

THE SOUNDS OF SILENCE:
HOW CHILEANS SAID NO TO GENERAL AUGUSTO
PINOCHET

A thesis presented to the faculty of the Graduate School of Western
Carolina University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Arts in English.

By

Caitlin Ann Tierney

Director: Dr. Beth Huber
Assistant Professor of English

Committee Members: Dr. Marsha Lee Baker, English
Dr. Laura Wright, English

July 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables.....	3
Abstract	4
Introduction.....	5
Chapter One: Historical Background: Development and Purpose of the No campaign...	13
Chapter Two: Art as Metaphor and Reality.....	28
Chapter Three: Rhetorical Analysis of No campaign Commercial.....	44
The No campaign's Vision.....	45
Methodology: reaching the audience.....	47
The Yes campaign's Strategy and Vision.....	49
How the vision perpetuated the No campaign's commercials.....	54
Rejuvenation and reclaiming of voices.....	55
Freedom and democracy.....	56
Escape and overcoming obstacles.....	58
Religion.....	59
Chapter Four: The Impact of the No campaign	61
Conclusion.....	76
Works Cited.....	83

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Public Assessments of Television Campaigns in the 1988 Plebiscite.....	62
---	----

ABSTRACT

THE SOUNDS OF SILENCE:
HOW CHILEANS SAID NO TO GENERAL AUGUSTO PINOCHET

Caitlin Ann Tierney, M.A.

Western Carolina University (July 2009)

Director: Dr. Beth Huber

Art provides an image of reality from the creator's perspective which sparks interaction between the viewer and the piece. Throughout history, metaphor-infused art has inspired dialogue and social change as a means for oppressed people to speak out in a society where a violent, political oppressor has silenced their voices. Employing art, oppressed people can communicate safely with the outside world through individual cultural expression. Through creating and viewing political art viewers are invited into a national discourse which contributes to building cultural identity. This study examines how political movements, focusing on Chile's 1988 No campaign against their dictator, Pinochet, can be facilitated by nontraditional, traditional, and performance arts because they each contain similar political messages and discrete expressions of emotion, hopes, and desires. Therefore, political art embodies a form of rhetoric that can potentially provoke emotional responses in viewers through visual images and inspire people to join movements by promoting the recognition of violence and images of peace for the future.

INTRODUCTION

"We have art in order not to die from the truth." -Friedrich Nietzsche

This project began in 2005 as a result of my study abroad trip to study at the Universidad de Valparaíso (University of Valparaíso) in Chile. I began my summer immersion experience in Valparaíso by staying with a host family, who briefly discussed what the country had suffered during their past government. Although they seemed a little hesitant to speak about their situation, my host parents described a little bit about how their lives were when they were in school in Chile. The brief glimpse they provided me was horrifying, a life of repression and persecution. As a 19-year-old American teenager, I could not even begin to imagine what they had suffered only years before. For instance, my host father recounted a time the military took action in his school and shaved his head because his long hair was a sign of homosexuality. I also recall my host mother's fear at school, as the military was frequently nearby in uniform intimidating students. The presence of armed military officials seemed to be part of the Chilean life while Pinochet was in power, I realized. I tried to discuss this situation more thoroughly during my interaction with Chilean citizens who had lived during that time period; however, the people seemed resistant to speak about the situation. My host mother explained to me that the people do not like to relive their past in Chile by discussing it frequently; it is too painful for them to describe and relive over and over again. Interestingly, although the people did not openly discuss the past, I noticed several pieces of graffiti indicating frustration and anger towards Pinochet which piqued my curiosity, increasing my interest in the hush-hush past of Chile.

Still, I was ignorant on the details of Pinochet's leadership and the United States' covert actions and political interferences. During a History of Chile course, my instructor shed light on a political transformation that occurred in 1988, when the citizens were invited to participate in a plebiscite, an election where the entire public votes to either accept or refuse a proposal as a result of Pinochet's constitution, which he revised in 1980. This new constitution gave Chileans the option to participate in a plebiscite in 1988, in which they would have the option to vote "yes" or "no" to the continuation of his dictatorship. If the "no" vote won, a year later they would hold democratic elections for a new presidential candidate. If they voted "yes," Pinochet's dictatorship would continue. Pinochet most likely included this option because he arrogantly believed the people would vote him back into office, or that Chileans would be so afraid to vote that they would relinquish power and surrender to his so-called protection. The campaign for the "no" proposal elicited a dramatic response from the silent people of Chile, without an oppressive leader directing and commanding the people to act.

The pieces of art that survived this period of violence and censorship are available electronically through Chilean and international art museums, providing a highly visual glimpse of what the people had suffered. Organizations dedicated to preservation of these groundbreaking art creations, such as C.A.D.A. (Colectivo Acciones de Arte or the Collective Art Actions) compile the work of visual performance artists, poets, writers, theorists, sociologists, and professors, who "exhibit a wide range of aesthetic diversity and bring to bear on a situation a variety of generational differences, historical backgrounds, artistic and academic experiences, visual languages, and political agendas" (Respasos Chapter 2, par. 1). Similar to C.A.D.A., current scholarship examines art before, during, and

after Pinochet's regime came to power in Chile as "one block or whole . . . [an] interpretation of [artists] combined cultural and artistic production that [represents] solely the mere existence of the dictatorship" (Repasos Chapter 2, par. 1). This thesis provides an addition of rhetorical theory and analysis to current information about General Pinochet's dictatorship in Chile, which primarily focuses on the historical, political science, and governmental perspectives. Today, many Americans are unaware of the United States' involvement with the hundreds of thousands of human rights violations that occurred in Chile from 1973 through 1990.

Although some pieces of art have been preserved from this period, finding information about the No campaign and many details behind its formulation, including copies and titles of all the commercials and persons involved in their creation, has been virtually impossible. Therefore, I have had to turn to some nontraditional resources to obtain what information I have, such as You Tube, for example, contains video footage of some versions of the Yes and No campaign's commercials; however, the exact titles remain unknown to me. Additionally, people who have published information about this time period in Chile are Chilean citizens or their relatives or friends. This is a subject of study where a tremendous amount of information has yet to be uncovered.

The purpose of this thesis is to add to the conversation about the dictatorship by examining not merely the existence of the dictatorship, but the ability of the people to successfully employ visual art for a political purpose, as a means of communication in an oppressed society. Because the art produced during this period encompasses fifteen years of human emotions and responses and nearly all artistic contributions spoke to the public on a new level and changed the people and the country forever. This study will focus on one form

of nontraditional art, the Chilean arpillera quilt, one form of traditional art, poetry, and the imaginative No campaign's performance art, created by the people during that key plebiscite year, 1988. Although I will discuss three examples of art, the primary focus of this study is to analyze the commercial campaign designed and implemented by the No campaign team, as their commercials seemed to be single-handedly responsible for reframing the country's national identity.

Although the No campaign utilized many types of propaganda to reach its audience, the central focus and most successful strategy were political commercials, which captivated viewers through performance art. While examining the No campaign's commercials holistically or individually, the majority of theorists merely describe their significance in historical, social, cultural, and artistic contexts; they are not analyzed in-depth for rhetorical effect. During this time some of the most convincing, inspiring visual art was created by ordinary people under extraordinary circumstances. The campaign's colorful, positive message was so inspiring, it seemed to pull the people from the silence Pinochet had inflicted upon them for fifteen years. The campaign art transformed the people and the country forever.

In Chapter One, I will discuss the historical events leading up to Pinochet's dictatorship and illustrate how this man gained such power over the Chilean people in such little time, without even a democratic election. I also will discuss how Pinochet came to dominate and inflict the most severe fears in the Chilean people. The events leading up to the military coup will also be discussed in detail, so readers can gain understanding of the turmoil Chileans suffered before becoming submissive, obedient, and silenced under Pinochet. Chapter One will examine not merely the existence and need for art in Chile's

society during Pinochet's strict censorship over the media and artistic community, but the rhetorical scene that created the need to produce metaphors that described the emotions and concerns of the people during this time period.

The arts are expressions deeply intertwined in all cultures, especially those that have experienced severe repression. Chapter Two explores human interaction with art and how, by studying its various forms, we can see what a culture has suffered and overcome throughout history. Additionally, Chapter Two will demonstrate how art sprang from Chile's political oppression and successfully contributed to Pinochet's removal from office, while strengthening and empowering the culture and people of Chile by giving them an artistic outlet to express and overcome their pain. In The Art of Protest, T.V. Reed suggests that, "[social] movements—the unauthorized, unofficial, anti-institutional, collective action of ordinary citizens trying to change their world—have shaped our politics, culture, and . . . those movements have been connected to global change . . . [seeking] dramatic action" (xiv). The events that occurred in Chile during Pinochet's dictatorship represent a culture that has suffered extreme loss.

Through art, Chileans describe their emotions, creating images of pain and suffering to document and cope with violence, while showing outsiders Pinochet's oppression of the people. Through these painful, personal accounts transformed into art, viewers do more than comprehend pictures or words, they connect to the pain of all Chilean citizens. As scholar Thorpe Running suggests in his article, "Responses to the Politics of Oppression," artists depict "sufficiently specific [pain] universalizing [their] experience—[transcending] the suffering of one person and [representing] what all victims go through" (73). Artists facilitate emotion in viewers by "[inviting] people to express feelings (e.g. excitement and fear)

[which] can be more effective than speech. [Art removes] emotions such as fear and despair” (73). In any form, art allows people to make a personal connection to an image, creating a rhetorical situation. Artistic political movements contain expressions of emotion, therefore evoking this same sentiment in observers, promoting the recognition of violence, and even eliciting action towards a solution. Throughout Latin America in the 1970’s and 1990’s countries employed the power of the arts and used creativity to overcome violence; in Chile, artists spoke out silently against their dictator, Pinochet by tapping into their imaginations and taking up their pencils, brushes, paints, and cameras as their well-concealed weapons for liberation.

During Pinochet’s reign of power, people who had never created art before became artists and produced new innovations the world had never seen before: arpilleras, hand-sewn quilts made with various materials that tell a story with symbols or images. These quilts were carried by protestors, hung in homes, and displayed anywhere possible to send a message to the public. The creators of these quilts often used personal materials including clothing and human hair to tell their story and the story of others “who [suffered] from hunger, unemployment, human rights abuses, and shantytown raids . . . visions of ‘the way things were’” (Adams 34). Immersing their hearts, souls, and bodies into these telling quilts, arpillera artists created images that people could see and interpret on a personal level; they could observe the reality of their country through concrete images. Poetry represents another form of art employed in Chile to describe Pinochet’s violence and advocate for action. While both the arpilleras and poetry employed visual metaphors, the most compelling and popular advocacy message for change was the commercials broadcast by the No campaign, whose

visual commercials utilized metaphors for peace and fused both visual and performance art to reach Chilean voters.

As Chapter Three will discuss and analyze, the rhetorical situation created by the No campaign in 1988 universalized the frustrations of the Chilean people; however, it also created a common vision for a future Chile that was free and happy, something the people had not experienced for many years. This vision reached the people on a deeply personal level and moved them to take action against a leader they greatly feared for a greater purpose: freedom and democracy. The No campaign's vision was so powerful that it inspired people to risk their lives, suspending their fears and giving them the strength to stand up and vote "no" to future violence for Chile.

Using Burkean philosophy, Chapter Four ventures to explain how and why the No campaign met such success among the people in 1988. In a repressed, violent political atmosphere, the fact that art moved the people, who were submissive and fearful, to take action cannot be discounted as mere luck or even strategy. Something much more persuasive occurred in the visions and rhetoric of the No campaign, and Kenneth Burke's theories provide an opportunity to fully examine the amazing rhetorical feat of the No campaign. In A Grammar of Motives, Burke identifies a rhetorical situation, the Dramatistic Pentad. This pentad promotes understanding because it invites observers to see information, or art, from five perspectives: act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose. Burke suggests that the Pentad, like Chilean art, may be controversial because, "Men may violently disagree about the purposes behind a given act . . . But be that as it may, any complete statement about motives will offer *some kind* of answers to . . . [questions]: how he did it (agent) and why (purpose)" (1299). Therefore, when examining Chile's artistic revolution, analyzing art using the Dramatistic

Pentad will help identify the message and silent purpose of the artists' work and why these pieces not only liberated the Chilean people from silence, but inspired them to stand up and take action for their freedom and vote for the same positive vision the No campaign illustrated.

When examining the actions of Chilean citizens after fifteen years of silence under Pinochet, it is clear that the people never truly surrendered to his power. The people proved themselves to be strong and independent through their quest to recapture their country through artistic measures. For Chile, metaphor proved to be the key to recapturing freedom and democracy after years of repression. The No campaign successfully employed visual images illustrating human rights violations carried out by Pinochet to remind voters of the suffering that had occurred in their country and what Chile could look like in the future if they could be fearless enough to stand up and say "no" to Pinochet. The No campaign was created by ordinary citizens who sought to fearlessly advocate for change in the country of Chile. The people, inspired by their vision, stepped up to the plate to make this vision a reality during the 1988 plebiscite.

