and left to pursue new journalistic endeavors in opposition to the military dictatorship.

A Journalist in the Gran Ciudad

Not all journalists had full-time work during and after the Allende government. Many worked as freelancers selling a story here or a story there to make enough money to survive. American journalist John Dinges eked out such an existence under Allende. He heard about Allende's socialist project while attending graduate school in California and was accepted into a journalist exchange program through the Inter-American Press Agency. Dinges jumped at the chance to get to Chile; once there, however, Allende's socialist government did not meet his expectations. He bounced around Santiago for a little over a year, submitting only a few stories for publication, and, seeking to join the intellectual milieu of the country, began attending classes at the Pontifical Catholic University (PUC), where he also taught English. The 1973 coup shocked Dinges into action, and he began to more earnestly write stories about what was happening in the

country under military rule. His newly found resolve led him into a close relationship with the Comité Pro Paz (Pro-Peace Committee), an ecclesiastical human-rights organization. There, he connected with other like-minded young Chilean journalists, until the regime forced the Comité Pro Paz to close on December 31, 1975.

Dinges' education and formative experiences before arriving in Allende's Chile are worth noting here. Upon finishing an undergraduate English degree, Dinges decided to pursue Catholic Theology to be ordained as a priest. After attending seminary in Innsbruck, Austria for three years, he realized it was not for him. He returned to the U.S. and briefly taught theology for two years, before again deciding he was moving in a different intellectual direction. He had some experience as an editor, he and four other American seminary students in Austria had put together a book with various essays on theological issues. With that feather in his hat, he successfully landed a job at the *Des Moines Register* (Des Moines, Iowa) as an editor. He worked as an editor for a year, then, in search of something more exciting, became the newspaper's police reporter. He stayed on as a police reporter for just under a year, but ultimately left to pursue the passion for Latin America he had gained as an undergraduate after an eventful trip to Mexico. He recalled, "We spent a couple of weeks there had a great time drank tequila and margaritas. I learned how to drink tequila with salt. That's when I really fell in love with Latin America and speaking in Spanish."[54]

He left Des Moines "with his eyes on Latin America" and applied at Stanford University's newly created Latin American Studies program. There, he was exposed to

[54] John Dinges, interviewed by the author, May 29, 2014.

numerous works, including Galeano's *Open Veins of Latin America*, and later dependency theory. Galeano's work was a major influence on his thinking at the time, and it spurred Dinges to write a critical essay on the U.S. press coverage of Cuba. When describing his intellectual development, he noted, "I was definitely fitting into the stereotype of the young intellectual…jumping to conclusions, but most of the time your instincts are right."[55] He began to look for a way to get to Latin America and found the Inter-American Press Organization Fellowship exchange, which would send an American journalist to Latin America and a Latin American journalist to the United States. He applied, was accepted, and chose Chile as his destination, because as a young leftist he had become fascinated with Allende's democratic road to socialism. He left for Chile in October 1972 with the goal of participating in a revolution: "I certainly went to Chile with the idea that I would be participating in a revolution, but a democratic revolution. I was never one of these dictatorship-of-the-proletariat kind of leftists. I thought the Allende experiment was interesting, because it didn't propose the overthrow of democracy," Dinges recalled.[56]

Dinges vividly remembers flying into the Santiago's Los Cerrillos International Airport, thinking, "This is going to change my life. My life is going to be different. This feeling that this is it and that this is really going to mark me." He had read Feinburg's *The Triumph of Allende: Chile's Legal Revolution*, which painted a positive picture of Allende's government, but he had heard things were not well. He was not aware of just how chaotic things had become. Arriving amid the Parro de Octubre, a massive

[55] Ibid.
[56] Ibid.

transportation strike, in October 1972, he could not get from the airport into the capital city. Dinges had arranged to stay at the apartment of a friend's family, but they kicked him out after a month. The chaos of being thrown into a new environment almost overwhelmed him. He remembers his first month as difficult because strikes had paralyzed the country, "I mean I was going out every day to… I don't know I didn't do much that was very effective, but I was definitely going out in the middle of demonstrations, and there were truckers' strikes."[57]

Given his political leanings, Dinges gravitated toward UP. He began to spend most of his days at the UNCTAD Building (named for the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development), a giant conference center and gallery constructed by the Allende government for the Third UNCTAD, held in Santiago in the spring of 1972. For young leftists, the UNCTAD became a meeting center. Dinges said of the UNCTAD, "There were restaurants and cafes downstairs they were crowded and you would just get to know people."[58] Dinges focused most of his energy on trying to make connections. He did very little writing. He believes he only wrote two stories that were published: the first on political polarization and volunteer work, and the second an interview with the head of Chile's Central Bank. Early in 1973, he had a falling out with the Inter-American Press Organization because he believed it was anti-Allende.

Instead of writing stories, he began to attend classes at the PUC. "I got to know a bunch of people. I took a bunch of classes. It was very much a student life. You know I was 30 at that time. So, I was somewhat older, but it didn't really matter," Dinges

[57] Ibid.
[58] Ibid.

explained.[59] He still "pretended" to practice journalism by writing stories that went unpublished. When describing his interaction with journalists who worked for actual media outlets, Dinges noted, "The real journalists the ones who were actually filing were in a world by themselves. We were just writing articles and sending them off. We would see them at press conferences and things. I didn't integrate myself into that."[60] His fellowship ran out, but he decided to stay in Chile.[61]

Dinges often thinks about the decisions he made in his life without any real forethought or planning: to work for the *Des Moines Register*, to travel to Chile, and to stay there once his scholarship ended. The last decision proved to be life changing, because shortly after his decision to stay, the military overthrew Allende. Dinges was a foreign leftist, dabbled in journalism, and was an English teacher living under a repressive right-wing military regime. Dinges had been living in what he referred to as a commune with thirteen other people, mostly leftists and foreigners. By early 1975, most of his companions had fled the country, forcing him to give up the house, because the rent became unaffordable. Through a mutual friend, he was connected with a man named Simon who lived in a suburb of Santiago. Simon's girlfriend was a *mirista* and had been arrested, but was freed because her father was an officer in the army. Simon planned to flee the country with her, and needed someone to take his house. Dinges could not afford the rent on his own. While looking for roommates, Dinges met Carolina, the woman who he would later marry, and realized that he needed something more with his life to feel

[59] Ibid.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Ibid.

fulfilled. He thought, "I hadn't started off to teach English. I started sending out resumes to get back into journalism."[62]

In April 1975 on a Sunday morning, the Pinochet regime's secret police, the Directorate of National Intelligence (DINA), raided the house Dinges rented. Agents arrested Dinges and the other renters, covered their heads with hoods, and threw them in the back of a truck. They were taken to Villa Grimaldi, a secret detention facility used by DINA, notorious for the use of torture on captives.[63] Agents first questioned one of Dinges's female roommates, thinking she looked like one of the people on their list of "subversives." In actuality, she worked for the Pinochet government in the economic planning agency ODEPLAN. After they discovered her identity, they turned to Dinges. As he described it, "they took me and interrogated me. I mean, I was blindfolded, the whole thing, but they didn't really interrogate me in a systematic way. Certainly, no mistreatment."[64] DINA knew the former residents of the house had been involved with the MIR, and they were looking for *miristas* who may be on the run or hiding out. There were none, but Dinges had been asked by friends to take in some people earlier that week. He had refused because the house was already full. "We had said no, and it saved our ass," Dinges said.[65] DINA held them for eight hours before loading them back onto the truck and dropping off on the streets of Santiago. They had satisfied the officers, convincing them they were not leftist threats.

---

[62] Ibid.
[63] "Historia," http://villagrimaldi.cl/historia/red-de-recintos-de-detencion/, (accessed on 2/12/16)
[64] John Dinges
[65] Ibid.

Shortly after the encounter with DINA, *Time* contacted Dinges and offered him a position as a stringer covering the Pinochet government and general Chilean affairs. Around the same time, ABC Radio also offered him a position as stringer, writing 15- to 30-second spots on the Chilean situation. Through *Time*, he received credentials to enter the Diego Portales building, the site of the Pinochet government, while the presidential palace, La Moneda, underwent extensive repairs after it had been bombed during the coup. The building was familiar to Dinges, though the atmosphere and people walking the halls were less so. The regime had renamed the UNCTAD the Diego Portales Building for its new purpose. Dinges spent many days at the UNCTAD during 1972 and 1973 trying to meet people, but not explicitly practicing journalism. He would now spend more time in the building, but as a credentialed journalist.

His newly found work in journalism took Dinges to an organization commonly referred to as the Committee for Peace. Religious organizations established the Committee for the Cooperation for Peace in Chile (COPACHI) to combat the human-rights violations committed by the regime. On October 6, 1973, Cardinal Raúl Silva Henríquez, the Archbishop of Santiago, founded COPACHI as an ecclesiastical effort to alleviate the suffering of victims of repression. COPACHI, which included representatives from the Catholic, Jewish, Lutheran, and Methodist churches, identified three main goals at its founding. The first was to find and provide material help for people or families impacted by the "situation." The second involved providing legal assistance to those impacted by human-rights violations. The third goal of COPACHI

was to gather information about human-rights violations.[66] It opened offices throughout Chile in nine of its major cities, including two in Santiago. In November, COPACHI began posting advertisements in *El Mercurio* that informed people of its services and warned them not to sign any waivers presented by officials representing the legal system.[67] Dinges's first contact with the organization came two years after its founding, by which time it had established a network of sources from within the military government itself to collect information on the regime's human-rights abuses. The person largely responsible for setting up that intelligence network was José Zalaquett Daher, who headed COPACHI's legal department and whose efforts, provided legal advice to nearly nine thousand people in cases of political persecution between 1973 and 1975. Cases included those heard by military tribunals. It also represented 6,511 people in cases of dismissal of employment due to political reasons. COPACHI also provided healthcare services to almost 17 thousand Chileans.[68]

When Dinges first arrived at COPACHI headquarters, he felt nervous. The military regime had stationed surveillance agents in the streets. He went into the offices anyway, resolved to cover human-rights abuses. "It was scary, but that's what we did," he said.[69] Their first encounter left Dinges thinking that Zalaquett, a lawyer, was also a priest, due to the latter's dark clothing and his solemn attitude. Zalaquett, nicknamed

---

[66] Comité de Cooperación para la Paz en Chile. "Carta a los sacerdotes, pastores evangélicos y religiosas sobre la creación del Comité de Cooperación para la Paz en Chile," October 6, 1973. http://www.archivovicaria.cl/archivos/VS4b13d2ebcda41_30112009_1112am.pdf. (accessed February 10, 2011)

[67] Arzbizopado de Santiago, "Aviso Publicado en El Mercurio," November 10, 1973. http://www.archivovicaria.cl/archivos/VS0000091.pdf. (accessed February 10, 2011)

[68] Interamerican Commission on Human Rights. Report on the Situation of Human Rights in Chile.(OAS: 1985). http://www.cidh.oas.org/countryrep/Chile85eng/chap.11.htm. (accessed March 16, 2011)

[69] John Dinges

Pepe by his friends, almost fell over laughing when Dinges informed him of that first impression. Though Zalaquett worked for a religious human-rights organization, he was firmly atheist.[70] Dinges most appreciated Zalaquett's ability to protect his sources, which according to Dinges, is a skill most people do not have. Dinges later discovered DINA intercepted and read everything he wrote and wired to the U.S. at that time, so Zalaquett's skill proved incredibly important. Dinges recalled that with the help of Zalaquett and COPACHI, he began to report on the disappeared. "With basically Pepe putting me on to this stuff, I was tracking month by month how many people were disappearing, as they were disappearing, which was incredible because no one was really doing that," Dinges elaborated.[71]

Zalaquett joined the Allende government as part of UP's agrarian reform project. He believed the forces of history seemed to be pushing Chile down a democratic road to socialism, but left the government six months before the coup, after growing increasingly concerned that the political situation was getting out of hand. Just after the coup, people knew he was a lawyer on the Left and would ask for his help when the regime arrested a family member. Feeling the eyes of the regime were upon him, he traveled to the southern city of Puerto Montt and sought protection from the Catholic Church. Upon returning to Santiago, Silva Henríquez invited him to join COPACHI. Starting in the North, he visited every town on his way southward, Zalaquett undertook organizing local COPACHI legal chapters as his first major task. Locals were reluctant to speak with him even behind closed doors, only later realizing he was following the route of the Caravan

[70] Ibid.
[71] Ibid.

of Death—only three weeks behind the death squad.[72] He knew what he was doing entailed risk. Yet, he did not feel he took unnecessary risks. "I was young, young people like the dizziness of risk. When you get old you grow more cautious. I would never claim to be innately brave. Being brave is about learning how to live with your fears. It is a daily task," he explained.[73]

Zalaquett first became involved with journalists through the foreign media and was impressed by their commitment to reporting on the Chilean situation, seeing that they would scour the country for information to support a 300-word piece. COPACHI provided statistics to one American journalist about the regime's dismissal of university professors, and a week later that journalist came back and corrected the numbers. They had been too high. From that moment on, "accuracy became our gospel," he said. [74] Zalaquett described COPACHI's human rights violations record keeping procedure, "We subtracted 10% from all figures, because if you tell a dictator he has killed ten and he has killed ten; he feels hurt, but if you tell him he has killed eleven; he feels outraged."[75]

At COPACHI, Dinges met other like-minded journalists who worked for the organization. Among them was Arturo Navarro, who had worked for Quimantú under Allende before returning to school prior to the coup in 1973. As a student, Navarro worked on the party newsletter for the MAPU Obrero y Campesino. The coup had come as a blow to Navarro, who had been invigorated by the revolutionary atmosphere of UP. He resolved to continue to work to undermine the dictatorship and to support the MAPU-

[72] José Zalaquett Daher, interviewed by author, August 27, 2014.
[73] José Zalaquett Daher
[74] Ibid.
[75] Ibid.

OC, though clandestinely. In the task of rebuilding the MAPU-OC, he was offered a job with the Committee for the Cooperation for Peace. He believed he did an important service to advance human rights in his time at COPACHI. "My analysis, on a team, served to give tools to the Bishops, foreign journalists, and ambassadors. In general, people who were incorporated into the struggle for human rights," he explained.[76]

In 1975, the newspaper *La Segunda* shocked Chile with its headline, "They Kill Themselves Like Rats." *La Segunda*, the afternoon paper published by *El Mercurio*, claimed 118 leftist Chileans had killed themselves abroad. COPACHI investigated the story and found that the sources cited by *La Segunda*—magazines in both Argentina and Brazil—did not actually exist. Instead, as Dinges would later report, those Chileans had been murdered by the regime.[77] Zalaquett believed DINA never forgave COPACHI for embarrassing it. The government got its chance at revenge later that year, when police arrested two members of the MIR and found that COPACHI had been providing them with sanctuary. As a result, DINA began a systematic crackdown on the COPACHI.

On November 15, 1975, DINA arrested Zalaquett. At the time of his arrest, the regime had already arrested 22 other COPACHI members. A few days later, Pinochet wrote to Cardinal Silva Henríquez to request COPACHI's dissolution. In his letter, Pinochet summarized the government's case against the ecclesiastical human rights organization:

> From the foregoing and after a calm analysis of the public events and their repercussions, both within the country and abroad, we are led to seek the roots of some of these events and we find them in the Comité Pro Paz. Consequently, we have considered that the above-mentioned institution is a means that is made use

[76] Ibid.
[77] John Dinges.

> of by Marxist-Leninists to create problems that disturb the peace of the public and the necessary calm, the maintenance of which is my principal duty as President.[78]

Cardinal Silva Henríquez wrote back to Pinochet and told him that he thought COPACHI had done nothing illegal and "provided in difficult circumstances assistance of a clearly evangelical nature." The cleric, however, agreed to dissolve the committee. The COPACHI officially closed on December 31, 1975. He also cautioned Pinochet: "I must now express my conviction that the measure advocated by your Excellency, that we take steps to dissolve the Committee, will in all probability—within and especially outside Chile—cause appreciably greater damage than that which it is intended to prevent."[79]

The regime released Zalaquett on January 31, 1976 after holding him for two and a half months. In February, he left Santiago to go on vacation with his family. When he returned to Santiago in March, he hosted three U.S. Congressmen: Thomas Harkin, George Miller, and Anthony "Toby" Moffet, Jr. DINA arrested him again, because "he had not learned his lesson." In response, the regime expelled him from Chile. Zalaquett lived the next 10 years of his life in exile, primarily in Spain and the U.S.[80]

Following the dissolution of COPACHI, Cardinal Silva Henríquez called for the creation of a new religious organization to champion human rights under the auspices of the Catholic Church. Founded in 1976, the Vicariate of Solidarity sought to stop the military's ill treatment and abduction of Chilean citizens. Over the next 14 years, the

---

[78] Augusto Pinochet Ugarte, "Letter to his Eminence Cardinal Raul Silva Henriquez," November 11, 1975, in Interamerican Commission on Human Rights. Report on the Situation of Human Rights in Chile, (OAS: 1985). http://www.cidh.oas.org/countryrep/Chile85eng/chap.11.htm (accessed March 16, 2011)
[79] Cardinal Raul Silva Henriquez, "Letter to Augusto Pinochet Ugarte," November, 1975, in Interamerican Commission on Human Rights. Report on the Situation of Human Rights in Chile, (OAS: 1985). http://www.cidh.oas.org/countryrep/Chile85eng/chap.11.htm. (accessed March 16, 2011).
[80] José Zalaquett Daher.

vicariate took care of families of disappeared Chileans, provided legal defense for those arrested by the regime, and connected Chile's opposition with international human rights-based funding sources. Especially because of its role in securing funding, the opposition press would have faced a nearly impossible task without the Vicariate of Solidarity.[81]

When it became clear COPACHI would close, Dinges, Navarro, and others associated with the human rights organization began to plan their next move. They wanted to found a news organization similar to the Associated Press, that would write stories for foreign publications and act as fixers for foreign journalists covering events in Chile. They named their organization the Information Agency on International Affairs, or APSI. However, when Cardinal Silva Henríquez established the Vicariate of Solidarity, many who wanted to work as fixers—local coordinators for foreign journalists—joined the Vicariate. The journalists shifted tracks and instead decided to found a newsmagazine, *APSI*, with Navarro as the director.

Journalism and the End of the Era of Mass Politics

The Constitution of 1925 ushered in a new era of political participation. The oligarchic republic, which had existed prior, gave way to diverse political parties, eventually representing all sectors in Chilean society. For a new class of politicians, reaching the masses was imperative as they sought to garner electoral support. To do so, most political parties published their own newspapers or magazines. Diverse political

---

[81] For more information on the Vicariate of Solidarity see: Cynthia Brown, *The Vicaría de Solidaridad in Chile,* (Washington DC: Americas Watch, 1987) ; Mark Ensalaco, *Chile under Pinochet: Recovering the Truth,* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000) ; Hugo Frahling, "Resistance to Fear in Chile: The Experience of the Vicaría de la Solidaridad," in *Fear at the Edge: State Terror and Resistance in Latin America*, ed. Juan E. Carradi, Patricia Weiss Fagen, & Manuel Antonio Garretón, (Berkley: University of California Press, 1992), 121-141 ; Jeffery Klaiber, *The Church, Dictatorships, and Democracy in Latin America,* (Eugene, Or: Wipe & Stock, 1998).

parties created publications representing a wide spectrum of ideological viewpoints. Political polarization reached its height in 1973. At the time, the breadth of Chile's pluralistic media was evinced by the ideology represented in the gulf between *La Vangardia de los Trabajadores,* a far-right Nazi inspired publication and *El Rebelde* a far-left revolutionary paper inspired by Che Guevara. Despite attempts by various political actors to restrict or redefine freedom of the press, the Constitution of 1925 guaranteed wide-ranging political and ideological participation in Chile's public sphere.

The military coup on September 11, 1973 sought to end politics in Chile, and tried to destroy the political system that had created the diversification of ideological publications. The regime hoped to end the political disputes that, it believed, had led to the crises of Allende's last years. By first banning leftist parties, and later banning all political parties, the dictatorship closed off the traditional avenues of funding available for partisan publications. Furthermore, the regime's harsh censorship between 1973 and 1976 allowed little room for ideological viewpoints outside of those put forth by the government, furthermore it obstructed accurate coverage of the regime's human-rights abuses.

This chapter demonstrated the effects of the end of constitutional democracy in Chile on a micro level by examining *Clarín, La Tribuna, Ercilla*, and the career of a particular journalist, John Dinges. The tabloids *Clarín* and *La Tribuna* thrived in the hyper mobilized political state of the UP years. The satire and sensationalism in the tabloids made their political messages entertaining and easily digestible for the masses. Both closed shortly after the coup, the government expropriated *Clarín* and *La Tribuna*

voluntarily ceased publication. Under the Constitution of 1925, *Ercilla* had evolved from a leftist literary magazine into a bold centrist publication with a style and journalistic sense of professionalism similar to *Time* or France's *Le Monde*. *Ercilla*'s record of journalistic impartiality led the PDC to purchase the magazine in 1969. However, after the coup, the staff, led by Filippi, could not cover the regime's economic failures and human-rights violations without censorship repercussions. When the PDC sold *Ercilla*, most of the staff resigned to seek new opportunities. Meanwhile, Dinges's journalism career lacked focus beyond support for the Allende government. Only after the coup did he find a journalistic voice and used his writing to oppose the dictatorship, but published his stories not in Chile, but outside of the country and rarely with bylines. He collaborated with likeminded journalists at COPACHI, and when the human rights organization closed, he, Arturo Navarro, and others struck out on their own to found the newsmagazine *APSI*.

In 1976, the dictatorship was poised to enter a new phase. The Chicago Boy's economic plan had begun to produce results and the military had exiled or disappeared many of its political enemies. Pinochet vanquished COPACHI, which had been a thorn in his side, and the regime had begun work on a new constitution that would ensure the legality of the military's rule. Pinochet's position seemed secure, and in that security the dictatorship slightly relaxed its control over the press. The opposition founded its first publications under the dictatorship when Dinges and others started *APSI*, and the former staff of *Ercilla* formed a new magazine: *Hoy*.

The subsequent chapter will evince that the regime's efforts to secure its own legitimacy contributed to the formation of the opposition newsmagazines *APSI, Hoy*, and *Análisis*. The impact of Chile's political culture both on journalists and regime collaborators led both to seek a freer press. The regime viewed limited opposition media as a way to boost its legitimacy both domestically and internationally, and therefore allowed it, whereas opposition journalists saw it as a way they could begin to push for a transition back toward democratic society. Journalists secured their limited space and then pushed to expand it, which led to the first of many climatic confrontations between the regime and the opposition media in 1979.

CHAPTER THREE: THE BIRTH OF THE OPPOSITION PRESS

> We have demonstrated proven breadth to allow views differing from those of the government, but those who believe that this represents opening a floodgate to overflow the clearly marked limits, whatever the power they have ensconced themselves within, they will feel the rigor of the law and all the authority of the government.
>
> - Augusto Pinochet Ugarte, Chilean Dictator

On June 22, 1979, the staff of the opposition magazine *Hoy* received notification from the military chief of the Metropolitan zone (Santiago), General Enrique Morel Donoso, informing them that the magazine's printing, distribution, and sale would be suspended for two months. *Hoy* had recently published extensive interviews with two Marxist Chilean politicians then in exile: Clodomiro Almeyda and Carlos Altamirano. Both men had expressed their continued belief in Marxist principles, and, in the eyes of the government, publishing interviews with them was tantamount to spreading Marxist propaganda. To explain *Hoy*'s suspension, then Interior Minister Sergio Fernández said, "Issues that have motivated the sanction in reference are but the culmination of the sustained conduct of the magazine *Hoy*, which explicitly and implicitly tries to ignore the government's authority to set the boundaries within which must be carried out a legitimate and constructive debate on the development of a new institutional framework for our homeland."[1] Rather than re-establish control of an increasingly bold opposition press, the ban and the resulting professional and public backlash against it emboldened journalists of the opposition. They seemed to prove that the opposition had won a place for itself within the public sphere in the latter half of the 1970s.

---

[1] *Ercilla*, July 27, 1979, I0.

The regime seemed to be showing signs of relaxing its control on opposition media as early as 1977. The regime's lessening of repression came about as its legal and economic policies began to enhance its legitimacy. The regime obtained greater stability as a result of settling on a neoliberal economic policy that began to show signs of success. After the failure of his initial policies, in 1975 Pinochet turned to a group of Chilean economists who studied under Milton Freidman at the University of Chicago. By 1977, their economic "shock treatment" had begun to produce results. The economy had been disastrous under Allende and economic success lent legitimacy to the military. In addition to economic success, 1977 also witnessed the beginning of the construction of a new legal-institutional framework for Chile. Even though it did not have a new constitution in place, the Pinochet government and civilian collaborators had created a plan for constitutional decrees that would lead to the creation of a "new" democracy. To that end, Pinochet formed a constitutional commission headed by the former minister of justice, Enrique Ortúzar. Despite abandoning the plan for constitutional acts, the regime would have the first draft of a completed constitution written by 1978. During this period, the regime responded to increasing pressure in regard to human rights. Among governments that pushed for change in Chile, the United States increased pressure on the regime after the assassination of Orlando Letelier, a former diplomat for the Allende government and harsh critic of the military dictatorship, whom the regime's secret police murdered with a car bomb in Washington DC in 1976. The combination of economic legitimacy and the urgency to present a new, kinder face led to the beginnings of an opening for the Chilean opposition. The most emblematic result of this shift away from

repression was the dissolution of the DINA (Directorate of National Intelligence) and its replacement with the National Intelligence Center (CNI). However, this period also provided an opportunity for opposition media outlets to gain a foothold in the public sphere.

Once established, opposition media outlets constantly ran up against and slowly expanded the regime's acceptable limits for criticism. Founded in 1976 by a group of journalists formerly of the Committee for Peace, the newsmagazine *APSI* used international news to obliquely criticize the regime. Over the next few years, *APSI* slowly expanded its domestic coverage and in 1979 created a national news section, despite not having permission from the government to do so. The staff at *APSI* worked closely with the staff at Radio Cooperativa, a station owned by members of the Christian Democratic Party. Under the direction of pioneering feminist journalist Delia Vergara, Radio Cooperativa was the first opposition outlet to cover disappearances of individuals arrested by the regime's security forces. In 1977, the former staff of the magazine *Ercilla* founded the magazine *Hoy* after receiving permission to publish. Despite a cautiously optimistic approach to the regime's projects in its first issues, after suspension of the magazine in 1979 *Hoy* grew bolder in its criticisms of the government. Another opposition outlet founded in the late 1970s, the magazine *Análisis,* used its connections to the Catholic Church to publish stories about and interviews with former and present Marxists abroad and in Chile. When the government announced the 1980 constitutional plebiscite, all opposition publications ran stories featuring opposition politicians, such as former president Eduardo Frei Montalva, urging Chileans to vote no on the constitution.

Furthermore, they questioned the legality of the plebiscite in the first place and in so doing challenged the regime's legal-institutional legitimacy. Despite the challenge the opposition press presented, the dictatorship did not silence the opposition press. It had learned with *Hoy* in 1979 that the cost of such an action could threaten the government's otherwise successful march toward greater legitimacy and a firmer grasp on power.

Establishing Legitimacy through Economic and Legal-institutional Success

Until 1973, Chile's military colleges did not offer courses in economics. As a result, the armed forces were ill prepared to take over the country's failing economy. They relied on the expertise of civilian collaborators to fill in their gaps in knowledge, but Pinochet could not decide between economic visions and instead opted for a middle road between the state-guided growth model of the Christian Democratic Party and the neoliberal free-market approach of the Chicago Boys. In the early years of the military government, the regime focused its efforts on fighting Allende's legacy of economic mismanagement. It reduced government price controls and froze wages and salaries. It also slashed spending on government programs to help with the budget deficit. These measures only served to slow down the economic decline, by 1975 Chile's economy had sunk into a deep recession. Pinochet reassessed his economic policy and the Chicago Boys convinced him—partially due to a visit by Milton Freidman himself—that neoliberalism offered a path toward economic success.[2]

At least initially, its neoliberal program paid dividends for the regime. What became widely known as Chile's first "economic miracle" began in 1977. On the

[2] Peter Winn, "The Pinochet Era," in *Victims of the Chilean Economic Miracle: Workers and Neoliberalism in the Pinochet Era, 1973-2002*, ed. Peter Winn, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004) 25-26.

macroeconomic level, the economy made great strides. The gross domestic product increased by 8.3 percent in 1977 and continued to rise, posting gains above seven percent until 1980.[3] Inflation, at 343 percent in 1975, shrank to nine percent by 1981. The Chicago Boys' policies also completely eliminated the government's deficit and created a surplus of 1.7 percent by 1979. Foreign capital poured in, reaching an average of $1.6 billion US dollars per year between 1978 and 1980.[4] The widely publicized success of the Chicago Boys' neoliberal economic strategies during this period strengthened the government's position. Due to the failure of Allende's economic policies, Pinochet was able to claim the military dictatorship was necessary for Chile's economic survival and growth. In addition, the economic success of the Chicago Boys also helped bolster the regime's efforts to establish its legal-institutional framework.

On July 9, 1977, a large group of Chilean youths gathered on Chacarillas Hill, one hundred miles south of Santiago, in celebration of Youth Day and National Flag Day. The National Unity Youth Front, a civilian-run organization carefully orchestrated to emphasize the link between the youth of Chile and its armed forces, held the event to honor new inductees.[5] Pinochet arrived that night to present a speech to the torch-bearing crowd, which chanted his name. In his speech, he laid out his plans for the future and, for the first time, Pinochet provided a definitive plan for ending the military dictatorship. He later described his appearance at Chacarillas as "an opportunity to explain to the youth that the Military Government would not be permanent, but it would be necessary to

[3] Arriagada, *Por la Razón o Por la Fuerza,* 75.
[4] Silva, *In the Name of Reason,* 153.
[5] Ibid., 251.

follow a path that would permit the acquisition of a 'full democracy.'"[6] The speech, however, did not describe a return to democracy but rather a creation of a "new" democracy. It portrayed a democracy that would be "authoritarian, protective, integrated, technified, and with authentic social participation."[7] The armed forces would lead Chile to this new democracy through a series of "constitutional acts," which would eventually be compiled as a new constitution. Pinochet envisioned a three-step process. Pinochet cautioned that if the transition were not carried out slowly, it would fail; the country would return to the way it was, with the same people, vices, and similar or worse chaos to that experienced under the Marxist government.[8] A transition period would begin in 1980, led by Pinochet with a new constitution to be fully implemented by 1985. Although the timetable and the plan for constitutional decrees were abandoned in favor of writing a complete document, the Chacarillas speech showed the maturation of Pinochet's ideology and his desire to create a more stable source of institutional legitimacy. Many of the ideas he expressed at Chacarillas appeared in the Constitution of 1980. Commensurate with his anti-party ideology expressed at Chacarillas, Pinochet banned all remaining political parties in 1977.