Pinochet and his military regime ruled Chile until its return to democracy in 1990. Now new historical information, art forms, and artists emerge as the nation heals and learns how to live and embrace freedom of expression again, as the conclusion will describe. To liberate themselves of the painful past, "younger artists reacted to their own feelings of disenchantment with a renewal of creative process, [creating] an entirely new body of work" (Reposos, Chapter 5, par. 5). The creation of new art after the dictatorship, demonstrates the resiliency of Chilean citizens and proves that even after violence and repression, creative art and descriptive metaphors can emerge

CHAPTER ONE: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:
DEVELOPMENT AND PURPOSE OF THE NO CAMPAIGN

“Sometimes democracy must be bathed in blood.” –Augusto Pinochet

Understanding the political turmoil Chilean people suffered during Pinochet’s reign of power is essential prior to analyzing the implications of art forms used in Chile’s artistic response to Pinochet’s violence. Additionally, learning and accepting the role the United States played in the politics of Chile leading up to Pinochet’s 15-year reign of terror cannot be discounted when looking at how the country’s history has unfolded. In *A Grammar of Motives*, Kenneth Burke’s Dramatistic Pentad provides a tool for understanding communication, examining the act, what took place, scene, the situation under which the event occurred, agent, who completed the action, agency, by what means the act occurred, and purpose, suggesting why the event happened. Therefore, new information can be learned about Chile’s situation through Burkean philosophy. While Chapter Four will provide an in-depth Burkean analysis of the No campaign’s implications in Chile, we must first fully delve into the scene of the political situation, the historical events leading up to the No campaign’s groundbreaking political movement. Burke defines scene as the “background or setting *in general*, a name for *any* situation in which acts or agents are placed . . . before we know what act is to be discussed, we can say with confidence that a rounded discussion of its motives must contain a reference to *some kind* of background” (1299). When focusing on the scene leading up to the No campaign in 1988, the scene or political environment, under which the people united together to say no to Pinochet’s leadership, the act, the event that took place, becomes much more powerful and significant.

John Muravchik, scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, a conservative think tank dedicated to strengthening and preserving freedom internationally, explores the foundations of struggling democracies in his book Exporting Democracy: Fulfilling America's Destiny. In his book, Muravchik discusses and analyzes the democratic situation in target countries from all corners of the world including Chile, which the National Endowment for Democracy identified as a “country in transition” in 1991. Perhaps the most useful information from Muravchik’s discussion is the information he provides on the covert action of the United States abroad. We, as American civilians, often do not hear what happens behind the scenes in the name of preserving democracy. Muravchik provides an unseen glimpse of the problem: “nurture[ing] democracy in countries that [have] had some democratic experience . . . but that also have an organized force working instead for dictatorship” (119). Additionally, Muravchik admits the successes and failures of the United States’ attempts to preserve freedom admitting that “[c]overt action has not always served to further democracy, and sometimes it may have had the opposite effect” (119). Covert actions in Chile began in 1969, when the CIA began meddling in Chilean politics and “began to devote a greater share of its energies to Latin America. Although the agency was probably active in several Latin countries, its activities in Chile have been documented most amply” (Muravchik 129). Preserving democracy, or preventing communism, in Chile seemed to be a priority for the United States government, especially after Cuba’s transition to communism.

Today, it is difficult to fully understand the motives behind the United States government’s desire to single-handedly monitor and regulate Chile’s politics; however, their interest in all of Latin America increased directly after Fidel Castro became the leader of Cuba in 1959. The United States was determined to stop the rise of another communist

country in the west. At this time, the United States was governed by President Dwight Eisenhower and Vice President Richard Nixon, an administration that detested the socialist and communist ideals Castro and Cuba came to represent. Consequently, one of the main goals of the Eisenhower/Nixon administration was containing the spread of communism worldwide. For Americans, the word “communism” represented a form of evil that threatened democracy and the free world. It is probable that America’s involvement in Chile’s politics was an attempt to prevent communism and socialism (communism’s close counterpart) gone terribly wrong. The result of the CIA’s interference may be one of the main reasons thousands of Chilean citizens later lost their lives.

Although there is some ambiguity about when the United States’ involvement began in Chilean politics, the CIA’s documented participation began in 1958 during the country’s elections. The United States seemed particularly nervous about presidential hopeful Salvador Allende, a favored socialist candidate who ran a successful campaign but “lost the election . . . to the Conservative party candidate Jorge Allesandre by a surprisingly narrow margin of 3 percent . . . [creating] alarm in some parts of Washington” (Muravchik 130). Allende and all he represented as the leader of the communist and socialist parties made the United States government uneasy and his political ideals posed an impending hazard to Washington’s preservation of democracy worldwide. Allende characterized himself as a socialist; the CIA, however, feared he was, “closer to the communists . . . [and] as vice president of the World Peace Council . . . ‘the major Soviet-dominated international front organization’” (Muravchik 130). Additionally, the United States government felt Allende’s amiable relations with Castro’s Cuba could be a threatening connection if he were elected as Chile’s president.

For the United States, Allende came frighteningly close to winning the election in 1958, demonstrating his favor with the Chilean people and foreshadowing a potential win in the future if he ran. The United States became determined to prevent that from happening when elections rolled around in 1964, when Salvador Allende ran for the presidency once more against Christian Democrat Eduardo Frei. Taking preventative measures against Allende's future presidential candidacy, "initially, the [CIA] decided to channel financial support to two other parties . . . when the election grew nearer, however, a decision was made that the strongest choice against Allende was the Christian Democrats, with their attractive candidate Eduardo Frei" (Muravchik 130). The financial support from the United States government comprised "more than half of Frei's campaign budget . . . although Frei was apparently unaware of the source" (Muravchik 130). The United States' financial contribution proved to make the difference as Frei won the election by "a decisive victory. [According to] the CIA's own analysis its efforts had made the difference between what would have been a mere plurality and the clear majority that he polled" (Muravchik 130). It seemed as though the United States had hand-picked Chile's new president; however, in the next election, their efforts would not be so successful.

The CIA conducted projects to elicit fear and distain for Communism and Socialist philosophies throughout Chile after the close calls with Allende in the 1958 and 1964 elections. Declassified CIA documents confirm the launch of "several strategies of 'drastic action' to 'shock' Chileans into blocking Allende" (Declassified Documents par. 6). Henry Kissinger, national security advisor, oversaw meetings planning and implementing these procedures in Chile. The Chilean people provided first-hand recollections of Kissinger's strategies as they were implemented in the country. According to Chile's Church committee

“as early as the 1950’s . . . the CIA had conducted projects in Chile, ‘among peasants, slum dwellers, organized labor, students, and the media’” (Muravchik 130). These projects were undoubtedly the direct result of Kissinger’s attempt to elicit distain and fear in the people for Allende, communism, and socialism, far before the next election. The Church committee also asserts that “the CIA worked secretly to divide the Socialist party and to prevent the Radical party from backing Allende by ‘[mounting] a massive anti-communist propaganda campaign” (Muravchik 13). The anti-Allende campaign used all forms of media to reach the people, including “extensive use of . . . the press, radio, films, pamphlets, posters, leaflets, direct mailings, paper streamers, and wall painting” (Muravchik 130). The campaign employed nearly every tool possible to get their message out to the people through an intimidating and violent “‘scare campaign,’ . . . [that] relied heavily on images of Soviet tanks and Cuban firing squads and was directed especially to women” (Muravchik 130). The violent, graphic, and fear inducing campaign tactics devised and executed during the 1964 campaign directly foreshadow the 1988 plebiscite propaganda of Pinochet’s Yes campaign, which will later be discussed in Chapter three.

In 1970, despite the United States’ launch of a campaign to turn voters against Allende and socialism, he was elected president of Chile. After Allende became the president, the United States did not accept the will of the people and let history run its course. Instead, the CIA did everything possible to interfere with Allende’s success, setting him up for failure from the very beginning. The United States actively opposed Allende’s presidency and limited funding to the country. Surprisingly, “the U.S. government tried desperately to sway the Congress against Allende, but it would not budge from the tradition of awarding the office to the leading vote getter” (Muravchik 131). It is interesting that the self-proclaimed

protector of democracy, the United States, actively attempted to fix elections in Chile in every possible way, and even wanted to take their sabotage of Allende a step further by overthrowing election results.

Declassified documents prove the CIA's failed attempt to organize a coup prior to Allende's inauguration. Even after Allende's successful appointment to office, the United States remained dedicated to Allende's demise as "files on national security council and cabinet meetings chaired by Richard Nixon [record] his administration's commitment to 'do everything we can to bring Allende down'" ("Declassified Documents" par. 5). Additionally, the United States funded terrorist groups against the government in Chile throughout Allende's presidency and "channel[ed] funds to various opposition groups, especially the leading newspaper, *El Mercurio*" (Muravchik 131). By backing these anarchist organizations, the United States was determined to solidify the demise of the Allende government, an administration that the people of Chile knowingly and enthusiastically voted into power.

Steve Stern, scholar and Professor of History at the University of Wisconsin, has dedicated his work to describing, documenting, and analyzing the Chilean struggle before, during, and after Pinochet's repression. In book two of his trilogy, Battling for Hearts and Minds, Stern confirm and discuss additional United States covert actions in Chile:

The U.S. foreign policy apparatus, led by President Richard Nixon and advisor Henry Kissinger, aimed to render the Allende government unworkable, Chilean society ungovernable. The key tools: drastic reductions of economic aid; trade obstacles that impeded acquisition of machinery, parts, and credits or made them more expensive; covert funding of opposition media

and strike actions . . . and sympathetic political conversation with Allende's opponents including coup-oriented actors. (Stern 22)

Again in 1970, declassified documents prove the CIA had attempted to organize yet another coup. As Henry Kissinger has mentioned in his books, Nixon ordered him to organize a coup in September 1970; however, Kissinger maintains that he shut this operation down a mere month later. However, plans for a future coup were still in the works in Chile.

The question still remains, however. Why did the United States and officials involved in the coup feel Allende posed such a danger to the country of Chile? Beyond Allende's ties to socialism and communism, he had a plan for restructuring Chile he called "The Chilean Way to Socialism," which, over a period of time, would nationalize major industries including copper and health care and redistribute land ownership. Many Chileans did not support Allende's vision for Chile's future of a "democratic revolution" through the constitution (Stern 23). Disdain for Allende's vision for "radical change" led to civil disturbances and many feared Chile would break out in civil war if action was not taken; Allende, however, was opposed to using repressive forces against his opposition, which many saw as a weakness of his leadership (Stern 26).

Allende continued to meet difficulties with Chile's economy including, "scarcities, inflation, rationing, and black markets. By 1973, the scarcities led to long lines for rationed goods, the inflation rate soared into a triple-digit spiral, and real gross domestic product had begun to fall" (Stern 23). President Nixon pumped \$10 million to be used for covert action in Chile to "use the 'best men we have,' . . . to 'make [Chile's] economy scream'" (qtd. in Stern 22). As the economic situation deteriorated in Chile, it became clear that Nixon had achieved his goal. Allende continued to struggle with economic issues and opposition among the

people who, by 1973, had broken out in “heated street confrontations, political speeches, and media reports. Eventually Allende lost control, and the country seemed on the brink of catastrophe” (Stern 27). The political unrest in the country set the perfect scene for a coup that would be successful this time.

Declassified CIA documents confirm another United States supported coup for 1972. In fact, one report “dated September 1972, [discussed] Augusto Pinochet’s belief that Allende should be forced from office” (“Declassified Documents” par. 5). Unknowing of the future coup, President Allende had appointed Augusto Pinochet, future violent dictator of Chile, head of the army, a fatal move. On September 11, 1973, a military coup overturned Chile’s government and put Pinochet into power. The United States cannot deny its role in this coup as documents released in 2000 confirm conversations and exchanges of information throughout the coup; the United States, however, claims it did not organize the coup, but instead set the scene, creating the conditions to make Allende’s downfall a possibility.

When it came down to the last moments before the coup officially began, General Arellano suggested that “after he arrived at Pinochet’s house around 8:30 p.m. ‘His [Pinochet’s] reaction was a mixture of surprise and annoyance. When he became aware that the only thing required of him was his support of a decision that had already been made, he seemed overwhelmed” (Verdugo 5). Arellano offered Pinochet leadership only during the final phase before the coup. Pinochet accepted Arellano’s offer for leadership; however, before signing off on the coup, Pinochet’s documented words seem to show his hesitation to undertake such a task. In Pinochet and the Caravan of Death, Patricia Verdugo, Chilean Citizen and journalist recounts a conversation between General Leigh and Pinochet during

the last hours before the coup. According to General Leigh, who had interrupted Pinochet's daughter's birthday party to discuss the impending coup, recalls Pinochet's demeanor:

[He was] very relaxed. He listened to the proposal as if he saw no other solution. Leigh remembered pressing Pinochet, saying, "What are *you* going to do? As for us, *we* can't take it anymore. If we don't act, the whole country will sink into chaos." Pinochet told [General Leigh], "Have you thought about the fact that this can cost us our lives and the lives of many others?" "I've thought about it," [General Leigh] answered. The meeting between Leigh and Pinochet was interrupted by [several] admirals . . . [who] brought a brief handwritten text that sealed the coup. Leigh signed immediately. Pinochet hesitated. "If this leaks, it could have serious consequences for us," . . . "And he finally signed." (5)

General Leigh nudged Pinochet into signing for the coup. Clearly, Pinochet was apprehensive about and concerned about its outcome, but it seems he felt or was instructed to believe that there was no alternative and he had to act. If it were not for General Leigh's pressure upon Pinochet, perhaps Chile's history would have unfolded much differently.