Pinochet further solidified his legal-institutional position early in 1978 with a national referendum on his rule. Despite opposition from within the junta and strong opposition to the idea from the Catholic Church, Pinochet held the referendum on January 4. The regime conducted the vote under a state of siege, with no voter registry

---

[6] Pinochet Ugarte, *Camino Recorrido,* 145.
[7] Ibid., 146.
[8] Ibid.

taken. The ballot read, “Faced with international aggression launched against our fatherland, I support President Pinochet in his defense of the dignity of Chile and reaffirm the legitimacy of the government.”[9] The “international aggression” referred to on the ballot was a UN vote condemning Chile for human rights violations. A Chilean flag represented a “yes” answer and a black box represented a “no” vote. By that evening, enough ballots were counted for Pinochet and the government to claim victory. The government reported in the final tally that “yes” received 75 percent of the votes and “no” received only 23 percent, with the remainder null and blank.[10] Bolstered by the results, Pinochet pushed forward with the creation of a new constitution based on the principles he expressed at Chacarillas.

A specially appointed constitutional committee finished its task soon after the Chacarillas speech, with a draft of a new constitution finished by October 30, 1978.[11] Pinochet made changes to that draft to strengthen the position of the president and to clearly define the transition period. In its final form, the constitution sought to limit the power of political parties, while ensuring the military would continue to play a large role after the eight-year transition period. On August 12, 1980, Pinochet called for a plebiscite to be held on the seventh anniversary of the military coup to ratify the new constitution. Chileans had only one month to examine the constitution in full or openly debate its merits before the vote. The regime reported 6.2 million voters took part in the plebiscite, a suspicious 91 percent participation rate of eligible voters. Although the regime made

[9] Constable and Valenzuela, *A Nation of Enemies*, 68.
[10] The Americas Watch Committee, *Chile: Human Rights and the plebiscite*, 19.
[11] Huneeus, *The Pinochet Regime*, 157.

voting compulsory, the lack of an electoral registry made it impossible to monitor. Many members of the opposition reported seeing the same people voting repeatedly.[12] When the votes were tabulated, 69 percent of voters had cast ballots in favor of the new constitution.[13] The eight-year transition period began in March 1981, with Pinochet serving as president. With the Constitution of 1980, Pinochet achieved full legal-institutional control of Chile. The regime's economic and legal-institutional success resulted in a decline in the use of repressive force.

Between the 1973 coup and 1976, nearly 2,000 Chileans died or disappeared at the hands of the military.[14] After the first three months of the military dictatorship, the DINA carried out the majority of Pinochet's violent actions against the opposition. The DINA, under Army Coronel Manuel Contreras, had extraordinary powers and answered only to Pinochet. In 1978, the regime replaced DINA with the CNI. after the formation of the CNI, violent repression decreased dramatically. Between 1977 and the end of 1980, the military killed or caused the disappearance of 62 people, or 77 fewer victims than in 1976.[15] Scholarship focused on the Pinochet dictatorship explains this transition, and the subsequent decrease in violence, by pointing to international pressure, domestic pressure, and the DINA's ineffectiveness.

---

[12] The Americas Watch Committee, *Chile: Human Rights and the plebiscite.* 23. The previous high points for participation rates of eligible voters occurred during the 1960 and 1970 elections drawing roughly 64 percent of all eligible voters.
[13] Ibid., 19.
[14] Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation, *Report of the Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation*, vol. 2, trans. Phillip E. Berryman, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993), 903.
[15] Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation, *Report of the Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation*, 903.

Political scientist Carlos Huneeus explains this shift in terms of pressure from civilian supporters of the regime, such as Jaime Guzmán. Guzmán and the Gremialist movement pushed for a greater degree of institutionalization for the regime. The DINA needed to be replaced by an agency with greater institutional control rather than the personal control of Pinochet.[16] CNI acted under the supervision of the Ministry of the Interior, which provided the regime with a higher degree of control; its main task would be gathering information important to national security and necessary to the supreme government's operation of the state.

Genaro Arriagada provides another explanation for the creation of CNI: Pinochet created it as a reaction to international pressure amid the backlash generated by DINA's assassination of Orlando Letelier.[17] On the morning of September 21, 1978, DINA operatives carried out the assassination of the former Allende government minister and critic of the military regime. Although DINA had killed numerous other critics, both in Chile and internationally, the assassination of Letelier had greater political ramifications because it happened in Washington D.C. DINA agents remotely detonated a car bomb, killing Letelier and his American assistant, Ronni Moffit. Before long, U.S. suspicion focused on Chile and DINA.[18] Even prior to Letelier's assassination, the U.S. government had been ratcheting up its criticisms of Chile's human rights violations. The election of Jimmy Carter to the U.S. presidency further increased the pressure as Carter made human rights a major component of his electoral platform and foreign policy. Once elected,

---

[16] Huneeus, *The Pinochet Regime*.
[17] Arriagada, *Por la Razón o Por la Fuerza*, 98.
[18] John Dinges, *The Condor Years: How Pinochet and his Allies Brought Terrorism to Three Continents*, (New York: New Press, 2004), 192.

Carter began urging Chile to improve its human rights record. One year after Letelier's death, the military junta dissolved DINA and issued Decree Law 1878 to create the CNI.

Political scientist Pablo Policzer incorporated both of the previous arguments—that pressure for increased institutionalization of the regime and international pressure for human rights played a role in the end of DINA—but relegated them to a secondary position. Policzer argues, ultimately, Pinochet chose to replace DINA because it did not effectively provide him with a degree of internal control over his government. DINA could not stop junta and civilian supporter opposition to his policies as the agency was designed to combat an external Marxist threat. The cost of continuing to tie his fortunes to DINA after 1978 could have been catastrophic for Pinochet, both domestically and internationally. Policzer speculates that if DINA had been more effective in controlling internal opposition Pinochet may not have abandoned it.[19]

Domestic criticism, international criticism, and inefficacy do not suffice to explain the reduction of easing of repression in this period. Between 1977 and 1980, the regime also reduced its censorship of the opposition press, its nonviolent method for silencing the opposition. Its policy toward the press, which received comparatively little international criticism, already operated through an institutional agency, DINACOS, and thus did not change due to a need for increased institutionalization. Reduced censorship, combined with the creation of CNI, provide a different picture. With its legal-institutional and economic success, the regime needed to rely less on coercive repression. The Constitution of 1980 gave Pinochet both a legal justification and an institutional

[19] Pablo Policzer, *Rise and Fall of Repression*, 126.

framework for his power, meanwhile, Chile's "economic miracle" made it seem as if the dictatorship had tangible fiscal benefits. In the climate of success, Pinochet no longer needed to maintain tight control of the opposition through coercive force to maintain his power.

After the initial repression of the opposition through the imposition of constitutional states of exception and prior censorship of the press, the military government worked to solidify its legitimacy and justify its control of the country beyond the constitutional states of exception. To accomplish this task, the regime turned to conservative politicians and political thinkers who had opposed the presidency of Salvador Allende. Pinochet chose former Alessandri Minister of Justice, Enrique Ortúzar to lead a commission for the creation of a new constitution. Meetings of the constitutional commission provide a rare glimpse into the regime's reasoning for pursuing certain policies.

Pinochet believed Ortúzar had a keen legal mind and was well acquainted with the anti-leftist values of the time through his work propagating them under Alessandri and his time working in opposition to Allende's presidency. The commission would come to be called the Ortúzar Commission. However, despite heading a commission that bore his name, Ortúzar's role in establishing legitimacy for the regime is oft downplayed or overshadowed by those who focus on Jaime Guzmán's gremialists. Guzmán also served on the Ortúzar Commission, but perhaps due to Ortúzar's preference for operating behind-the-scenes and Guzmán's very public career as a politician, Ortúzar faded into the background. However, it is a mistake to understand the early years of the dictatorship

through the contributions of Guzmán alone. Ortúzar accomplished more than any other right-wing thinker in terms of creating the framework for the military regime.

When right-wing journalist and National Party politician Hermógenes Pérez de Arce evaluated the second half of the twentieth century, he found only four rightist thinkers who had real impact: Jaime Guzmán, Pedro Ibáñez, Sergio Onofre Jarpa, and Enrique Ortúzar. He recalled, "The rest of us were commentators, *opinólogos*, snipers or dilettantes who said we knew very well what had to be done, but we did nothing. On the other hand, the four nominees were perhaps speaking less, but doing more. In particular, Enrique Ortúzar made the most important contribution of all."[20] The contribution of Ortúzar that Pérez de Arce referred to was "The Chamber of Deputies Agreement on the Severe Breach of Constitutional and Legal Order of the Republic," signed by both conservatives and Christian Democrats in the Chamber of Deputies on August 22, 1973. The statement called on Allende to respect the constitution and laid out the chamber's grievances against the Popular Unity government. The document is worded in such a way that Christian Democrats largely understood it to be a call to the Allende government to cease its path toward socialism, but for many on the Right the agreement was an oblique call for the military to step in and overthrow Allende should he continue to push the country toward socialism.

The meetings to draft the document were held in the offices of National Party Deputy Francisco Bulnes Sanfuentes and attended by other National Party members, including Pérez de Arce, and Christian Democrats. Among those who suggested changes

[20] Hermógenes Pérez de Arce, "Versos a una difunta reiterada," accessed on 9/17/2016, http://blogdehermogenes.blogspot.com/2014/02/versos-una-difunta-reiterada.html.

or additions to the original document were Patricio Aylwin Azócar and Claudio Orrego Vicuña. Pérez de Arce asserts that there was only one author of the agreement and that author was not an elected official. Of the writing process, Pérez de Arce recalled, "The only one who did the task was Ortúzar, who must be considered, in my opinion, the fundamental author of the Agreement."[21]

The agreement lays out numerous grievances against the Popular Unity government, including UP's handling of the press:

> It has seriously violated freedom of expression, exercising all manner of economic pressures against broadcasting bodies that are not unconditional adherents of the government; Illegally closing newspapers and radios; Imposing on these Illegal "chains"; Imprisoned unconstitutionally opposition journalists; Using devious maneuvers to acquire the monopoly over printing paper and violating openly the legal provisions to which the National Television Channel…by converting it in to an instrument of sectarian propaganda and defamation of political opponents.[22]

In this section, Ortúzar echoes many of the complaints Christian Democrats had about Alessandri's Abuses of Publication law and adapted them to the National Party's hard oppositional line to UP. It should be noted again here that even the National Party's *La Tribuna* suffered very little direct intervention at the hands of Allende's government.[23] As the primary author of the Abuses of Publication law, Ortúzar created a much more repressive legal framework for controlling the press than that employed by Allende. Ortúzar, perhaps, learned from his experiences and the reaction to the Abuses of

---

[21] Hermógenes Pérez de Arce, "Los Comunistas No Son Agradecidos," accessed on 9/17/2016, http://blogdehermogenes.blogspot.com/2016/01/los-comunistas-no-son-agradecidos.html
[22] Centro de Estudios Bicentenario, El Acuerdo de la Cámara de Diputados sobre el Grave Quebrantamiento del Orden Constitucional y Legal de la República, del 22 de agosto de 1973, (accessed on 12/15/16), http://www.bicentenariochile.cl/attachments/017_Acuerdo percent20C percentC3 percentA1mara percent20de percent20Diputados percent2022 percent20agosto percent201973.pdf.
[23] See Chapter Two.

Publication law that journalists and human rights organizations, both domestically and internationally, took such claims seriously. Furthermore, he also included a liberal economic argument, accusing UP of asphyxiating the press and seeking to acquire a monopoly over newsprint: two accusations that accurately represented Allende's strategy to control the media. Ortúzar further displayed his hard-earned understanding of freedom of expression in debates surrounding the constitutional acts written by the commission bearing his name.

Pinochet granted both Ortúzar and Guzmán privileged positions within his inner circle of advisors. The general would meet with the two men to alert them to any important policy or governmental actions, long before others within the government or the general public would find out. These meetings strengthened the authority the two men held on the Ortúzar Commission, as their knowledge clearly demonstrated their privileged positions.[24] In the discussion surrounding constitutional acts 2, 3, and 4, both men took a wary stance on absolute freedom of expression or the press; however, Ortúzar's council was much more nuanced. While the former minister clearly displayed his keen understanding of the relationship between freedom of the press and government legitimacy, Guzmán pushed to have more overt control of the press written into the constitution.

The Ortúzar Commission proposed a guarantee on freedom of the press and expression. It granted all natural or naturalized Chileans the right to found a written publication or radio station, but restricted television to the domain of the state and

[24] Huneeus

universities. Admiral Merino and others presented doubts about allowing such freedom to the media, especially radio stations, and argued for more specific controls written into the constitution. For Guzmán and others, radio and television were just too dangerous. Ortúzar did not disagree with the assessment, but believed that due to international constitutional norms the regime must guarantee the right to freedom of information, but could and should restrict it later through legislation and constitutional states of exception. He argued, "It is not logical for a government to grant at its discretion, the concessions of broadcasting, renewing or canceling them, which has always been done with political motivation." He urged, "From the point of view of the outside, it would have great significance if this government made it. The first government to make such a distinction, the first government to be branded a dictatorship etcetera."[25] The lawyer recognized that the eyes of the country and the international community would scrutinize the dictatorship's constitution and pushed for less restriction. Ortúzar drew from his experience as Minister of Justice when he argued that it is much easier to create and modify laws than it is to reword the constitution.[26] To Ortúzar, the regime's legitimacy depended on having a constitution that both Chileans and the international community would find acceptable. That meant adhering to certain international conventions regarding the form a constitution should take.

After much back and forth in this instance, Pinochet sided with Ortúzar and stated, "The constitution should only give the broad strokes. The rest will be established

[25] Ibid.,, 109.
[26] Ibid.

by law."[27] The act would state only that control of broadcasting would be established by law. Furthermore, the constitutional acts would guarantee the right of citizens to receive accurate information, but would in times of crisis restrict the right of media outlets to provide information, especially during a State of Siege.

Though they feared radio and television, legal experts and members of the Junta believed the written press was much more trustworthy. Guzmán summed up the views of the Ortúzar Commission on the press when stating, "Written media, for which a person pays each time, is one thing, whereas, the type of media that is like an atomic bomb, radios where a person can turn it on and tune to whatever station without anyone knowing who is tuning into what broadcaster when and how many are doing so. The same applies for television, and this, in our opinion, is enormously important."[28] Guzmán stated newspapers and magazines were different because, "each person buys their copy… and has the ability to reflect on it."[29] For the Ortúzar Commission, this was the most important aspect of the written press. If possible, it wanted to remake the media landscape based on the model provided by newspapers and newsmagazines. Guzmán explained, "What we propose is a whole new conception of the media…that is easy to understand, unassailable, and indisputable." Somehow, the regime must fundamentally change radio and television so that it would not stoke society's passions. However, the Ortúzar Commission recognized that the powers of the military government were critical to accomplishing this task. A democratic society would not be able to reign in the press

[27] Ibid., 117.
[28] Ibid., 107.
[29] Ibid.

as effectively. They considered it very important to make this change under the military government. As Guzmán explained, "Once the current situation of power is over, it will be difficult to give birth to new media bodies, because the situation will be much more conflicted than if we are able to give birth to them now, with all of the guarantees."[30]

The legacy of this dispute is evinced by the final draft of the Constitution of 1980. In it, Pinochet established a new set of laws to govern the press. Article 19(12) guaranteed "the freedom to express opinions and to disseminate information without prior censorship in any form and by any means." Any individual or legal entity had the right to "establish and maintain newspapers, magazines, and periodicals." They did not have the right to form television or radio stations.[31] Although Article 19 seemed to allow freedom of the press, the press remained subject to strict content control under Article 8, which made it illegal for any group or individual "to propagate doctrines which are antagonistic to the family or which advocate violence or a concept of society, state, or judicial order of a totalitarian character or based on class warfare." Any organization or political movement with Marxist-Leninist ideology was illegal.[32] Moreover, Article 8 made it dangerous for the press to cover stories or conduct interviews with leftist political figures. The constitution also included 29 transitory articles to govern the transition period between 1981 and 1989. Under Transitory Article 24, the president had the power to restrict the freedom of information. Pinochet could only do this if he were to declare a national state of exception.

---

[30] Ibid.
[31] The Americas Watch Committee, *Chile: Human Rights and the plebiscite*. 207.
[32] Ibid., 205.

The supposedly dangerous nature of television and radio seemed to require immediate attention. The risk they posed to the regime's ideal society of anti-politics could threaten everything Pinochet hoped to accomplish. Additionally, overt Marxist-Leninist propaganda could not be tolerated. The regime then would need to focus its efforts primarily on reshaping the radio and television industry and suppressing leftist voices, leaving the written media outside its immediate concerns. It is not coincidental that the first opposition media outlets were newsmagazines. Though the meetings for the passing of constitutional acts were classified, there was a general sense amongst opposition journalists that the regime placed a lower priority on controlling print media. Journalists took advantage of the opening provided to them by the regime's focus on radio and television to push back against the government.

Discovering the Limits of Participation: Opposition Media

John Dinges, Arturo Navarro, and the other young journalists who emerged from the ashes of Committee for Peace, had been meeting to discuss founding a newsmagazine prior to José Zalaquett's expulsion in November 1975. Dinges recalled, "We saw this as a part of the process of moving back toward democracy…there were other publications like *Politica y Espiritu* and *Mensaje*, but none of them were journalistic. We were going to give people the information that they needed with the context to understand what was going on around them with the goal of returning to democracy."[33] However, before anything of the sort could happen the journalists needed to clear two major hurdles: first, they needed to fund the operation, and second, they had to receive approval from the

[33] John Dinges.

military government to begin publishing. Zalaquett and the newly formed Vicariate of Solidarity connected Navarro with foreign sources of money looking to support human rights in Chile. Through this connection, they obtained $7,000 to found the newsmagazine.[34] The regime would not have approved a magazine with the stated goal of ending the military government, so the staff at *APSI* applied to publish a newsmagazine focused on international news. The censors accepted the application and gave them permission to begin publication.

Navarro served as the new publication's first director, as he was both an experienced journalist and a Chilean citizen (the government required all directors of media outlets to be Chilean citizens. Rafael Otano Garde, a Spaniard, was the first editor). Otano had been a priest, left the priesthood in 1970, traveled to Chile, and began working as a journalist writing for the Jesuit magazine *Mensaje*. Navarro, Otano, and the *APSI*'s legal representative were the only names to appear anywhere in the magazine because there were no bylines to protect the authors of articles from harassment by the military. Dinges handled the layout because he had experience doing so from his time at the *Des Moines Register and Tribune*. The initial design of *APSI* was simple, because as Dinges recalled, "I knew how to do that in a mechanical way, but layout is a work of design and I wasn't very imaginative. I could set up pages, so that they would fit, but would they look good? I just did it because no one else knew how to do it."[35]

---

[34] Francisca Araya Jofré, *Historia de la Revista APSI: El que se ríe se va al cuartel* (Pico para Pinochet), (Santiago de Chile: LOM Ediciones, 2007), 20.
[35] Dinges

Initially, Navarro's connection to the Unitary Popular Action Movement Worker and Peasant (MAPU-OC) threatened the magazine's journalistic independence. Prior to *APSI*'s first issue, Navarro recalled, "The clandestine leadership of the MAPU-OC tried, unsuccessfully, to seize the directorship of the magazine."[36] However, Navarro and the other journalists working at *APSI* pushed back against direct party control, citing both the danger of that and the need for journalistic integrity. According to Navarro, "In short, they realized that the publication was much more effective as an independent medium than as a partisan mouthpiece"[37] *APSI*'s staff primarily consisted of former members of Center-Left parties. Dinges recalled, "*APSI* was basically MAPUistas and there were some Socialists, *Izquierda Cristiana* (Christian Left), and I brought in a Communist named Ramón to write about culture."[38] He explained, *APSI*'s "Staff were all on the Left, but no Movement of the Revolutionary Left sympathizers, for example. Everybody's personal politics were firmly in the mainstream of what later became the Concertación."[39] He continued, "Ideology was not a factor among that group. It was very pragmatic politics, with the goal of restoring democracy… The Communists were kept on the outside, intentionally. That was also a pragmatic decision, but that didn't mean we couldn't have writers who were associated with the Communists."[40] Communists needed to be kept on the outside of the leadership, because including them would risk being named an organ of Marxist-Leninist propaganda and being immediately shutdown. *APSI,*

[36] Arturo Navarro
[37] Ibid.
[38] John Dinges
[39] John Dinges, email interview with author, July 9, 2016.
[40] Ibid.

then, was oppositional, but not aligned with any one opposition party or group. Instead, it endeavored to challenge the regime where possible amid censorship.

APSI initially published twice a month, with a circulation of 500 subscriptions. The journalists released their first issue in the second half of July 1976. Despite being restricted to international news, the staff at *APSI* had a plan to make their magazine relevant to the Chilean situation. Under Navarro, *APSI* published stories about authoritarian regimes and human-rights violations in other countries. It also published stories about international political issues that might have a direct bearing domestically. They formed the strategy in the intervening six months between when the government granted *APSI* permission to publish and its first issue. As a result, *APSI'*s first issue contained examples of both strategies.

The front page of issue no. 1, published on July 15, 1976, prominently featured an article titled "Carter and Brzezinski." The article focused on the relationship between Carter's presidential campaign and Columbia University political scientist Zbigniew Brzezinski. Navarro—the article's uncredited author—expressed optimism about the combination of Brzezinski's expansive view of the United States as a force for global development and Carter's emphasis on human rights. The article highlighted Brzezinski's view that the United States needed to "make a more open, more humanist, and less ideological society."[41] These changes should be part of a broader global consciousness. The sub-textual relationship to the Chilean situation was the hope that Carter's election and the possibility that Brzezinski would be Secretary of State would force Pinochet and

[41] *APSI,* "Carter y Brzezinski," no. 1, July 15, 1976, 2.

the dictatorship to reduce human-rights violations to receive development aid from the United States. The strategy of writing about congruent situations was exemplified in an article about post-Franco Spain titled, "The Way of the Future." The article detailed conflicts in Spain over the return to civilian rule and challenges of democratic reform describing the various interest group, including the military, pushing for their vision of Spanish society.[42] The title of the article had dual meanings. Literally, it was an article about the way forward for Spain. However, "The Way of the Future" could also refer to using post-Franco Spain as an example for what Chileans would face post-Pinochet, thus, the notion that the regime will end.

Another common subject of *APSI* stories was military dictatorships elsewhere in Latin America. Through coverage of human-rights violations in countries like Brazil and Argentina, *APSI* could bring attention to and criticize the killing of supposed dissidents by such regimes. For instance, the article "Controlling the Violence" detailed the mass killing of "47 supposed militants" by General Jorge Videla's military government in Argentina.[43] The article argued that such killings represented a major problem for Videla in terms of international public opinion. If *APSI* had changed the names and facts a little, the story could have applied directly to Chile. Other similar stories from *APSI*'s early years included: "Political Model Not Yet Clear" about the military dictatorship in Uruguay; "Elections for 1980: Parties and Trade Unions in Banzer's Political Opening" about Bolivian Dictator Hugo Banzer's promised opening and free elections for 1980; and "The Strikes in Argentina" about opposition strikes in Argentina paralyzing the

[42] *APSI*, "El camino del future," no. 1, July 15, 1976, 3-4.
[43] *APSI*, "Controlar la violencia," no. 3, September 2, 1976, 9.

nation and sending a message to the armed forces.[44] Under Navarro, *APSI* continued to use these strategies for opposing the regime without drawing censorship from it. Navarro remembered that, occasionally, a censor would take issue with the wording of one passage or another, complaining that it sounded too much like Chile, but DINACOS usually approved issues of *APSI* with only minor changes.[45]

Dinges remembers the early days of *APSI* fondly. Every other Tuesday night, the staff met to plan the stories for the next edition. Fifteen to 20 people would gather in the largest room and sit on tables, chairs, and beanbags. Dinges described the atmosphere, "The best and freest discussion that you could ever take part in occurred in those meetings." They would have great conversations about human rights, the situation in Chile, and their lives. Dinges continued, "We were planning the issue, but we were also exercising freedom of expression. It was the only place where you could just let it all hang out and have a completely free discussion because we all trusted each other."[46] Most of the journalists who wrote stories for *APSI* during its early years worked for free in exchange for access to foreign newspapers.[47] Rather than having an editorial board assign stories, the group of those involved chose their own stories. Dinges recalled, "It was a group of people, I remember the room being fairly full meaning 12-15 people. People would pitch stories, but it wasn't like NPR or the Washington Post, where an editor would assign stories. We were all well informed… If we could get ahold of any international magazines or newspapers those would be our sources. I would interview

---

[44] *APSI*, no. 4-33,October, 1976- December, 1977.
[45] "Arturo Navarro"
[46] John Dinges, telephone interview with author, May 4, 2011.
[47] Ibid.

people at the [U.S.] embassy…we had a pretty good idea of what was going on in the world."[48] He continued, "We would interview visiting labor leaders and at that time there were a bunch of people flowing through Santiago semi-clandestinely or they would come on a tourist visa and have meetings with labor people. It was an open secret sort of thing, but they wouldn't appear in the papers or anything like that… It was a lot of fun."[49]

In February 1977, editor Rafael Otano left to return to Spain, and Arturo Navarro—while remaining the director at *APSI*—took a job as the morning radio host at Radio Cooperativa. Radio Cooperativa under the leadership of Delia Vergara had established itself as an acceptable source of opposition to the regime and carried much prestige in the country. As such, Navarro shifted a large part of his day to Radio Cooperativa and Dinges took on more of the editing duties at *APSI*. Dinges recalled, a lot of the writers "were academics and so their style of writing was to give you a great big long introduction with theoretical frameworks and background and it was my job to cut through all that and make it make sense."[50] Dinges recalled working with the social scientist Carlos Portales Cifuentes, "I did a story about China with Carlos Portales and he wrote this academic thing with three pages of introduction, which I just cut and gave it back to him and he was so surprised. No one had ever done that to him before, but he accepted it and that is how it was."[51] Under Dinges's editorial guidance, *APSI* continued to challenge limits of what it could get away with. Although the regime had begun to secure its economic and legal-institutional position, the press did not experience a full

[48] "John Dinges"
[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid.
[51] Ibid.

opening. The regime did not replace its violent repressive apparatus, DINA, until August of that year, and the Chicago Boys' economic policies were just beginning to show signs of success. Politically, Pinochet had announced a plan for a "new democracy," but his legal-institutional position had not yet been secured by the 1978 plebiscite and the Constitution of 1980. The regime, unsurprisingly, continued to subject the press to careful control. In March 1977, the regime issued Edict 107, which required journalists to solicit and receive permission from the Military Governor of their occupation zone if they wanted to establish new publications under a State of Emergency.[52] Despite the restrictive atmosphere, *APSI* started to push the envelope with its editorial choices.

Even though it relied primarily on international news stories to indirectly criticize the regime, *APSI* began to slowly publish more articles about Chile. One, titled "Latin America Increased Production and Importation of Armaments," reported that "in 1976 the military spending in Latin America surpassed U.S. $4 billion. Eighty percent of that spending is concentrated in only six states: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Peru, and Venezuela."[53] Excepting Venezuela and Colombia, the countries listed had military dictatorships at the time, allowing *APSI* to link an increase in arms imports and production to military governments in Latin America. *APSI* also pointed out that Chile was one of the top importers of arms.[54] The article was the closest *APSI* came to direct criticism of the regime in 1977. More noteworthy, *APSI* failed to publish any articles relating to the Letelier assassination, indicating the cautious line it took during this time.

---

[52] Baltra Montaner, *Atentados a la Libertad de Información*, 15.
[53] *APSI*, "Latinoamérica Acrecienta producción e importación de Armamentos," *APSI: Actualidad Internacional,* April 1-15, No. 17, 1976, 9-10.
[54] Ibid.

Dinges experienced how difficult it could be to criticize the regime firsthand. He wrote the *Washington Post* line on Chile, but had been publishing articles without his name attached to protect himself. Early in 1977, he made a career decision. Dinges recalled, "I wrote the first stories about disappearances, I think. None of this with my name on it. I decided that for my career I needed to have my name on my stories."[55] He remembered running into a US State Department official at a Ravi Shankar concert in Santiago. He told Dinges that putting his name on stories was crazy and gave the distinct impression that he "wasn't saying it like a joke, he was saying it like a warning. That sort of thing is rocking the boat and it is dangerous. It wasn't in their [the United States] interest for us to be writing those kinds of stories."[56] The warning proved true, and in response to Dinges's *Washington Post* articles and his work at *APSI,* the Pinochet government rescinded his press pass and started the process of kicking him out of the country.[57] Upon notification, Dinges immediately called the U.S. Embassy in Santiago. The ambassador then contacted DINACOS and convinced it to reconsider and allow Dinges to stay.[58] Though the US government was generally permissive of the regime's human-rights violations, it would step in to protect US citizens from regime abuses.

In 1978, *APSI* invited its readers to a dinner in celebration of its two-year anniversary.[59] *APSI*'s director, Navarro, invited the former Rector of the Pontifical Catholic University, Fernando Castillo Velasco, who had recently returned from exile, to

---

[55] John Dinges
[56] Ibid.
[57] John Dinges, phone interview with author. May 4, 2011.
[58] U.S. Embassy in Santiago, "Expulsion of Washington Post Correspondant John Dinges," February 23, 1977. http://foia.state.gov/documents/Pinochet/9044.pdf. (accessed May 20, 2011) 1.
[59] *APSI*, "A Nuestros Lectores," *APSI: Actualidad Internacional* July 1-15, No. 47. 1978, 3.

be the event's main speaker. On the evening of the event, more than 200 people arrived, including diplomats, guild and union leaders, members of the clergy, directors of communications media, youth leaders, professionals, and university professors. Castillo used his first public reappearance to speak out against human-rights violations committed by the dictatorship. Navarro later remembered that the event, "although intended only to be a celebration, its guests saw it as an oppositional political event."[60] Also in 1978, Dinges left Chile. He returned frequently, due to the deep connection he felt with the country. *APSI* left his desk and his typewriter in place so that he would always have a desk at which to work when he visited. Dinges also mailed stories and served as a foreign correspondent for *APSI*.

Navarro's position at Radio Cooperativa, meanwhile, provided a direct connection between the staff at *APSI* and another early opposition media outlet. Dinges remembered, "Man, we were really close *APSI* and Radio Cooperativa at the time."[61] Navarro also recalled, "There was a certain professional solidarity, not only between the two media outlets, but also with all the national journalists and foreign correspondents who tried to inform something of what the official media—almost all the others— hid. Solidarity was also a survival strategy, because there were serious risks at that time."[62] In his role at Radio Cooperativa, Navarro quickly gained a reputation for being a "real journalist." When asked about his reputation, Navarro pointed to the director of Radio

[60] Arturo Navarro Ceardi, personal interview by author, December 14, 2010.
[61] John Dinges
[62] Arturo Navarro Ceardi.

Cooperativa at the time, Delia Vergara Larraín, and said it was she who set the tone and emphasis for the work done at the radio station.

Vergara grew up in Viña del Mar, a coastal city near Valparaíso where many of Chile's political elites had homes. She described her family as "elite: part of the bourgeoisie."[63] For instance, she grew up playing with Allende's children in Valparaíso. She went to college at the University of Chile and studied journalism. When she graduated, her family ties with the media mogul Edwards family paid off, and Agustín Edwards, owner of *El Mercurio,* wrote a letter of support for her to the Columbia University School of Journalism, as a result, she was accepted to and attended the elite institution. She obtained her Masters in Journalism in 1965 and moved to Geneva, Switzerland. While living in Europe, she received a letter from Roberto Edwards—brother of Augustín Edwards—requesting that she return to Chile to direct his new project: the women's magazine *Paula*. It would be Chile's first stand-alone women's magazine. She studied women's magazines in Europe and returned to Chile with the goal of making a modern magazine for women. She described its editorial line as feminist, but not militant for a political party or position, or "feminist without a flag."[64]

Roberto Edwards was very hands off with the magazine. Vergara remembered he largely left her to her own designs as long as the magazine made money, and during Vergara's tenure *Paula* was very profitable. He became even more hands-off when the Edwards family left Chile in 1970 to avoid direct conflict with Salvador Allende. Of the UP years, Vergara remembered most of the staff supported Allende, but she recalled,

---

[63] Delia Vergara, interview with author. October 13, 2014.
[64] Ibid.

"*Paula* was neither for nor against Allende. It was for women."[65] She had always been fascinated by politics, but never thought of herself as political. However, as UP began to face more and more problems, Vergara wanted to take on a different journalistic challenge and began to write pieces for Filippi's *Ercilla* about the prospect of a military coup. After the coup, *Paula* lost some key staff members to the regime's repression. Amanda Puz, subdirector, failed to sing the national anthem at a new year's celebration, which DINA members noticed and exiled her for.[66] Isabel Allende, who wrote for the magazine, left for Venezuela. She went on to be a famous author. Roberto Edwards returned to Chile intent on taking more hands-on control of the magazine. He and Vergara clashed constantly during this period, until he fired her in 1974. She was sad, but relieved.

In 1976, the PDC-owned Radio Cooperativa contacted her and offered her a position as director of the media outlet. She agreed on one condition: she could choose the editorial line with no interference by the Christian Democrats. She recalled she wanted a line that "was professional and not partisan."[67] To be a professional journalist, Vergara believed, "is to inform, to illuminate, to satisfy the readers' intellectual curiosity, to advocate for justice, and to expose abuses of power."[68] According to Vergara, the journalist must do all of that with objectivity and disinterest. She was surprised when the PDC agreed. However, her conception of professional journalism matches very closely

---

[65] Ibid.
[66] Ibid., For more information about Amanda Puz see also: Amanda Puz, *Última vez que me exilio*, (Catalonia: Santiago, 2013).
[67] Ibid.
[68] Ibid.

the PDC's own image of an ideal press (see chapter one). Despite similar views on the role of journalism in society, Vergara described her relationship with the ownership of the radio station as rocky. The pay was poor and Radio Cooperativa always seemed to be on the verge of economic collapse. She felt as though the party did not realize what they had and did not support it enough. "There was money available everywhere in those days," she recalled of the ample sources of foreign donations from human-rights organizations meant to support a free press. Vergara believed the fact that the PDC did not take advantage of those to strengthen the station beyond its morning programing proved it did not care about the station. However, Vergara's assessment did not line up with the PDC's. Genaro Arriagada—the PDC's voice in Radio Cooperativa—believed the station was critically important.[69] The party's lack of intervention both in terms of editorial line and financial support probably stemmed from a desire to keep the station independent.

Following the closure of the much more militant Radio Balmaceda in 1977, many of the staff there moved over to Radio Cooperativa, and Vergara laid down the law and forbade partisanship in the stories they reported. Yet, Vergara and her staff came up with a brilliant way to report on disappearances. Instead of reporting based on rumor or family members' testimony, Cooperativa based its reporting on public legal documents filed with the government by lawyers looking for their clients.[70] The strategy provided a

---

[69] Genaro Arriagada.

[70] It was believed a person had a greater chance at escaping death at the hands of the regime if as soon as they went missing a lawyer submitted what was called a recurso de amparo, stating they represented this person and if the government had them in custody that they give the lawyer the right to meet with their client. This work was broadly carried out by the legal arm of The Committee for Peace and continued with the Vicariate of Solidarity.

degree of separation; instead of accusing the government of disappearing someone, Radio Cooperativa reported only that someone was missing and that the person's legal representation suspected the government might have them. The strategy was successful, and Radio Cooperativa gained a reputation as a reliable source of information that could be trusted despite government attempts to control the media.

Radio Cooperativa did not, however, escape the watchful eyes of the censors at DINACOS. The station had sympathizers within the censorship agency who would alert Vergara if one of her stories had caused a stir. This forewarning allowed her to prepare herself mentally for the intimidation tactics employed by the agency. She recalled, "Agents would ride up on loud motorcycles, storm in and demand that [she] presents herself at the Ministry of the Interior immediately."[71] The entire show was meant to scare her, but, as she said, "I am not scareable."[72] She recalled those meetings, "I was young and beautiful and I used all of my resources to keep the station going. I told myself it was for journalism."[73] Arriagada also remembered those meetings, "Delia was from a good family and well educated. On top of that, she was one of the most beautiful women in Chile at the time. The government censors did not know how to handle her."[74] More important than her charm, she believed her argument that Radio Cooperativa was good for the regime is what kept it operating. She recalled telling censors repeatedly, "We are good for you. When you are criticized for being repressive you can point to us and say,

[71] Delia Vergara
[72] Ibid.
[73] Ibid.
[74] Genaro Arriagada

'look there is some press freedom.'"[75] Under Vergara, Radio Cooperativa operated with minimal interference from the dictatorship. However, she learned there were some subjects that were too dangerous to touch including the Dignity Colony and Pinochet's family.[76] Vergara remembered receiving a call from one of her spies within DINACOS after running a story on the Dignity Colony, about the story she was told firmly, harshly, and with no further explanation, "This, No."[77]

Radio Cooperativa pioneered an effective way to oppose the regime through impartial reporting. Vergara said, "I always saw myself as very different from the other opposition media. We were not rivals, but we weren't friends."[78] She recalled, "We saw each other everywhere: at the Vicariate of Solidarity and the various European embassies," but she believed first *APSI*'s and later *Hoy*'s and *Analisís*' opposition to the government was too political and lacked objectivity.[79] Emilio Fillipi—former director of *Ercilla* and member of the PDC—was eager to follow the examples of *APSI* and Radio Cooperativa. He and the former staff of *Ercilla* founded in late 1977 the opposition magazine *Hoy,* with a focus on domestic political issues. Though both media outlets had a connection to the PDC and *Hoy* benefitted greatly from Radio Cooperativa's model for how to cover domestic issues without being censored, Fillipi and his staff remained broadly independent of both the radio station and the PDC party apparatus.

---

[75] Delia Vergara
[76] Arturo Navarro also mentioned these limitations in my conversations with him. The Dignity Colony was a cult run by Paul Schaffer in Southern Chile. The cult and its leader molested hundreds of young children during the Pinochet government's rule. The regime was complicit in these crimes and agreed to broadly leave the group alone as long as it could use part of the colony as a secret detention center for political prisoners. Though, this was not known at the time.
[77] Delia Vergara
[78] Ibid.
[79] Ibid.

Shortly after leading his staff in a mass exodus from *Ercilla*, Filippi laid out his plans at the Santiago restaurant El Parrón.[80] The staff gathered for a dinner in Filippi's honor January 27, 1977. The event was planned to host 100 guests—mostly other journalists. In his speech, Filippi outlined his vision of what journalism should be, "We believe journalism should be to serve the truth… to be sound… to be clear and sharp."[81] Filippi continued by stating that the new ownership of *Ercilla* had not provided the staff with the ability to exercise true journalism and "that is why we preferred to reclaim our autonomy."[82] It was one thing to announce the idea and another thing to make it happen, however. The new publication still needed to clear the hurdles of funding and government approval.

Funding for the project came initially from donations, both domestic and foreign. Most important among those was the continued patronage of the Catholic Funding Organization for Development Programs, a charity group based in the Netherlands. Permission to publish proved more difficult. The journalists enlisted other professionals in the field to help them petition DINACOS for the right to found a magazine. A disparate group, including *El Mercurio*, *La Segunda*, and the Inter-American Press Society (SIP), began to pressure the government to allow the magazine to be published. Furthermore, due to personal connections, Pinochet's daughter, Lucía Pinochet Hiriart, worked to convince her father of the worthiness of the publication. All of the pressure

[80] El Parrón was demolished a few years ago to make room for a tall office building.
[81] Emilio Filippi in Paula Mobarek and Dominic Spiniak, *Revista Hoy, 1.108 ediciones con historia* (Santiago: Ediciones Copygraph, 2001) 31.
[82] Ibid., 32.

paid off, and the government granted the former staff of *Ercilla* the right to publish a news magazine called *Hoy*.[83]

The staff chose *Hoy* for the name of the magazine, because *Hoy* had been a rival of *Ercilla* in the 1930s. Eventually, the first *Hoy* and *Ercilla* came under the ownership of the same man, and *Hoy* gained a reputation as *Ercilla*'s more intellectual counterpart.[84] *Hoy*'s subdirector Abraham Santibáñez recalled, "For the public, this probably meant nothing. For us, the connection was very important."[85] The newsmagazine looked, from its outset, much more professional than *APSI.* The staff's experience at *Ercilla* and the funding they received paid off in that regard. Published June 1, 1977, the first issue included an editorial by Filippi in which he laid out his vision for the magazine. Titled "The Truth without Compromises," the piece promised, "Our line 'the truth without compromises' synthesizes the spirit of *Hoy*. We want our journalism to be truthful, objective, and independent. This is a profound sentiment, which is more than mere words."[86] Santibáñez described the staff's goal, "We did not want to become another opposition paper. We wanted something professional."[87] The staff celebrated the first issue with a reception, serving empanadas and red and white wine. Attendees included the director of DINACOS, Colonel Werther Araya, and Government Press Officer Max Reindl Hauser.[88] Neither of the two men would attend *APSI*'s one-year anniversary dinner a month later. Their attendance showed a clear hope on the part of the government

---

[83] Paula Mobarek and Dominic Spiniak, Revista Hoy, 1.108 ediciones con historia (Santiago: Ediciones Copygraph, 2001) 39.
[84] See Chapter 2.
[85] Abraham Santibáñez
[86] Emilio Filippi, "La verdad sin compromisos," *Hoy*, No. 1, June 1, 1977, 10.
[87] Abraham Santibáñez.
[88] "El primer dia de Hoy" *Hoy*, No 2, June 8, 1977, 16.

that *Hoy* would be akin to Radio Cooperativa, keeping criticism within acceptable bounds. *Hoy* also received a letter from Air Force General, future member of the ruling junta, and Minister of Health Fernando Matthei Aubel, wishing the staff lasting success in maintaining their journalistic line of "objectivity, veracity, and public service."[89] Initially, the regime's hopes seemed to be realized in *Hoy*'s editorial line.

In order to safeguard their publication, the staff at *Hoy* took a cautious line. One reader noticed the caution immediately and wrote the magazine to inform it that he saw "absolutely no difference between *Hoy*'s first issue and the official government press."[90] Arriagada also believed *Hoy* was too cautious to be useful for an opposition political movement.[91] Though Santibáñez recalled that the relationship between *Hoy* and the PDC was close, much like with Radio Cooperativa the PDC did not try to impose any editorial control.[92] Despite its caution, *Hoy* managed to work in coverage of the opposition. For instance, in an interview with two youth leaders, titled "The Youth after Chacarillas," *Hoy* represented not only the officially sanctioned position of the Youth Front, but the unauthorized oppositional youth position led by Guillermo Yunge Bustamante. Yunge argued, "A fair, free and united society can achieve neither Marxism nor capitalism."[93] Instead, Yunge hoped for a more humanist approach to an open, democratic society. Yunge's position fell within the realm of safe opposition, because he was not advocating for Marxism.

---

[89] *Hoy*, No 2, June 8, 1977, 65.
[90] Ibid., 66.
[91] Genaro Arriagada.
[92] Abraham Santibáñez.
[93] Patricia Verdugo, "Los jóvenes, después de Chacarillas," *Hoy*, No. 11, August 10, 1977, 23.

Hoy would continue to cautiously push the limits of acceptable opposition. In a November 1977 editorial, Filippi argued, "neither censorship nor self-censorship can be acceptable as a permanent state, meanwhile, without the total recovery of media autonomy, it will not even be possible to say that we are on a path to normalizing our institutional democracy."[94] *Hoy*'s commitment to the truth without compromises would push it into the oppositional camp whether it intended to be there or not, eventually leading to the magazine's suspension for two months in 1979.

While *Hoy* was just beginning to publish in 1977, Cardinal Raúl Silva Henríquez—a staunch supporter of a free press—worked to gain funding for another opposition news source. *Análisis,* a monthly newsmagazine published by Silva Henríquez's Academy of Christian Humanism (AHC), was initially meant to be a monthly bulletin about the institution. However, under the directorship of Juan Pablo Cárdenas, it gained a reputation for a scholarly criticism of the regime. Cárdenas had been a journalism student at the Pontifical Catholic University during Allende's presidency. He was a member of the Christian Democratic Party at the time and did not support Allende, but when the coup happened he opposed the break in democratic tradition.[95] Cárdenas also edited the newspaper *Debate Universitario* at the PUC. On the evening of September 10, 1973, the staff at *Debate Universitario* had a meeting to discuss the possibility of a military coup. The meeting went deep into the night, and around 2:00 am a Communist professor, UP Assessor of the University of Chile, and Salvador Allende's personal doctor, Enrique París Roa, entered the room and told them in

[94] Emilio Filippi, "Limitacions a la libertad de prensa," *Hoy*, No. 24, November 9, 1977, 7.
[95] Juan Pablo Cárdenas, interview with author, October 2, 2014.

confidence that the coup was imminent. Cárdenas and one other staff member went to the presidential palace—La Moneda—to observe what might come.[96] They went with París to his office at the University of Chile, and from there continued to La Moneda. When they arrived, París went inside and they remained outside nearby as they were not important enough to receive entrance. They would not see him again. When the military took the presidential palace, Paris was arrested, tortured, and disappeared.

Shortly after the coup, Cárdenas completed his degree and moved north out of Santiago to Antofagasta, returning to the capital a few years later to work at Cardinal Silva Henríquez's Academy of Christian Humanism. Silva had founded the school to protect academic freedom and employ persecuted professors under the protection of the Catholic Church. It was there where Cárdenas would, with the Cardinal's help, found *Análisis*, with the goal of promoting resistance to the government through social agitation.[97] The magazine would not exclude any political viewpoint as long as it opposed the government. It had writers from the Left, Right, and Center of Chile's political spectrum. Cárdenas believed it was important to found the magazine, because, in his words, "I had a journalistic vocation. I had a vision that was more than politics. The vision was a moral one."[98]

Despite the support of Cardinal Silva Henríquez, *Análisis* could not find a major press willing to print it. Instead, the magazine created a web of small publishers. Though the intent was to publish monthly, the staff only managed 10 issues in the first year due to

[96] Ibid.
[97] Ibid.
[98] Ibid.

production and funding difficulties. The first issue appeared in December 1977, focusing on the university system, with pieces written by ex-directors of many universities who now worked out of AHC.[99] *Análisis* was the last of the major opposition magazines founded in the 1970s. However, due to Cárdenas' willingness to give everyone a voice and its position under the protection of the Catholic Church, it employed and gave a voice to many on the far Left who had been excluded from other opposition media outlets. In its fourth issue, the magazine ran an extended interview with labor activist and a founder of the Movement of the Revolutionary Left, Clotario Blest. Throughout the interview, Blest advocated for the right to strike and criticized capitalism.[100]

Análisis joined *APSI,* Radio Cooperativa, and *Hoy* as the main voices of dissent in the latter half of the 1970s. These media outlets pushed up against the limits of the dictatorship's allowance for opposition: *APSI* through the clever use of international news, Radio Cooperativa and *Hoy* through carefully managed reporting on domestic issues, and *Análisis* through the presentation of all political viewpoints under the protection of Cardinal Raúl Silva Henríquez. As the regime's legitimacy improved, prior censorship gave way to self-censorship and warnings if a story went too far. The journalists at these media outlets used the relaxation of restrictions to further push the limits of what they could cover. In 1979, there was some reason to be optimistic about the state of freedom of the press, until July, at least, when the government tried to force closed the challenge to the regime's legitimacy the opposition press represented by suspending *Hoy*.

---

[99] *Análisis*, no. 1, December, 1977.
[100] Clotario Blest, "La eficaz no violencia," *Análisis*, no. 4, April-May, 1978, 4-6.

Journalists Challenging the Regime's Legitimacy

The decision by General Enrique Morel Donoso to suspend *Hoy* immediately created controversy. The opposition press, which since 1976 had been pushing against the limits of acceptable dissent, rallied to support *Hoy*. Furthermore, many journalists outside the opposition media acted against the incursion on freedom of the press. The opposition media used the regime's relaxing of restrictions to expand the limits of acceptable opposition, which, short of a complete crackdown, the Pinochet government could not so easily restrict. *APSI* expanded its coverage to include national news following *Hoy*'s model and all opposition media sources would continue to cover politicians and stories critical of the government, emboldened by each success. Despite Pinochet's claims that the government had not opened a floodgate, it did not seem able or willing to control an increasingly vocal opposition as the 1970s gave way to the 1980s.

Subdirector Santibáñez recalled that the closure was a major blow to the magazine's finances. The magazine's staff was helped through this period by a network of supporters called The Friends of *Hoy*. Groups of supporters all over the country arranged for the journalists of *Hoy* to travel and give speeches about freedom of the press. At one such meeting in San Antonio, a small town on the Pacific coast near Santiago, Santibáñez remarked on the staff's reason to hope, "We keep our hopes, because that silence has been compensated with the emergence of thousands of vibrant voices, like yours, which for us confirms the essential: *Hoy* has been converted into a light of hope for many Chileans and these Chileans, in this difficult hour, have responded by fighting

with sacrifice so that this light will not be extinguished forever," he said.[101] In addition to appreciating support from the Friends of *Hoy*, Santibáñez was also referring to the broad support *Hoy* received from other opposition newsmagazines and journalists in general.

At the same time that the regime silenced *Hoy* in 1979, *APSI* pushed the legal limits further by publishing a national news section, even though the magazine only had permission to cover international events. Navarro went to DINACOS to ask permission to begin publishing national news and was told that the law only stipulated that a publication needed the government's permission to begin publishing; it said nothing about needing permission to change the editorial line. *APSI* was in a legal grey area, but decided it was a risk that it had to take, both to continue to compete with the other opposition magazines and to further push the boundaries to move toward a free press.[102] In *APSI*'s second issue with a national section, Navarro offered his support to *Hoy*:

> We learned of the Government's determination to temporarily close a Chilean magazine. The cause of *Hoy* is for us the cause of all the journalists, the defense of freedom of expression effects, the media and the community, which has the right to know opinions from all sectors to maturely discern on which side is reason and on which side is error.[103]

Navarro's sentiment reflected the attitudes of other journalists. The College of Journalists rejected the government's ban, which, it said, severed the freedom of the press. The National Press Association issued a statement that the action against *Hoy* proved that for a long period of time the government had been restricting the freedom of the press.[104]

---

[101] Abraham Santibáñez in Paula Mobarek and Dominic Spiniak, *Revista HOY, 1.108 ediciones con historia* (Santiago: Ediciones Copygraph, 2001) 53-54.
[102] Manuel Contreras, interview with author, September 23, 2014.
[103] *APSI*, no. 60, July 16, 1979.
[104] Paula Mobarek and Dominic Spiniak, *Revista Hoy*, 54.

Perhaps the most surprising support came from the director of the generally pro-government newspaper *El Mercurio*. In an editorial, Arturo Fontaine Aldunante wrote, "When closing an opposition magazine, the government is not right and this contributes to weakening the country's negotiating capacity in any political terrain…(*Hoy)* does not seem incompatible with the debate about future institutions"[105] Fontaine argued that closing an opposition publication, rather than strengthening the government's legitimacy, actually weakened it.

The fervor surrounding the government closure of *Hoy* became so problematic that Pinochet addressed it in his annual Youth Day speech at Chacarillas Hill:

> Some voices have been heard that, with varying tone and intent…claim that the government would violate that which should characterize the institutional political debate [freedom of press]. Nothing is more unfounded. The measure in question should not be construed as prejudicing freedom of expression or a genuine public debate on the new institutions…We have demonstrated proven breadth to allow views differing from those of the government, but those who believe that this represents opening a floodgate to overflow the clearly marked limits, whatever the power they have ensconced themselves within, they will feel the rigor of the law and all the authority of the government.[106]

Despite the dictator's harsh words, the situation had changed since the end of 1975. A growing opposition press existed, because journalists exploited the small openings the regime had provided them. The outcry not just from the opposition, but from supposed allies like Fontaine, demonstrated to the government that overtly restricting freedom of the press and expression would be a detriment to that which it sought: legitimacy. Conversely, having an opposition presence in the media granted

---

[105] *El Mercurio*, June 24, 1979.
[106] Augusto Pinochet Ugarte in Paula Mobarek and Dominic Spiniak, *Revista HOY, 1.108 ediciones con historia* (Santiago: Ediciones Copygraph, 2001) 56.

Pinochet's government legitimacy. The regime had trapped itself; it wanted the legitimacy that the opposition provided, but had largely lost its main tool for controlling it. At a time when everything else seemed to be going well for the regime, institutionally and economically, attacking freedom of the press was no longer worth the possible fallout. This is not to say that the press was free of restrictions, however. Opposition media outlets continued to push against those limits as the 1980 constitutional plebiscite approached expanding the definition of acceptable opposition.

Hoy returned after its two-month suspension with a 116-page edition covering the period it had been closed. All of the magazine's regular columnists wrote articles about their time off and freedom of the press. The closure had redoubled their commitment to journalism.[107] In the aftermath, *Hoy*'s line became more oppositional and skeptical of the dictatorship's policies. The trend would only continue when former President Eduardo Frei Montalva returned from his self-imposed exile to criticize the regime's plans for a constitutional plebiscite in 1980. Santibáñez recalled that Frei and Cardinal Silva Henríquez were both very important role models and influences for the staff of *Hoy*.[108] Both men opposed the new constitution.

In an editorial titled "False Dilemma," Filippi argued that the military had created a false dilemma stating by arguing that if the constitution didn't pass the country would return to the chaos of 1973: "if we don't accept the prolonged omnipotent government, we will return to the chaos that provoked the military coup…but it is not true that the democracy we lived through in the past had been unable to stop excesses or those who

[107] Paula Mobarek and Dominic Spiniak, *Revista Hoy*, 57.
[108] Abraham Santibáñez.

would work against it…Rather, the lack of public participation has now created a lamentable civic weakness."[109] Filippi argued the reason the military remained in charge was not because democracy was inherently dangerous, but rather that the people had allowed the dictatorship to remain in place. Voting "yes" on the constitutional plebiscite would only continue the trend of tacit acceptance. As September 11—the date of the plebiscite— approached, *Hoy* increased its coverage trying to debunk the military's claim that a "no" victory would return Chile to the political crisis of 1973. Late in August, it ran a five-page interview with Frei. Frei and the editorial staff agreed that people needed to vote "no." He said, "they should not abstain, because I think that would be a useless gesture, that abstention is not factored into the results."[110] Frei went further, calling the entire plebiscite illegitimate and instead pushed for the establishment of a new government. He argued, "The solution is to immediately establish a transitional government outside of the military or civic-military establishment."[111] On September 10, Santibáñez wrote, "Publicly and categorically we pronounce ourselves for 'No.'"[112] During the period between its closure and the plebiscite, *Hoy*'s line changed substantially, no longer was *Hoy* just critical of the government's actions it had put itself firmly and openly against the regime.

The staff at *APSI* also vehemently opposed the constitutional plebiscite and continued to expand their national coverage despite being in a legal grey area. In a piece called "The Opposition Space," Jorge Donoso laid out his vision for what the opposition

---

[109] Emilio Filippi, "Falso Dilema," *Hoy*, no. 160, August 13, 1980, 11.
[110] Eduardo Frei Montalva in "El desafio de Frei," *Hoy*, no. 162, August 27, 1980, 12.
[111] Ibid., 13.
[112] Abraham Santibáñez, "Nuestro 'No,'" *Hoy*, no. 164, September 10, 1980, 7.

must do. He wrote, "In this moment it is surely a necessity— …or a temptation?—to secure the space won… what it must do is to occupy this space and move forward to achieve the establishment of full democratic values."[113] Though his message was meant for the opposition broadly, he perfectly summed up the continued strategy of the opposition press. In an editorial prior to the plebiscite, *APSI* flatly dismissed the official reasons for the new constitution and offered a different explanation: "The principal objective of the government would seem to be, then, the prolonged stabilization of the regime."[114] Two days before the plebiscite, moreover, Frei's name appeared in giant block letters on *APSI*'s cover. Inside, it devoted six full pages to Frei's speech and the "real alternative" to Pinochet's constitution he offered. Titled "Frei's Road," the article detailed the path Chile would take if the "No" vote prevailed, which included a return to civilian rule under a revised constitution of 1925.[115] Even though the constitution passed, *APSI*'s coverage of it solidified its relationship with the political opposition led by Frei.

In the latter half of the 1970s, Pinochet's dictatorship worked to establish its legitimate right to rule. With the passage of the Constitution of 1980, Pinochet was guaranteed at least eight more years in power. His legal-institutional legitimacy was at its height. The Chicago Boys had also produced an "economic miracle," providing the regime with further legitimacy. As part of that process, it had allowed for a very limited opposition press. Opposition journalists risked legal action or exile trying to force the definition of acceptable opposition to broaden. The outcry against the suspension of *Hoy*

---

[113] Jorge Donoso, "El espacio de la oposición," *APSI*, no. 78, July 29, 1980, 8.
[114] "Despues del once," *APSI,* no. 80, August 26, 1980, 1.
[115] Arturo Navarro, "El Camino de Frei," *APSI: Actualidad Nacional e Internacional*, September 9-22, 1980, No. 81, 2-7.

in 1979 proved the opposition press had won a larger place for itself. For the regime to force it closed, when everything else was going well, was not worth the outcry and loss of legitimacy. In the aftermath of *Hoy*'s closure, the opposition press grew even bolder in their criticism of the regime leading it to an outright oppositional stance toward the dictatorship. The broadening of press freedom would come to a halt in the early 1980s as Pinochet's economic legitimacy crashed along with the economy. A poor economy, combined with a more organized vocal political opposition, led to waves of repression as the government struggled to maintain its hold on power. The fight for the restoration of democracy—including a free press—was not over with the Constitution of 1980; rather, it had just begun.

CHAPTER FOUR: APERTURA AND REPRESSION

> Pinochet was a dictator in the strictest sense. There was no rule of law. Even Pinochet's own constitution did not constrain him, so a 'right' was pretty much what Pinochet ceded ad hoc in case by case. Dozens of media organizations were shutdown, some confiscated.
>
> -John Dinges, Co-Founder of *APSI*

In November 1984, General Augusto Pinochet Ugarte's military government faced a crisis of economic and political control over the country. After the economic and legal-institutional success of the latter half of the 1970s, the Pinochet regime appeared to have firm control of Chile. However, by 1982, the economy had collapsed due to Pinochet's commitment to neoliberal policies that left the country vulnerable to a global economic recession. The economic collapse led to renewed rounds of repression against the opposition media. In the heightened environment of economic crisis, the regime decided it could not afford to allow a vocal opposition press. Furthermore, opposition forces challenged the regime's legal-institutional legitimacy in 1983, when the government faced striking copper miners and the first open political protests in the streets since it had assumed control on September 11, 1973. These protestors challenged the timeline for transition set out by the Constitution of 1980 by calling for Pinochet to step down immediately. When repression failed to stop the protests, the general tried to get the country under control in 1983 by appointing former National Party head Sergio Onofre Jarpa as Minister of the Interior, a powerful position in the military government. Jarpa initiated a period of dialogue with the opposition and general relaxing of the regime's tight control over society. Jarpa's policy known as *apertura,* or opening, called to

constructively engage in an increasingly organized opposition.[1] As part of *apertura*, Jarpa again relaxed the dictatorship's control of the press. However, the problems with the opposition persisted into the following year. Pinochet decided he needed a change, reshuffling his cabinet to bring in a young and politically unknown lawyer, Francisco Javier Cuadra, as the Secretary General. Secretary General in the Pinochet government was responsible for propaganda and press censorship and served as the director of DINACOS. Cuadra's ascension signaled a shift away from *apertura* and toward greater repression.