Soon after the coup began, Allende was found dead; he was said to have fought in the palace and allegedly took his own life with a gun given to him by friend Fidel Castro. Pinochet became the new leader of Chile and, coincidentally, the United States restored foreign aid to the country. Clearly, it had finally accomplished its goal after the previously failed attempts: Allende was dead. Pinochet was appointed the new leader of Chile. At the beginning of the military coup, the people of Chile trusted their government was acting in their best interest and supported Pinochet; however, the violent acts against human rights that

occurred after Pinochet's regime took power are unforgettable and unforgivable in Chile and worldwide. Immediately, Pinochet eliminated congress and suspended the constitution, banned political parties, and imposed strict censorship laws. Any opposition to his regime was identified as terrorism. Pinochet's regime targeted over 27,000 people as "terrorists" who were imprisoned, tortured, or murdered. Chileans call these people "los desapareados" or "the disappeared." Niece of Salvador Allende, Isabel Allende, Chilean-American writer and a Chilean citizen at the time, provides a first-hand description of Pinochet's government as "a slaughter . . . [where] many people were murdered, in cold blood, their throats slit, [and] burned to death . . . these were murders that were planned, premeditated, [and] coordinated by the state" (Anderson 1). Muravchik suggests that, "it was entirely proper for the CIA to support the opposition forces during Allende's reign, but if the agency did contribute to the 1973 coup, it contributed to the destruction of democracy in Chile, even though Allende himself might have endangered it" (131). Many would disagree and feel that the United States' actions were anything but "proper." When looking at the devastation that came upon Chile after the 1973 coup, it is difficult to say that the United States' actions were in the best interest of Chile or democracy as a whole.

The majority of Chilean citizens willingly surrendered to the military and trusted their government to make the right choices for their families and country. This initial confidence may have been due to the "Chilean culture's strong legal tradition" (Verdugo 1). However, in a move that shocked the unquestioning Chilean people, before and after the military coup, at least 75 political prisoners were taken from at least five Chilean cities including Cauquenes, La Serena, Copiapó, Antofagasta, and Calama in Pinochet's "Caravan of Death," a term coined by the people of Chile and Pinochet's victims that was said to have been whispered

“from mouth to mouth for the 12 years that the truth lay hidden [and] silenced by the military regime’s mandated censorship” (Verdugo 1). The capture and treatment of these political prisoners was allegedly the result of “holding political views and participating in political organizations that could be characterized as liberal, leftist, socialist, or, in a few cases, communist” (Verdugo 1). Pinochet, the new protector of the people, had been imprisoning people for their political views even before the coup occurred, when several political powers plotted against Allende in early 1973.

At the time of the coup through Pinochet’s reign of power and for some time after, the details of political prisoners and executions were a well-kept secret; therefore, the Chilean people did not have a realistic understanding of the political environment or scene of the country under Pinochet. We may never fully understand the secret details of what happened in Chile before, during, and after the coup in 1973. How the many Chilean citizens and government officials who died for their political opinions during and after the military coup still remains undocumented many vanished in the night never to be heard from again. To this day Chileans remain unsure of how and why their loved ones disappeared during Pinochet’s time in office. Many secrets of United States involvement were released in 2000, when President Clinton declassified over 50,000 pages of “secret U.S. records on the Pinochet dictatorship in Chile, and the violent overthrow of the Allende government and the advent of the military regime to power” (“Documents Declassified” par. 1). Peter Kornbluh, director of the Archive’s Chile Documentation mentions that even with these documents declassified, ““many CIA records [remain] heavily blacked out.’ CIA censors continue to dictate what Chileans and Americans alike know about this shameful history” (“Documents Declassified” par. 7). These documents suggest that the United States essentially looked the

other way to avoid “pressuring the Pinochet regime on human rights atrocities” (“Documents Declassified” par. 5). The people long for answers necessary for healing and moving forward, but their questions will most likely never be answered by the United States or Chilean governments. Books such as Verdugo’s Pinochet and the Caravan of Death, published just after Pinochet’s defeat in the 1988 plebiscite, shed light upon the “enormous crime[s], completely without legal justification, which also violated the faith placed in the military by Chilean ‘citizens who entrust[ed] [them] with weapons, so that [they] could defend and not kill them’” (Verdugo i). Verdugo, along with other journalists sought to uncover the shocking details and truths behind what really happened after the coup. Because of their brave efforts, we can now learn and understand the horrible results of the coup.

Under Pinochet’s administration, Chile changed drastically. The country was in worse shape than under Allende, and the people lived in fear of the military regime. The human rights violations and unwarranted murders that occurred under Pinochet are shocking:

In a country of only 10 million people in 1973, individually proved cases of death or disappearance by state agents (or persons in hire) amount to about 3,000; torture victims run in the dozens of thousands; documented political arrests exceed 82,000; the exile flow amounts to about 200,000. These are lower-end figures, suitable for a rock-bottom baseline. Even using a conservative methodology, a reasonable estimated toll for deaths and disappearances by state agents is 3,500-4,500, for political detentions 150,000-200,000. Some credible torture estimates surpass the 100,000 threshold, some credible exile estimates reach 400,000. (Stern xxi)

The violence of Pinochet's regime touched every Chilean citizen in some way. Nearly all citizens, "including supporters and sympathizers of the military regime, had a relative, friend, or an acquaintance touched by one or another form of repression" (Stern xxi). Many Chilean citizens simply could not believe their eyes and "believed such violence by the state—beyond margins set by legal procedure and human decency—to be an impossibility" (Stern xxii). The disappearances of people without explanation also shook the Chilean people to their core and acted as "a new technique of repression . . . people vanished in a cloud of secrecy, denial, and misinformation by the state" (Stern xxii). The law abiding society of Chile was shocked in the aftermath of the coup much as any law abiding, democratic culture would be at such violence without proper recourse.

We now know for a fact that, after the coup, many officials under Allende's administration were imprisoned or murdered, along with his supporters, members of his political party, and many people who were against the coup from the beginning. Colonel Jana Girón, part of the Allende administration, remembers the time he spent imprisoned for treason. Lead to prison by former military friends and acquaintances, he recalls many guards' reactions to the new leadership in Chile. The reactions of people were quite similar:

They knew if they did not follow orders blindly, they could be shot in the back . . . [Girón] always told them that the army was debasing its role, that [they] were being used as instruments . . . "Officers, noncommissioned officers, and recruits talked about the atrocities that were being done in other places . . . they spoke about the ill treatment of prisoners and that people had been thrown out of helicopters into the sea or in the mountains. (Verdugo 26)

Aside from small “guerilla groups,” the majority of people were far too afraid to speak out against the Pinochet regime (Stern xxii). Any individual who expressed distain for the government or adversary political opinion endangered their lives. Therefore, “proponents of deep change—whether they considered themselves ‘reformers’ or ‘revolutionaries’ –ran up against entrenched opposition, fear, and polarization” (Stern xxii). Understandably, the people were afraid to unite against Pinochet. The people who did speak out against him became a statistic of those who disappeared during his time in office.

Pinochet took legal action to protect his and his administration’s actions after the coup by passing the amnesty law on April 19, 1978. This law “pardoned all individuals who committed crimes between September 11, 1973, and March 10, 1978, also known as the ‘state of siege period.’ This law included authors of crimes, their accomplices, and those who covered up crimes” (Verdugo i). This new legislation rewarded the unlawful murders and torture of thousands of law abiding citizens who had supported Allende, and more than likely, the murder of Allende himself, although officials claimed he committed suicide, many who were close to him believe that to be out of character and highly unlikely. Pinochet’s new constitution allowed him to legally imprison or exile any citizen without probable cause or recourse, along with many other measures to protect his inhuman actions against the people.

In the months before the plebiscite, the scene was set for the Chilean people to take action and finally vocalize their distain for Pinochet’s leadership. In this new scene, Chileans could step up as actors and facilitate change in their country by developing discrete metaphors to propel their message; they had taken enough of the violence from Pinochet’s regime and could now band together against the dictator. Many political parties and Chilean citizens unified to form a grassroots political campaign, known as the No campaign. This

campaign developed a positive, nonviolent vision for a reunited, prosperous, democratic Chile. Leaders of the No campaign risked their lives, to form a creative, nonviolent campaign against the dictator, rooted mainly in television broadcasts. Despite the government's efforts, Chilean citizens found a way to reach out to each other employing artistic metaphors to communicate about the violent reality surrounding their country in an attempt to reunite and move forward towards the No campaign's vision of peace and democracy.

CHAPTER TWO: ART AS METAPHOR AND REALITY

“Art is our constant effort to create for ourselves a different order of reality from that which is given to us.” –Chinua Achebe

Metaphor defines our world. Throughout history, metaphor-infused art has inspired dialogue and social change as a means for oppressed people to speak out in a society where a violent, political oppressor has silenced their voices. In her article “Art in Social Movements,” Jacqueline Adams defines artistic action as a “political power that . . . [acts] as a safety valve for discontent, [that serves] as an emancipatory force, [challenges] dominant institutions . . . [and works] at an even deeper level, [to shape] our ideas and political behavior” (27). Employing art, people can communicate safely with the outside world through individual cultural expression. Cultural expression becomes particularly important when utilized for political purposes. Metaphors contained in political art convey a specific message and seek to obtain a certain response in viewers and outcome. Similar to marketing a product, political art endeavors to market a vision. Typically, there is a target audience and discrete agenda behind any political action that may not be clear to the observer. This chapter discusses how political movements, focusing on Chile’s 1988 campaign against their dictator, Pinochet, can be facilitated by the arts because they contain expressions of emotion and truth. Therefore, visual art containing both cultural expression and/or a political message embodies a form of rhetoric that can potentially provoke emotional responses in viewers through visual images and shape reality by promoting societal and political change.

Art is the facilitator of cultural expression and understanding. As images are deeply engrained in the human psyche, what people see and experience on a daily basis shapes the pieces created and the way in which viewers receive and perceive the art itself. In Art and

Answerability, Mikhail Bakhtin, Russian philosopher, literary scholar, and rhetorical theorist, explores how art interacts in social and cultural situations. In “Bakhtin and the Visual Arts,” Deborah J. Haynes, practicing artist and theorist, suggests that Bakhtin sought to define an approach focusing on a new aesthetic dimension that unifies “nature and humanity (and cognition and action)” (294). Exploring the relationship between reality and art in the aesthetic sphere, Bakhtin suggests that “reality and life intertwine with art: Aesthetic activity does not create a reality that is wholly new . . . art celebrates, adorns, and recollects . . . [it] creates the concrete intuitive unity of these two worlds. [By placing] man in nature . . . it humanizes nature and naturalizes man” (Bakhtin 278-9). According to Bakhtin, art is a way to complete the reality of a situation. In other words, it is the concrete representation of the cultural reality. In viewing the artists’ creation, those living in the reality can gain a sense of “completeness” by seeing the artist’s perspective and a concrete representation. If people employ metaphor as a way to sort out confusing thoughts, images, and emotions artists sort out these abstract images, symbols, and metaphors from reality and create a concrete depiction of abstract confusion for people to view and interpret on a more accessible level.

If art represents the artist’s interpretation of society, it would make sense that frequently works of art portray the history of a culture as “reality and life interpenetrate with art . . . nearly all art . . . evolves in relation to history and historical artifacts, to personal experience and reflection, and to identifiable formal issues” (Haynes 293-297). Traditionally, we think of history as words that are written in books; however, it can also be and has been created through brushes, paints, chisels, etc. In fact, art may even provide a more accurate illustration of history because it can transcend traditional words, sentences, and paragraphs and go far beyond language, creating colorful and/or intricate illustrations of historical

events. Languages change and evolve over time; images, however, stay consistent and viewers speaking different languages and coming from all different cultures view images similarly. At some point, words can only take us so far, and that is where visual art comes in, describing events that words could never fully explain.

Art shapes reality through individual vision and creation and then absorption of the audience or viewer. Without viewers, art could not serve its most important purpose: spreading and documenting reality. Current American artist Marcel Duchamp suggests that art is a “creative act [that] is not performed by the artist alone; the spectator brings the work in contact with the external world by deciphering and interpreting its inner qualities and thus adds to the creative act” (3). Duchamp establishes the fact that a piece of art stands alone until a viewer can see the work and bring his or her unique experience and interpretation to the piece. Therefore, neither the creation of art nor the viewing of art occurs in an isolated situation; both are intensely social activities significantly influenced by cultural surroundings.

As Mikhail Bakhtin suggests in “From Marxism and the Philosophy of Language,” “A sign does not simply exist as a part of reality—it reflects and refracts another reality. Therefore, it may distort that reality or be true to it . . . Every sign is subject to the criteria of ideological evaluation” (1211). Our interactions with signs in the form of art are not merely contained by a formal exhibition or the stifled atmosphere of an art gallery. Art and signs can affect us most personally when we are not expecting it, in our daily lives. People constantly interact with art without realizing, and that is what makes the contact so powerful; it is subconscious. We bring our experiences, perceptions, and emotions to the art and interpret it individually. As Bakhtin suggests, “Within the domain of signs—i.e., within the ideological

sphere—profound differences exist: it is, after all, the domain of the artistic image . . . Every ideological sign is not only a reflection, a shadow, of reality, but it also itself a material segment of that very reality” (1211). This interaction brings art to life. In her discussion of Bakhtin’s early essay, Haynes asserts that “art and life answer to each other . . . an artist enters into dialogue (in actual, historical, or mythological time) and expresses something about a place, person, or event” (295-296). The artist begins the dialogue by creating the work; however, the observer brings his or her views and experiences to the piece, interpreting and participating in dialogue. Through arts, the artist communicates large societal and/or personal concepts and leaves them open for understanding by viewers.