Following the Secretary General's appointment ceremony in November 1984, Pinochet summoned Cuadra to his office. There, Cuadra found himself alone with the politician Jarpa and Pinochet. In that meeting, Pinochet proposed the implementation of a State of Siege for three months to reassert control over the political situation. The economic collapse had led to widespread protests and even violent terrorist action by some on the far Left. The general wanted the advice of these two ministers on the matter. Jarpa spoke first, presenting a very political approach to the problem. For about ten minutes, he acknowledged that some groups of leftists were indeed causing violence in the streets, but they were now under control. He also acknowledged that there were some problems with opposition politicians, who were demanding that Pinochet step down from office. He argued that these politicians held little sway over public opinion. He concluded that the situation in the country was possible to handle through regular administrative

[1] If it is helpful for scholars of the Cold War to think of Jarpa's *apertura* as a Chilean version of the Soviet Union's later Glasnost, the notion is not far off, though Jarpa's movement led to little real government opening.

channels and did not call for a State of Siege. [2] Pinochet then turned to Cuadra and asked his opinion. Cuadra started by saying that he did not agree with Jarpa's political analysis and argued that the constitutional obligation to transition the country to democracy in 1989—pending the results of a 1988 plebiscite—should be the most important focus for the government. He argued that it would be a difficult transition from a constitutional point of view, so the military government must decide when to implement the laws necessary for such a transition. However, the government would not be able to implement these laws, Cuadra argued, "If we continue to have the social and economic crisis that we have, because each step opening the framework for a transition to democracy could not fall behind." [3] To ensure that progress continued to be made toward democracy, Cuadra argued that a State of Siege was necessary to stop armed leftists and to silence opposition politicians. This would include censorship of the media to make journalists recognize the irresponsible nature of the politicians' actions. Cuadra argued journalists needed to understand that giving politicians a public platform in the media only caused the government to fall further behind in its plans for returning the country to democracy and by extension was irresponsible. The opposition media and politicians needed to be made to understand, as Cuadra argued, "this is a military government, it is not a democratic government and we must decide our positions from this sense."[4]

Pinochet asked the two men to wait while he went to confer with the members of the Junta. Pinochet left the room for what Cuadra described as the longest ten minutes of

[2] Francisco Javier Cuadra. Interviewed by author. Santiago, Chile, July 17, 2014.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.

his life. He had been a supporter of Jarpa during the 1970s and now the two men waited in icy silence for the general to return. Pinochet reentered the room and addressed Jarpa, telling him that the government would follow Cuadra's suggestion. Pinochet ordered Jarpa to draw up the documents and bring them to Cuadra, who would approve and then take them to Pinochet to be signed.[5] With that decision, Pinochet ended the period of *apertura* in favor of tighter control over civilian society.

Apertura and Closing: Pinochet's Rule 1980-1984

"Not a leaf moves in Chile if I don't know about it," Pinochet asserted in 1981.[6] Pinochet's assertion of absolute control only served to weaken his position when it became clear that he did not possess it. The success of his neoliberal economic and legal-institutional projects created a sense of security and control for Pinochet. He felt comfortable allowing a greater space for opposition to his regime. Press freedom reached its greatest point following the passing of the Constitution of 1980. However, the opening would not last.

In March 1981, Pinochet declared a State of Danger in response to increasing protests against the regime's human-rights violations. By August 1981, Chile's economy was in trouble. A global economic downturn combined with a reduction in internal demand, created a 30 percent decrease in demand for Chilean raw and manufactured goods in that month alone.[7] Pinochet had worked hard to personalize Chile's stability and

---

[5] Ibid.
[6] Augusto Pinochet Ugarte, quoted in BBC News, "General Pinochet's Dance with Justice." News.bbc.co.uk, September 8, 2006, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/4696617.stm (accessed February 10, 2011)
[7] Marcelo Contreras Nieto, "Las Fantasmas de Invierno: Violencia y Recesión," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* July 28-August 10, No. 104, 1981, 3.

economic success, and many Chileans did associate Pinochet with those things. Conversely, Pinochet also suffered the consequences when things began to go poorly; he became the person to blame. Publicly, the regime blamed the problems on an international Communist conspiracy originating in Moscow. Some government ministers began to argue for the state to play a greater role in controlling the economy.[8] Pinochet did intervene in banking and monetary policy to fix the problem, but also increased the repression of the opposition.

In 1981, the military killed or disappeared 36 people, a figure higher than the totals for the previous three years combined.[9] The regime's use of violent repression also coincided with a crackdown against the opposition media. DINACOS banned *APSI* for publishing information about national news without permission.[10] The government also exiled the magazine's director, Arturo Navarro. The timing of the closure corresponded directly with the beginning of the economic downturn that would intensify the following year. *APSI* remained closed until May 1982, when the judiciary granted a stay of the ban in response to an appeal. However, that same year the pro-Pinochet Supreme Court upheld the ban and *APSI* ceased publication. The economic situation in the country continued to worsen as GDP fell by 14.5 percent in 1982, manufacturing fell by 21.1 percent and construction dropped by 23.4 percent, all of which caused unemployment to

---

[8] Ibid., 3.
[9] Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation, *Report of the Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation*, vol. 2, trans. Phillip E. Berryman, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993), 903.
[10] Francisca Araya Jofré, *Historia de la Revista APSI: El que se ríe se va al cuartel (Pico para Pinochet),* 23.

reach 26.1 percent of the population due to the drop offs in other sectors.[11] Such problems created a large amount of popular unrest.

In early 1983, it appeared the military government may not make it to the scheduled 1988 plebiscite. As the government began to adjust its neoliberal economic system, the first major protest movement against the government took hold.[12] In response to wage controls meant to help alleviate the financial crisis, the Confederation of Copper Workers called for a general strike to occur on May 11. On the day of the strike, workers in the copper mines and mainly middle- and upper-middle-class sectors in the cities demonstrated by banging together pots and pans and honking car horns.[13] Though the protest was carried out peacefully, the military occupied two copper mines, killing two protestors. The middle classes organized a second strike for June 1. It occurred in the poor neighborhoods of Santiago, and a third major protest took place a month later, in July, responding to the arrest of several Christian Democratic Party leaders.[14] The fourth major protest took place in August. The regime responded violently and occupied Santiago with 18,000 soldiers. Twenty-three people were killed.[15] On the back of these strikes and/or protests, leaders from the rightist Republican Party, the centrist Christian Democrats and Christian Socialists, and the leftist Socialist and Popular Socialist Union came together to form the Democratic Alliance (AD). The group represented united

---

[11] Huneeus, *The Pinochet Regime*, 365.
[12] Pinochet attempted to improve the economy by reducing government spending and decoupled government employee wages from the inflation rate. He also raised import tariffs to make Chilean products more competitive domestically.
[13] This protest mirrored a protest by women against the Allende government, where they marched through the streets banging pots and pans. For more information see:
[14] Genaro Arriagada, *Por la razon o la fuerza*, (Santiago: Editorial Sudamericana, 1998) 171.
[15] Huneeus, *The Pinochet Regime*, 373.

nonviolent opposition to the Pinochet regime and was the precursor to the Concertación coalition.

Opposition groups on the far Left also gained confidence from the success of the protests. Left out of the Democratic Alliance due to its embrace of violence, the Communist Party formed the Popular Democratic Movement (MDP) with a small faction of the Socialist Party and the Movement for the Revolutionary Left. (MIR)[16] The MDP also used protests as a tool to put pressure on the regime, but for it, protests were only the first step toward mobilizing the population into a violent uprising.[17] When it became clear that violent coercion could not stem the rising tide of protest, Pinochet opted for a flexible response to the problem, hoping to put the opposition off balance. The man who would coordinate that response was Sergio Onofre Jarpa.[18]

Head of the National Party in 1973, Jarpa had expressed support for the dictatorship in his party's newspaper *La Tribuna.*[19] Though *La Tribuna* closed by the end of 1974, Jarpa's public support of the military government convinced Pinochet that he would be a good candidate to work for the government in some capacity. In 1974, the general sent Jarpa to New York as Chile's ambassador to the United Nations. Jarpa was then made ambassador to Colombia in 1976, where he helped to extricate Chile from the economic agreement known as the Andean Pact, citing economic incompatibility as the

[16] The MIR was initially a university based far left movement that promoted the violent seizure of land in Chile's countryside.
[17] Arriagada, *Por la Razon o La Fuerza*, 175.
[18] Huneuus, *The Pinochet Regime*, 372.
[19] See Chapter 2.

reason for the withdrawal.[20] In 1978, Jarpa served as ambassador to Argentina and played a major role in easing tensions between the two Southern Cone nations over a border dispute around the Beagle Straight. As a result, Jarpa had a reputation as an excellent mediator and politician within the Pinochet government's ranks, which is why when the economy collapsed and opposition groups began challenging the regime outright, Pinochet recalled Jarpa from his post as ambassador to Argentina.

On August 10, 1983, Jarpa was sworn into the role Minister of the Interior as part of a broader change that included seven other new ministers. Many of the new ministers, like Jarpa, had been involved in conservative politics before the coup. Jarpa believed he could calm the situation by reaching out and engaging with the political opposition. Through Jarpa, Pinochet would allow some freedoms in hopes of calming the opposition and giving the government a chance to fix the country's economic situation. However, the opposition had doubts when it came to Jarpa's promises of an opening.

Jarpa began to institute policies necessary to achieve his goal. He allowed exiled opposition politicians to return to the country, suspended media censorship, and ended suspension of the opposition newsmagazine *APSI*, even granting it special permission to publish national news. When dealing with the press more broadly, Jarpa took a hands-off approach, allowing space for the opposition as a sign of good faith. However, there were still limits to what the press could safely publish. Jarpa and Pinochet remained focused on forcing the media to represent good values for youth. One seemingly innocuous challenge

[20] Congreso Nacional de Chile. "Reseña Biográfica Parlamentaria: Sergio Onofre Jarpa Reyes." http://historiapolitica.bcn.cl/resenas_parlamentarias/wiki/Sergio_Onofre_Jarpa_Reyes. Accessed 1/29/2015.

to those moral standards arrived in the form of Boy George, the charismatic homosexual front man of the British band Culture Club. Boy George often wore makeup and dressed in women's clothing for performances. Jarpa explained the problem foreign acts like Boy George could cause:

> I think we are trying to copy the American way of life, and through music, through film, through television have come, not to the culture that actually exists in the United States and Europe, but we have reached the subculture or the negation of culture. For example, traditionally role models are proposed to children. People who stand out through their behavior through moral lessons or ethics or education. But also, to mimic certain characters who have been important figures in their countries as rulers or as scientists or public servants as people who have marked the path of progress of their country. But now, now we are proposing a prototype for the youth as a series of strange characters.[21]

Jarpa learned of the appearance of Boy George in an article in *La Nación*. He was shocked to see such a man publicized and immediately contacted the paper's director. He recalled:

> They (*La Nación*) dedicated a special issue to a well-known homosexual named Boy George or something like that. Then, of course, I called the director of *La Nación* and asked him how it was possible that the newspaper *La Nación* was doing this. Then, he apologized saying he had a contract with Channel 7, which had to promote this artist. Next, Channel 7 had special programs to promote this famous homosexual. And what are the youth to think? He is the prototype of the modern man? The man of our time? Or the person, because it is not definite if it is a man or if it is not a man or, maybe it is a neutral character.[22]

Though it reads like an extreme reaction to a popular singer performing in Chile, for Jarpa and the dictatorship he represented, Boy George was a very visible symbol of unacceptable moral values the regime sought to eliminate. It could shake the foundations

---

[21] Sergio Onofre Jarpa, transcript of interview by Ramón Angel Gottor, "Especial de prensa entrevista a Sergio Onofre Jara," Radio Santiago, May 20, 1986.
[22] Ibid.

of the state in a way engagement with the opposition would not. He argued, "If any state allows deviation fostered through television programs like these it is lost. It is a deviation that— I hope—will be rectified before bringing about the worst consequences for the country."[23]

Jarpa also made attempts to engage the opposition in constructive dialogue. Jarpa recalled, "He (Pinochet) considered that the dialogue we were opening to reach some agreement with the opposition, in short, and live more quietly."[24] However, the protests continued. Pinochet then instructed Jarpa to create a plan to instate a legislative branch, to incorporate the opposition, and make them a part of the government. Jarpa proposed a plan with a bicameral legislature to the junta—the regime's legislature according to the Constitution of 1980— and it rejected the plan. Ultimately, *apertura* was doomed to fail. The opposition demanded the immediate demission of Pinochet and the dictator was not willing to negotiate on this point. Jarpa's plan seemed to be helping the opposition to mobilize and coordinate their efforts rather than placate them. In response, regime repression increased as the military government had killed 15 people in 1982 whereas 82 were killed in 1983. The regime, in turn, began to reject all opposition proposals as communist plots meant to provoke armed confrontation.[25] Jarpa's *apertura* seemed to be breaking down.

Though Jarpa remained committed to his policy, Pinochet increasingly believed *apertura* had been a mistake and that Jarpa's moves to increase freedoms did little more

---

[23] Ibid.
[24] Sergio Onofre Jarpa. Interviewed by Patricia Arrancibia et al. CIDOC Santiago, Chile. January 24, 2000.
[25] Huneuus, *The Pinochet Regime,* 381.

than provide the opposition with more space in the public sphere to operate and cultivate support. However, Jarpa knew that his continued position as a minister in the Pinochet government relied on the success of *apertura*. It had been his signature policy, and if it failed, it would be perceived as his failure. For that reason, when Pinochet first approached him about ending *apertura* and instituting a State of Siege, Jarpa threatened to resign; a move that provided him with a temporary stay of failure. [26] As an ambassador, Jarpa had acquired a reputation as a problem solver and a mediator. He hoped that he would be able to apply those same principles to the domestic turmoil. Jarpa, as a politician, always tried to find the advantageous position. It is possible that he believed if he could sort out the problems with the opposition in ways that helped both sides, leaving him well positioned after the return to democracy. The implementation of a State of Siege in 1984 did not just mean the end of his policy of *aperture*; it also signaled a major blow to his political prestige, both within the military government and in Chile at large. Pinochet again brought up the State of Siege in November 1984, this time with his newest minister, Francisco Javier Cuadra, there to provide another perspective.

Cuadra grew up outside of Santiago in Rancagua. He came from a family of eight children, all of them boys. During the 1970s, he was militant for the Nationalist party, which was led by Sergio Onofre Jarpa. His fear of what might happen to the elite under Allende had affected Cuadra's life personally. He had wanted to study law, but his father, a lawyer for Braden Copper Company, advised him to study business administration because if the family needed to flee the country, law was a profession specific to Chile,

[26] Ibid.

whereas business administration had a transnational utility. It was only after the coup that he was able to study law. Cuadra's family was not alone in their fear. Many elites feared the Allende government because of anti-socialist propaganda campaigns, funded in part by the United States, that compared Allende to Fidel Castro. These included campaigns during the presidential elections that implied Allende would use the educational system to brainwash children and turn them against their parents. Once Allende was elected, right-wing media outlets worked to heighten the sense of panic and maintained a strong public presence during the UP government, by way of *La Segunda, La Tribuna, Que Pasa*, and *El Mercurio*, among other outlets. These newspapers and magazines often printed inflammatory stories in attempts to create fear that the UP government would destroy Chile.[27] Food and product shortages, seizures of factories by workers, and seizures of land in the countryside further stoked elite fears.[28]

Cuadra moved to Santiago to pursue a degree in business at Adolfo Ibanez University, but transferred to the Pontifical Catholic University (PUC) in 1973 to pursue a degree in law. It was during his time at the PUC that Cuadra first met Pinochet. Jaime Guzmán, a professor at the university and the leader of the conservative Gremialist movement, held meetings in which a select group of conservative students could meet members of the military government. Cuadra attended one such meeting in 1976: a tea with General Pinochet. Guzmán hoped to form a broad based and powerful right-wing movement, and he saw support of the military regime as a means to this end. Guzmán

[27] See Chapter 1.
[28] For more information about the heightened sense of panic involving the Allende government see: Powers, Wynn, and Mallon.

used both his intelligence and his ability to recruit young people to his cause to greatly strengthen the regime. He would hold various advisory positions in the Pinochet government, including one with the General Secretariat of the government, a previously unimportant ministry that he made into a powerful tool for the dictatorship with control over the media and mobilization of civilian support.[29] By 1983, however, there was a concerted effort in the military government to distance itself from the Gremialists who, Pinochet believed, had become too powerful.

Though Cuadra would not later identify as a member of the Gremialist movement, Guzmán had identified him as a promising young conservative law student and began inviting him to meetings. The two men did not stay on good terms; Guzmán would later describe Cuadra as a snake.[30] On the occasion of the tea with Pinochet in 1976, about twenty students traveled with Guzmán to Pinochet's offices. Cuadra recalled that the dialogue was interesting, but he was silent during the conversation and Pinochet noticed, asking him directly why he was so quiet and encouraging him to ask any question on his mind. Nervously, Cuadra asked Pinochet, "What is your real position about human rights?"[31]

According to Cuadra, Pinochet answered, "Listen, I am an army officer. I am the commander of the Army and the President of military government. We have a responsibility to maintain order and peace in the territory that is Chile. We know all of the human-rights international law, we know that we have obligations as part of the

[29] Huneuus, Carlos. The Pinochet Regime, 229.
[30] *The Clinic*, "Los 100 rostros de la Dictadura." http://www.theclinic.cl/2013/09/03/los-100-rostros-de-la-dictadura/
[31] Francisco Javier Cuadra.

Army, and we also know we have problems caused by the Left that require special military operations." Pinochet continued insisting that, during these operations, all government soldiers follow these laws, but "he cannot be sure that in reality, in the course of real military operation against leftists and extremists, he cannot be sure if all of his people do that." For Pinochet, it was important to point out that his men were also in danger and they also died in these operations. In light of the stressful nature of anti-leftist action, he could not guarantee that his soldiers would be "English gentlemen."[32]

Cuadra came away from the meeting with a very positive impression of Pinochet. He saw him as both sincere and realistic in his approach to governance. What Pinochet said resonated with Cuadra, because Cuadra's family opposed the Allende government and believed it would take the country into Communism. It welcomed the military coup, because, as Cuadra said, "We understood what was the real Left in the streets and they were people that admired Che Guevarra and Fidel Castro and it was very disingenuous to believe Chile's problems could be resolved without violence. Chile had a real problem and real problems often required realistic and difficult solutions."[33]

Cuadra began working for the military government in March 1983 in a special department doing political analysis. The chief of his office, Sergio Rillón, was a lawyer and Navy officer, but kept an open mind.[34] Cuadra specifically developed political analysis for Pinochet with a focus on the Catholic Church. He and Rillón provided weekly presentations involving their analysis of the political climate during the

[32] Ibid.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid.

tumultuous period in 1983 when wide-spread protests erupted against the government. The department played an important role in explaining to Pinochet what was happening in the country and advising him as to what his approach should be. One of the most impressive and successful projects he did was a political analysis of the statement released by striking copper workers, similar to a statement released in 1982 by the Vicariate of Solidarity. From this he concluded that the Vicariate was exerting influence over the workers and encouraging them to strike. He later confirmed in a conversation with opposition politician Genaro Arriagada that Arriagada had authored both statements.[35]

In August 1983 when Pinochet nominated Sergio Onofre Jarpa to Minister of the Interior, the office of special affairs advised against the appointment. Rillón and Cuadra thought that Jarpa was a known politician, and that by appointing Jarpa, perhaps the political opposition would settle down in the short term, but, in the long term, having a politician as part of the government would lead to more problems. When Pinochet was looking for a new minister to support a policy change toward repression and away from *apertura*, he went to the office of special affairs, remembering its opposition to Jarpa's appointment. The general picked Rillón to be the Secretary General of the Government, but Rillón refused the position because his twin, Andrés, was a popular comedic actor on television. Rillón believed the public would be confused by their similarity. Pinochet, in a very military fashion, then called on Cuadra— who was Rillón's immediate inferior. Rillón argued that perhaps Cuadra, at 30 years old, was too young for the post. Pinochet

[35] Ibid.

called in one of his captains and asked him how old he was. The captain replied he was thirty years old. "You see," said Pinochet, "I am accustomed to working with young people, so Cuadra must come here."[36]

Cuadra believed that Chile faced "real problems" and accepted that the solutions to those problems would be difficult and could result in the violation of some human rights. This predisposed him to favor tighter control of society to prevent leftist extremists from again sewing havoc. His association with Guzmán exposed him to Gremialist anti-politician rhetoric, which shaped his recommendation to institute a State of Siege. Opposition politicians were, he believed, irresponsible and had to be made to understand that they could not say and do whatever they wanted. Finally, his youth and junior status as a minister may have led him to favor agreeing with Pinochet because he was new on the job. Cuadra acknowledged, "I was an unknown in the country."[37] The dictatorship ushered in a new period of repression following the implementation of the State of Siege. In November 1984, the government banned all opposition magazines—except *Hoy*—indefinitely.

Apertura and Coercion for the Opposition Press

For the opposition press, the 1980s were a tumultuous time. As we have seen, the regime seemed willing to allow greater latitude in press freedom following the passage of the dictatorship's constitution. Opposition media began regularly publishing stories about politicians opposed to the government. However, as the economy began to decline in 1981—entering a recession in 1982—the regime sought to again tighten restrictions.

---

[36] Ibid.
[37] Ibid.

APSI received a ban for publishing national news without permission and would not publish again until Jarpa instituted his policy of *apertura*. The opposition press benefited greatly from Jarpa's opening. *APSI*, *Hoy*, and *Análisis* all published stories about the newly formed Democratic Alliance and gained an increased readership, as media sympathetic to the regime minimalized its coverage of the coalition. Additionally, *apertura* created the conditions necessary for the founding of the last major opposition magazine, *Cauce*. However, Pinochet increasingly became convinced that the opposition media and politicians had grown too bold. Early in 1984, the regime began to take steps to minimalize the impact of the opposition media. When these failed to produce results, Pinochet acted and issued a State of Siege, banning all opposition media indefinitely. The State of Siege also provided Cuadra with the springboard he needed to assert his control over the press.

A little over a month after the government announced the successful passing of the Constitution of 1980, *APSI* published a special edition examining the document from various perspectives. The issue had 72 pages and was the longest issue *APSI* had ever published. In it, *APSI* printed numerous photographs of the voting along with both "yes" and "no" campaign propaganda. Also included in the special issue was a section that interviewed 100 Chileans about their thoughts on the new constitution. As part of this section it interviewed Christian Democrat and ex-senator Patricio Aylwin. Aylwin explained the "yes" victory by stating that many people were "not properly informed."[38] Miguel Vega, president of National Confederation of Textile and Clothing Workers,

[38] Patricio Alwyn in "Cien Chilenos opinan sobre el contenido del plebiscito." *APSI: Actualidad Nacional e Internacional*, October 21, 1980, No. 84, 13.

explained why his organization voted "no," writing, "We do not endorse a constitution enacted behind the backs of the working class."[39] Many others expressed opinions similar to Miguel Jacob Helo, president of The College of Technicians. Jacob said a "no" vote "means forgetting the present peace" and economic stability.[40] The article provided in depth coverage of all political perspectives including that of the opposition. The opening that the government had allowed before the plebiscite, had not closed after it.

APSI reached a milestone in 1981: it began circulation in news kiosks. It had been distributed previously on a subscription-only basis, and its appearance on street corners greatly expanded its sales. *APSI*'s expanded sales eased the pressure of one of the newsmagazine's greatest challenges. Navarro recalled his greatest trial as *APSI*'s director, "The daily challenge was to survive to the next issue. We never knew if the next edition could come out, as much for problems of repression as for economic subsistence. We lived in embers, in a true militancy of 'true journalism' that was a scarce commodity in those days."[41] Also, in 1981, *APSI* celebrated its 100th issue. An article detailed the celebration and listed the guests of the party, which included the editor of *La Segunda*, director of *El Mercurio*, and some ex-ministers of the Popular Unity government. Given how vehemently *La Segunda* and *El Mercurio* had opposed Allende, it must have made for a strange gathering. In a speech, Navarro proclaimed:

> We have won a space within the nation's journalism, and we have done everything possible to fill it. We are conscious of this responsibility, but we are not alone. Other posts of no less significance from the perspective of the

[39] Miguel Vega in "Cien Chilenos opinan sobre el contenido del plebiscito." *APSI*, No. 84, October 21, 1980, 14.
[40] Miguel Jacob Helo in "Cien Chilenos opinan sobre el contenido del plebiscito." *APSI*, No. 84, October 21, 1980, 15.
[41] Arturo Navarro Ceardi.

> expression of a pluralistic thought. They have been added to us— and to the preexisting magazine *Mensaje*—other publications amongst them the best known is *Hoy*, in them we have always found sincere support…*Análisis* that searches for a space to reflect progressive academic thought, digestibly, to the peasant.[42]

Unfortunately, Navarro would soon learn how tenuous the space *APSI* had won could be.

In the early months of 1981, *APSI* increased its coverage of domestic issues including criticism of the regime's human-rights record. In response to the first signs of the regime lashing out due to the economic downturn, Navarro wrote an editorial titled, "Opposition and Repression." In it, he argued, "That to avoid an outbreak that could profoundly damage Chile, the government should understand repression is the worst way to treat the opposition."[43] As 1981 progressed, the Pinochet government proved it did not agree with Navarro's assessment.

In February 1981, *APSI* published the article "Law or Justice," written by Tomás Moulian who questioned the legitimacy of the actions of Chile's security forces. He argued, Chileans "cannot live in peaceful society where the state jails, relegates, or exiles for no other reason than its will and without arguments other than its suspicions."[44] Even though the government always stated that security forces acted within the limits of the law, it made those laws and could change them and their interpretations to fit almost any situation. He went on to ask who should be held responsible for the deaths of numerous civilian and political figures killed under the dictatorship. The article ended with Moulian asking if the justice system was just and if it was unjust, whether people should quietly

---

[42] "*APSI* celebro su numero cien," *APSI,* No. 101, June 16, 1981, 23.
[43] Arturo Navarro Ceardi, "Oposicion y repression," APSI, no. 91, January 27, 1981, 1.
[44] Tomas Moulián, "La Ley o La Justicia," *APSI,* No. 92, February 10, 1981, 4.

accept it.[45] In July, *APSI* published an article titled "The Ghosts of Winter: Violence and Recession," written by subdirector Marcelo Contreras Nieto, Contreras detailed Chile's dual descent into economic recession and political violence. It then presented the plans for fixing the problem provided by right-wing opposition: "For the first time, in these years, some have bluntly proposed to dispense with all members of the government's economic team."[46] *APSI* used rightist criticisms to directly criticize the Chicago Boys's faith in the invisible hand of the market while supporting those members of the government that advocated reaching out to all of Chilean society and including them to create a "new economic policy."[47] "The Ghosts of Winter" echoed arguments *APSI* had made earlier in 1981 urging for reform and inclusion. These articles had detailed human-rights violations committed by the Pinochet regime, but "The Ghosts of Winter" differed in one important way: prior articles generated no backlash, whereas two weeks after the latter DINACOS banned *APSI*. According to DINACOS, it shut *APSI* down because *APSI* had not received permission to publish national news.[48] However, it had been doing so since 1979, with no repercussions. The change in 1981 should be understood as less about what *APSI* was doing and more about how insecure the government felt its position was as the economy began to collapse.

For the time being, DINACOS allowed other opposition magazines to continue publishing. With *APSI,* the government had a legal justification for its actions and could

---

[45] Ibid.
[46] Marcelo Contreras Nieto, "Las Fantasmas de Invierno: Violencia y Recesión," *APSI,* No. 104, July 28, 1981, 2-3.
[47] Ibid.
[48] Arturo Navarro Ceardi, email interview by author, July 12, 2010.

act without imposing broader controls on the press. Perhaps *APSI*'s closure was meant as a warning to the other opposition media. If so, it was not heeded. Both *Hoy* and *Análisis* expressed their solidarity and support for *APSI* and continued to work to expand the space of acceptable criticism of the regime. As the economy declined, *Hoy* intensified it criticisms of the regime's economic plan.[49] *Análisis* also continued its coverage of human-rights violations and economic problems.

APSI's staff challenged DINACOS's ban on the grounds that they had received verbal permission when they had requested the right to publish national news. In actuality, they had received only notification that the law did not expressly prohibit or require approval for existing publications to change their editorial lines. During the appeal process, Navarro was forced to step down as the director, because, as he recalled, "I left because the authority threatened me with expulsion from the country."[50] He left Chile and went into exile in Miami. From Miami, Navarro got a job working for the Chilean publishing house ANDINA, which published women's magazines written in Miami and then printed and distributed in Chile. In regard to his experience directing *APSI,* Navarro lamented the difference between his expectation at its foundation and the reality. "In founding *APSI*, we only had the expectation of one day fulfilling the role the left-wing press in Chile played until the coup of 1973, which constituted a balance to right-wing journalism. The reality was that of censorship, first and then self-censorship. Finally, the reality of the repression and the threats that forced me to leave *APSI*, August

[49] Paula Mobarek and Dominic Spiniak, *Revista Hoy*, 57.
[50] Arturo Navarro Ceardi.

of 1981," he said.[51] With Navarro gone, Marcelo Contreras Nieto, the magazine's subdirector and legal representative, assumed the position of director.

In 1970, Contreras was a young Socialist living in Valparaiso. After the coup, the regime arrested him on two different occasions for his political leanings. He moved with his wife and two daughters to Santiago in 1974 and began working with the Vicariate of Solidarity. He joined the staff of *APSI* in 1978. Working for *APSI* was important to him because, as he said, "We wanted to break the monopoly of information."[52] The dictatorship controlled television, newspapers, and many of the radio stations, and those media outlets only reported what he called "the official truth."[53]

Contreras led the challenge to *APSI*'s ban. The judiciary allowed *APSI* to publish again pending the results of its legal appeal: *APSI* could publish as long as it only published international news. Under Contreras, *APSI* continued to push the boundaries of what it covered. A month later, *APSI* conducted an interview with economist René Cortázar about the economic crisis.[54] From that point on the magazine slowly published more stories about Chile until July 1982, when in issue no. 111 only six of 32 pages were not devoted to news about Chile. The following issue was prominently titled "Chile Today: Crisis, Rumor, and Fantasy." The first humor section appeared in this issue, featuring political cartoons from Franco's Spain.[55] For the next two months, *APSI* continued to push the boundaries by covering opposition movements and party members.

---

[51] Ibid.
[52] Marcelo Contreras Nieto.
[53] Ibid.
[54] María Ester Aliaga, "Las Alternativas Del Momento Económico," *APSI,* June 8-21, 1988, No. 108, 4-5.
[55] *APSI*, "Seccion Alegre," *APSI*, August 8-16, 1982, No 112, 32.