Bakhtin’s dialogic method provides a way to deconstruct verbal and nonverbal communication as an evolving conversation. This discussion extends beyond human interaction and encompasses interaction with anything “discussable in actual, real-life dialogue” (1221). As Bakhtin suggests,

[V]erbal interaction is the basic reality of language. Dialogue, in the narrow sense of the word, is, of course, only one of the forms . . . But dialogue can also be understood in a broader sense, meaning not only direct, face-to-face, vocalized verbal communication between persons, but also verbal communication between persons, but also verbal communication of any type whatsoever. (1221)

Bakhtin continues to suggest that “A book, i.e., a *verbal performance in print*, is also an element of verbal communication . . . it is calculated for active perception, involving attentive reading and inner responsiveness, and for organized, *printed* reaction in the various

forms devised” (1221). Visual art created to relay a political message and elicit a response, therefore, begins a political dialogue by moving Chileans to react.

True to Chile’s history, visual art created during the time period of Pinochet’s dictatorship illustrates feelings of frustration and loss of identity. Something in the people changed forever; it seemed as though they lost all trust in their leadership, government, each other, and themselves. Bakhtin suggests art created during any time period is representative of some version of the reality; therefore, Chilean art symbolizes one perspective, from the eyes and interpretation of an average citizen, of what Chilean people suffered. The words of their writing and artistic illustrations signified a collective pain of repression. As a whole, their art demonstrates a process of grieving and mourning for the Chile that was lost.

Chileans used the arts to cope with these painful experiences and to release repressed anger, frustration, and helplessness, demonstrating “a definite and pervasive sense of nationality and communal concern . . . the repressive political atmosphere of the last thirteen years is reflected in the work. . . This national consciousness, to be sure, is the result of shared experiences” (Running 43). Further, Luis Bocas asserts that Chileans tapped into their emotions and experiences, overcoming the repressive government, creating a “national art [form]” (43). Because artists suffered the same persecution as others, they reflect similar emotions, themes, and frustrations throughout their art.

The artists’ works transformed Chilean art into a confession of reality disguised behind elaborate metaphors. Artists translated abstract concepts such as violence, murder, and torture into concrete images using metaphor and helped Chileans understand what was happening around them. The artists’ depictions are “sufficiently specific [to Chile’s history] while still universalizing the experience—it transcends the suffering of one person and stands

for what all victims are going through” (Running 73). All people living in Chile during this time period could connect to the messages of political art on a personal level because of their common shared experience with political violence and repression. Through interpretation of this informative art, Chileans could articulate their thoughts because the artists’ descriptive images showed them another perspective of reality. They could not turn a blind eye to their government when looking at the issue directly in a piece of art. Some bold art works begged for both recognition and action against the political crimes in Chile, while others took a safer, more subtle approach. No matter what artistic approach was taken, each piece had a widespread message: recognize Pinochet’s violence and take action. These artists did more than merely create innovative art; they used metaphor to invite viewers to really see and visualize the reality around them. The metaphors revealed themselves in several forms reaching out on national and international levels to silently tell the story of Chile’s repression, paving the way for freedom and real democracy for Chileans by beginning conversations about Pinochet’s oppression and helping the people to find common ground with one another. As Chilean art forms circulated beyond the borders of Chile, they created dialogue and initiated worldwide acknowledgement and concern for Pinochet’s oppressive laws and punishments to many people and governments who had before turned a blind eye to the actions of his brutal regime.

Examining one limited example of nontraditional Chilean art, the arpillera quilt, provides an example of the role metaphor plays in political communication. This piece was not only an art form, but as Adams suggests, also “served to mark membership in a movement . . . [enabling] people to understand, when they met a stranger, that the stranger ‘was on their side,’ a member of the movement in some way” (42). In Pinochet’s Chile, the

people could not differentiate their friends from their enemies and no longer knew who to trust. Trusting the wrong person with information opposing the government, even a family member, could mean death. The arpillera quilt indicated that they stood united for the same rights, and it allowed oppressed people to “speak more freely” among allies (42).

At the front line of protests, the arpillera was visible at the forefront of many political events. These quilts contained images such as a white dove, representing peace as citizens marched silently up the streets of Chile in protest. The symbol, the art of the people, illustrated the pleas of Chilean citizens as they fought to walk safely through the streets at night like they had before Pinochet. The discrete use of metaphor describing these scenes of death allowed their suffering to be seen and interpreted by others. The stories of Pinochet’s violence against his people were told, stirring emotion in viewers and spreading the truth of their government’s actions.

The art of the arpillera undoubtedly began conversation in Chile and throughout the world and provided an outlet to alert the world of the violence they were suffering many miles away. The arpillera began a conversation and created an ongoing dialogue about Chile’s situation:

[T]he person selling [the arpillera] often used it as a starting point for conversation about problems in Chile. As Brigta, the daughter of a Chilean exile, selling arpilleras in Holland explained: ‘There were also several [church] masses to help Chile, things like that, and on one side of the church they put tables and you would sell arpilleras there. Lots of people went, and they would notice the little dolls [figures on the arpilleras] and would say

‘how nice, but what is it really about?’ but we would explain all that was happening at that time in Chile. Each arpillera told a tale, a story. (Adams 36).

The dialogue begun by these arpilleras initiated international acknowledgement of Pinochet’s oppression and violence, and perhaps led to a feeling of strength when the time came to openly campaign against Pinochet as the plebiscite year drew near. The arpilleras sparked discussions and led to action and resolution for Chile, all by initiating conversation. In the introduction to the book, The World Café, published in 2005, Juanita Brown, David Isaacs, and the World Café Community illustrate the importance of dialogue to achieve peace. They emphasize its importance in resolving violent situations because “if we could converse and talk things out, we would find new ways of being together in the world . . . conversation is a profound action that helps us expand our consciousness and connect together parts and people that are separated” (EPI). According to Brown and Isaacs, without dialogue, communication, and understanding, peace cannot occur. The most difficult part of the conversation is its beginning, and the arpilleras began the important international and local conversation about Pinochet’s violence. For Chile, art proved to be one of many unspoken facilitators of peace.

As political dialogue continued to evolve silently, internationally famous poetry describing the brutal dictatorship surfaced, eliciting recognition through illustrative metaphors. Using few words, poets burned images of Chile’s pain and suffering into the minds of readers. This poetry is significant because it demonstrates how carefully constructed descriptions could bring similar images and reactions to the minds of the Chilean people who had experienced similar trauma and fear under Pinochet. As Bakhtin suggests,

Utterance, as we know, is constructed between two socially organized persons, and in the absence of a real addressee, an addressee is presupposed in the person, so to speak, of a normal representative of the social group . . . Each person's inner world and thought has its stabilized *social audience* that comprises the environment in which reasons, motives, values, and so on are fashioned. (1215)

The “utterances” in poetry targeted Chilean citizens, the presupposed “addressee” and concerned parties of the world, advocating for social change and contributing to international dialogue about Pinochet’s oppression of Chile’s people. Due to strict censorship laws, many of these poems do not contain direct political references, as doing so would most certainly put the author’s life in danger. As a result of this risk, the rhetoric of poetry demonstrated “distrust of the communicative power of language . . . [poets incorporated] phrenological questioning of language into their work” (Running 40). At a time when citizens questioned every aspect of their lives, it is not surprising that they began to question and transform their use of language as well. The strict censorship of Chilean poets brought on the creation of a poetic form that contained deeply symbolic, secretive images of death, anger, and frustration, further eliciting pathos in readers on national and international levels.

In The Philosophy of Rhetoric, I.A. Richards suggests a distinct connection between language and metaphor; people often speak in metaphors without realizing because they are deeply engrained in verbal communication. Richards asserts that we speak, write, and think in images, which can be a way to sort out confusing thoughts, situations, and emotions. Richards cites The Poetics, where he says, “The greatest thing by far is to have a command of metaphor” (89). Metaphor is fundamentally [the process of] borrowing between

intercourse of *thoughts*, a transaction between contexts. Thoughts are metaphoric . . . and [from these thoughts] metaphors of language derive” (25). Metaphors, in relation to art, are a powerful way to evoke emotional reactions in readers and observers. A person can read a descriptive metaphor in the stanzas of a poem or see a beautiful picture that represents the artist’s emotion and connect with that same sentiment, making a meaningful relationship with the symbol, what it represents, and the creator. Therefore, metaphor is deeply rooted not only in the arts, but cultures, spirits, and emotions.

Pablo Neruda, a famous Chilean poet, member of the Communist Party of Chile, and most popular left-wing literary figure, is notorious for defying government censorship through his poetry. He was even exiled from Chile from 1947-52 for his writings exposing the violence and concentration camps of President Gabriel González Videla in 1947 during a speech entitled “I Accuse,” which provided names of Chilean citizens unlawfully imprisoned. As a political supporter and friend of Allende, was certainly devastated by his death and the coup and died only months later in September 1973. When Pinochet’s troops invaded his home in Isla Negra, which I visited during my stay Chile, legend has it that Neruda condescendingly warned military officials, “Look around—there’s only one thing of danger for you here—poetry.” Neruda’s reputation for defying government censorship and exposing human rights violations did not end with his death, as he continued writing until his last day, which were later published posthumously. Although Pinochet prevented Neruda’s funeral from being a public ceremony, the people disobeyed him and his curfews for the first time by taking to the streets to protest and mourn the beloved poet.

Although he died in 1973 during the aftermath of the military coup, publication of his stirring descriptions of the violence, death, and repression resonated with the people on a

personal level and reached international recognition. Neruda's powerful use of metaphor and the bitter emotion that seeps into the stanzas of his poetry, serves as timeless representation of secret, violent acts which struck Chileans who suffered the same experience after his death. His vivid poetry still speaks to people today for both their cultural relevance and emotional metaphors that were so descriptive they allowed readers to come face-to-face with the pain. For example, in his poem "The Dictators," Neruda describes a scene of death, using the metaphor of a flower to represent the innocent people. Throughout the poem readers see the beautiful bloom crushed and killed under the violence of a dictator. Even in the introductory stanzas, Neruda forces the stench of rotting corpses into the reader's nostrils as they read the lines: "An odor has remained among the sugarcane: / A mixture of blood and body, a penetrating / a petal that brings nausea . . . / blow on blow, in the ghastly water on the swamp, / with a snout full of ooze and silence" (574). Refusing to distinguish between poetry and politics or the personal and political realms, Neruda informs the world of Chile's pain. Through his vivid descriptions, the Chileans could connect with the poem on an even deeper level to gain individual understanding of their environment.

During Pinochet's reign, the people stayed in their homes out of fear; therefore, their interaction was limited to these pieces of art and isolated activities. If people were found on the streets at night, they were imprisoned or murdered. Therefore, the people spent the majority of their time in the shelter of their homes, interacting with the outside world predominantly through television and radio. Understandably, this affected communication and inhibited dialogue. Considering this fact, television became essential to Chilean communication and understanding.

In “The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility,” Walter Benjamin, art theorist and scholar, analyzed the effect of media on the arts during the mid 1900’s, during a time when radio, film, photography, and television were still in rudimentary form, allowing him to provide a perspective of this new technology as someone who had lived long before it became engrained in culture. Benjamin sheds light on the influence of television and other forms of technology on viewers, offering some answer to how this period of social isolation affected Chileans. Benjamin suggests that television represents a form of mass produced “art [which] can . . . contribute to the political struggle in ways that would be a mistake to underestimate” (20). Through technology, art can reach a broader audience and therefore, persuade the masses through this vehicle. This opens up new political and cultural possibilities because nearly all people could access the information. Technology and mass production opened the elite “art world” up to all classes and age groups allowing for democracy. Providing access to art through this new, interactive world, and playing a significant role in historical and political situations because all people are now able to view and interpret information and images. As cliché as it sounds, knowledge is power and mass production opened up a wealth of information to people of all classes and finally allowed them to view the breadth of information available—a culmination of national and international art and representations of many perspectives. Although the arpillera quilts and poetry spread the message to Chilean people, the commercials reached the masses, continuing to aid the evolution of dialogue on a much broader scale.

Interestingly, Benjamin seemed perplexed and frustrated by the fact that through technology, authentic images and messages could be distorted and falsified to convince viewers of inaccurate information as a political strategy, but recognized the possibility that

authentic technical reproductions could as a positive addition to culture. Benjamin asserts that in

[E]ven the most perfect [art] reproduction, *one* thing is lacking: the here and now of the work of art—its unique existence in a particular place. It is this unique existence—and nothing else—that bears the mark of history to which the work has been subject . . . But whereas the authentic work retains its full authority in the face of reproduction made by hand, which it generally brands forgery, this is not the case with technological reproduction [because] technological reproduction is more independent of the original than is manual reproduction . . . [and] technological reproduction can place a copy of the original in situations in which the original cannot attain. (21)

As Benjamin warns, we cannot underestimate the impact of the arts in political movements. Speeches, commercials, T-shirts, bumper stickers, slogans, and songs all represent persuasive pieces of art that single-handedly impact candidates' elections. Each piece employs metaphor to imply a subtle message, a discrete vision to viewers. One of the most effective strategies used in political art forms is pathos. In The Poetics, Aristotle suggests the importance of persuading audiences using this appeal. He defines pathos as a form of persuasion that occurs when “speech stirs emotions . . . [leading viewers] to understand the emotions—that is, to name and describe them, to know their causes and the way in which they are excited” (25). Through art, viewers “name and describe” their emotions, bringing forth related images. This sentiment relies heavily on metaphors and vivid descriptions to grab the viewer’s attention, pulling on their heartstrings and advocating for political action. When used in politics, art taps into deeply, personal emotions, hopes, and dreams for the viewer facilitating strong

reactions: “[allowing] people to express feelings (e.g. excitement and fear) can be more effective than [mere] speech. [Art] can help people remove emotions such as fear or despair” (28). In any form, political art allows people to see an emotional image, connect with it, formulate opinions, and typically be moved to take action.