In September, it published an article called "Who is Víctor Jara?" which told the story of the Chilean folk singer and leftist murdered by the military shortly after the coup.[56] The following week, the court of appeals rejected *APSI'*s appeal and prohibited its publication. Over the next three months, *APSI* took its case to the Supreme Court and won the right to publish once more on January 5, 1983; however, it would not resume publication until May 1983.

*APSI'*s staff had fought hard to begin publishing again, however, the Supreme Court had restricted the magazine to international news once more. Needless to say, the staff at *APSI*, which had worked hard to regain the right to publish, was not satisfied with this ruling. When *APSI* began to publish regularly again in May, Contreras editorialized that being restricted to international news "represented a grave limitation" to *APSI*'s ability to engage in the debate about what shape Chilean societal structure should take. However, *APSI* had used international news stories to make observations about the situation in Chile since 1976, and it would continue to do so in light of the new(old) restrictions on its editorial line. Later, in the same editorial, Contreras laid out the strategy explicitly when he explained *APSI*'s goal this way: "We hope that this *APSI* international constitutes a real contribution to its readers, who may find, in each of the articles some opinion about Chile."[57] The magazine kept its national news section, but used it to explain the court's ruling. It also informed the reader that *APSI* had again

[56] Eliana Jara Donoso, "Quién es Víctor Jara?" *APSI*, September 14-27, 1982, No. 115, 21-22.
[57] Marcelo Contreras Nieto, "Transición Internacional," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística*, May 24-June 6, 1983, No. 118, 1.

requested permission to publish national news in accordance with the laws under a "state of emergency."[58]

The restriction on national news lasted from May, when *APSI* began publishing again full-time, until September. During these months, its staff used international news stories to speak to Chile's situation. In issue no. 118, Jorge Edwards wrote "Parallel Censorship," The article discussed the censorship faced by Irish author James Joyce and Uruguayan author Carlos Martínez Moreno.[59] Edwards noted that since he could only talk about censorship in the international context he, too, was the victim of censorship. He went on to say, "I do not completely dislike the idea of joining this club."[60] Edwards's article was clearly meant to be a commentary on the censorship of the media and literature in his own country. Two issues later, in June, *APSI* published the article "Mexico-Brazil the Failure of Civic Military Movements." It argued, "In all cases, the fate of civil military movements tended toward two alternatives: to prioritize economic models that enable social participation, or to favor economic models diametrically opposed to any participation."[61] The article implied Chile clearly fell into the second group.

Following months of waiting for a response to their request to publish national news, *APSI*'s editors met with Jarpa on August 18, 1983. Contreras recalls reaching out to the office of the new Minister of the Interior and requesting a meeting. To his surprise,

---

[58] Los Propietarios, "Nacional," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* May 24-June 6, No. 118, 1983, 2-3.
[59] Jorge Edwards, "Censuras Paralelas," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* May 24-June 6, No. 118, 1983, 25.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Dionisio Hopper, "Mexico-Brasil: El Fracaso de Movimientos Cívico Militares," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodistica,* June 21-July 2, No. 120, 1983, 4.

Jarpa seemed more than happy to meet with him. He told Contreras to come to the ministry's offices the following day. Upon arrival, Contreras and *APSI*'s editors waited 45 minutes before Jarpa was ready to see them. They were shown into Jarpa's office and told that the Minister only had five minutes available. Contreras quickly made *APSI*'s case for publishing national news.[62] Jarpa promised to consider it and give the journalists an answer in a timely fashion.[63] One month later as part of his plan to reach out to the opposition, Jarpa granted *APSI'*s request. *APSI* immediately began to focus the majority of its coverage on the opposition movement led by AD. In the first issue, it could cover national news *APSI* only devoted nine out of 49 pages to international news. The rest focused on Chile and the AD. One such article, "Subercaseaux, Abeliuk, Aylwin, Alvardo, Ramirez, Correa, Insunza: The Unity of the Opposition," presented viewpoints of the leaders of the coalition's parties.[64] *APSI* showed that the leaders agreed on a wide array of topics. When asked about possible collaboration between disparate political groups in the future, René Abeliuk, head of the Christian Socialist Party, stated, "Now, there is an enormous and vast opening because of common action."[65] Pedro Felipe Ramírez agreed, arguing that he had "no doubt that unity and consultation was essential in social mobilization."[66] Luis Alvarado also concurred, noting that the political

---

[62] Marcelo Contreras Nieto.
[63] *APSI*, "Nacional," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* September 6-19, No. 125, 1983, 3.
[64] Patricio Aylwin was leader of the Christian Democrat party, René Abeliuk was leader of the Christian Socialist Party, and Luis Alvarado was leader of one branch of the Socialist Party, Pedro Felipe Ramírez led the Christian Left, Germán Correa led the other branch of the Socialist Party, and Julio Subercaseaux represented the Liberals.
[65] René Abeliuk in "Subercaseaux, Abeliuk, Aylwin, Alvardo, Ramirez, Correa, Insunza: La Unidad de la Oposicion," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* November 29-December 12, No. 126, 1983, 11.
[66] Pedro Felipe Ramírez in "Subercaseaux, Abeliuk, Aylwin, Alvardo, Ramirez, Correa, Insunza: La Unidad de la Oposicion," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* November 29-December 12, No. 126, 1983, 11.

movements showed "true significance" of the unified opposition.[67] While the opposition to Pinochet unified, the Right seemed to be fragmenting, and *APSI* focused several articles on rightist opposition to Pinochet. Ximena Ortúzar interviewed Engelberto Frias, a former supporter of Pinochet and leader of the democratic Right. In the interview, Frias referred to the government as "the worst in all our history." He went on to say it was also worse than any "earthquakes, wars, or floods."[68] Over a series of nine issues, *APSI* showed a united Left and Center in favor of democracy and a divided Right, unsure which way to proceed. The dichotomy *APSI* correctly depicted in early 1984 existed for the rest of the dictatorship and hurt the "Yes" campaign's chances of winning the 1988 plebiscite.

APSI continued to use the space provided to it by the dictatorship to publish stories critical of Pinochet's actions. In 1984, beginning in issue no. 135 and continuing for the next four issues, *APSI* serialized John Dinges's and Saul Landau's book about the Orlando Letelier assassination, *Assassination on Embassy Row: The Shocking Stories of the Letelier-Moffit Murders*.[69] The monograph which heavily implicated the DINA in the assassination, would not have been publishable as a book in Chile.[70] In February 1984, *APSI*'s front cover depicted a person being tortured and, in large letters, "They Torture Like this in Chile." An article by the same name told the story of several Chileans who

---

[67] Luis Alvarado in "Subercaseaux, Abeliuk, Aylwin, Alvardo, Ramirez, Correa, Insunza: La Unidad de la Oposicion," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* November 29-December 12, No. 126, 1983, 11.
[68] Engelberto Frias in "Engelberto Frias: Del Aplauso al Repudio*" APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* January 24-February 6, No. 135, 1984, 14.
[69] John Dinges and Saul Landau, "Asesinato en Washington: El Caso Letelier," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* January 24-February 6, No. 135, 1984, 23-27.
[70] John Dinges and Saul Landau, Assassination on Embassy Row: The Shocking Stories of the Letelier-Moffit Murders, (New York: Pantheon Press, 1980).

had been tortured. It also contained graphic illustrations of the torture methods.[71] Such journalism demonstrates that *APSI* benefitted greatly from Jarpa's strategy of engagement with the opposition, and they were not alone.

In 1983, Jarpa granted permission for a new opposition magazine called *Cauce*. In an introduction to the magazine's first issue, director Carlos Neely Ivanovic described the publication as "an organ of public expression of thought."[72] In explaining its reasoning, Neely stated, "We have faith in the perfectibility of man, especially of the part that we will be concerned with directly, our country. This faith is the primordial cause of participation for each of us and each one committed in the adventure of founding, sustaining, and spreading *Cauce*."[73] *Cauce*'s editorial body consisted primarily of Social Democrats and was a project of the Radical Party.[74] Like the other opposition magazines, *Cauce* focused its criticism of the regime on human rights. In its second issue, *Cauce* examined torture. "Torture: We are all Culpable," detailed what was known about secret detention centers, the torture used there, and that 45,000 Chileans were detained in concentration camps.[75] Furthermore, *Cauce* argued it was the fault of all Chileans that this was happening. According to the article, "Sooner or later we should recognize that during these 10 years we have lacked bravery to reject, to denounce, to protest tirelessly in the face of repeated practice of torture exercised in secret places and with the impunity that an unrestricted authorization concedes."[76]

---

[71] María Isabel Valdés and Angélica Beas, "Testimonios Directos: Así se Tortura en Chile," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* February 7-20, No. 136, 1984, 8-12.
[72] Carlos Neely Ivanovic, "Un cauce abierto," *Cauce,* No. 1, November 18, 1983, 4.
[73] Ibid.
[74] Hector Soto, email interview with author, May 29, 2017.
[75] "Tortura: todos somos culpables," *Cauce,* No. 2, December 8, 1983, 30.
[76] Ibid., 27.

In its fifth issue, *Cauce* pushed the limits of allowable criticism by publishing a photograph of Pinochet's mansion in Lo Curro on its cover. In an article titled "The Lo Curro Mansion," Mónica Gonzalez painstakingly listed the luxuries and how much each cost. Pinochet's extravagance seemed especially grievous in the face of the economic recession.[77] Pinochet's personal life and his family had been the understood "third rail" of the opposition media. After facing threats from DINACOS for the article, Neely explained *Cauce'*s position in the following issue. He stated, "Nevertheless, self-censorship that the principle communication media has voluntarily subjected itself constitutes a predominant factor in the silencing or the disguise of illegal, abusive, and susceptible to criticism action of the regime."[78] He continued, "An established norm of not writing includes a *golden rule,* something like a tacitly accepted limit for everyone: don't cross certain red alert borders…you cannot affect the government and its family."[79] Neely then promised, "Our magazine proposes not to accept any rule, save those that safeguard the rights of the people and logically, those that are sanctioned by the laws in place."[80] *Cauce* continued to publish stories critical of Pinochet's family.

The opposition press benefitted from Jarpa's policy of *apertura*. *APSI* was able to regain the right to publish national news; a right they would keep for the rest of the dictatorship. *Hoy* and *Análisis* continued their critiques of the government. *Hoy* focused primarily on economic issues and *Análisis* on human rights. Finally, the founding of *Cauce* provided yet another perspective to critique the regime. A March 1984 study

---

[77] Mónica Gonzalez, "La mansion de Lo Curro," *Cauce,* No. 5, January 17, 1894, 17-20.
[78] Carlos Neely Ivanovic, "Por razones de bien public," *Cauce,* No. 6, January 31, 1984, 1.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Ibid.

showed *Hoy, APSI, Análisis,* and *Cauce* had joined the older *Ercilla* and *Qué Pasa* among the most relevant and respected newsmagazines in Chile.[81] Stronger positions from opposition media in turn benefitted opposition politicians of the AD. Contreras explained, "*APSI* (and other opposition media) helped them in three ways: first, it showed a side of the truth that was hidden by the regime. Second, it provided a dissident voice to criticize the actions of the regime. Third, its coverage gave opposition politicians name and face recognition."[82] For Contreras, the last point was critically important because the opposition had broadly—due to the ban on political parties—been operating clandestinely until 1982. The public needed to know what these politicians were doing and the official government media was failing to provide coverage. In November 1984, Pinochet and his young Secretary General, Cuadra, showed they disagreed with the idea that the public needed to know about opposition politicians and instituted a State of Siege. The government banned *APSI, Análisis*, and *Cauce* indefinitely. It would allow *Hoy* to continue to publish with prior censorship. *Hoy* had restricted its criticism primarily to economics, and since economic indicators were obvious to most, perhaps *Hoy* suffered less. Contreras had another explanation, noting, "There are two pillars of Chilean society that the regime was hesitant to confront head on: The Catholic Church and the PDC."[83] Under the State of Siege, the regime instituted a period of harsh societal repression relying on the monopolies of force and information using coercion to force consent for its

[81] Paula Mobarek and Dominic Spiniak, *Revista Hoy*, 93.
[82] Marcelo Contreras Nieto.
[83] Ibid.

rule to compensate for the legitimacy it had lost during the economic recession and political protests.

The Siege and Beyond: A Palace Coup

Pinochet's decision to implement a State of Siege in November 1984 was not only a blow to the opposition press, but also a challenge to Jarpa's influence within the government—and the old politician knew it. The day following the meeting on whether or not to implement a State of Siege, Jarpa brought the legal documents he had prepared to Cuadra for approval. However, upon inspection, Cuadra found that the documents were poorly prepared. The younger man told Jarpa that he could not accept these documents nor could he bring them to Pinochet. Angry, Jarpa suggested Cuadra prepare the documents himself. Still new on the job and not wishing to make an enemy of a man he had once seen as a hero, Cuadra suggested another plan. Cuadra told Jarpa that he would prepare the documents and then bring them to Jarpa for approval, then Jarpa could bring them to Pinochet to be signed. The elder minister smiled, agreed with the plan, and left the room.[84] On November 7, 1984, the regime announced the implementation of the State of Siege. Despite the setback for his personal policies, Jarpa remained Minister of the Interior and was able to announce that his *apertura* was still in effect.[85]

The State of Siege gave Pinochet broad legal powers and brought the opposition media under control of the government. However, the regime's primary goal in the State of Siege was to bring the media under control. Not because of the need to control the

---

[84] Francisco Javier Cuadra. Interviewed by author. Tape recording. Santiago, Chile, July 17, 2014.
[85] Tim Johnson. "Chile's Pinochet Imposes State of Siege after weeks of violence." Christian Science Monitor. 9/8/1984. http://www.csmonitor.com/1984/1108/110845.html

media in and of itself, but rather to force them to realize they had a responsibility to the country. Cuadra believed that "media had the freedom to decide" whether they covered responsible or irresponsible politicians. If the country was "in a transition to democracy, we were in a very difficult place," Cuadra said. If that transition was to succeed under the stipulations of the Constitution of 1980 and go smoothly, the media had to understand politicians who called for the immediate demission of Pinochet were irresponsible and were pushing the country toward chaos. The media, television, radio, and print fell under the direct control of DINACOS and its head the Secretary General, Cuadra and he was prepared for the task of controlling it. On the evening of November 6, 1984, he invited the directors of every media outlet to his office to inform them of the State of Siege, which would go into effect the next day. He clearly laid out his expectations that under no circumstances would the media be allowed to cover opposition politicians. Some of the directors had questions about certain content. Cuadra remembers that the director of Radio Cooperativa was particularly concerned about the limits of the new restrictions. Cuadra told the assembled directors that if they had any questions about any content, they should contact him directly for the approval or rejection of stories. However, Cuadra found the opposition press fairly easy to manage and stated the only real challenges the government faced in controlling content during the State of Siege came from *El Mercurio*, which was generally sympathetic to the regime, but also wished to continue publishing political content.[86] Since the State of Siege focused on the media, Cuadra's ministry became more important and powerful. He had also gained the favor of Pinochet

[86] Francisco Javier Cuadra.

by supporting the policy the general had proposed. Despite Cuadra's rising star, Jarpa remained in the government after the implementation of the State of Siege and continued to exert a powerful influence over other ministers.

As there were no official cabinet meetings called for within the Constitution of 1980, every Wednesday, Jarpa would have the other ministers over to his office for tea. Cuadra, like the other government ministers, attended these meetings. He immediately noticed a bad environment amongst the ministers. "Mr. Jarpa and Mr. Cáceres, Minister of Finance, always disturbed Mr. Collados who was Minister of the Economy. He was an old man who had also been a minister for Mr. Frei between 1964 and 1970," he recalled. Mr. Collados was supported by most of the minor economic ministers. The Minister of the Economy and the Minister of Finance had different ideas about how to approach the economy and economic recovery, and Jarpa supported the Minister of Finance. Cuadra described, "Mr. Jarpa always began the tea asking about economics to the Minister of Finance and he always took an approach that was ironic to Collados and the technical ministers' position." By the third tea he attended, Cuadra had seen enough. He recalled, "When the same dynamic began, I stood up and began to leave the office. Mr. Jarpa told me that we were in a meeting, but I told him I had things to do that the president had asked of me. He ended the meeting immediately."[87] When Cuadra returned to his office, many of the other ministers began to stop by and tell him there was a problem within the cabinet and they were with him against Jarpa. Cuadra wrote a one-page memorandum to Pinochet that suggested Jarpa's removal from his position as Minister of the Interior.

[87] Ibid.

Pinochet called Cuadra to his office the next day and told him that he agreed with his suggestion, would enact a change in cabinet, and suggested the two of them work closely to coordinate it over January when the government was on break.[88] Cuadra and Pinochet decided to replace Jarpa with Ricardo García and Finance with Hernán Büchi. When Pinochet called Büchi to offer him the position, the general said, "we are going to do a change and Francisco will explain what you have to do." Cuadra explained that for a possible transition to democracy to be successful, the social and economic crisis needed to be resolved. Büchi said he could get the economy back on track and growing in two and a half years. Cuadra then told the new Minister of the Interior that he would be responsible for political laws and following Büchi's timeline, he had two and a half years to get them ready. Cuadra would manage the political situation himself, García would take care of legal design, and Büchi, a future presidential candidate in 1989, would resolve the economic crisis. In February 1985, Pinochet announced the cabinet change. Cuadra emerged from the change—having both inspired it and constructed it—the most powerful minister in Pinochet's government.

For the opposition, Cuadra's ascendance marked the beginning of a new era in relations between the opposition press and the government. Contreras referred to Jarpa as receptive, but Cuadra as "very inflexible."[89] Christian Democrat and member of the opposition Edmundo Pérez Yoma recalled, "With Jarpa we knew him from before the

[88] During January 1985, both Cuadra and Pinochet left Santiago for their homes in the country. Cuadra's summer home in Santo Domingo was located thirty miles from the army house that Pinochet stayed in. Every day for the first twenty days of January, Cuadra left his house after lunch and drove to Pinochet's home to discuss the change of cabinet.
[89] Marcelo Contreras Nieto.

coup. We would see what he was doing and say, 'same old Jarpa.' Except now that he had real power, he was a little worse."[90] Whereas his view of Cuadra was only negative. Genaro Arriagada felt much the same way. There was a general feeling among opposition politicians and journalists that you could work with Jarpa, but Cuadra was unscrupulous and could not be trusted.[91]

Over the next year, Pinochet and Cuadra would make the opposition accept the legitimacy of the constitution, ending its calls for Pinochet's immediate demission and forcing it to work within the time table that the constitution laid out. Furthermore, Cuadra would labor to make the press more responsible. As for freedom of the press, Cuadra believed the Constitution of 1980 to be the most liberal constitution, in regard to the press, Chile ever had; excepting the restrictions placed on that freedom as part of the transition period. The opposition needed to understand, "A military government is not a democratic government, so you can ask and you must ask, but you must wait for a civilian government." [92] The opposition press would return, poised to continue its fight for space within Chilean politics.

---

[90] Edmundo Pérez Yoma.
[91] Many journalists and politicians expressed this sentiment. Some asked that their names not be directly attached to it.
[92] Francisco Javier Cuadra.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE LONG ROAD TO THE DECISIVE YEAR

> I believe that more so than freedom, which is of course the foundation, in politics one must see democracy as the only political system that guarantees liberty. That means free elections; alternation in power, where the one that wins the election can take power and the one who loses does not have to go into exile or be tortured, but rather is a legitimate opposition.
>
> -Genaro Arriagada, Director of the "No" Campaign

The Constitution of 1980 contained a timeline for the return to democracy. As part of that process, it stipulated that sometime in late 1988, the government would name a candidate to continue a "transitional period" that would last another eight years. Pinochet, in his desire for legitimacy, included a plebiscite to confirm that candidate. If—in what the general considered an unlikely chance—the people voted "no" in the plebiscite, then the transition to democracy would begin immediately. By late 1987, most major political groups in the opposition had decided to mount a "No" campaign to end the dictatorship and return democracy. The government ran a "Yes" campaign with Pinochet as the candidate. On October 5, 1988, Chileans voted and "No" prevailed over "Yes." After the government announced the results, people streamed into the streets to celebrate.

In explaining the defeat of the government's "Yes" campaign in 1988, Minister of Interior Sergio Fernández Fernández said, "The results were regrettable. After a few days, nobody could ignore the obvious technical superiority of the 'No' campaign, better argument construction, better filming, better music. Its characteristic melody, around the phrase 'joy is coming,' was so catchy that even the partisans of 'Yes' hummed it

unconsciously."[1] As catchy as "La alegria ya viene" was, the official campaign of "No" alone cannot explain its victory. Opposition media outlets had, since 1976, taken the space given to them by Pinochet and expanded it, cultivating a space for opposition sentiment to be expressed. From their founding, *APSI, Hoy, Análisis,* and *Cauce* had pushed for a return to democracy and gained large readerships, connecting people who wanted the same. Amid dealing with the regime's repression, the opposition newsmagazines had consistently advocated for the return of democracy for 12 years prior to the plebiscite's 30-day official campaign. As early as 1986, and certainly in 1987, opposition newsmagazines turned their efforts explicitly toward assuring the success of "No." Their efforts at least as critical to understanding the defeat of "Yes" than a "catchy," but short ad campaign.

The opposition press played an important role in urging people to register to vote for the 1988 plebiscite. By the time the televised "No" campaign started, voter registration was already closed. Where the "No" campaign remained generally positive, reassuring, and forward looking, the opposition media focused on more substantial critiques of the dictator. Broadly defined, opposition magazines tried to remind their readers that Pinochet was not the benevolent hero of the nation as regime propaganda depicted in 1987 and 1988. The "No" campaign and its catchy positive song helped make people feel safe to vote, and opposition magazines sought to remind people why it mattered. However, in 1985, it was not clear if the opposition press would survive to play a vital role in the plebiscite.

---

[1] Sergio Fernández in Edgardo Boeninger, *Democracia en Chile: lecciones para la gobernabilidad,* (Santiago: Editorial Andres Bello, 1997) 343.

As noted in Chapter Four, the State of Siege, implemented on November 6, 1984, suspended all opposition media except *Hoy*, which the government allowed to continue publishing with prior censorship. It was the beginning of a hardline approach to the political opposition. Pinochet abandoned Sergio Onofre Jarpa's *apertura* in favor of a tougher stance and found a champion for that position in his new young Secretary General, Francisco Javier Cuadra. The power of the General Secretariat rested in its responsibility to control the press and run the government's propaganda and censorship office. Despite the importance of this position, it had never been the office to set the dictatorship's agenda. Cuadra changed that when he forcefully argued that the problems facing Chile were caused by the media reporting on "irresponsible politicians."[2] If the media could be controlled and the politicians could be brought back in line, they would cease challenging the regime's legitimacy. Once installed as Secretary General, Cuadra moved to eliminate rival power groups within the government. He successfully advocated for the ouster of Jarpa, and also purged the government of Jaime Guzmán's Gremialists, arguing that they were too political. He then worked closely with Pinochet to restructure the government over January 1985. From January 1985 to his resignation in 1987, Cuadra was the most powerful civilian minister in the Pinochet government. When Pinochet lifted the State of Siege in June 1985, Cuadra was firmly in control. During his tenure, any challenge to the government's legitimacy was harshly suppressed. The opposition media suffered successive waves of repression. Cuadra left his post in 1987, prior to the 1988 plebiscite. As the government moved into full campaign mode in 1988, it struggled

[2] Francisco Javier Cuadra.

to maintain control over the press without hurting Pinochet's image. Ultimately, the opposition media weathered the government's attempts to control it and provided important support for the victorious "No" campaign.

The Loyal Minister

Sergio Onofre Jarpa's *apertura* had—without the legal framework in place—made it possible for political parties to organize and gain publicity again. The Constitution of 1980 contained mandated congressional elections for 1989, but the appearance of political parties on the national scene as early as 1983, disrupted the regime's transition plans. For Cuadra and Pinochet, the State of Siege was a way to try to reduce the pace of change to a manageable level. The author of the emergency decree, Cuadra, described its purpose: "This decree was completely incompatible with reality, because anything can have the character, relevance, or association to the political. It consisted precisely in this surrealist affirmation so as to have them saying 'How can they prohibit the political?' That was exactly our intention."[3] According to Cuadra, the political opposition had to be made to understand the Constitution of 1980 was the law of the land, and the government would neither negotiate with nor allow the participation of anyone who sought to delegitimize it. As Secretary General, Cuadra led the government's censorship agency DINACOS and used his power both during and after the State of Siege to enforce this limit.

Cuadra's approach to managing the press was very hands on. During the State of Siege, he personally reviewed issues of *Hoy* for censorship. *Hoy's* political editor

[3] Francisco Javier Cuadra in Paula Mobarek and Dominic Spiniak, *Revista Hoy*, 79.

Ascanio Cavallo Castro recalled, "I was a political editor when we were censored in November 1984 and for the next five months not a single one of my weekly chronicles was authorized. Without exception, all were censored."[4] Regarding *Hoy,* Cuadra recalled, "It was a very creative journalistic team that constantly was trying to break the rule. But, we did not act like they predicted and sometimes there were things that we let pass and in at other times we censored the same type of journalism. They responded by saying that we were arbitrary, a thing that for us was optimal, because that meant they were paralyzed."[5] He also kept close tabs on Channel 13, the television station run by the Catholic Church. He recalled a news program that liked to run editorial pieces as part of the broadcast. He received word that an upcoming editorial would discuss the political environment, which was counter to the mandate of the State of Siege. Cuadra called the station manager and told him, "I have heard about your planned editorial and it cannot happen. If it does the station will be shut down."[6] According to Cuadra, the station manager was both confused and incredulous. He did not think Cuadra could shut the station down and did not know how Cuadra had learned of the editorial. Cuadra told him, "I will be watching tonight and then we will see."[7] The program aired with a different editorial.

The government lifted the State of Siege in June 1985. Although political-party activity was banned during the State of Siege, the Democratic Alliance (AD) continued to operate and emerged in June 1985 with a new strategy. The AD accepted the legitimacy

---

[4] Ascanio Cavallo Castro, email interview by author, August 8, 2016.
[5] Francisco Javier Cuadra in Paula Mobarek and Dominic Spiniak, *Revista Hoy*, 82.
[6] Francisco Javier Cuadra.
[7] Ibid.

of the Constitution of 1980 and began advocating for an early plebiscite to allow the opposition to run a candidate against the government in 1988. It again denounced the Communist Party and the Manuel Rodríguez Patriotic Front, a far-Left terrorist group, and became an active supporter of the government's plan for transition. The coalition hoped that by fully participating it could achieve a victory for the "no" vote and end the dictatorship.[8] Cuadra recalled, during the State of Siege, the Pinochet government had reached out to the United States to ask for its assistance in making the politicians understand Pinochet would follow the timetable laid out in the constitution. Any position that didn't accept that fact would lead to further repression.[9] Opposition politicians and journalists did meet with US officials and afterward decided to participate in the plebiscite. The intervention had produced positive results, and for Pinochet, the opposition's acceptance of the constitution combined with economic stabilization assured his government's legitimacy. Although protests still occurred, by June 1985 Pinochet deemed his power secure enough to lift the State of Siege.

After the State of Siege, Cuadra continued his hands-on approach. Marcelo Contreras recalled Cuadra called him at 9:00am one morning shortly after *APSI* had begun to publish again. Contreras remembered Cuadra introduced himself and said, "Listen, in an article you said I was a member of Patria y Libertad and I was never a member."[10] Cuadra urged him to be more careful and counseled Contreras to call if he ever had a question about something like that. Such was the type of connection *APSI*'s

[8] Arriagada, *Por la Razon o La Fuerza*, 184.
[9] Francisco Javier Cuadra.
[10] Marcelo Contreras Nieto, Patria y Libertad was a far-right fascist political party in Chile active in the 1960s and 1980s.

director had with Cuadra. Contreras recalled, "Cuadra was always checking in personally, and when he called about an article we would also discuss our lives...We began to have political conversation. We discussed much."[11] Contreras continued, "We were not friends, but we had respect for each other."[12] Cuadra also expressed his respect for Contreras, noting "We were on opposite sides, but we were both committed to our jobs. I respected him professionally."[13] Contreras was singular among the opposition in his not completely negative view of Cuadra; most saw him and the repression he advocated as dangerous and/or evil.

The opposition's distaste for Cuadra was caused not by his ineffectiveness, but by how good he was at his job. Few within Pinochet's government understood the way media worked as well as Cuadra. His use of propaganda was so well crafted it could, in some cases, take on a life of its own, as was the case in 1986. The regime was set to announce a new set of laws for the establishment of political parties as part of the transition process, but Minister of the Interior, Ricardo García Rodríguez, called to inform him that the laws would not be ready on time (in March), additionally, Hernán Büchi's economic agenda would take some time to prepare. Cuadra recalled immediately searching for something else to occupy the public's attention besides the failure of the regime to produce the promised laws, because, he said, "They would not give the military government the benefit of the doubt, and would instead assume the worst."[14] He found an article about Halley's Comet, passing by earth in March 1986, which mentioned that

[11] Ibid.
[12] Ibid.
[13] Francisco Javier Cuadra.
[14] Ibid.

Chile would be one of the best places to see it. Cuadra recalled, "I immediately sent a team of researchers to the United States and Europe to learn everything they could about Halley's Comet."[15]

The Halley's Comet campaign started with a short 30-second piece on the government's television channel. As the date of Halley's Comet's passing approached, Cuadra increased the coverage of the event. Government news coverage increased from the 30-second spot to 10-minute pieces. Further, the government produced and aired whole programs relating to the comet's history and on astronomy in Chile. In a special called "Halley 1986: Once in a Lifetime," the government owned TVN encouraged people to go out and see the comet by showing the comedians from a popular show, "Jappening con Ja," viewing the comet with amazement.[16] Cuadra also reached out to friendly press organs and encouraged them to cover Halley's Comet as well. The approach of Halley's Comet became an incredibly important event; it is not an exaggeration to say Halley's Comet fever swept Chile. Stores found it difficult to keep telescopes in stock and people planned trips out of Santiago and into the Atacama Desert to observe the celestial body.[17] The clamor for anything related to Halley's Comet spread even to the opposition press.

In March 1986, *APSI* published a biographic about Mark Twain's use of humor to criticize titled "Mark Twain: Between Halley's Comet and the Pleasure of Sin." The article had very little to do with the comet except to point out that Twain was born when

---

[15] Ibid.
[16] TVN, "Halley 1986: Once in a Lifetime," March, 1986, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VjnMp1MNJDM&t=5s, (accessed 4/3/2017).
[17] Ibid.

Halley's Comet had passed by earth in 1835, the *APSI* article stated, "Now that the Halley returns to pass near this ball of water and land that he so much loved and hated, a century and a half from his birth and a century from publication of *Huckleberry Finn* have been completed."[18] *Cauce* gave the approaching comet even more weight. Leading up to the comet's best viewing times, *Cauce* published numerous stories referring to it, including a piece that talked about the importance of the comet in France.[19] *APSI* and *Cauce*'s use of the comet as an historical marking point to create interest in their magazines inadvertently contributed to the historical weight and importance the dictatorship had been working hard to ascribe to it.

March 1986, the date planned for the new laws, came and went, and though the opposition politicians certainly noticed the delay, most Chileans were distracted by Halley's Comet. About his role in Chile's brief obsession with the sky, Cuadra maintained, "I didn't trick anyone. Halley's Comet really passed. I didn't force anyone to buy a telescope."[20] The drafts of laws for political parties were finished only a few weeks late and Cuadra had prevented a broader panic or backlash against the government for the delay. In any case, the law for the creation of political parties would not go into effect until March 11, 1987.

Cuadra's relationship with Pinochet was generally good throughout his tenure as Secretary General. He remembered meeting with Pinochet daily and would discuss classic literature, for which they shared a mutual passion. They also discussed the

---

[18] Elvio E. Gandolfo, "Mark Twain entre el Halley y el placer de pecar," *APSI,* No. 14, March 10, 1986, 47-49.
[19] "Francia de smoking para recibir al cometa Halley," *Cauce*, No. 64, March 2, 1986, 28-29.
[20] Francisco Javier Cuadra.

domestic situation including newspaper stories—both domestic and international. According to Cuadra, "He (Pinochet) never understood why they didn't like him and he would always ask me to explain it to him."[21] Pinochet had a temper and Cuadra recalled numerous times he had argued with the dictator. Once, Pinochet became so angry he started to throw things off Cuadra's desk. The Secretary General recounted, "We would argue and I would place my resignation on his desk. He never accepted it."[22] Cuadra had a reputation as an intelligent, cold thinker who had cared only about the success of Pinochet's government. As such, even when the two men fought, Pinochet remained convinced of Cuadra's loyalty to his cause.

Even with the clever and loyal minister leading the government, the latter half of the 1980s proved tumultuous for the regime. Initially, the regime regained economic stability from the recession of the early 1980s. Along with austerity measures, Pinochet raised the import tariff from 10 percent to 35 percent between 1982 and 1984. He also bailed out the banking system and created a central bank, which suggested appropriate interest rates. By 1986, the government had devalued the peso by 80 percent.[23] These actions combined with a more rigorous enforcement of tax law largely stabilized the economy by 1985. The success of the economic stabilization and the opposition's acceptance that challenging the regime's constitution would lead to oppression, resulted in space for the opposition to work. The opposition press began publishing again following the lifting of the State of Siege in June 1985. Despite improved economic

---

[21] Ibid.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Winn, "The Pinochet Era," in *Victims of the Chilean Economic Miracle,* 42.

conditions, labor and political opposition continued to protest the government. In the increasingly politicized environment, the dictatorship worked hard to keep the opposition within acceptable limits.

In addition to Cuadra's hands-on approach to the opposition press, it was not uncommon for opposition journalists to receive threatening phone calls in the middle of the night. Under Cuadra, moreover, violent suppression of the opposition continued at its highest levels since 1976. Sometimes, that violence would affect journalists covering the protests. The conflict between the opposition trying to expand the limits of dissent, and Cuadra's government trying to restrict it, came to a head in the winter and spring of 1986 with two events: Carabinero's brutal murder of *APSI* photographer Rodrigo Rojas Denegri in July, and a failed assassination attempt on Pinochet in September. The latter event resulted in the imposition of another State of Siege.

The Opposition Press between States of Siege

In June and July 1985, after the State of Siege, the opposition press returned with its focus on the upcoming 1988 plebiscite on the dictatorship's rule. All opposition publications sought to strengthen the position of politicians in the AD. In advance of the plebiscite, they encouraged Chileans to vote "no" and begin the transition to democracy. Opposition newsmagazines could again publish stories featuring the opposition, as it had accepted the legitimacy of the government and resolved to participate in the plebiscite.

Unlike the other opposition magazines, the government allowed *Hoy* to continue to publish during the State of Siege. However, it had to submit its issues for prior censorship. After the State of Siege, *Hoy* published a special issue with many of the

stories that had been censored by DINACOS during the State of Siege. Among the more ridiculous things the regime censored was a *semiserio*—a humorous sometimes satirical news story—about a street named "Prensa Libre" (free press) in Quinta Normal. DINACOS cited that it was just a description of the street's condition and the article would bother people who lived on the street.[24] The fact that *Hoy* could publish its previously censored articles shows censorship was less about what the opposition magazines were saying and more about the regime's perceived sense of legitimacy in any given moment. The same articles that were too dangerous just a few months earlier could, in June 1985, be published with impunity.

Cauce returned to publication in July and published an article naming Pinochet as the military's most likely candidate for the plebiscite in 1988. However, it listed possible sources of dissent within the regime.[25] Also, following the State of Siege, *Cauce* issued a new set of promises to its readers about its editorial line going forward. *Cauce* would, "put all of its effort in procuring the return to democracy…the promise of *Cauce* remains with human rights…we will serve especially insistent in the abolition of all the hurdles placed in the way of the freedom of the press."[26] *Cauce'*s promises reaffirmed to its readership that despite regime pressure, it would remain committed to the return of democracy and to opposing the regime.

APSI began to publish again in July 1985, focusing the majority of its articles on the upcoming plebiscite. In issue no. 158, *APSI*'s staff wrote an article speculating about

---

[24] Paula Mobarek and Dominic Spiniak, *Revista Hoy*, 84.
[25] "Pinochet candidato el 88," *Cauce,* No. 31, July 16, 1985, 4-6.
[26] Gonzalo Figueroa Yáñez, "El compromiso de CAUCE en esta nueva etapa," *Cauce,* No. 31, July 16, 1985, 7.

the presidential candidate the military would put forth as part of the "yes" vote. The article offered three possibilities, with the most likely option being Pinochet. *APSI* wrote that "Pinochet intended to continue his government until 1997," and that he had "already commenced his campaign."[27]

Once *APSI* settled on Pinochet as the government's most likely candidate, it immediately began to discredit his leadership. In September, journalist Elizabeth Subercaseaux interviewed Christian Democrat International President Andrés Zaldívar, who expressed his opinion on Pinochet's rule. Zaldívar said, "Pinochet has demonstrated an absolute lack of capacity to govern." He had increased the foreign debt and "today Chile produces 15 percent less than it did in 1970." [28] As early as December 1985, *APSI* began running pictures that advocated a "no" vote. One such ad featured a woman wearing a black shirt with a piece of paper pinned on it. The paper read, "For never again."[29] *Análisis* followed a similar path. In its first issue after the State of Siege, *Análisis* also focused on the PDC's opposition to the regime. In an interview with the president of the PDC in Chile, Gabriel Valdés, *Análisis* highlighted the PDC plan to engage the regime: "Recently re-elected president of Christian Democracy proposes social mobilization should drive a negotiation that permits an effective transition to

---

[27] *APSI*, "La Sucesión de 1989: Los Planes Políticos del Ejercito," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* July 29- August 11, No. 158, 1985, 10-12.
[28] Andres Zaldívar in Elizabeth Subercaseaux, "Andres Zaldivar: Pinochet Nos Lleva a la guerra civil," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* September 9-22, No. 161, 1985, 6. The PDC international was a loose affiliation of Christian Democratic Parties througout Latin America. Zaldivar, Chilean served as its head in the late 1980s.
[29] *APSI*, "Para Que Nunca Mas," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* December 16-29, No. 168, 1985, 51.

democracy."[30] By mobilization, the PDC meant continued social agitation, but also voter turnout for the plebiscite.

Although the regime allowed *APSI* and other opposition magazines freedom to publish information, the press was still subject to bullying by both the regime and the Right. *Análisis* and *APSI* especially experienced pressure during this period. Early in August 1985, carabineros (national police) detained *APSI* photojournalist Alvaro Hoppe and fiercely beat him. According to Hoppe, he was tortured by having his head repeatedly held underwater to make him think they would drown him. Days later, they dropped him off at a hospital. On August 16, the director of *Análisis* and its political editor were forced to stand trial for violating the state security law for an article which criticized government minister Alberto Novoa.[31] That same day, *APSI*'s management received a threatening phone call from an unknown individual.[32] A month later, unknown assailants in civilian clothing assaulted *APSI*'s Elizabeth Subercaseaux in her home. The following day, *APSI* offices received a threat of violence against its employees and a death threat against Subercaseaux.[33] In October, the director and editor of *Cauce* were arrested for insulting the regime. *Cauce* had published an article in June about the National Intelligence Center (CNI) committing torture, provoking the response.[34] Two months later, the regime detained another *APSI* photojournalist, Oscar Navarro, as he covered a demonstration for human rights.[35] *APSI* journalist Andrés Braithwaite recalled it was not unusual to receive

---

[30] *Análisis, "*Gabriel Valdes: 'quiero aislar la dictadura y negociar de cara al pueblo,'" *Análisis*, No. 95, June 19, 1985, 13-15.
[31] "Tras caso Canovas: a prensa opositora," *Análisis*, August, 13, 1985, 15.
[32] Baltra Montaner, *Atentados a la Libertad de Información*. 44.
[33] Ibid., 45.
[34] "Encargados reos dos periodistas de CAUCE," *Cauce,* No. 44, October 15, 1985, 3.
[35] Ibid., 47.

threatening phone calls in the middle of the night with just nothing or threatening breathing on the other end of the line.[36] At *Hoy,* political editor Ascanio Cavallo recalled, "Anonymous telephone calls, surveillance, and bomb threats were frequent. We lived that as a routine and we did not feel heroes for it."[37] When addressing the Interamerican Press Association in October 1985, Emilio Filippi explained the situation, "Freedom of the press is under attack in Chile through two channels. For one part, fronds of punitive and restrictive legislation, for the other, the adoption of administrative measures or pressures targeting the editors and directors of media outlets."[38] At the same meeting, Cuadra defended the government, saying, "There would be things to see in the magazine, directed by Fillipi, in order to see this freedom of the press… to justify this branch of restrictive and punitive legislation."[39] Cuadra remained committed to the government's hard line despite criticisms and he even blamed the opposition press for their own censorship. If the press would not print such inflammatory stories challenging the regime's power, there would be no need to censor it. The situation for the press would continue to be dangerous.[40]

In July of 1986, carabineros killed *APSI* photographer Rodrigo Rojas Denegri. Rojas, the nineteen-year-old son of an exile returned to Chile, was a freelance photographer hired by *APSI* to take pictures of the national protests set to take place on July 2 and 3. His mother had sent him to live with family in Canada in 1973 and,

---

[36] Andres Braithwaite.
[37] Ascanio Cavallo.
[38] Emilio Filippi in "La SIP conoce lo que pasa en Chile: Denuncian sistemas para amedrentar a la prensa," *Cauce*, No. 44, October 15, 1985, 12.
[39] Francisco Javier Cuadra in "La SIP conoce lo que pasa en Chile: Denuncian sistemas para amedrentar a la prensa," *Cauce*, No. 44, October 15, 1985, 12.
[40] Ibid.

eventually, mother and son were reunited in Washington D.C., where the family made a new home in exile. Rojas had always been interested in photography and dreamed of being a sports photographer. He also felt a strong desire to return to Chile. When *APSI* hired him, he had only been in the country for a few weeks. While Rojas covered the protest, carabineros attacked the group he was covering. He had embedded himself with a group of youths who planned to set up a barrier along one of Santiago's main thoroughfares. When the carabineros attacked the group, most of the youths fled, but they captured Rojas and another protestor, Carmen Gloria Quintana. Their captors beat them while interrogating them about the intentions of the group. The Carabineros then doused them in gasoline and set them on fire.[41] Once their bodies had been burned to the point of disfigurement, carabineros wrapped the still living youths in blankets and loaded them into the back of a truck. They dumped them in the middle of a "fallow site" 17 kilometers outside Santiago.[42] Some agricultural workers found them and called the local police, who transported the youths to a hospital. Rojas had suffered a broken jaw, broken ribs, and a collapsed lung. Severe burns covered most of what remained of his body. Only Quintana survived the incident with Rojas succumbing to his injuries, dying July 6 in a Santiago hospital.

APSI condemned the Pinochet government for the killing and mourned the loss of Rojas. In issue no. 183, Heraldo Muñoz wrote an opinion piece titled "Returning to Chile to Die." In it, Muñoz stated the Chilean people deserved justice and hoped "the tragic

---

[41] Steve J. Stern, *Battling for Hearts and Minds: Memory Struggles in Pinochet's Chile, 1973-1988*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 267.
[42] Pablo Azócar, "Antes de Morir, Rodrigo Rojas Dijo el Juez: 'Me Quemaron los Militares," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* July1 4-27, No. 183, 1986, 9.

experience of the youth who returned to Chile to die will not be in vain and serve, at least, to move the conscience of those who can act to put an end to the arbitrariness, torture, humiliation and misery that affect the vast majority of the population."[43] In the editorial of the same issue, Contreras blamed the climate created by Pinochet as the reason for Rojas's death. It linked the problems to Pinochet's lust for power and his intent to step forward as the presidential candidate for the 1988 plebiscite. This is what separated the opposition from Pinochet. The opposition wanted control "not for power, for government, or control of the state," but it fought "for life, for peace, for justice, and for liberty. And in this fight all Chileans who really share these values take part."[44] *APSI*'s staff hoped that the tragedy of Rojas's death would show Chileans once and for all why the dictatorship needed to end.

As protests against the government continued through the summer of 1986, Pinochet's regime also continued to crackdown on the press. At the end of July, DINACOS fined *Análisis* for violations in its previous five issues. The government cited *Análisis's* coverage of the strikes as advocating for violence and breaking the state security law. The fine prompted the staff at *Cauce* to express their support in an editorial "The Role of the Press in a Dictatorship." *Cauce* explained that under a dictatorship, the press should try to keep the public informed of the truth if the government will not, urging readers, "Along with manifesting our unrestricted solidarity with *Análisis*, we want to alert the public about the evil intentions of the dictatorship against the dissident

---

[43] Heraldo Muñoz, "Volver a Chile a Morir," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* July 14-27, No. 183, 1986, 55.
[44] Marcelo Contreras, "Por Qué Murió Rodrigo Rojas," *APSI: La Nueva Alternativa Periodística,* July1 4-27, No. 183, 1986, 1.

press, and to call on the Judicial Branch to comply with the requirements that the government has sent to it, in the context of the role that the press should assume in this historical moment."[45]

The situation became even more tense for the Pinochet government in September. Escalating violence both committed by the regime and violent opposition groups threatened to destabilize the country. In August 1986, the regime announced its discovery of a huge cache of weapons in the northern dessert. It found over three thousand M-16 rifles, almost 300 rocket launchers, some two thousand grenades, and a large supply of ammunition.[46] The regime immediately blamed the Communist Party and the FPMR. The FPMR formed in 1980 as the paramilitary branch of the Communist Party, but remained inactive until 1984 when they began murdering carabineros, planting bombs on Santiago's subway, sabotaging busses, and causing large blackouts by blowing up power lines.[47] To prove his case, Pinochet invited a group of U.S. experts to verify whether or not the weapons stash belonged to the FPMR.[48] Before the owner of the weapons could be officially verified, the FPMR removed the doubt that they belonged to it. On September 7, less than a month after the discovery of the weapons cache, the FPMR ambushed Pinochet as his caravan returned from his rest home El Melocotón in the Andean hills east of Santiago. The attack occurred in a narrow portion of the mountain road leading back into Santiago, with FPMR members assaulting the caravan using automatic weapons and rocket launchers, killing five soldiers and injuring twelve others.

---

[45] "El papel de la prensa en dictadura," *Cauce,* No. 86, August 3, 1986, 1.
[46] Stern, *Battling for Hearts and Minds,* 324.
[47] Arriagada, *Por la Razon o La Fuerza*, 178.
[48] Arriagada, *Por la Razon o la Fuerza*, 194.

Pinochet managed to escape due to the skill of his driver and the failure of a rocket to explode when it hit his vehicle.[49]

Pinochet responded violently to the attempt on his life. Pinochet immediately declared a State of Siege and DINACOS banned the opposition press. *Hoy* would petition and be allowed to publish again only two day later. The rest of the opposition press remained closed until the end of the year. Members of the opposition in no way connected to the Communist Party or the FPMR became the targets of Pinochet's wrath. The regime arrested many opposition leaders, including Ricardo Lagos, the socialist leader of the nonviolent AD. It also killed numerous Chileans who had nothing to do with the attempt on his life, among them the international news editor for *Análisis*, José Carrasco Tapia.[50] Carrasco had been a member of the Movement of the Revolutionary Left and had a career as a journalist that began in the 1960s. For the Regime, he was a very visible former advocate of violent revolution, upon which to lay part of the blame for the assassination attempt. When word began to circulate that the military was searching for Carrasco, he went into hiding, hoping to get out of the country. The night before he was arrested and disappeared, Carrasco stayed at Cárdenas' house. Cárdenas recalled his wife was very nervous, because their children were also there. Carrasco's death was very hard for the staff of *Análisis.*[51]

---

[49] Stern, *Battling for Hearts and Minds*, 325.
[50] Baltra Montaner, *Atentados a la Libertad de Información*. 45.
[51] Juan Pablo Cardenas.

Pinochet and Plebiscite Campaign

The State of Siege allowed Pinochet to reassert his absolute control of the country and secure his position prior to the 1988 plebiscite. As the date for the plebiscite approached, Cuadra began to focus his efforts on preparing the government for the upcoming campaign. Pinochet intended to be the person put forward as the candidate and was confident that he would continue his presidency for eight more years. He had won the other plebiscite votes in 1978 and 1980, after all. In order to defend his reputation, Cuadra and his successors sought to strictly enforce that there be no marring of the president's image within the opposition press. As the plebiscite approached, the opposition experienced greater freedom to publish on all topics except those that could be deemed insulting to the president. In concert, with his efforts to defend the character of Pinochet, Cuadra also began to conduct polls to discover the best strategy for appealing to voters in the government's "Yes" campaign. What he discovered ended his time as Pinochet's most trusted and powerful minister.

In 1987, Cuadra began to investigate the best strategy for the "Yes" side. According to Cuadra, through polling he discovered that if the military went with Pinochet as the candidate for "Yes," the government seemed to lose no matter what way he framed the poll. Cuadra claimed, however, if "Yes" put forward another candidate, it would win in most polls.[52] Cuadra then had to frame it positively for Pinochet. He told the general, "I think we should run someone else, and you should step back from direct

[52] Francisco Javier Cuadra. I asked Cuadra if he had been able to convince Pinochet to step back from the forefront who he would have suggested as a candidate. He was quite insistent that it did not matter. I asked if he thought he would have been suited for the role. He smiled at me and winked.

control. Transform yourself into the grandfather of the nation."[53] In this way, Pinochet could best help the "Yes" campaign. Though the two men had disagreed before without Cuadra losing his position of influence, Pinochet was not willing to compromise and asked for Cuadra's resignation. However, in tense situations, Pinochet tried to ease hard feelings and offered Cuadra a lesser ministry of his choosing. Instead, Cuadra asked to be ambassador to the Holy See, because as he said, "I knew the government would lose the plebiscite, and I did not want to be in Chile when it happened."[54] Pinochet granted his request and Cuadra left for the Vatican in July 1987. Before he left Santiago, Cuadra called *APSI* director Marcelo Contreras and asked for an off-the-record meeting.[55] Contreras recalled Cuadra was very candid in the meeting, "He told me, Pinochet was making a mistake running as the candidate and that he fully expected the 'Yes' to lose."[56] Contreras was struck by Cuadra's commitment to the government, even after he had been relieved of his position, because he had expected Cuadra to feel spurned by his apparent mistreatment. Pinochet replaced Cuadra with Sergio Fernández Fernández who had previously served as Minister of the Interior and had been in charge when the government closed *Hoy* in 1978.[57] Instead of closing down opposition media outlets, which created a lot of bad publicity for the government, Fernández increasingly relied on levying heavy fines against the opposition media. Fernández would direct the government's ultimately failed "Yes" campaign.

---

[53] Francisco Javier Cuadra.
[54] Ibid.
[55] Ibid.
[56] Marcelo Contreras Nieto.
[57] See Chapter 3.

Fernández took over as Pinochet's lead minister—traditionally Interior Ministers held the most power in Pinochet's government. Fernández led the dictatorship's campaign for the 1988 plebiscite. The Constitution of 1980 limited the official campaign period for the plebiscite to twenty-eight days, beginning thirty days before the vote, and ending two days prior. During this time period, the constitution prohibited posters in public places, sound trucks, and wall painting. The constitution did allow groups to hold assemblies and pass out flyers. However, Fernández used many mechanisms to try to advantage Pinochet's campaign.

Beginning in 1986, but increasing in frequency as the plebiscite approached, Pinochet began to tour the country's various regions. In 1987 and 1988, Pinochet made 49 separate tours to bolster his personal image. Often, these were quick visits that involved various promotional stops. These events could range from presenting the deeds to new homes to cutting ribbons on public-works projects. He would also meet with local community leaders and hold dialogues. Importantly, he would visit local military posts to bolster his support among his key group of supporters: the military.[58] He also attended events held by universities, businesses, and the National Women's and Youth Secretariats. Generally, at these events, Pinochet refrained from mentioning the upcoming plebiscite and instead focused on the past accomplishments and successes of the regime.[59] As the opposition could only support a "no" vote without a candidate, Pinochet's ability to campaign gave the dictator a distinct advantage.

[58] Huneuus, *The Pinochet Regime*, 408.
[59] Ibid, 409.

During the official campaign period, the Constitution of 1980 guaranteed the opposition equal time for campaign advertisements. However, the government controlled TVN and the sympathetic Channel 13 tried to tilt things in the government's favor by airing the "No" campaign's advertisements late at night. The treatment failed to produce the desired results for the regime, as Chileans stayed up to watch anyway.

As the plebiscite approached, Pinochet decided to increase pressure on the opposition press because his position seemed to be weakening. While his opposition was uniting behind "No," key groups of his supporters on the Right were breaking away from him. Jaime Guzmán and his Gremailistas had begun to break with Pinochet in an effort to position Guzmán to be the Right's presidential candidate if "No" succeeded. "Yes" also consistently polled behind "No." In July 1988, "No" polled at 42 percent whereas "Yes" only received 36.6 percent, with the rest of the respondents unsure or not replying. In August, 40.6 percent of people polled responded "No," but only 30.8 percent responded "Yes."[60] The regime seemed to be losing ground immediately before the beginning of the official campaign period for the plebiscite.

In 1988, the regime abandoned its policy of harassing or detaining individual journalists or editors in favor of levying large fines against the publications themselves. The use of fines, rather than shutting down opposition publications, made the regime appear less repressive as the plebiscite neared. The regime walked a thin line between its desire for the legitimacy the opposition press could lend to the plebiscite and the threat that it posed to the government. For the first infraction, the government could fine a

[60] Huneeus, *The Pinochet Regime*, 420.

magazine up to U.S. $19,800, with a second infraction doubling the fine.[61] Getting fined could be devastating for an opposition magazine; most barely made enough money to cover their expenses. One editor told an Americas Watch delegation that his magazine would not survive three fines, and another editor doubted that his could survive even one.[62] The journalists who worked for opposition magazines were strong willed and brave individuals, but the regime had found a weak spot: the wallet.

The Long "No" Campaign of the Opposition Press

Opposition newsmagazines played a critical role in the success of the "No" campaign by encouraging people to register and participate, through publicizing the "No" campaign, and working to discredit Pinochet and the military. Though the dictatorship had distinct advantages leading up to the plebiscite—Pinochet as the candidate and control of television advertisement—opposition newsmagazines worked hard to balance the field. Prior to and following the 1986 State of Siege, the opposition focused much of its coverage on the upcoming plebiscite. Even though the official campaign period was short, opposition magazines effectively supported the "No" campaign beginning in 1986; matching Pinochet's own personal campaign period. Furthermore, the opposition press published stories about opposition leaders, thus putting a face to the "No" campaign to rival Pinochet's personalization of "Yes." Pinochet's personalization of "Yes" also provided the opposition press with a specific target.

As we have seen, by the end of 1986, Pinochet had asserted his control of the country. The FPMR's violent attack on Pinochet united the Right behind him. The

---

[61] The Americas Watch Committee, *Chile: Human Rights and the plebiscite*, 140.
[62] Ibid., 141

economy also began to grow again after the downturn of the early 1980s. He felt secure enough to allow more space for the opposition. On December 10, 1986, the regime granted *APSI* permission to publish weekly under the State of Siege. It did not lift the ban on other opposition magazines until the third of January 3, 1987. At that time, he also lifted the ban on political parties, with both the military government and the opposition turning their attentions to the impending 1988 plebiscite.

APSI received numerous letters congratulating and supporting its right to publish. These letters show how important *APSI* was to the opposition movement. Among numerous others, acting president of the Radical Party, Carlos González Márquez, wrote, "With profound satisfaction we have learned of the reappearance of your prestigious magazine."[63] Gabriel Valdés Subercaseaux, president of the Christian Democratic Party, wrote, "I want to offer my sincere congratulations on the reappearance of *APSI*. Your magazine has been necessary. You give life to news media, free, serious, and very interesting."[64] The president of the right-wing Republican Party, Armando Jarmillo, concurred with the others noting, "The fact that the newsmagazine in your worthy direction has been liberated from the injustice of its closure is a large triumph for democracy."[65]

With the support of numerous opposition parties, *APSI* began to play a key role in the preparations for the 1988 plebiscite. In its first issue back, *APSI* published a "Call for

---

[63] Carlos González Márquez, "Carta a *APSI,*" *APSI: Por El Derecho a No Estar De Acuerdo,* December 15-28, No. 188, 1986, 62.
[64] Gabriel Valdés Subercaseaux, "Carta a *APSI,*" *APSI: Por El Derecho a No Estar De Acuerdo,* December 15-28, No. 188, 1986, 62.
[65] Armando Jarmillo, "Carta a *APSI,*" *APSI: Por El Derecho a No Estar De Acuerdo,* December 15-28, No. 188, 1986, 63.

Dialogue for Democratic Coalition," written by the leaders of the parties belonging to the MDP. In it, they proposed cooperation between all parties on the Left, Center, and Right that sought a return to democracy. They would form a coalition for democracy "without altering the autonomy of those parties or political alliances."[66] Although the AD did not agree to form a coalition with the MDP, due to the latter's support of violence, the ideas laid out in this call influenced the "No" movement. *APSI*'s decision to publish a document written by Marxist-Leninists in its first issue back was bold. Indeed, Article 8 of the Constitution of 1980 made it a crime. The fact that the regime did not pursue legal action against *APSI* demonstrated that the regime believed its position to be strong enough not to worry about this.

APSI continued to inform readers about both the opposition and the government. The Constitution of 1980 set up the plebiscite so the military could choose a candidate, but that person would run against a "no" vote. If the "no" vote won, congressional and presidential elections would be held the following year. In May 1987, *APSI* published an article about Pinochet on the campaign trail, even though the military had not officially named him as the "Yes" candidate. The article claimed, "a political campaign needs an electoral program and a candidate. And that candidate is no other than General Augusto Pinochet."[67] Pinochet did not officially announce his candidacy until August 1988.

In 1987, the government began to reconstruct the electoral registers it had destroyed in 1974, necessary for the plebiscite to meet international standards for

---

[66] Clodomiro Almeyda, Luis Corvalán, and Luis Maira, "Llamado el Dialogo para la Concertación Democrática," *APSI: Por El Derecho a No Estar De Acuerdo,* December 15-28, No. 188, 1986, 23.
[67] Nibaldo Fabrizio Mosciatti, "Augusto Pinochet: Candidato en Campana," *APSI: Por El Derecho a No Estar De Acuerdo*, May 4-10, No. 199, 1987, 4.

legitimacy. As a result, all Chileans needed to be registered to participate in the 1988 plebiscite. However, many Chileans expressed skepticism about registering and the overall fairness of the plebiscite.[68] *APSI* encouraged its readers to register and participate. One full-page ad asked readers if they "wanted to have Marcos as President of Chile." It described how Ferdinand Marcos, dictator of the Philippines, was defeated in 1986. According to *APSI*, the important factor was the "millions of Philippines that registered in time to vote against him." It cautioned, "In Chile, if only Pinochet's supporters register, Pinochet will win."[69]

In addition to its focus on the upcoming plebiscite, *APSI* also began to more forcefully challenge the moral norms established by the dictatorship. When describing *APSI'*s strategy Contreras noted, "The government imposed a certain authoritarian norm on society; especially the youth with the way they dressed, the cut of their hair, and attitudes about sex. These articles were meant to break that authoritarian model."[70] In a special report titled, "We are Lesbians by Choice," *APSI* journalist Milena Vodanovic interviewed four lesbians about their lifestyle. The photograph accompanying the article showed two women laying naked together in bed. The goal was to demystify homosexuality through providing greater coverage of the issues homosexuals faced.[71] In another interview with family planning expert and medical doctor Benjamín Viel, *APSI* prominently featured the quote, "There are Victorian prejudices about sex in Chile."[72]

---

[68] The Americas Watch Committee, *Chile: Human Rights and the plebiscite*, 105.
[69] *APSI*, "Querría Usted a Marcos como Presidente de Chile?," *APSI: Por El Derecho a No Estar De Acuerdo,* July 6-12, No. 208, 1987, 19.
[70] Marcelo Contreras Nieto.
[71] Milena Vodanovic, "Somos lesbianas por opción," *APSI,* No. 206, June 22, 1987, 29-32.
[72] Milena Vodanovic, "Confesonario: Benjamín Viel experto en planificación familiar,"*APSI*, No. 226, November 16. 1987, 35.