In The Insubordination of Signs, Nelly Richards mentions Benjamin’s suggestion that artists designed and employed “Refractory art (an art of negation and deviation) to escape military authoritarianism and the censorship administered by the official culture” (4). The social problems the art addressed would have been useless without a clear, universal experience of suffering and frustration, which each Chilean citizen met under Pinochet; however, artists could not spell out what each sign meant, and they put their trust in readers and viewers to interpret the message: get Pinochet out of office. Artists needed to trust that viewers would be affected by their work and the issues addressed because of their similar personal experiences.

The most profound artistic step that Chileans took towards peace was a grassroots political campaign the No campaign, Chileans used their right to vote “no” to Pinochet and violence by launching a widespread ad campaign. This campaign reached Chilean homes predominantly through television propaganda. This message came into the isolated homes of afraid and downtrodden Chilean citizens, encouraging them to take a stand and say no to Pinochet’s government. Although Pinochet controlled the media, artists maneuvered the situation by crafting commercials that adopted an ultra-subtle message to send to the scared Chilean people, calling upon their shared experiences of suffering as a nation. Similar in purpose, visual representation, message of the arpilleras and poetry by illustrating violence and advocating for change in Chile, these commercials represented the most widely a

circulated art form in Chile. The commercials broadcast throughout the country on public television included beautiful colors, a rainbow as an inspiring metaphor for peace, and a theme song repeating “happiness is on the way.” The commercials showed a future Chile with happy people free in the streets, something that they had not seen since the 1973 coup. The No campaign illustrated Chilean citizens walking safely through the streets, waving their nation’s flag freely. It was more than a metaphor for peace; it was a metaphor for citizens’ hopes and dreams for the country, hopes that had been torn away from them from their leader. These visually charged peace metaphors brought out emotion, inspiring suppressed Chileans to stand up and fight for their freedom, to break the silence.

The No campaign’s propaganda, playing upon the hopes and dreams of voters, was a direct response to Pinochet’s Yes campaign, which tried to reformulate the people into submissive, afraid beings looking for guidance through scare tactics, including threats of communism and escalated violence. As a complete counterpoint to Pinochet’s commercials, the No campaign’s message went against every scare tactic of the Pinochet regime—embracing hope, happiness, resiliency, and prosperity for the people. The streets of Chile saw divided messages, “new creative works [battling]—works that refused to attend to the merely figurative contingency of the ‘NO,’ without simultaneously critiquing the entire discursive regime responsible for transforming the dogmatic rigidity of ‘YES’ versus ‘NO’ into an imprisoning paradigm” (4). Signs in the No campaign and all art speaking out against the dictator “formulated meanings that were merely contrary to the dominant point of view” (4). The subtle messages behind these signs went against everything Pinochet’s government tried to enforce onto the Chilean people.

The No campaign's message inspired people to say no to Pinochet's fear tactics and look to a brighter day. Motivational art, as exhibited through the No campaign, inspired both artists and viewers and facilitated "venting of emotion (e.g. via telling one's story in artwork) [which could be] therapeutic for movement members" (Adams 49). By creating or viewing visions of hope, a frustrated and silenced Chilean citizen could connect his or her story with the art. Therefore, artistic creativity can promote social change. Like other Chilean art of that time period, images displayed by the No campaign depicted a masked sense of frustration as the present and hope for the future, employing peace symbols, such as the rainbow or dove, paired with images of positive human interactions and the single word "No." The No campaign sent a subtle message out to the people, but it was up to them to interpret the meaning and make the decision.

During Pinochet's dictatorship, the people of Chile attempted to make sense of a violent situation that stripped them of the identities they had always known on a cultural, national, and personal level by using art. The people did not have the option to speak freely as they always had before; therefore, metaphor became necessary for communication. Pinochet's strict censorship forced them to take their dialogue to a whole new visual level. Through government-imposed silence, the Chilean people developed creative ways through art to continue the dialogue during a time of catastrophe and deterioration. Metaphors gave the oppressed citizens of Chile a voice, as artists, to safely and silently speak out against Pinochet.

CHAPTER THREE: RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF NO CAMPAIGN COMMERCIAL

“The weapons that served the bourgeoisie in bringing down feudalism will now be used against the bourgeoisie itself” –Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The Communist Manifesto

The 1988 election hinged on free television commercials, known as “franjas,” that aired on public television for 27 nights from September 5 through October 1, 1988, preceding Chile’s plebiscite election. Attempting to seem like a fair and legitimate candidate, Pinochet granted each side “the right to air a fifteen-minute program on television . . . The program strips ran at night [from] 10:45 p.m. to 11:15 p.m. The campaign whose franja aired first in the half-hour sequence alternated from one night to the next” (Stern 357). The Yes campaign employed television commercials as early as 1987, however, the No campaign was granted access to television only six weeks before the plebiscite. The franjas were the No campaign’s first opportunity to reach the people through television. Despite having far less time to campaign than the Yes campaign, the No campaign “stunned the nation with its unity and series of upbeat, appealing advertisements that stressed harmony and joy in a reunited Chile, called for a return to democratic traditions, and hinted at the poverty and oppression average people had suffered under the dictatorship” (Authoritarianism Defeated by It’s Own Rules 3). In “The Modernization of Communications: The Media in the Transition to Democracy in Chile” Eugenio Tironi, television scriptwriter-editor for the No campaign, and Guillermo Sunkel suggest that “the period preceding the presidential plebiscite of 1988 . . . marked the beginning of the transition to democracy” (174). The campaign for change and restoration of the democratic process centered on commercials broadcast throughout the country on public television. Tironi and Sunkel assert that in Chile, “the dominant position [was] acquired by television. This was manifested . . . in television’s rapid rise to first place among the public,

becoming the fundamental component of daily mass culture” (178). Therefore, it was essential that the No campaign employ the country’s most widespread communication tool to grab viewers and clinch the “no” vote.

The No campaign’s Vision

The No campaign’s central theme was a vision of a positive, peaceful future for Chileans. It avoided emphasizing the negativity of the past and focused instead on how wonderful the future could be if the Chilean people stood up and said “no” to Pinochet’s continuation in office. Tironi and Sunkel suggest that “the ‘No’ campaign was based on the notion that Chilean society had just passed through a prolonged period of disintegration and that the tacit demand of Chileans was for strengthening bonds of social interaction” (182).

The vision for change did not ignore the past and present frustrations of the Chilean people, but juxtaposed extremely brief snapshots of frustrated people with happy, warm and fuzzy images, preventing people from dwelling on their negative experiences. The No campaign was comprised of a team of “independent producers and directors, some with experience in television and others trained in documentary filmmaking and advertising. This team . . . reflected the modernization of the Chilean communications media in the 1980s, since all its members were professionals with considerable experience” (Tironi and Sunkel 183). The commercials created by the No campaign fuse the past and present frustration with a future vision of prosperous people, who were happy and free again, living together. The vision avoids using fear tactics or negativity, despite the fact that the repeated catch phrase repeated is merely the word “no.” While the No campaign created several commercials, as a whole, the themes of the No campaign’s commercials are similar, illustrating the struggles of the people; however, for the purpose of this study, I have chosen to focus on one particular

commercial, entitled “Video del No,” meaning “Video of No,” because of all the commercials I have observed, it is the longest version I have been able to obtain, enabling me to fully analyze the No campaign’s themes.

The capstone symbol of the No campaign, the rainbow, is visible throughout the “Video del No” and has been used historically in many political movements as symbol of hope. In “Memory Scripts in the Making: Chile’s 9/11 and the Struggle for Meaning,” Michael J. Lazzara quotes former Chilean president Patricio Aylwin’s reference to the symbolism behind the 1988 campaign during a weekend retreat to discuss the No campaign:

There was a consensus among us that we had to come up with propaganda that was not hateful, propaganda that emphasized the hope of something better than retribution for the past. So, clearly, I think that one of the factors that facilitated the NO’s victory was that Chilean society was tired of many years of odious confrontation, not only sixteen and a half years of dictatorship, but also Allende’s three years and, to a certain extent, the final years of Frei’s government. The country had become polarized, and for a long time the campaigns were very aggressive. Chileans were quite divided. The country was breathing an air of bitterness, hatred, and bellicosity, and we wanted to overcome that and create a friendly, happy campaign, a campaign that would diminish controversy and generate enthusiasm around a project that would cast as wide a net as possible. (251)

Throughout many of the scenes of the “Video del No,” the rainbow represents a metaphor peace, giving people an image on which to focus their emotions. The rainbow color scheme

appeared at protests, on campaign materials, and in discretely placed positions throughout the commercial, igniting optimism and political action to restore peace and democracy.

Methodology: reaching the audience

The No campaign closely examined the people, their past, and their present in order to determine the way to relay its message. Since all the people had experienced Pinochet's violence and suppression, the No campaign team utilized individual experience to create a compelling campaign that would reach the people on a personal level; therefore, the commercials became more effective because they were created by Chilean citizens and voters with the same past and present frustration as the audience. As Tironi and Sunkel indicate,

The public opinion surveys on which the campaign was based revealed that Chileans longed for several fundamental changes: first, an open and tolerant society that would stress security, and not fear; second, respect for individual rights and dignity and an end to the humiliating abuses visited on citizens by the state and other powerful groups in society; third, the opportunity for progress and social mobility for all members of society, such that some would not be condemned to a frustrating marginalization, deprived of the benefits of economic modernization; and fourth, the opening up of channels of political participation, thereby making possible an end to alienation and a revival of citizenship and a sense of membership in a political community—the Chilean nation. (182)

The No campaign's commercials all contained similar scenes, themes, and visual representations accomplish its purpose: to reunite the people and restore a sense of national safety and security. Tironi and Sunkel claim that the primary "objective was to overcome the

widespread feelings of resignation and despair, born out of fear and skepticism . . . This campaign sought to identify itself with such values as social cohesion, historical continuity, national unity, and normalization” (182). Nowhere in the commercial does Pinochet’s name appear nor is the election mentioned. Instead, the advertisement displays Chilean people from all classes living safely in peace.

The No campaign’s cast in the “Video del No” seems to target Chilean citizens who were eligible to go out to the polls and vote. Actors and actresses represent all men, women, and classes. However, the actions of each of these characters change throughout the advertisement. Throughout the “Video del No,” children play safely together or spend time with their families. Images of picnics, birthdays, and dinners are just a few of the family-oriented activities shown. As a predominantly Catholic nation, Chilean culture clearly had strong familial values. The inclusion of a young cast illustrates the campaign’s emphasis on the future of Chile and its children telling voters to stand up and fight for their children’s futures if they would not stand up for their own.

Viewers see all age groups, income levels and sexes throughout the “Video del No.” Although white collar businessmen in suits appear in the first few scenes, the majority of characters are blue collar workers, or people involved in the arts, such as dancers, musicians, and students, emphasizing the middle, working class as the target audience. The inclusion of all classes shows how the No campaign attempted to create its vision of a reunited Chilean community through equalizing all professions and bridging gaps between the classes. While the cast encompass many different professions, this advertisement shows how they were all on the same team and has a similar dream, a bright future for Chile.

This commercial, the “Video del No,” is specific to the Chilean audience in the year of 1988. Outsiders could never have the same reaction to the vision illustrated throughout this commercial. Therefore, it is difficult to understand their response to this commercial or connect with its themes on the same level. Chileans had suffered through 15 years of silence, brutality, and strict censorship and were at the end of their patience under Pinochet. They needed a vision of hope that the No campaign provided for them. They could see a hero riding on a horse to save them, see smiling children playing in the streets or blowing out the candles on a birthday cake, and find what spark of hope was left inside. To outsiders, this vision of happiness may seem merely cliché or cheesy, but at this point in history, the Chilean people had not seen freedom or children playing safely in the streets for 15 years.

The Yes campaign’s Strategy and Vision

In order to fully understand the No campaign, it is important to see strategy of the opposition, as the No campaign most certainly developed their strategy as a response to Pinochet’s. Stern’s analysis of the Yes campaign demonstrates how, the campaign for Pinochet, also known as the Yes campaign or “officialist” party, was the complete opposite of the No campaign, emphasizing fear, playing upon the Chilean people’s past, showing the presidential hopeful in a positive light as a savior of the people, protecting them from communism. The so-called “trump card” of Pinochet’s campaign was the past before the military coup in 1973, “when they reached the very edge of a bloody civil war . . . [tying] its vision of a modernizing, prosperous, and peaceable Chile to a memory as salvation” (Stern 358). Playing upon painful memories from the past civil war, the officialist campaign attempted to provoke fear in the people and use this emotion to promote the dictator as a candidate who would protect Chile and lead the people to prosperity. This vision perpetuated

the Chilean psyche through “rallies, ceremonies, and speeches [that] drove home the connection between memory of a frightful past and the glow of a bright present-and-future” (Stern 358). Pinochet had successfully used fear in the past to get his message across to the people; therefore, it is not surprising he attempted to continue this trend throughout his campaign.

As Stern suggests, in a television pre-campaign, “I Love This Country,” the Yes campaign “drove home the connections of progress, memory as salvation, and memory as deliberate forgetting” (Stern 348). One version of the “I Love This Country” clip illustrates a parent-child relationship between Pinochet’s regime and Chile:

[Featuring an] image of a well-cared for baby with a bright future, a metaphor for Chile elucidated by the authoritative off-camera voice. ‘Fourteen years ago, from deep inside our Chile, another Chile was born. And it was born from a labor, with tearing and suffering, with amazement and hope. Today it serves not at all to relive these wounds, if not to remember that from them was born the new country. This country.’ (Stern 348).