Later in the interview, Viel explained Chile's low birthrate by saying unhappy people don't have children: "what we should call it is an explosion of misery."[73] During 1987, *APSI* writers worked hard to challenge the "Victorian prejudices" of their country. Some of the articles meant to challenge the regime's moral norms *APSI* published included: a history of pornography in Chile, a history of syphilis, a dictionary of Chilean sexual slang, and an investigation into the yakuza and the Japanese sex industry.[74]

Prior to its tenth year of publication, *Hoy'*s director, Emilio Filippi, left the magazine in order to found an opposition newspaper called *La Época*. Some of *Hoy*'s staff—including Ascanio Cavallo—went with him. *La Época* was the second opposition daily newspaper behind *Fortín Mapocho.* Subdirector Abraham Santibáñez assumed the directorship of *Hoy*. Santibáñez recalled the exodus of Filippi and the staff that accompanied was a hard blow to *Hoy*.[75] Many of the staff who stayed at *Hoy* blamed Filippi's abandonment and the emotional toll it took for the eventual collapse of *Hoy.*[76] In reality, the absence of Filippi changed little in terms of *Hoy's* editorial line or quality. Santibáñez, having been part of the magazine since its founding, made the transition between directors almost seamless. In his first editorial as director, Santibáñez promised readers, "Public opinion has recognized this work. And-as was natural-it has been personified in Emilio Filippi… Our roads inevitably separate here. But, the common commitment, so often reiterated within our country, with its democratic destiny, with its

[73] Ibid, 37.
[74] *APSI,* No. 191-232, January-December, 1987.
[75] Abraham Santibáñez.
[76] Paula Mobarek and Dominic Spiniak, *Revista Hoy*, 91.

desire for freedom, and also with the best of our profession, will remain the same."[77] Under Santibáñez, *Hoy* approached the plebiscite from three main angles: coverage of human rights abuses, coverage of Pinochet's plans, and coverage of the political opposition.

There were many past and ongoing human rights-abuses committed by the regime that *Hoy* could keep fresh in readers' minds. In an article about Carmen Gloria Quintana, *Hoy* told her side of the horrific events which led to the death of Rodrigo Rojas.[78] Moreover, in February 1987, *Hoy* conducted and published an interview with family members of Orlando Letelier.[79] It reminded many of the dictatorship's role in the assassination of the former Popular Unity government diplomat. The government's attempts to restrict freedom of the press and freedom of information also provided many opportunities to criticize the regime. In an editorial titled "The Irritating Role of the Press," Santibáñez stated, "To start, a broad affirmation: It is not possible to have democracy without enough freedom of expression." He also discussed the persecution of *Análisis* and the murder of José Carrasco. Finally, he criticized pro-government news sources for casting aspersions on the opposition press and not covering important issues, stating, "This is not precisely a demonstration of faith in freedom and democracy."[80]

Hoy also worked to cover the dictator's plans for the coming plebiscite by trying to expose any hidden motivations, or, at least keep the public informed of the regime's

---

[77] Abraham Santibáñez, "Un balance y una esperanza," *Hoy,* No. 494, January 5, 1987, 7.
[78] Claudia Lanzarotti, "Jovenes quemados: Carmen Gloria cuestiona la reconstición," *Hoy*, No. 495, January 12, 1987, 14-15.
[79] *Hoy,* No. 500, February 16, 1987, 8.
[80] Abraham Santibáñez, "El irritante papel de la prensa," *Hoy,* No. 513, May 18, 1987, 5.

strategy. In an article about the political party law, *Hoy*'s political analyst, who focused on the dictatorship's strategy, Alejandro Guillier, wrote, "In order to assure his success, Pinochet patiently waited for the opportune moment. The idea was to buy time and weaken the opposition before undertaking any initiative. And the government's diagnostic is the opposition is divided, maybe better, disoriented. They waited for this instant since May 1984."[81] In another article, titled "General Pinochet, The Populist Candidate," Guiller highlighted the numerous trips and public appearances the dictator made, despite having not been put forward as the official candidate.[82] Reflecting on 1987, Guillier argued, "Creating conditions for the triumph of "Yes" was the priority." To this end, Pinochet had made numerous public appearances and even welcomed the Pope to Chile.[83]

In the face of the regime's supposed calculation that the opposition was divided, *Hoy* often depicted the opposition as working toward greater unity and the common goal of democracy. Socialist Ricardo Lagos published a call for the creation of one large party, "The Party for Democracy." He stated, "We will not fall into the trap set by the dictatorship by forming six or seven big political parties...We will respond to the dictatorship with the unity of a party whose only desire is the immediate return to democracy."[84] By the end of 1987, the opposition had formed itself into to three main blocks: The Christian Democrats, The Party for Democracy, and the United Left.[85]

---

[81] Alejandro Guillier, "Leyes politicas: Nueva táctica de Pinochet," *Hoy,* No. 494, January 5, 1987, 8-10.
[82] Alejandro Guiller, "General Pinochet, el candidato populista," *Hoy,* No. 511, May 4, 1987, 6-9.
[83] Alejandro Guiller, "1987: año pre-electoral," *Hoy,* No. 545, December 28, 1987, 7-9.
[84] Ricardo Lagos Escobar, "El partido de la democracia," *Hoy,* No. 496, January 19, 1987, 12.
[85] Jorge Olave, "1987: la modorra de la oposición," *Hoy*, No. 545, December 28, 1987, 11-12.

In June 1987, *Hoy* celebrated its tenth year in circulation. The staff held a party and many figures within Chile's opposition attended the event, including former *APSI* director Arturo Navarro, Lagos, and the subdirector of the newly formed *La Época,* Ascanio Cavallo.[86] *Hoy* also published a series of congratulatory letters it received from individuals across the political spectrum. The widow of Letelier, Isabel Margarita Morel wrote, "Not only those that are in Chile, but many Chileans—and non-Chileans—that live outside of Chile have depended on *Hoy* to inform them of what is really happening in our country."[87] Minister of the Interior, Ricardo García Rodríguez took the opportunity to reiterate his feelings of consideration and appreciation.[88] Christian Democrat and former Pinochet press secretary Federico Willoughby praised "the decision to fight to maintain, without fear, a daily battle to provide the truth, in a free space that I hope each day becomes broader and more honest for Chile."[89]

Hoy did not carry out the daily battle alone. Collectively, all of the opposition magazines participated in it. *Cauce*'s return to publication after the 1986 State of Siege marked another change in its editorial line. In the article "A New Era of *Cauce*," the staff promised, "Our first promise is with the truth and our first objective is to return our country to democracy…In this context, we have an indelible commitment to human rights, which is the same as saying with the dignity of man…The thought of *Cauce* identifies with democratic socialism in its most broad conception."[90] With its new

---

[86] "*Hoy* y su 'convocatoria," *Hoy*, No. 515, June 1, 1987, 20-23.
[87] Isabel Margarita Morel, "Letter to Editor," *Hoy,* No. 515, June 1, 1987, 15.
[88] Ricardo García Rodríguez, "Letter to Editor," Hoy, No. 515, June 1, 1987, 15.
[89] Federico Willoughby, "Letter to Editor," *Hoy*, No. 515, June 1, 1987, 16.
[90] Gonzalo Figueroa Yáñez, "Una nueva etapa de *Cauce*," *Cauce*, No. 92, January 26, 1987, 10.

mission in mind, *Cauce* turned its attention toward the "No" campaign. It focused primarily on the democratic Left's approach to the upcoming plebiscite, while continuing to cover human-rights abuses. The magazine defended its commitment to socialism in an article titled "The Obsolescence of Socialism?" Columnist Gonzalo Figueroa Yáñez explained, "We understand 'socialism' in the broadest sense: All of the political sentiments that subordinate the interest of the individual to the benefit of the collective, all the ideologies that the community has rights greater than those of the individuals who make it up."[91] *Cauce*'s commitment to democratic socialism, if it had occurred even a year earlier, would have led to its permanent closure; however, in the political environment of 1987—one in which the Socialist Party participated non-violently with a commitment to electoral reform and capitalism—the editorial line was safe. Like *APSI* and *Hoy, Cauce* continued to focus on human rights violations and published stories on the Letelier assassination, the Rojas murder, and the repression of the press.[92]

Like the other opposition magazines following the State of Siege, *Análisis* focused its reporting on human-rights violations, the regime's abuses, and the opposition's approach to the plebiscite. What separated *Análisis* from the others was a skeptical line toward participation in any government-held election. The staff at *Análisis* believed any such vote could not be legitimate. Cárdenas laid out the danger in an editorial titled "Elections, Free?" He warned, "The opposition should push for and promote free elections, but should be careful not to become enveloped in a process created by antidemocratic forces… At the same time, the opposition cannot fall into the

[91] Gonzalo Figueroa Yáñez, "Obsolencencia del socialism?" *Cauce*, No.93, February 2, 1987, 16.
[92] *Cauce*, No. 92-139, 1987.

trap of concentrating its efforts solely after the achievement of elections. There are many other national demands felt as urgently as they are and whose achievement depends also on the unity and mobilization of democratic parties and social organizations."[93] Cárdenas believed it was too dangerous for parties to focus all their efforts on one vote, while ignoring other issues that needed to be solved for such a vote to be fair. Among those other problems were the lack of freedom of the press and the many thousands of Chileans forced to live in exile. Without a free press or the participation of all Chileans, the plebiscite could not be fair. In another editorial, Cárdenas elaborated, "The most significant error of the opposition in the last years was its concurrence to the plebiscite of 1980. It was absurd to imagine that a country paralyzed by fear and an electoral process at odds with its democratic character could conclude in a result that really represent the opinion of the people…Today, political parties and democratic political organizations run the risk of making a mistake for the second time."[94] Cárdenas believed *Análisis'* skeptical approach to the plebiscite alienated himself and the magazine from the political opposition.[95]

As the year of the plebiscite approached, the opposition press continued to push up against the regime's limits of acceptable opposition. Sometimes, the dictatorship would tighten the restrictions—at times it seemed almost arbitrary, as was the case with *Hoy.* During 1987 and early 1988, *APSI, Hoy, Cauce* and *Análisis* all faced sanctions

[93] Juan Pablo Cárdenas, "Elecciones, libres?" *Análisis,* No. 158, January 20, 1987, 3.
[94] Juan Pablo Cárdenas, "Una dilema moral," *Análisis,* No. 160, February 3, 1987, 3.
[95] Juan Pablo Cárdenas.

from the regime for articles they published. Before the beginning of the plebiscite campaign, the directors of each were arrested.

In 1987, *Análisis* garnered both accolades and denunciation. On June 25, Cárdenas was informed he had received the Golden Pen of Liberty prize, which was organized annually by a federation of 29 European newspapers. On June 28, he was condemned to 541 days in prison for "defamation of the President of the Republic" based on a charge dating back to 1986.[96] The Supreme Court judges ruled that his sentence would be served through nocturnal seclusion and that he was free to go about his daily business, but had to spend his nights in custody. Cárdenas was in Europe receiving his award for journalism when the judges issued the ruling. He took his time touring various European nations and did not return to Chile for weeks.[97] Throughout the saga, *Análisis* remained open. For the regime, imprisonment of directors could be an option short of closing opposition magazines; it did not generate the same kind of universal condemnation that shutting down opposition press outlets earned.

APSI experienced similar treatment when it, too, "defamed the image of the President of the Republic." During 1987, the regime allowed opposition magazines to publish stories about human-rights violations and the opposition movement, but still absolutely restricted the freedom of press on one topic: Pinochet, as noted in Chapter Four. In August 1987, *APSI* published an extra edition called *APSI-Humor*. The issue, called "The Thousand Faces of Pinochet," satirized Pinochet as having multiple personalities. The regime confiscated 15,000 copies, arrested, and imprisoned *APSI*'s

---

[96] "Premio y condenas," *Hoy,* No. 515, June 1, 1987, 14.
[97] Juan Pablo Cárdenas.

director, Marcelo Contreras, and its sub director, Sergio Marras, without bail.[98] *APSI*'s staff changed the cover picture of *APSI-Humor* by obscuring Pinochet's face with a mask, and used it as the cover of the next issue of *APSI*. The cover depicted Pinochet as Louis the XIV of France, complete with makeup and wig.[99] In an article titled "Military Prosecutor Bans Laughing," *APSI* explained its use of humor this way: "Humor is not simply a line and a laugh, but it communicates a wide range of ideas, sentiments, and opinions."[100] Despite the name of the article, *APSI* continued to use humor as a tool to express its message. The regime released Contreras and Marras almost two months later. Contreras recalled, "I was never more famous."[101]

Hoy also experienced pressure from the regime. Early in 1988, the regime ordered the arrest of Santibáñez, Guillier, and politician and member of *Hoy's* directorship Genaro Arriagada in connection with the previously mentioned story *Hoy* ran about Letelier. The arrests came almost a year after *Hoy* published the story. The three spent only one night in jail and were then released on bail. Guillier believed, "More than the article I wrote and for which I was arrested, it was like telling the opposition to be careful. I believe that somehow it was thought that by censoring *Hoy*, all opposition media were put on notice."[102] The arrest of Arriagada was also strange. Typically, in these cases, the military would arrest the director of the magazine and possibly the political editor or subdirector. Rarely would it arrest a third party in connection to a story.

---

[98] Baltra Montaner, *Atentados a la Libertad de Información*. 54.
[99] *APSI*, "El Que Se Ríe Se Va al Cuartel," *APSI: Por El Derecho a No Estar De Acuerdo*, August 24-30, No. 214. 1987, Cover.
[100] *APSI*, "Fiscal Militar Prohibe la Risa," *APSI: Por El Derecho a No Estar De Acuerdo*, August 31-September 6, No. 215, 1987, 10.
[101] Marcelo Contreras.
[102] Alejandro Guillier in Paula Mobarek and Dominic Spiniak, *Revista Hoy*, 100.

The regime likely was not only trying to put the opposition media on notice, but politicians as well. At the time, Arriagada directed the campaign for free elections in Chile and would go on to direct the "No" campaign. Both the opposition media and the opposition politicians, then, entered the decisive year "on notice."

Perhaps to guarantee the opposition received its message, shortly after the government released Santibáñez, Guillier, and Arriagada, police detained *Cauce's* director Francisco Herreros January 1988. He had supposedly caused offense to the military, and by extension, the president, by criticizing the justice system in an editorial published June 1987. However, a judge ruled he was allowed to go free without serving any time in prison.[103] He was released the same day on bail.

At the end of 1987, the opposition had made major strides in preparation for the plebiscite of 1988. Most of the political parties that made up the AD had successfully met the government's requirements for legal status as parties. Over three million people had registered to vote, with the number continuing to rise. On the government's side, it had yet to name a candidate for the plebiscite. Though, both the regime's harsh enforcement of anti-slander laws and Pinochet's own campaigning pointed to him as the candidate.

The Decisive Year

On February 2, 1988, thirteen opposition parties met at Tupahue Hotel in Santiago and formed the Coalition of Parties for "No" (The Concertación).[104] These parties pledged to work together to advance the cause of the "No" vote without sacrificing any

[103] Hernan Millas, "Libertad de expresion arremetida contra la prensa," *Hoy,* No. 550, February 7, 1988, 17.
[104] The original 13 members were: The Christian Democratic Party, Socialist Party, Popular Socialist Union, Radical Party, Social Democracy Party, National Democratic Party, MAPU, MAPU OC, Christian Left, Humanist Party, Liberal Party, Party for Democracy, and The Greens Party.

individual party's sovereignty. What emerged from the Tupahue resembled the proposal made by the MDP a year earlier; however, the PC and MIR were not included because they continued to advocate violent change. The Concertación abandoned hopes of running a candidate against the government's candidate, resolving instead to fully participate in the 1988 plebiscite as per the Constitution of 1980. For the Concertación, opposition magazines became one of the most important ways to reach a wide audience with their message. Although the Constitution of 1980 guaranteed both the government and the opposition equality in televised campaign spots, news coverage often heavily favored the regime. TVN covered the "Yes" campaign almost exclusively and the Catholic University Channel 13 covered the "Yes" campaign in over 80 percent of its news reporting.[105] *APSI, Hoy, Cauce,* and *Análisis* covered the Concertación and the opposition on the majority of pages in every issue leading up to the plebiscite. They also began publishing advertisements for the "No" campaign before the end of February.

Opposition magazines widely reported on the founding of the Concertación. *APSI's* coverage of the event was perhaps the most artfully executed. It served two purposes: to inform the public about the opposition's move and to make Pinochet look poor in comparison. It accomplished both in an article titled "Political Moment: The Opposition Takes the Lead," in which political analyst, Nibaldo Mosciatti, argued that the value of the coalition aside from its broad spectrum of political support had two main features: First, "no is chaos, but it represents a constructive, ordered, and peaceful path

[105] Huneeus, *The Pinochet Regime*, 419.

for rebuilding democracy."[106] Second, "to vote no, the people would break Pinochet, his regime, and his institutional project."[107] The article accomplished the objective of lampooning Pinochet by discussing what he had been doing when the coalition was created. On February 4, "Pinochet had already returned from his vacation to La Moneda, but he had yet to make any comments to the press."[108] However, he took questions from the press later that day until he became angered by one of the journalists, called him names, and stormed off.[109] *APSI* showed a well-organized, unified, and mature opposition with a clear goal, juxtaposed against a self-centered and childish opponent.

Hoy's director, Santibáñez, believed that for the "No" to have a chance in the plebiscite, the electorate needed to be well informed. To this end, *Hoy* began work on a magazine that would bring the quality reporting of *Hoy* to an underserved segment of the population: urban slum dwellers. *Haciendo Camino* (*Making Way*) provided information about the "No" campaign in an easily digestible format. The new magazine appeared as a supplement to *Hoy*—to avoid the requirement for regime approval—and was tailor made to suit what the staff at *Hoy* identified as the needs of the urban poor: the typeface would be larger, there would be more photographs and graphics, and it would use a simpler language. To keep costs down so it would be affordable to the working class, the magazine was printed on cheaper paper and with lower quality ink. The thought was to make it the same price as a bus ticket. The project never made it past the first issue. There

[106] Nibaldo Fabrizio Mosciatti, "Momento Político: La Oposición Toma La Batuta," APSI, February 8-14, 1988, No. 238, 6.
[107] Ibid.
[108] Ibid., 4.
[109] Ibid.

was no system of distribution set up in the slums and no clear way to get its intended audience to purchase it.[110] Despite the failure of *Haciendo Camino*, the fact that it was attempted at all, shows how committed the opposition press was to achieving victory for the "No" campaign.

Hoy also tried to urge people to register and vote. The magazine tried to use statistical analysis to move "No" voters out of complacency and encourage them to go to the polls. In the article "The Psychological War," the author relied on statistics to show why people should register and vote, stating, "The majority of the nation is for voting 'No,' except for those registered to vote where by a wide margin it's 'Yes.'"[111] Chileans for "No" could not afford to sit back, and instead needed to register and vote because even though they seemed to be the majority, if they did not participate, "No" would lose. *Hoy* also challenged perceptions of support using statistics in an article titled "War of Percentages." Statistics showed that across three major cities—Santiago, Valparaiso, and Concepción—most respondents believed that the 'No' had gained significant support between 1987 and 1988. However, the same poll showed that people who responded saying they planned to vote 'No' changed very little between 1987 and 1988. In Santiago, reported 'No' voters made up 43.7 percent of respondents in 1987 and 44.1 percent in 1988.[112] The polls demonstrated that despite perception that 'No' had made gains, much more worked needed to be done to ensure victory.

---

[110] Paula Mobarek and Dominic Spiniak, *Revista Hoy*, 101.
[111] "La guerra sicológica," *Hoy*, No. 548, January 18, 1988, 11.
[112] Maria Irene Soto, "Guerra de porcentajes," *Hoy,* No. 564, May 9, 1988, 20.

On June 20, *APSI* reported that the PC had resolved to participate in the 1988 plebiscite and vote "No."[113] The change in policies was widely reported by both opposition and pro-regime publication. The following week, the government took legal action against the editors of *APSI*, *Análisis*, *Cauce*, and *Fortín Mapocho* for violating the law against publishing Marxist-Leninist material.[114] Each of these publications, if convicted, would have to pay large fines to the government. Enforcement of the law now seemed almost arbitrary, given that all opposition magazines had been covering leftist parties' participation in the plebiscite for months.

Opposition magazines, like *APSI*, helped the "No" campaign get around the restriction on public signage. By publishing very overt anti-Pinochet or pro- "No" photos or slogans on their covers, opposition publications essentially served as posters at any kiosk or stand that sold them. The cover of *APSI* issue no. 268 in September 1988 served this purpose. It prominently featured a picture of the bombing of La Moneda and a celebratory Pinochet. The title read "The Nomination of Pinochet: Trip to the Past."[115] The cover served to remind people of the violent, illegal nature of the overthrow of Allende and Pinochet's seemingly glee-filled role in it. Also on September 5, *Cauce*'s cover prominently featured Pinochet growing older as the years passed, until he becomes a desiccated old man in 1997. The words "This is the Offer" displayed above the aging general and "No" below; implying a vote for "Yes" was like voting for the past.[116] By October, the opposition press had done everything in its power to achieve a "No" victory.

---

[113] Marcelo Contreras, "El No de los Communistas," *APSI*, June 20-26, 1988, No. 257, 1.
[114] The Americas Watch Committee, *Chile: Human Rights and the plebiscite*. 142.
[115] "La Nominación de Pinochet de Vuelta al Pasado," *APSI*, September 5-11, 1988, cover.
[116] "Esta es la oferta," *Cauce*, No. 174, September 5, 1988, cover.

In its last issue before the plebiscite, *Hoy* ran an interview with the director of the "No" campaign, Genaro Arriagada who assured readers that the "No" campaign will have their own counters stationed to monitor the vote and that it will be fair. He urged people to vote as early as they could and then go to their homes to wait for the "No" campaign to announce its victory. He continued, "In the moment that the opposition claims victory—and not before—I find it reasonable that the people with joy, with discipline, and without violence should celebrate the triumph."[117] He also urged people not to be afraid to vote: "In the secret of the voting chamber, they should peacefully mark their vote with the security that no one knows their vote."[118] The article also included a graphic that walked readers through what voting would be like step by step so they would not be nervous.

On October 5, 1988, Chileans went to the polls.[119] As both the opposition and the government tabulated the results, many Chileans intently listened to radios or watched televisions. At 6:00 pm, the Catholic University's Channel 13 announced early tabulations in which it appeared "Yes" had a significant lead.[120] By 7:00 pm, numerous opposition radio stations were reporting a clear victory for "No." Meanwhile, Channel 13 broadcasted Looney Toons.[121] At 7:35, the polls had all closed and the government issued its first official count, with "Yes" in the lead throughout all of Chile.[122] At 9:30, the government again announced that the "Yes" vote continued to be in the lead. However, at "No" headquarters the Concertación had carried out their own count and had "No"

---

[117] Genaro Arriagada in "El no que viene," *Hoy,* No. 585, October 3, 1988, 10.
[118] Ibid., 11.
[119] All registered Chileans over the age of 18 could vote.
[120] Francisco Mouat, "El Dia 5, Minuto a Minuto," *APSI,* October 10-16, No. 273. 1988, 40.
[121] Ibid., 41.
[122] Ibid., 42.

winning with 58 percent of the vote.[123] Early morning on the October 6, after some internal debate within La Moneda, the government announced the victory of the "No" vote.[124] The semi-empty streets of Santiago filled with thousands of celebrants.

[123] Ibid., 44.
[124] Ibid., 46.

EPILOGUE

> I believe that the reconquered democracy was petty in recognition. I'm not saying it for me. I say this, in general, for the role played by the press, the humanitarian agencies ...international solidarity, which accompanied us so strongly in the struggle for democracy, but I think that in that hard time of dictatorship, the recognition of the people was what most rewarded us for what we did.
>
> -Marcelo Contreras Nieto, Director of *APSI* (1981-1995)

The journalists who risked much to oppose Pinochet believed they had achieved a great victory in the plebiscite of 1988. Many of them fought hard for democracy because they believed it would lead to a media landscape in which diverse opinions from across the social spectrum would be represented. However, despite Pinochet's defeat, the written press would never again experience the pluralism and diversity of the Allende years. In other words, the opposition's victory failed to deliver the kind of media landscape for which opposition journalists had fought. Within a decade of the return to democracy, all former opposition media outlets had been forced to close and the written press was controlled by a conservative, neoliberal duopoly. Indeed, the media landscape had undergone a fundamental change since the early 1970s.

On September 11, 1973, the military coup that toppled Salvador Allende began 17 years of dictatorship. The political violence and repression under the dictatorship was worse than any other political violence experienced in the history of Chile, as the Pinochet regime murdered over 3,000 people and detained and tortured tens of thousands more. Pinochet also restricted the freedoms of speech and suppressed the opposition press, but despite the harsh repression, opposition journalists took great risks and exploited openings in the regime's censorship policies, giving the opposition a public voice under the dictatorship. Opposition newsmagazines pushed the limits of what they

could publish and expanded the scope of public discourse, eventually playing a critical role in the "No" campaign of 1988.

Immediately following the coup, the military issued Edicts 11 and 12 to control the press. With these two edicts, the regime built an elaborate censorship apparatus controlled by the agency DINACOS. At the same time, the regime began to institute a program of systematic violence under a military State of Siege. Between September 1973 and December 1976, the military government suppressed all forms of opposition. During these years, the military went so far as to treat ecclesiastic human-rights organizations as dangerous sources of dissent. The Regime forced the closure of the Committee for Peace (COPACHI) and journalists associated with the organization founded the first opposition magazine, *APSI*. The regime granted *APSI* permission to publish international news only. *APSI*'s staff took advantage of the opening and began publishing international stories that related closely to the Chilean situation and used analogies to criticize the regime without addressing it directly.

In 1977, the regime adopted neoliberal economic policies and began the process of creating a new constitution. As Pinochet's hold on power tightened, he allowed more leeway for the opposition to operate, and, by the end of 1977, two more major opposition publications, *Hoy* and *Análisis*, had appeared. *APSI* took advantage of this opening by expanding to include coverage of national news. By 1979, *APSI* regularly published stories about Chile and the opposition to Pinochet. However, the government banned the newsmagazine *Hoy* for publishing interviews with exiled Marxists. The backlash from that act, combined with Pinochet's desire for increased legitimacy around the 1980

constitutional plebiscite, led to an opening for the opposition press. When Chile's economy collapsed in 1981 and 1982, the regime's position became unstable, as protestors marched in the streets against the military government. The return to instability caused Pinochet to again repress the opposition, and DINACOS began to more strictly enforce the censorship laws once more. The regime banned *APSI* in 1981 and again in 1982 for publishing stories on national news without permission; however, *APSI* had been doing so since 1979 without repercussions. The government allowed space for opposition journalism when its legitimacy was stronger, but repressed opposition journalism when its power was challenged by a variety of factors, including economic crises. The opposition press took advantage of these ebbs and flows.

The Supreme Court allowed *APSI* to begin publishing again in 1983 as long as it only covered international news. *APSI* returned to criticizing the regime through analogy. The regime's new Minister of the Interior, Sergio Onofre Jarpa, believed the best way to control the opposition was to reach out to it. *APSI* petitioned Jarpa for permission to publish national news once again, and he granted it. Jarpa also granted such permission to *Cauce*. In 1984, the opposition magazines began to cover the Democratic Alliance and other opposition movements. When leftist groups destabilized the country with terrorist attacks in 1984, Pinochet again cracked down on the opposition, implementing a State of Siege and closing opposition publications indefinitely. By July 1985, stability had returned to Chile and DINACOS again allowed *APSI* and other opposition publications to publish, but banned them again in 1986 when terrorists attempted to assassinate Pinochet. In 1987, DINACOS again lifted its ban on the opposition press, which returned to report

on and also play a key role in the opposition movement. *APSI* and other opposition magazines published campaign advertisements for the Concertación and used their covers to display "No" campaign messages in public spaces. The Concertación succeeded in 1988 with the triumph of the "No" vote. In accordance with the Constitution of 1980, the government held elections the following year, and Chileans elected Christian Democrat Patricio Aylwin as President. Pinochet stepped down in 1990, but remained in charge of the military.

Remembering those Halcyon Days

Many opposition journalists saw the success of the Concertación as their own. The opposition newsmagazines *APSI, Hoy, Análisis*, and *Cauce* had repeatedly affirmed throughout the dictatorship that one of their main goals was the return of democracy. However jubilant the celebrations for the return to democracy, the opposition newsmagazines would begin to fail, with the last true opposition magazine, *APSI,* shutting down its presses in 1995. *Hoy* would continue to publish until 1998, but, shortly after the victory of "No," its ownership sold the magazine. The new owners sought to make the magazine a mouth piece for the Christian Democratic Party, rather than an independent journalistic endeavor. Throughout the 1990s, the two wealthiest media groups, El Mercurio and Copesa, worked to either out-compete or purchase smaller media outlets. Print media in Chile today is dominated by this duopoly. Between them, they own over 90 percent of all newspapers.[1] In their editorial lines, each espouse neoliberal economics and adhere to political conservativism. Each, media group, through

[1] Freedom House, "Country Report: Chile," (accessed on 7/14/2017), https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-press/2013/chile.

their flagship newspapers — *El Mercurio* and *La Tercera* respectively — had been sympathetic to the military dictatorship. Paradoxically then, there was a greater range and diversity of political thought represented by the print media under Pinochet, than there has been since democracy's return. Despite passing through a 17-year military dictatorship, the period between 1960 and 1990 was a golden age for print media in Chile, especially for newsmagazines.

The directors of opposition magazines and the journalists who worked for them have a strange contradiction in their memories. The dictatorship and the repression they suffered were simultaneously the most difficult things they had ever faced, while still seeing the work that they were doing as worth the risk. At the same time, for most of the journalists involved it was the height of their career. If they are known now it is because of what they accomplished then. There is a tendency among most of the journalists interviewed for this study to look back on those trying times as the "glory days" and with some fondness. While others, such as Juan Pablo Cárdenas, look back at the suffering and it is made all the worse by what happened after the return to democracy.

The most logical and convincing explanation for the failure of the opposition press in the wake of the return to democracy is they simply could not achieve the readership necessary to support their costs. During the dictatorship, the opposition press had received charitable contributions primarily from foreign human-rights organizations to offset its operating costs. Broadly, these organizations supported a free press because, like the opposition journalists, they believed it would move Chile toward democracy. Once that democracy had been achieved, there was no longer any pressing need to

continue to fund an opposition press. The director of *Hoy,* Abraham Santibáñez, believed that apart from the staff at his magazine, none of the other opposition newsmagazines had any experience competing in a free market where subscriptions and advertising alone paid the bills.[2]

APSI's first director, Arturo Navarro Ceardi, explained that the coup and the period of repression immediately after had thrust him into the forefront of journalism in Chile. He said, "I felt very strongly the sensation that I had passed, without looking for it, to the front rank of national journalism, in spite of being very young, but the previous generations were dead, exiled, frightened, or missing."[3] His greatest challenge at *APSI* was simply to get the next issue published. He remembers well the challenges, recalling, "We lived on embers, a real militancy of "true journalism" which was a scarce commodity in those days."[4] Navarro returned from exile in the 1980s and began to write a literary supplement for the opposition daily *La Época.* His participation in opposition journalism had put him in important company. After the dictatorship, he served as a member of President Eduardo Frei Ruiz-Tagle's Cultural and Artistic Advisory Commission and later served President Ricardo Lagos as the Executive Secretary of the Committee on Cultural Infrastructure. Following his time in government, Navarro became Executive Director of the private Mapocho Station Cultural Center, a position he retains today. In 2005, he received the Gabriela Mistral Order of Educational and

[2] Abraham Santibáñez Martínez.
[3] Arturo Navarro Ceardi.
[4] Ibid.

Cultural Merit, in the degree of Commander, granted by the Government of Chile. He also writes a blog about Chilean culture.[5]

APSI's second and last director, Marcelo Contreras Nieto, created a rift between himself and other *APSI* employees by not paying his staff before he closed the magazine in 1995. Contreras was so committed to *APSI,* he ran it at a loss in order to continue to publish. Eventually, it could no longer be sustained and Contreras was forced to close the magazine. *APSI* contributor Francisco Mouat described the difference between Contreras' view and the rest of *APSI*'s staff this way: "For us *APSI* was a magazine; for Maras, Villagrán, and Contreras it was a political task."[6] Contreras remembered, "We tried very hard to be successful in a very difficult market. It was difficult to compete with *El Mercurio* and *La Tercera*."[7] *APSI* simply did not have as large a readership as the two companies could offer to advertisers, and without the help of outside funding sources, quickly found itself unable to compete. Contreras now directs the media watchdog Fucatel. Ultimately, Contreras believed that the democratic governments did not fully appreciate the role of the opposition press. The director of the "No" campaign Genaro Arriagada perhaps best explained, from the political side, why members of the opposition press received little appreciation from the Concertación. For Arriagada, the opposition press was too cautious and did not act as boldly as the politicians would have liked.[8] However, the opposition media was fiercely independent of political parties, and perhaps this conflict between an independent media and political parties led to the rift between the

[5] http://arturo-navarro.blogspot.com/
[6] Francisco Mouat in Araya Jofré, *Historia de la Revista APSI*, 93.
[7] Marcelo Contreras Nieto.
[8] Genaro Arriagada.

two groups. Abraham Santibáñez's experiences at *Hoy* during and after the plebiscite seem to bear this out.

Santibáñez left *Hoy* in 1990. The most difficult time for him during his tenure at *Hoy* was the 1988 plebiscite campaign and the subsequent political campaigns, including the electoral campaign of Aylwin. He recalled, "*Hoy* was very involved with the plebiscite and Aylwin's campaign, but constantly received notes or requests from the PDC."[9] In that environment, Santibáñez found it difficult to maintain *Hoy's* journalistic integrity, as an independent professional journalistic organ. When Santibáñez left *Hoy,* he became the director of *La Nación* until 1994 at the request of newly elected President Aylwin. He has received numerous awards since the end of the dictatorship, including Chile's National Journalism Prize in 2015. His greatest memory of his time in the opposition press was when he and Alejandro Guillier were released from prison. The two were met in the street by many opposition journalists, and Santibáñez described it as "very, very emotional."[10]

Of the former directors of opposition newsmagazines, Juan Pablo Cárdenas does not buy into the theory that the opposition papers collapsed strictly due to economic pressures. He believes not only that there was a rift, but that the democratic government actively sought to destroy the opposition press. Though *Análisis* closed in 1993, it published a special edition in 2007 to commemorate the 30th year anniversary of its creation. In it, Cárdenas wrote, "They say the 'market' killed *Análisis* and other

[9] Abraham Santibáñez Martínez.
[10] Ibid.

publications. It is a lie that insults and hurts us."[11] He believed that the Aylwin government sought to completely shut down the opposition press, because it was inconvenient dealing with an opposition press, which was looking for evidence of past crimes committed by the military or investigating things that could make the new democratic government look bad. Cárdenas recalled that international donors for his magazine told him they had tried to send him money, but the Aylwin government had made it very difficult and, in fact, encouraged them not to.[12] Cárdenas is most hurt that his magazine could survive a dictatorship, but only managed three years under democracy, ultimately closing in 1993. Since he left *Análisis* in 1991, Cárdenas has worked at various journalistic outlets, including his current position as director of Radio Universidad de Chile. In 2005, he won Chile's National Journalism Prize.

After Francisco Javier Cuadra's predictions about the plebiscite proved true, he returned to Chile and devoted most of his time to academics and political analysis. However, Cuadra maintained his suspicion of politicians. The world for Cuadra is still very black and white; there are good people who follow the laws and bad people who break them. In 1995, this outlook led him to denounce members of his own political party (National Renovation), accusing them of using drugs while holding political office and legislating. In what can only be described as a great irony, Cuadra was convicted under the Security of State Law for insulting elected officials, and was sentenced to 540 days in prison. Just as he had imprisoned journalists during the dictatorship, Cuadra found himself in prison for trying to expose something he thought was wrong with the

[11] Juan Pablo Cárdenas, "Nosotros, los de entonces," *Análisis,* December, 2007, 3.
[12] Juan Pablo Cárdenas.

government. Marcelo Contreras of *APSI* visited him in prison and claims he took no pleasure in the irony.[13] Cuadra remembers the visit fondly and believes it shows the respect that two men on opposites sides of an issue can have for one another.[14] He also does not regret his role in the dictatorship.[15]

Despite the failure of the opposition press during the 1990s, most of the journalists involved hold their participation as a point of pride. Their travails during the dictatorship define them as surely as the Pinochet regime defined late-twentieth century Chile and still shapes the country's politics today.

The Opposition Press and the End of Pinochet

It is easy to dismiss the importance of the opposition press by pointing to the regime's ability to censor and the reality that the press was not free, by any stretch of the imagination, under the dictatorship. In order to minimize the role of the opposition press, Opposition politicians seized on the lack of complete freedom as well as accusations that the press was too cautious or too independent to be useful for the political movement to end the dictatorship. As a result, politicians who participated in the opposition to Pinochet have minimized the role of the press in the dictator's downfall. However, the opposition press consistently provided oppositional arguments and information to the Chilean people since 1976, long before the rise of any unified or effective political

---

[13] Marcelo Contreras Nieto.
[14] Francisco Javier Cuadra.
[15] Cuadra has a reputation as being very cold. Personally, I found him engaging and friendly. He did cry once during our interview. However, it was when I asked him about Pinochet's death. He became very emotional briefly. It shows how important Pinochet was to him to show that kind of emotion even briefly.

opposition to the dictatorship. The work of journalists at *APSI*, *Hoy*, *Análisis*, and *Cauce* stands among the most important factors in the downfall of Pinochet.

Beginning in 1976, opposition journalists challenged the regime and opened up more and more space for public debate. When Eduardo Frei Montlava returned to Chile to oppose the 1980 plebiscite, the opposition press had already expanded the sphere of legitimate controversy enough that he could do so openly and publicly and the newsmagazines could cover his movement. Certainly, opposition politicians had ways of communicating information to devoted party members, but with political parties officially in recess, parties needed to rely on independent news media to inform the public about their actions.

When the "No" campaign won in 1988, the parties behind it began to try to re-establish direct control over the opposition media and use it to support their electoral campaigns. The directors of the opposition newsmagazines resisted this, wanting to maintain objectivity and independence. With the Concertación in power beginning in 1990, the former opposition newsmagazines struggled to remain both independent of political parties and economically viable. The rebirth of Chilean democracy was fragile, Pinochet remained in control of the armed forces and loomed over the newly reformed democracy like the sword of Damocles. Politicians of the Concertación feared former oppositional newsmagazines investigating the regime's human-rights abuses would anger Pinochet and cause him to intervene in politics. The Concertación did little to support these newsmagazines and instead embraced *El Mercurio* and *La Tercera,* as support from

those newspapers could help bring about the politics of consensus that they sought in the aftermath of the dictatorship. As a result, print media's pluralism ended in the 1990s.

WORKS CITED

Archives and Libraries

Archivo Nacional de la Administración (Santiago)

Biblioteca Nacional de Chile (Santiago)

Centro de Investigación y Documentación, Universidad Finis Terrae (Santiago)

Newspapers and Periodicals (Santiago)

APSI (1976-1990)

Análisis (1977-1990)

Cauce (1983-1989)

El Clarín (1960-1973)

El Mercurio (1960-1990)

Ercilla (1933-1985)

Fortín Mapocho (1984-1990)

Hoy (1977-1990)

La Aurora de Chile (1812)

La Época (1987-1990)

La Tercera (1960-1990)

La Tribuna (1970-1973)

The Clinic (1997)

Topaze (1924-1970)

Qué Pasa (1970-1985)

Interviews

Abraham Santibáñez. Interview by author. Tape recording. Santiago, Chile. September 25, 2014.

Andrés Braithwaite. Skype interview by author. Tape recording, July 11, 2015.

Arturo Navarro Ceardi, Email interview by author, July 12, 2010; interview by author. Tape recording. Santiago, Chile. December 14, 2010; email interview by author, June 6, 2014; correspondence with Author, June 18, 2014.

Ascanio Cavallo Castro. Email interview by author, August 8, 2016.

Delia Vergara. Interview by author. Tape recording. Santiago, Chile. October 13, 2014.

Edmundo Perez Yoma. Interview by author. Tape recording. Santiago, Chile. October 27, 2014.

Francisco Javier Cuadra. Interviewed by author. Tape recording. Santiago, Chile, July 17, 2014.

Genaro Arriagada. Interviewed by author. Tape recording. Santiago, Chile, October 28, 2014.

Hector Soto. Email interview by author, May 29, 2017.

John Dinges. Telephone interview with author. Tape recording. May 4, 2011; interviewed by the author. Tape recording. Santiago, Chile, May 29, 2014; email interview with author, July 9, 2016; conversation with author, March 13, 2017.

José Zalaquett Daher. Interviewed by author, Tape recording. Santiago, Chile. August 27, 2014.

Juan Pablo Cárdenas. Interview with author, October 2, 2014.

Marcelo Contreras Nieto. Interview with author. Tape recording. Santiago, Chile. September 23, 2014.

Óscar Guillermo Garretón Purcell. Interviewed by author. Tape recording. Santiago, Chile. November 3, 2014.

Sergio Marras. Email interview by author. August 26, 2014.

Government Documents (Chile)

"De Presidente del consejo de defense del estado al Señor General, Ministro de Tierras y Colonización: Estudio sobre Proyecto de decreto ley," September 27, 1974, ARNAD, Ministerio de Interior, Oficios, 1975, V. 17711.

"Publicidad Relacionada con area de Propeidad Social y Poderes Compradores Acciones," Archivo Nacional de la Administración, CORFO, Correlativo Oficios, January, 1973, V. 6550.

Camara de Diputados Legislatura Extrodinaria, "Sesion 12a, en martes 25 de Junio de 1963."

Camara de Diputados Legislatura Extrodinaria. "Sesion 40a, en martes 14 de Enero de 1964."

Camara de Diputados Legislatura Extrordinaria, "Sesion 7a, en Martes 11 de Abril de 1972."

Centro de Estudios Bicentenario. "El Acuerdo de la Cámara de Diputados sobre el Grave Quebrantamiento del Orden Constitucional y Legal de la República del 22 de agosto de 1973." (accessed on 12/15/16). http://www.bicentenariochile.cl/attachments/017_Acuerdo percent20C percentC3

percentA1mara percent20de percent20Diputados percent2022 percent20agosto percent201973.pdf.

Diario de Sesiones del Senado, “Sesión 17., en martes 8 de julio de 1958.”

Diario de Sesiones del Senado, “Sesión 07, en 15 de Junio de 1966.”

Diario de Sesiones del Senado “Sesion 19a., en 8 de Noviembre de 1966.”

Diario de Sesiones del Senado, “Sesion 3a, en 6 de Octubre de 1972.”

Junta de Gobierno de Las Fuerzas Armadas y Carabineros de Chile. “Bando 11,” September 11, 1973, in Lidia Baltra Montaner, *Atentados a la Libertad de información y a los Medios de Comunicación en Chile 1973-1987*, 10, Santiago de Chile: CENECA, 1988.

Junta de Gobierno de Las Fuerzas Armadas y Carabineros de Chile. “Bando 12,” September 11, 1973, in Lidia Baltra Montaner, *Atentados a la Libertad de información y a los Medios de Comunicación en Chile 1973-1987*, 9, Santiago de Chile: CENECA, 1988.

La Honorable Junta de Gobierno. “Decreto Ley No. 1878,” accessed March 12, 2011. http://www.archivovicaria.cl/archivos/VS0000005.pdf.

Ministerio de Justicia, Government of Chile, “Ley 16239,” https://www.leychile.cl/Navegar?idNorma=28348&idVersion=1965-03-30 (accessed on 6/20/16).

_____ “Ley 16636,” http://bcn.cl/1wtab (accessed on 6/15/16).

Pinochet Ugarte, Augusto. “Letter to his Eminence Cardinal Raúl Silva Henríquez,” November 11, 1975, in Interamerican Commission on Human Rights. *Report on*

the Situation of Human Rights in Chile, accessed March 16, 2011. http://www.cidh.oas.org/countryrep/Chile85eng/chap.11.htm.

Government Documents (United States)

"Informational and Communist Cultural Developments under President Allende." National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), Record Group 306 (RG 306), United States Information Agency, Research Reports, 1960-1999, Box 36.

CIA, "Resignation of Junta Press Secretary in Regards to Restriction of Freedoms of Press," January 12, 1976, accessed March 16, 2011. http://foia.state.gov/documents/Pcia/9d03.pdf

Memorandum of Conversation, Charles Meyer (Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs) – Sergio Jarpa (President of the Chilean Partido Nacional), 8 December 1970, National Archives and Records Administration, Records of the Department of State (Record Group 59), Central Foreign Policy Files, 1970-1973, Political and Defense, Box 2193.

Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, "Church Report: Covert Action in Chile 1963-1973," December 18, 1975, accessed February 8, 2011. http://foia.state.gov/Reports/ChurchReport.asp

U.S. Embassy in Santiago, "Expulsion of Washington Post Correspondent John Dinges," February 23, 1977. http://foia.state.gov/documents/Pinochet/9044.pdf. (accessed May 20, 2011).

U.S. Embassy in Santiago, "Pinochet Comments on Press Freedom," November 4, 1974.

US Embassy in Santiago, "The Chilean Plebiscite: SITREP Seven," October 6, 1988, accessed May 4, 2011. http://foia.state.gov/documents/StateChile3/00007B77.pdf

Published Primary Sources

Arriagada, Genaro. interview by the Freedom Foundation, accessed on 4/27/2017, http://www.freedomcollection.org/interviews/genaro_arriagada/?vidid=1379

Arzbizopado de Santiago, "Aviso Publicado en *El Mercurio*," November 10, 1973. accessed February 10, 2011. http://www.archivovicaria.cl/archivos/VS0000091.pdf

Aylwin Azócar, Patricio. *Crecimiento con Equidad: Discursos Escogidos*, 1992-1994. Santiago: Editorial Andrés Bello, 1994.

Cardinal Raúl Silva Henríquez, "Letter to Augusto Pinochet Ugarte," November, 1975, in Interamerican Commission on Human Rights. *Report on the Situation of Human Rights in Chile*, accessed March 16, 2011. http://www.cidh.oas.org/countryrep/Chile85eng/chap.11.htm.

Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation, *Report of the Chilean National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation*. vol. 1 & 2, trans. Phillip E. Berryman. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.

Comité de Cooperación para la Paz en Chile. "Carta a los sacerdotes, pastores evangélicos y religiosas sobre la creación del Comité de Cooperación para la Paz en Chile," October 6, 1973. accessed February 10, 2011, http://www.archivovicaria.cl/archivos/VS4b13d2ebcda41_30112009_1112am.pdf

Comisión Nacional sobre Prisión Política y Tortura. *Informe Valech*. accessed February 27, 2011 http://memoriaviva.com/Tortura/Informe_Valech.pdf

Frei Montalva, Eduardo. *The Mandate of History and Chile's Future*. trans. Miguel d'Escoto. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1977.

_____ *La política y el espíritu,* Santiago de Chile: Editorial Pacifico, 1946.

Gamboa, Alberto. *Un viaje por el infierno*. Santiago de Chile: Editorial Forja, 2010.

_____ *Las siete vidas del Gato Gamboa*, *conversaciones de Francisco Mouat con el Gato*. Santiago de Chile: Lolita Editores, 2012.

Interamerican Commission on Human Rights. *Report on the Situation of Human Rights in Chile*. accessed March 16, 2011. http://www.cidh.oas.org/countryrep/Chile85eng/chap.11.htm

Johnson, Tim. "Chile's Pinochet Imposes State of Siege after weeks of violence." Christian Science Monitor. 9/8/1984. Accessed April 23, 2016. http://www.csmonitor.com/1984/1108/110845.html

Marras, Sergio. *Memorias de un testigo involuntario, 1973-1990*. Santiago de Chile: Catalonia, 2013.

Pérez de Arce, Hermógenes. "Los comunistas no son agradecidos." accessed on 9/17/2016, http://blogdehermogenes.blogspot.com/2016/01/los-comunistas-no-son-agradecidos.html

_____ "Versos a una difunta reiterada." accessed on 9/17/2016, http://blogdehermogenes.blogspot.com/2014/02/versos-una-difunta-reiterada.html

Pinochet Ugarte, Augusto. in BBC News, "General Pinochet's Dance with Justice." News.bbc.co.uk, September 8, 2006, accessed February 10, 2011, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/4696617.stm

_____*Camino recorrido: Biografia de un soldado.* Vol. 1-2. Santiago de Chile: Instituto Geográfico Militar, 1990.

Puz, Amanda. *Última vez que me exilio*. Catalonia: Santiago de Chile, 2013.

TVN, "Halley 1986: Once in a Lifetime," March, 1986, accessed April 3, 2017, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VjnMp1MNJDM&t=5s

Published Secondary Sources

Angell, Alan, *Democracy after Pinochet: Politics, Parties, and Elections in Chile*. London: Institute for the Study of the Americas, 2007.

Araya Jofre, Francisca. *Historia de la Revista APSI: El que se rie se va al cuartel (Pico para Pinochet),* Santiago de Chile: LOM Ediciones, 2007.

Arnello, Mario. *Proceso a una Democracia: Pensamiento Político de Jorge Prat*, 1965, Accessed February 23, 2016, http://historiapolitica.bcn.cl/buscador/buscar?busqueda=Jorge+Prat&submit=Buscar&pagina=1&mindate=&maxdate=&sort=Relevance&minrelevance=30&MP_Personajes=true&MP_Partidos_Politicos=true&MP_Publicaciones_de_Memoria_Politica=true&MP_Parlamentarios=true&MP_Junta_de_Gobierno=true&MP_Legislacion=true&MP_Labor_Parlamentaria=true&MP_Diarios_de_Sesiones=true&MP_Resenas_Efemerides=true&cantidadresultados=10

Arriagada, Genaro. *Pinochet: The Politics of Power.* Trans. Nancy Morris. Boston:

Unwyn Hyman Inc, 1988.

_____. *Por La Razón o La Fuerza: Chile Bajo Pinochet.* Santiago de Chile: Editorial Sudamericana Chilena, 1998.

Baltra Montaner, Lidia. *Atentados a la Libertad de información y a los Medios de Comunicación en Chile 1973-1987*. Santiago de Chile: CENECA: 1988.

Barros Arana, Diego. *Un Decenio de la Historia de Chile (1841-1851*). New York: Forgotten Books, 2015

Barr-Melej, Patrick, *Psychedelic Chile: Youth, Counterculture, and Politics on the Road to Socialism and Dictatorship.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017.

_____*Reforming Chile: Cultural Politics, Nationalism, and the Rise of the Middle Class*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Boeninger, Edgardo. *Democracia en Chile: lecciones para la gobernabilidad.* Santiago de Chile: Editorial Andres Bello, 1997.

Booth, John and Patricia Richard, *Latin American Political Culture: Public Opinion and Democracy.* Los Angeles: Sage, 2015.

Brett, Sebastian. *The Limits of Tolerance: Freedom of Expression and the Public Debate in Chile.* New York: Human Rights Watch, 1998.

Brown, Cynthia. *The Vicaría de Solidaridad in Chile.* Washington DC: Americas Watch, 1987.

Burnett, Ben, G. *Political Groups in Chile: The Dialogue between Order and Change*. Austin, University of Texas Press, 2015.

Cane, James. *The Fourth Enemy*: *Journalism and Power in the Making of Peronist Argentina, 1930-1955.* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2011.

Collier, Simon. *Chile: The Making of a Republic, 1830-1865 Politics and Ideas.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Collier, Simon and William F. Sater. *A History of Chile: 1808-2002.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Congreso Nacional de Chile. “Reseña Biográfica Parlamentaria: Sergio Onofre Jarpa Reyes.” Accessed January 29, 2015. http://historiapolitica.bcn.cl/resenas_parlamentarias/wiki/Sergio_Onofre_Jarpa_Reyes

Constable, Pamela and Arturo Valenzuela. *A Nation of Enemies: Chile under Pinochet.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1991.

Coreaga, Roberto C. “Omar Saavedra: "La Gran Ciudad es una novela mayor del exilio chileno," accessed July 12, 2016, http://www.latercera.com/noticia/cultura/2014/08/1453-589894-9-omar-saavedra-la-gran-ciudad-es-una-novela-mayor-del-exilio-chileno.shtml

Davis, Nathaniel. *The Last Two Years of Salvador Allende.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Dinges, John and Saul Landau. *Assassination on Embassy Row: The Shocking Stories of the Letelier-Moffit Murders*. New York: Pantheon Press, 1980.

Dinges, John. *The Condor Years: How Pinochet and his Allies Brought Terrorism to*

Three Continents. New York: New Press, 2004.

Dooner, Patricio. *Periodismo y Politica: La Prensa de Derecha e Izquierda 1970-1973.* Santiago de Chile: Andante, 1989.

Dougnac, Paulette, et al. *El Diario de Augustín: Cinco Estudios de Casos sobre El Mercurio y los Derechos Humanos (1973-1990).* Santiago de Chile: LOM Ediciones, 2009.

Drake Paul W. and Iván Jaksic eds., *The Struggle for Democracy in Chile*, 1982-1990. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1991.

Editor and Publisher, *Editor and Publisher: International Yearbook.* New York: Editor and Publisher Co., 1965-1973.

Edwards, Alberto. *La fronda aristocratica en Chile*. Santiago de Chile: Editorial Universitaria, 2015.

Elsey, Brenda. *Citizens and sportsmen: Fútbol and Politics in Twentieth-Century Chile*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011.

Encina, Francisco A. *Historia de Chile: desde prehistoria hasta 1891*, tomo 1-20. Santiago de Chile: Editorial Nascimento, 1941.

Ensalaco, Mark. *Chile under Pinochet: Recovering the Truth*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.

Ercilla Extra 2.000 Semanas. Santiago de Chile: La Editora Nacional Gabriella Mistral, 1973.

Fermandois, Joaquín, *La revolución inconclusa: La izquierda y el gobierno de la Unidad Popular*. Santiago, Chile: Centro de Estudios Públicos, 2013.

_____*Mundo y fin de mundo: Chile en la política mundial, 1900-2004.* Santiago de Chile: Ediciones Universidad Católica de Chile, 2005.

Ffrench-Davis, Ricardo. *Entre el Neoliberalismo y Crecimiento con Equidad.* Santiago de Chile: Dolman, 1999.

Fontaine Aldunate, Arturo. *Los Economistas y el Presidente Pinochet.* Santiago de Chile: Zigzag, 1998.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.

Frahling, Hugo. "Resistance to Fear in Chile: The Experience of the Vicaría de la Solidaridad," in *Fear at the Edge: State Terror and Resistance in Latin America*. ed. Juan E. Carradi, Patricia Weiss Fagen, & Manuel Antonio Garretón. Berkley: University of California Press, 1992.

Fuentes, Luis Arturo. *Grandes grupos económicos en Chile y los modelos de propiedad en otros países*. Santiago de Chile: Dolmen Ediciones, 1997.

Gazmuri, Cristían. *Eduardo Frei Montalva y su Época*, vol 1& 2. Santiago de Chile: Aguilar, 2000.

_____ *Historia de Chile: 1891-1994: política, economía, sociedad, cultura, vida privada, episodios.* Santiago de Chile: RIL Editores, 2013.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from a Prison Notebook*. trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffery Nowell Smith. New York: International Publisher, 1999.

Gross, Leonard. *The Last Best Hope: Eduardo Frei and Chilean Democracy*. New York: Random House, 1967.

Hallin, Daniel C. *The Uncensored War: The Media and Vietnam*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1989.

Harmer, Tanya. *Allende's Chile and the Inter-American Cold War.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014.

"Historia," accessed on February 12, 2016. http://villagrimaldi.cl/historia/red-de-recintos-de-detencion/

Huneeus, Carlos. *The Pinochet Regime*. trans. Lake Sagaris. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2007.

Hutchison, Elizabeth. *Labors Appropriate to Their Sex: Gender Labor and Politics in Urban Chile, 1900-1930.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2001.

Israel Zipper, Ricardo. *Politics and Ideology in Allende's Chile*. Tempe: Arizona State University, 1989.

Jones, Adam *Beyond the Barricades: Nicaragua and the Struggle for the Sandinista Press, 1979-1998.* Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2002.

Klaiber, Jeffery. *The Church, Dictatorships, and Democracy in Latin America.* Eugene, Or: Wipe & Stock, 1998.

Linz, Juan. *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1978.

Londregan, John Benedict. *Legislative Institutions and Ideology in Chile*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Mallon, Florencia. "Barbudos, Warriors, and Rotos: The MIR, Masculinity, and Power in

the Chilean Agrarian Reform, 1965-1974," in *Changing Men and Masculinities in Latin America*, ed. Mathew C. Gutmann. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

_____ *Courage Tastes of Blood: The Mapuche Community of Nicolás Ailío and the Chilean State, 1906-2001*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005.

_____ *Peasant and Nation: The Making of Post-Colonial Mexico and Peru.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Marinello, Jaun Cristobal. "Quien es Chile la visión de lo nacional en la colección 'Nosotros los chilenos' de la Editora Nacional Quimantu." in *Seminario Simon Collier 2007,* ed. Ana Maria Cruz Valdivieso, 9-39, Santiago de Chile: LOM Ediciones, 2008.

McCann, Bryan. "A View from the Corner Bar: Sérgio Porto's Satirical *Crônicas* and the *Democradura." Hispanic American Historical Review* (2012) 92(3).

Medina, Eden. *Cybernetic Revolutionaries: Technology and Politics in Allende's Chile*. Cambridge: MIT Press: 2014.

Mobarek, Paula and Dominic Spiniak. *Revista HOY, 1.108 ediciones con historia*. Santiago: Ediciones Copygraph, 2001.

Mönckeberg, María Olivia. *El saqueo de los grupos económicos al Estado chileno*. Santiago: Ediciones B Grupo Zeta, 2001.

MOxLAD, "Chile illiteracy graph," Oxford: Oxford University, Accessed on 5/1/2017, https://moxlad-staging.herokuapp.com/home/en#tabs-graficar

Nord, David Paul. "A Plea for Journalism History." *Journalism History* 15 (Spring 1988).

O'Brien, Phillip J. *Chile, the Pinochet Decade: The Rise and Fall of the Chicago Boys*.

London: Latin America Bureau, 1983.

O'Shaughnessy, Hugh. *Pinochet: The Politics of Torture.* New York: New York University Press, 2000.

Policzer, Pablo. *The Rise and Fall of Repression in Chile*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.

Power, Margaret. *Right-Wing Women in Chile: Feminine Power and the Struggle Against Allende*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.

Reyes Matta, Fernando ed. *Investigacion sobre la Prensa en Chile (1974-1984).*Santiago: Badal ltda., 1986.

Rosemblatt, Karen Alejandra. *Gendered Compromises: Political Cultures and The State in Chile, 1920-1950.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

Salazar Vergara, Gabriel. *La violencia política popular en las "grandes alamedas": la violencia en Chile, 1947-1987: una perspectiva histórico-popular.* Santiago de Chile: LOM Ediciones, 2006.

Sigmund, Paul. *The Overthrow of Allende and the Politics of Chile, 1964-1976*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1977.

Silva, Patricio. *In the Name of Reason: Technocrats and Politics in Chile*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008.

Skoknic, Francisca. "La vida al límite de Darío Sainte Marie, creador de Clarín," Accessed on August 24, 2016, http://ciperchile.cl/2008/04/30/la-vida-al-limite-del-creador-de-clarin/

Spooner, Mary Hellen. *Soldiers in a Narrow land: The Pinochet Regime in Chile.*

Berkely: University of California Press, 1994.

Stern, Steve J. *Battling for Hearts and Minds: Memory Struggles in Pinochet's Chile, 1973-1988*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.

Sunkel, Guillermo. *El Mercurio: 10 Años de Educacion Politico.* Mexico City: Instituto Latinoamericano de Estudios Transnacionales, 1983.

The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, "Voter Turnout Data for Chile," accessed August 14, 2016. http://www.idea.int/vt/countryview.cfm?id=45

Valdivia, Veronica, Rolando Álvares, and Julio Pinto. *Su Revolución Contra Nuestra Revolución: Izquierdas y Derechas en el Chile de Pinochet (1973-1981).* Santiago de Chile: LOM Ediciones, 2006.

Verdugo, Patricia. *Chile, Pinochet, and the Caravan of Death.* Trans. Marcelo Montecino. Coral Gables, FL: North-South Center Press, 2001.

Waisbord, Sergio. *Watchdog Journalism in South America: News, Accountability, and Democracy.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

Weber, Max. *Economy and Society.* vol. 1 & 2. Berkley: University of California Press, 2013.

_____ *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York: Free Press, 1947.

Winn, Peter. "The Pinochet Era," in *Victims of the Chilean Economic Miracle: Workers and Neoliberalism in the Pinochet Era, 1973-2002*. Ed. Peter Winn, Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.

_____ *Weavers of Revolution: The Yarur Workers and Chile's Road to Socialism.*

New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Thesis and Dissertation Services