The Yes campaign tells the people not to “relive these wounds,” but to forget about the past and look towards the future. This statement treats the past as an essential part of a prosperous future, indicating to the people their suffering and pain has happened as a stepping stone towards some greater purpose, a level of happiness and success that has not yet been attained but is in progress. This commercial paved the way for future advertisements, suggesting the regime was merely taking necessary steps and laying the groundwork for the country’s success, and that if they changed leaders, this would never be achieved and all their suffering was without purpose. The Yes campaign also warned that voting “no” would be a vote for

taking steps backwards into one of the most violent time periods of Chile's past when the people suffered violence in the streets and were on the brink of civil war among one another. The Yes campaign depicted Pinochet and his regime as heroes, who had saved the people from themselves, civil war, and Allende so many years ago.

As the plebiscite neared, the Yes campaign intensified, by sparking the memory of pre-1973 distress under the Unidad Popular (U.P.), a predominantly left-wing coalition comprised of several parties including the socialist, communist, and radical parties, and MAPU, the movement of popular unified action that supported Salvador Allende, a Marxist and co-founder of the socialist's candidacy in the 1970 election. The Yes campaign's new propaganda gave Chileans only two choices: either say yes to Pinochet or return to the chaos, violence, and civil war that had occurred under the Unidad Popular in the 70s. In August of 1988 the Yes campaign began to push this choice with the release of, "a new television spot—'Yes, You Decide,' [that] aired 220 times in four variations—depicted the threat to the successful and satisfied Chile . . . Images of death, entrapment, and disillusion represented the traumatic past suddenly reborn in the present" (Stern 359). The Yes campaign's commercials showed,

The faces of the nation [as] beneficiaries of [Pinochet's] rule, untroubled today but forgetful about Chile during the Unidad Popular. A young working man, a child, a housewife, an older man are all threatened by a return to those times. Roberto's income could fall prey to 700 percent price inflation; [Little Pablo] could be indoctrinated by a Marxist curriculum at school; Julia could suffer long lines and scarcity of food; Juan might have no place to live in his mature years. Images of death, entrapment, and disillusion represented the

traumatic past suddenly reborn in the present. Roberto chokes in rising water; [Little Pablo] panics as he tries to escape the crystal bubble surrounding him; Julia's food vanishes from her supermarket carriage; Juan's house of cards falls in on him. Relief comes when they return to today's 'new country' of progress. Finally the viewer faces the choice: "Yes, you decide. [Brief pause.] We continue forward or we return to the U.P." (Stern 359).

Posing this choice to the fearful Chilean people extended beyond the television commercials, reaching people through similarly themed radio and print media including, "a magazine-book of horror: 'Chile under the Popular Unity.' The ad's images recalled economic ruin and violent danger—people in food lines, women demanding milk, Fidel Castro visiting Chile, Salvador Allende with a rifle" (Stern 359).

By showing them the detrimental path that would follow a No campaign victory, the Yes campaign gave people no choice. A vote against Pinochet was a vote for returning to the violent, unstable times preceding the 1973 coup. Pinochet is romanticized as a hero, a father figure, and protector of the weak, struggling Chile. In Pinochet's commercial, "Canción del Si," meaning, "Song of Yes," he appears saluting the Chilean people in military uniform and embracing children, clearly suggesting he is a strong, reliable father figure and caretaker. Additionally, "Canción del Si," opens with a single vocalist singing and transitions to the people singing the same song uniformly while dressed up in formal attire, including jackets, ties, and dresses. This formal dress paired with unnatural, rehearsed singing reflects Pinochet's desire for conformity and order—at any cost. In "Canción del Si," Pinochet seems to put the people in a helpless, childlike position where they need to be nurtured and directed because they are incapable of living, functioning and making individual choices, a

characteristic mentality of the dictator's regime which isolated, censored, and silenced the people for fifteen years preceding the 1988 plebiscite. Like "Canción del Si," Stern suggests, that all the Yes campaign's commercials indicate that no individual could protect the people as Pinochet had, and that he and his regime had saved the people, seemingly from themselves.

Throughout the six weeks before the plebiscite, the Pinochet regime took steps to modify obvious repression symbols and revamp the appearance of the government by removing "two states of juridical exception that gave the president-candidate powers to suspend rights of expression, association, transit, and personal liberty, and to decree exile and enforce ideological proscription. It cancelled exile decrees against Chileans still abroad, and ratified the United Nations Convention against torture" (Stern 357). With these modifications and a heavy push of its vision, the Yes campaign attempted to reach the voters by igniting their fears and putting them in a subservient position where they needed Pinochet's protection.

According to Stern, in the final phase of the campaign, the official "franja" commercials debuted on public television on September 5, solidifying the campaign's previous groundwork by establishing fear and inability of the people. In the franjas, "the main slogan was positive and extolled success: 'Chile, a Winning Country' . . . [and brought to the forefront a] Chile of progress and prosperity. The method of persuasion, however, relied on fear of return" (Stern 359). The characterization of Pinochet as a father, nurturer, and protector became more than a theme in one commercial of the Yes campaign, it became the central point. The Yes campaign continued to soften his reputation by constructing him as a different man than Chile saw during his leadership since the coup in 1973. The final

commercials continued to push the idea of him as a hero, “a person who worked to save Chileans from war in 1973, war with Argentina in 1978, —and to build economic growth and social peace. ‘I risked my life the eleventh of September of ’73. I fought for the tranquility of the country . . . so that you [he pointed his finger at the camera-audience] could have the serenity of being able to go where you want,’” Pinochet said, directly addressing the audience (Stern 360). As demonstrated in “Canción del Si,” with a sign stating “Un País Gandador” meaning, “A Winning Country,” the Yes campaign insisted that Pinochet had saved the people and because he was their leader, they had won.

In addition to re-envisioning history and Pinochet from new, favorable perspectives, Stern suggests that throughout several of the Yes campaign’s commercials, the No campaign’s vision was shown in a distorted manner, attempting to ignite those fearful memories of the past. For example, one of the Yes campaign’s clips “reminded viewers that ‘the country went to hell in a hand basket’ between 1970 and 1973, and that the leaders of the No were the same people who had dragged Chile into a ‘tunnel without exit’” (Stern 360). Other commercials predicted a “bloodbath again awaiting Chile. Carrying a giant red flag that features a sickle and hammer, a person in red rides a horse—to distorted versions of the No slogan, melody, and ad image—into Chile’s future” (Stern 360). According to Stern, the Yes campaign depicted the No campaign as either communists or close allies of communists, bringing back the divided, violent public that existed in Chile before the coup.

How the vision perpetuated the No campaign’s commercials: analysis of themes

The No campaign’s themes artistically reached voters through uplifting images that emphasized its vision for Chile’s future. These themes worked towards the No campaign team’s goals to reunite the people and give them hope for peace in Chile’s future. The

following predominant themes emerge in “Video del No”: rejuvenation and reclaiming of voices, religion, freedom and democracy, and escape and overcoming obstacles.

Rejuvenation and reclaiming of voices

As the people had been silenced by Pinochet’s censorship and violence for fifteen years preceding the plebiscite, several scenes throughout “Video del No” symbolize this silence the people endured. However, as the commercial progresses, the people get their voices back, showing the bright future that could be possible if they voted no. For example, a surgeon appears at the beginning of the commercial with a surgical mask covering her face and looks sheepishly at the camera. Later, in the final scenes, she tears the mask, revealing her mouth and smiles at the camera, making direct eye contact. A man sits in a chair, silent in a dark room holding his guitar and staring down, but then he looks at the light out the window as the scene shifts. Towards the end of the commercial, this same man can be seen in a room lit up by the light from the window and playing his guitar. A middle-aged woman looks out the window, wipes off her mouth, and smiles, demonstrating that finally she can speak after years of silence.

The musician characters facilitate the concept of breaking through the silence throughout the “Video del No.” In one scene a man appears singing and beating on his drum, while in several scenes, groups of people are shown singing the lyrics to the theme song that plays throughout the commercial:

Happiness is coming/ Survive, the happiness is coming / Happiness is coming
 / Survive, the happiness is coming / I’m free to think / Moreover, I feel it is
 time to secure our freedom / enough abuses / It is time to change / It is enough
 of triviality / I’m going to say no! / Because it’s not good for anyone / To

surrender during the storm / I want to express myself / Happiness will not
 come until there is no more dictatorship / Because I care about my future / I'm
 going to say no! / With my God's power / Conversing without fear! / All
 together we will triumph / Let's say no / For peace and life / Let's fight the
 death / This is the opportunity / Let's fight the violence / With the weapons of
 peace / Because our country needs to gain its dignity / It will help everybody /
 Let's say no! / All together we will triumph / Let's say no / For peace and life
 / Let's say no!

The fact that the song is not merely playing as background music but that the people sing along in many scenes represents a profound step for the characters in the commercial.

Finally, they can stand up and shout out their frustrations and speak out against the dictator.

The people spoke out and sang the lyrics to help their country regain "its dignity." By showing the people in the commercial speaking out, viewers were inspired to do the same in their lives. The song from the commercial became a jingle repeated all throughout Chile before the plebiscite and even today. By seeing the characters in the commercial regain their voices, and the citizens began to do the same.

Freedom and democracy

The will to return to a free, democratic country is a reoccurring theme throughout the "Video del No." As the lyrics repeated throughout the advertisement clearly state, "Survive, the happiness is coming / I'm free to think / Moreover, I feel it's time to secure our freedom" ("Video Del No"). The concept of securing freedom permeates this commercial. In one scene, a king wearing a crown appears, and the crown topples off his head. This represents the desire for an end of Pinochet's dictatorship and the return to democracy. At several points

through the commercial, different men appear walking alone, representing individuality—a staple of democracy. Additionally, a crashing wall in the beginning scenes represents the breakdown of the dictatorship's power.

Throughout the commercial characters wave their hands in various gestures. Each waving motion represents a different type of motion towards freedom. For example, in one scene a man points and shakes his finger in a gesture of negation. In another scene a man shakes his head from left to right—a way to say no without using words. Both of these gestures demonstrate saying no without words. In another scene a man gestures with his hand to the left, possibly suggesting a governmental movement from the right-wing government to the left-wing, or indicating that Pinochet's regime should move over to make room for another candidate.

The backdrop in several scenes of the "Video del No" represents freedom and is frequently set outside in nature or in the home. In one scene, families safely picnic outside with their children. Another scene shows children riding around in a pickup truck waving their feet. While yet another scene shows a man dancing outside on a bridge. The majority of scenes that represent a peaceful, democratic Chile are set outside. Interestingly, the scenes that show clips of the past and present frustrated, captive Chilean citizens appear inside. For example, a man punches a punching bag in frustration inside. Another frustrated man pounds on a desk in an office. The frustrated citizens of the past and present are cooped up inside their homes in frustration, while the happy, free Chilean citizens of the future appear safely outside in the sunlight. Some signs of freedom are less subtle and come right out to demand freedom. For example, in one scene a man driving his cab with the word "libre" meaning

“free” or available, waves his hand in negation along with his windshield wipers, a clear indication of his will to be free again and say “no” to Pinochet.

Escape and overcoming obstacles

Freedom is not easily obtained, and as prevalent as the idea of regaining freedom is throughout all of the No campaign’s advertisements, the idea of overcoming obstacles is equally significant. Windows and doors frequently appear throughout “Video del No.” Nearly every scene demonstrates some sort of obstacle for the character to overcome. For example, a window with bars barricades one character. Therefore, the character looks to be imprisoned in his or her home; this image is a clear reminder of Pinochet’s suffocating curfews that had kept the people in their homes for years. In another scene a bridge appears with three bars, trapping the character. Another scene shows a man trying to enter a shop, but the owner shuts a door in his face and puts up a sign that says, “cerrado” (“closed”). Further emphasizing the idea of a democratic society, men riding horses through the countryside appear to flee into the countryside. Chile’s Andes Mountains represent an obstacle in one scene when a group of hikers have reached the top and excitedly cheer about their accomplishment, while singing the theme song “Let’s say no.”

In many places the characters whisper to one another, indicating that it is unsafe to speak loudly and clearly, but that they must find a way to communicate. Whispering was another way the people could overcome their silence. Whispering is one first step towards speaking up and eventually conversing normally. The people were silenced and told no and isolated by Pinochet’s government and their frustration with these obstacles is clear throughout the commercial. These obstacles and frustrations are shown very briefly and juxtaposed with happier images for the future. This strategy goes along with the campaign’s

ultimate purpose: “to identify itself with such values as social cohesion, historical continuity, national unity, and normalization” (Tironi and Sunkel 182). The obstacles appear in the commercial because the campaign could not ignore the past and the present; however, the characters in the commercial overcome these obstacles in a matter of seconds and find their ways to freedom again.

Religion

Religious symbolism permeates “Video del No.” The No campaign’s strategy demonstrates that it did, indeed, see God on its side. In a predominantly Catholic country, this religious identification was essential to reaching viewers. The direct religious symbolism was a result of a visit from Pope John Paul II to Chile in 1987. During this visit, “the government tried to orchestrate television coverage . . . in their favor, [but could not] deny or suppress the pope’s public call for a return to Chile’s democratic traditions” (LaMay par. 16). To say yes to Pinochet was to go against the Pope’s wishes and ultimately the will of God. The Pope urged the people to stop the violence and called for peace through television broadcasts that “[led] Chileans to see themselves as a community capable of eschewing violence, living in peace, and replacing the previous skepticism with hope for the future. Television, one of the products of the regime’s modernization policies, helped make this ‘miracle’ possible” (Tironi and Sunkel 181).

After the Pope made it clear that he and God supported the “no” vote, blatant religious symbolism appeared present throughout the No campaign’s “Video del No.” The lyrics establish God as justification for saying no in the repetitive chorus that states, “Because I care about my future / I’m going to say no! / With my God’s power” (“Video Del No”). In the opening scene of one commercial, seven bright lights beam onto the stage. The

website dailycatholic.com maintains that the number seven is holy with evidence located all throughout the Holy Bible (par. 1). Additionally, of the seven bright lights, the two located in the center of the screen create crosses.

Throughout the commercial, the concept of religion continues. The use of light throughout the scenes seems to simultaneously represent God's presence and a hope for the future. Characteristically in Christianity, bright white lights represent good while dark symbolizes evil. In several scenes, the characters look sad and downtrodden while sitting in a dark place, but then suddenly the lighting becomes brighter and they look up and smile either directly at the light or right into the camera. It seems that they feel the light of God and are reassured of their futures when they look up to the heavens.

The No campaign team used their shared experiences under Pinochet to reach voters and inspire all Chileans to reunite together and vote "no" in the 1988 plebiscite. Their positive, uplifting vision reached the people through television and shattered against the Yes campaign's vision of fear. The people resisted the Yes campaign's threats for a violent future and refused to become submissive to Pinochet once again. Voters went out to the polls to reunite Chile and say "no" to Pinochet and "yes" to a peaceful Chile for themselves and their children.

CHAPTER FOUR: IMPACT OF THE NO CAMPAIGN

“I could have rested, relaxed, breathed, but the duty to the dead does not give me pause: they died, you lived. Do your duty so that the world will know everything.”

–Alexander Solzhenitsyn

Launched publicly through the media by Chile’s No campaign, metaphor proved to be the silent facilitator of peace and democracy by giving the oppressed citizens of Chile a voice to safely and silently speak out against violence. The people of Chile did more than just say no; they altered their emotions and state of mind, leading to real political and cultural change. They transformed from passive followers to courageous citizens who acted on behalf of themselves and their country. In what seemed like a battle between good and evil, the No campaign’s uplifting vision and commercials reached frustrated Chilean citizens on a personal level, and despite the late evening air time from 10:45 to 11:15 p.m., “some 1.25 million persons tuned in on weeknights; in the nation nine out of ten voters saw franja programs at one point or another” (Stern 363). Many reality-altering events took place preceding the plebiscite; however, “As several analysts have concluded, the decisive factor that produced this electoral outcome was the publicity the campaign waged on television” (Tironi and Sunkel 183). Tironi and Sunkel discuss the significance of the No campaign’s franjas and conclude that,

Admittedly, it is difficult to determine with precision the degree to which the “Yes” campaign undermined support for its political option and provoked a flight of undecided voters to the “No” side or, conversely, the extent to which the “No” programs succeeded in converting voters who had not made up their minds . . . The “No” program, intended to show that political change was

possible without major upset or breakdown of the socioeconomic order, succeeded in modifying citizens' perceptions of the political force identified with change and, at the same time, with order—that is, it presented the opposition as having the ability to initiate a substantial change in Chile while reestablishing social cohesion. (183)

The No campaign's franjas seem to be the central force that created a positive vision for Chile's future and conveyed it to the people through uplifting commercials that truly reached the people and promoted political change. As the 1989 public opinion survey results in Table 1 demonstrates, "these programs were being broadcast – in September 1988 – clearly shows that the 'No' television slots were very positively evaluated by viewers, while the 'Yes' ads failed abysmally" (Tironi and Sunkel 183).

"Which ad did you regard as..."	"Yes" Campaign	"No" Campaign
More entertaining	16%	62%
Closer to the people	19%	60%
More motivating	21%	58%
Clearer and more understandable	25%	57%
More dynamic	22%	56%
More optimistic	24%	55%
More credible	24%	52%
More appropriate for a political campaign	23%	47%
Projecting a greater capacity to govern the country	29%	43%

Table 1. Public Assessments of Television Campaigns in the 1988 Plebiscite
Eugenio Tironi and Guillermo Sunkel cite the following source for this table: Roberto Méndez et al, ¿Por qué ganó el NO? In *Estudios Públicos*, no. 33, Summer, 1989, p. 93. Data collected by the Centro de Estudios Públicos and Adimark.

The No campaign's message counteracted the fear Pinochet's commercials attempted to instill in the people and instead made them feel hopeful and empowered. On the day of the plebiscite it became clear that the people had finally spoken in a unified voice and said "no" to Pinochet. The No campaign solidified victory over the Yes campaign as the people

rejected “Pinochet’s plebiscite preference . . . by a substantial margin: 54.7 percent of Chileans voted ‘No,’ 43 percent voted ‘Yes’ and 2.3 percent cast blank or null ballots” (Tironi and Sunkel 183). Because Pinochet’s regime silenced their voices through censorship and intimidation, Chilean citizens successfully employed artistic metaphors shaped in a positive, attainable vision for Chile’s future, spreading the truth and empowering fellow voters to say “no” to Pinochet and to violence.

In “How Can We Talk It Through?” Anne W. Doshier, author, community psychologist, and committed World Café member explores the effects of war, turmoil, and violence and determines that, “the lack of ongoing and authentic dialogue among nations create[s] conditions for future conflict” (Epi). This conclusion also applies to political parties and members of Chile’s government. Without conversation and ongoing dialogue between the general public and political officials, change, healing, resolution, and progression cannot occur. Doshier also asserts that, “every societal change processes [she] knew of started with an informal conversation in which men and women—young or old—were witnessed and ‘heard into speech,’ sharing . . . their dreams and hopes for making a difference around something they cared about” (Epi.). Doshier’s concludes that, “In being truly seen and heard, people [can be] transformed and [discover] their mutual commitment to act. That small group went on to invite other groups into conversation and change became more and more real” (Epi.). What Doshier describes represents No campaign’s path and may shed light on how the commercials reached the people, by beginning conversation and sharing hopes and dreams with fellow community members.

The No campaign facilitated this conversation by acting as progressive, concerned citizens and broadcasting their positive vision for Chile’s future on national television, rather

than playing upon people's fears like the Yes campaign. The franjas that aired on television from both the Yes and No campaigns elicited a national dialogue in the country of Chile by providing an opportunity for ongoing conversation, helping the people to resolve frustrations and discuss moving forward. Viewers would watch the campaigns and discuss the themes and topics amongst themselves, and "the franja itself . . . became the talk of home, street, workplace, radio, and newspaper the next day" (Stern 363-64). These broadcasts provided an outlet for discussion and people slowly regained their voices by discussing the issues, a national step that cannot be discounted as insignificant after fifteen years of silence under Pinochet's censorship. A poll conducted by the Centro de Estudios Publicos (CEP) in September 1988, preceding the plebiscite, illustrates the success of the No campaign:

The effectiveness of the 'no' media far eclipsed that of the "yes." Chileans rated the "no" campaign highest in every category tested in the survey, including being "credible," "optimistic," "clearly understood," "dynamic," "motivating," and the "better choice, and in communicating its "capability in governing the country. (Chile's Transition to Democracy 42)

The No campaign's conversation-eliciting commercials impacted the people and invited them into the national political dialogue, essentially handing the power back to the people by promoting a vision for democracy.

Including the Chilean public in the political conversation was another important impact of the plebiscite. Advocates for the No campaign initiated public dialogue among Chilean citizens and Pinochet himself. Richard Lagos, a prominent political figure and professor well known as a United Nations delegate who worked under former President Allende to create a "model democracy" for Chile, successfully began difficult conversations

and instilled bravery in the people before, during, and after the plebiscite. Most importantly, Lagos was also the first individual to elicit accusative conversation with Pinochet in public about his abuses to the people. Preceding the plebiscite, when the Catholic University Television invited him and several leaders of the Party for Democracy to appear on the show, Facing the Nation, Lagos became a heroic, inspirational figure for the Chilean people by beginning a conversation about Pinochet's abuses to the people on public television (Stern 380). In his article "Without Yesterday There is No Tomorrow," Peter Winn recounts Lagos' nationally televised speech:

In a nation accustomed to controlled media, Socialist leader Richard Lagos was allowed a rare TV appearance. Pointing straight at the camera, Lagos defied the dictator: "You promise the country eight more years of tortures, assassinations, violations of human rights," he said. "It is unacceptable for a Chilean to have such ambition for power as to try to be in power for 25 years!" When his panicked interviewers tried to interrupt, he insisted, "I speak for 15 years of silence." (par. 1)

Lagos' words reflected the thoughts Chilean people had internalized for fifteen years. As the first individual to publicly question Pinochet's actions in office, he broke the silence. His courageous accusations on a nationally televised program earned him the position as the voice of Chile through "a simple finger and a simple act of talking back . . . Marco Antonio de la Parra, recalled an electric mix [of emotional responses]: fear, fantasy, contagion. 'We [were] stunned . . . Lagos fixes himself [on our minds] with a firmness that is contagious. His finger is the finger of Chile'" (Stern 381). Lagos became a heroic figure to the people in that moment before the plebiscite, and the people looked to him as a leader who could inspire

them to overcome their fears in the aftermath of Pinochet and the transition to democracy. Lagos spoke to the people about the government, inviting them into a political realm and a conversation they had been excluded from by Pinochet.

As a voice of the people, Lagos won the trust of Chileans and inspired them to participate in the conversation, guiding and encouraging them through the process of healing and reminding them that, like him, they had the power to speak up and say “no” to Pinochet. Lagos elicited dialogue amongst the people as he “broke the rule of polite euphemism” (Stern 380). According to New York Times reporter Shirley Christian, when Lagos accused the dictator on national television, “Pinochet was ‘climbing the wall’” (qtd. in Stern 380). Lagos’ fearless actions also became a conversation piece as “the incident entered into the realm of compelling memory folklore. People kept asking, in Chilean streets, homes, and workplaces, ‘Did you see Lagos?’” (Stern 380). Therefore, Lagos did more than begin dialogue with Pinochet; he inspired the Chilean people to participate in the dialogue as well.

After the plebiscite, dialogue continued and remained a significant aspect of Chilean politics and the process of moving forward after Pinochet’s repression. Suarez and Doshier seem to be in agreement about the fact that dialogue leads to reconciliation as Suarez also recognizes the importance of dialogue and acknowledges both the Yes and No campaigns’ contributions to international dialogue that helped to lead Chile towards reconciliation and would continue to do so in the future. In the Statement of International Observer Delegation on October 6, 1988, Adolfo Suarez, President of the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs addressed Chileans:

Today we would like to offer a consensus view of the leaders of our delegation as to what we have seen here in the past few days. For we realize

we have witnessed an historic event and one that has captured the imagination and attention of the democratic peoples of the world. The long and proud democratic tradition of Chile was reawakened yesterday by Chileans of all political persuasions. We congratulate the Chilean people . . . The Chilean people have been heard. We have been greatly impressed by the leaders of the “no” campaign, before and after the plebiscite. They have acted responsibly in calling for a national dialogue and reconciliation. Their objective was not a negative one; they sought not to defeat a president, but bring about free elections. Now they have the support of the Chilean people. The government, in conducting a free and fair plebiscite, and acknowledging the result, has taken the first important step at reconciliation. Supporters of the “yes” also acted responsibly and patriotically in pursuing a different path. This is the spirit in which democracy can thrive. (Suarez 80-81)

Suarez’s speech confirmed what the majority of the people had thought for so long: they deserved a voice. He acknowledges and praises the followers of the No campaign for acting out for Chile’s freedom. This speech marked a turning point in Chile, and from this point on the country began its slow transition into a democratic society. The people had spoken and said no to Pinochet and Suarez praises them for their bravery. As Suarez so eloquently states it in his address to the Chilean people, the No campaign fearlessly stepped up to the plate and began the national conversation in Chile, which empowered the people to begin the transition to the democratic, peaceful society the No campaign’s commercials portrayed.

Although the plebiscite was over, the work of the people was not. They would have to wait another year to hold democratic elections. The people were wary that there would be an

uprising or Pinochet would prevent the elections from happening or dupe them in some way, as his notorious past stirred permanent distrust and suspicion. Even after the “no” vote won the plebiscite in October 1988, the people fostered a fear of Pinochet and the possibility of future political turmoil. However, despite the reservations of the Chilean people, competitive elections were to be held for a new president and congress. The initial fears of Pinochet undoubtedly followed the people after the victory of the “no” vote, as he remained in control as their president until official democratic elections in 1990. The No campaign’s commercials had given the people a vision for a positive future, but they had to unify and put their fears aside to make the difficult transition to democracy together.

Mary Helen Spooner, journalist and nine year foreign correspondent with Chile on December 14, 1989 recounts Election Day and three candidates competing to lead Chile: former Senate leader, Patricio Aylwin, Independent candidate Fransisco Javier Errázuriz, and Hernán Buchi, previous finance minister and the pick of Pinochet’s regime (Spooner 254). Spooner describes Hernán Buchi as “the epitome of the Chilean yuppie, [who] attracted the support of much of the country’s business community, as well as the right-wing political parties backing Pinochet in the plebiscite” (255). With elections nearing and the candidates set, it seemed Pinochet had accepted with his defeat and “by the middle of that year, [he] seemed resigned to the fact that he would be vacating the La Moneda presidential palace . . . Pinochet told reporters, ‘One has to live with reality. I at this moment, am not a good candidate,’ and [said] he would not try to run in the forthcoming presidential election” (255). Despite this accepting, gracious face Pinochet put on for the media, clearly he had no plans to fully admit defeat and surrender control of the country to the democratic voice of the people. Pinochet remained “adamant about not surrendering his post as army commander, which

raised fears that Chile's future president would be little more than a puppet worked from behind by a military leader . . . as the date for elections approached his public statements revealed a growing hostile defensiveness" (255). Pinochet claimed he was retaining his position as Commander of the Army "to protect 'his' people" (255). Pinochet continued to threaten the people and stated, "'The day they touch any of my men will be the end of the state of law,' . . . during a speech two months before the vote" (255). Clearly, he was not as accepting of his new subservient position as he would have people believe.

As a Presidential candidate, Patricio Aylwin spoke out as the voice of the people and challenged Pinochet's threats asking, "'what is one to understand by touching a man? Is it to apply the law and justice?' . . . 'I believe that phrase was an unfortunate one pronounced by this gentleman in an outburst, without really thinking'" (Spooner 255). This eloquent challenge to Pinochet's words demonstrated Aylwin's ability to speak out as the heroic voice of the people and elicit dialogue towards resolution of conflict with Pinochet as Lagos did before the Plebiscite. Therefore, it came as no surprise when on December 15, 1989, Election Day, "Aylwin won easily, with 55.2 percent of the votes" (255). Pinochet offered no congratulations to Chile's new president; however, he did give a "televised address the day after the election, urging Chileans to 'face with hope the new horizon we ourselves have opened up to our children'" (255). As Pinochet handed over his presidential title and sash to Aylwin, he headed back to his hometown of Valparaíso and faced the disgust and outrage of the people. Their reaction to his presence was clear as "Pinochet's open car was pelted with eggs, and he was confronted with cries of 'Assassin! Assassin!'" (256). The people finally had the courage to confront the general and display their hatred for his actions.

President Patricio Aylwin transitioned into his role as the leader of Chile by taking a “symbolic step toward healing some of the wounds of repression” (Spooner 255). This symbolic step was a ceremony to recognize the violations of human rights during Pinochet’s reign, something that had not publicly occurred before that point. The ceremony was held at Santiago’s National Stadium, “the most notorious site of mass detentions, torture, and executions after the coup” (255). During this ceremony President Aylwin publicly addressed the nation for the first time:

From this spot, which in the sad days of blind and hateful dominance of force over reason was for many a place of prison and torture, we say to all Chileans and to the world that it is watching us: Never again insults to human dignity! Never again hate between brothers! Never again fratricidal violence. (256)

This emotional ceremony marked the beginning of a new day for Chile, a day of recognition of the diseased and democracy. Finally, it was more than the No campaign saying “no” to violence and oppression. The democratic leader of their country was saying “no” along with them. The vision of the No campaign’s commercials began to become reality as the people and the government spoke together in a unified voice.

When examining the transformation of the Chilean people and government from 1970 through 1990, it is clear that something drastic must have moved all parties involved to change so dramatically without resorting to force or reverse oppression. As previously established, employing art and metaphor to convey a political message, the people unified to successfully topple an oppressor. Under extreme circumstances, ordinary citizens made a real difference for their country, but the question remains, how did they accomplish this? How did they maneuver their situation to meet such success? In A Grammar of Motives, Kenneth

Burke explores the motives behind human action, inaction, and interaction. Burke “is concerned with the basic forms of thought, which, in accordance with the nature of the world as all men necessarily experience . . . [their motives] are equally present in systematically elaborated metaphysical structures, in legal judgments, in poetry and fiction, in political and scientific works, in the news and in bits of gossip offered at random” (1298). However, Burke suggests that the Pentad itself may be controversial because, “Men may violently disagree about the purposes behind a given act . . . But be that as it may, any complete statement about motives will offer *some kind* of answers to . . . [the question]: how he did it (agent), and why (purpose)” (1299). Burkean analysis helps to explore the actions and reactions of the No campaign and shed light about why it met such great success.

The people, the agents, united together and successfully advocated for their cause under extreme circumstances, an action that cannot easily be discounted. According to Burke, Agency is “what means or instruments [a person] used” (1299). For Chileans, the Agency was several forms of art inspired by commercials, which successfully employed metaphors. This metaphor served as a persuasive element, evoking emotion in readers and convincing them to join the nonviolent movement. All of these instruments worked together for a common purpose, to overcome the violent dictator, Pinochet, through art and transform Chile into a true, free democracy.

The first interaction to examine must be the change that occurred in the agent, Pinochet. As the plebiscite neared, Pinochet began to loosen his grip on the people and encourage them to forget and repress the painful memories they had about the coup, murders, and disappearances that occurred afterward. Instead, Pinochet painted himself as a hero of the people, a man who saved them from Allende and did what was necessary to protect them.

In short, he scaled back his hold on the people, assuming they would continue to support him and believe he could save them from meeting more violence in the future. He may have done this to win the favor of voters before the plebiscite in order to regain their support, by reminding of the economic turmoil under Allende. He may have thought the people would support him if they realized the alternative could be much worse for their country.

Additionally, he loosened his censorship of opposing political opinions. For the first time since the coup, people could resist Pinochet's politics without disappearing permanently. The agent changed and affected the entire scene. Pinochet's actions were the fatal flaw in controlling the citizens of Chile. When he provided the opportunity for the people to speak out against him without facing death, he created the means, the agency for his downfall.

Allowing the No campaign's television broadcasts, and showing a different side, an alternate future for Chile without him, the people were inspired to act when they otherwise may not have had the courage.

In this scene, new agents courageously came to the forefront inspiring others to join and act against Pinochet, such as Richard Lagos, who showed people that they could point the finger at Pinochet and remember the past in his unforgettable accusation on public television before the plebiscite. Lagos acted as an agent, a new kind of leader who inspired others to join his mission and become agents for change as well. When mourning loss or enduring violence, a person needs to recognize what has happened and take steps towards improving the situation in order to move forward. Pinochet prevented them from taking this action, making them seem almost childlike. However, through Lagos' actions and the No campaign's vision, the people were empowered again, and as these agents broke the silence other Chilean citizens followed. They saw Pinochet and themselves in a new light, as agents

who could act, and a new an alternative scene, a Chile where they no longer needed to act as submissive followers. They could take action and make change, and live in a Chile that did not need Pinochet's protection. They realized that if they stood up and said "no" and took action they could be the people who changed the scene, they could regain control by only standing up and voting, and they could create the change they wanted to see.

Interestingly, the people did not use violence as a means to an end. Although there was protest and violence in the streets at times, it is important to recognize that the No campaign's message and vision focused not on remembering the bloodshed and human rights abuses of the past, but to moving forward towards a positive, nonviolent, and prosperous future for Chile. The people overcame their fears to work towards this vision in an uncertain political environment.

The overall purpose of the No campaign's movement and commercials was to unite, inspire, and ultimately persuade the people to vote "no" to Pinochet when the plebiscite came, no matter the outcome. But after the No campaign achieved their goal and won, the work of the Chilean people continued to expand to achieve even greater purposes. While Pinochet was the agent, his purpose was to control the people. When the agents changed, the purpose shifted as well. Now the people worked together as agents to not only to regain control of their lives and their countries and to work towards the peaceful, democratic vision of the No campaign, but to get Pinochet out of office and take away his control over Chile permanently. The people also needed to strive for an even greater purpose, rebuilding their national identity. This reconstruction began by removing power from a man who took their identities and individuality and continued by working to rebuild all oppressed parts of

Chilean cultures. Pinochet's oppression had affected every outlet of Chilean culture, and beyond the immediate purpose, Chile had large-scale cultural transformations to make.

In a society bullied into silence through brutality, threats, and murder, the people were understandably skeptical about casting their ballots; they had seen what could happen when speaking out against Pinochet's government in the past: death. Because Pinochet silenced their voices and intimidated them beyond recognition for fifteen years with his violent tactics, the only seemingly safe communicative tool the Chilean citizens had left was the use of metaphoric art to spread the truth. Burke suggests that "Rhetoric is the art of persuasion or a study of the means of persuasion available for any given situation . . . a speaker persuades an audience to identify itself with the speaker's interest" (1340). The No campaign's commercials successfully persuaded viewers through the use of metaphor, allowing the people to identify with their common experiences, repression, and pain and empathize with one another on a local level. Nationally, the No campaign's persuasive, descriptive metaphors convinced other Chileans to join the No campaign's movement for peace and work towards the peaceful, positive future illustrated in the commercials. Although the No campaign's commercials did not air internationally, the effects empowered the people to take action and elicited emotion on an international level, convincing other governments to support their cause.

Demonstrating resiliency, Chile used its pain and suffering to globally advocate its cause. Although Pinochet was temporarily successful, "[managing] to neutralize his violent enemies, the nonviolent movement that disavowed the violence he started and that others emulated that became the catalyst for his downfall" (Ackerman par. 3). Interestingly, without Pinochet's brutal violence, the movement would not have reached the level of success that it

did. He inflicted pain on the people that gave them the need to create the metaphors of suffering, peace, and redemption that so powerfully spoke out and persuaded people to join the dialogue and their movement. They advocated for their cause by joining together to overcome an oppressive dictator. In 1988, Chileans demonstrated to a world in turmoil that they could overcome violence nonviolently, a fact hard to accept in the “world at war” we seem to live in today, proving that through violence and repression, creative art and descriptive metaphors can be born, and a people can find their voices again by breaking through the silence as one united voice against violence and for a peaceful, democratic society.

CONCLUSION

In Chile, the people saw the No campaign's commercials, integrated them into reality, and made them their own, all through interaction and absorption of performance art. Also, considering the pain, suffering, and censorship imposed on the Chilean people, the No campaign's television commercials provided an outlet for dialogue, slowly allowing people to converse about politics as they had before Pinochet's censorship and oppression. Symbols, such as the No campaign's rainbow, and illustrations of a peaceful, democratic Chile, enabled the people to visualize their hopes of freedom and act to make them a reality. They saw the No campaign's rainbow on television and envisioned a purpose. Through "an examination of art in social movements, [it can be determined] that [the act of joining a movement] is not just a cognitive process that persuades people to believe their situation is unjust and worth struggling . . . people are also drawn to movements as a result of emotional processes" (Adams 46). A metaphor of peace, such as the rainbow, or a symbol of patriotism, the Chilean flag, gave people a vision on which to fixate their emotions and an inspiration to communicate. This connection could be the reason the No campaign's images grabbed viewers' attention, because they helped people identify reality and formulate political perceptions. The commercials and art that sprang from the No campaign's movement against Pinochet told the story of repressed, silent citizens. The unified voice of oppressed Chileans could be heard through the No campaign, giving them the ability to take action towards change, to finally stand up and say, "No."

Interestingly, no oppressive force told the Chilean people that they had to say "no" to Pinochet. They were not bullied into speaking against him, but were invited to participate in the discussion. In Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Paulo Freire, Brazilian scholar, suggests,

“Dialogue with the people is neither a concession nor a gift, much less a tactic to be used for domination. Dialogue, as the encounter among men to ‘name’ the world, is a fundamental precondition for their true humanization” (137). The act of saying “no” to Pinochet was a step in the healing process for Chileans after the many human rights violations they experienced. As Freire asserts, “The newness of revolution is generated within the old, oppressive society; the taking of power constitutes only a decisive moment of the continuing revolutionary process. In a dynamic, rather than static, view of revolution, there is no absolute “before” or “after,” with the taking of power as a dividing line” (137). There is no point at which we can say the revolution began in Chile, regaining power of their country is still a movement in progress.

Because of citizens’ persuasive artistic forms, Chileans live much differently than during Pinochet’s dictatorship. The people are now able to walk, speak, and write freely because of artistic and political contributions. The people of Chile fought creatively and artistically for liberation from repression. Chile is a country that demonstrated how political art promotes peace and can potentially free a nation. Chile’s silent power was demonstrated by “workers [who were] determined to reclaim their old strength . . . the regime had brutalized or killed . . . By not using violence that would heighten repression, and by inspiring the help of outside institutions and governments, this inchoate but resilient movement became the lever that dislodged the dictator” (Ackerman par. 3). The people rose above violence and used political art to regain control of their country, their lives, and their voices.

The No campaign’s artists’ messages, although directed towards a national audience remain a reoccurring theme seen in many works for advocacy, recognition, and justice for the

people; this is something the people never received, as Pinochet, the man who inflicted so much pain and suffering on their country's people, was never brought to justice and has recently died. The wounds of the country remain fresh, and during the time that I spent in Chile, I found that the people found discussing this recent part of their past too painful. Throughout this study, even while trying to contact my friends and teachers in Chile, I found they were grateful and honored to hear of my investigation, but they were hesitant to answer any questions about their reactions to the No campaign's commercials or Pinochet in a formal interview. Although there is still hesitance among Chileans about discussing the past, there is a large group of brave poets who wrote to speak out and spread the truth about the tortures that occurred in Chile during the violence. These poets continue to write today, building upon "their common experience and tradition . . . [However,] [so]me of the references to the political and social situations are somewhat oblique, suggested or allusive rather than blatant" (73). Even though they continue to use digression when discussing, their work is metaphorically descriptive, evoking emotion in readers all over the world by sharing their experience, their efforts contribute to historical representations documenting their perceptions of Pinochet's violence and its aftermath. Whatever the result of this widespread truth, whether it is for recognition, advocacy, or an evocation of pathos, Chilean artists were brave enough during a time of oppressive censorship to stand up and put the truth out there, laying their lives on the line. Their literary contribution contributes to discourse about Chile's past, present, and future.

Today, Chile has become a democratic society with an economy thriving above all others in Latin America. Despite their individual success, during the pursuit to spread and preserve democracy, the United States continues to take special interest in the politics of

Chile. The Committee on Foreign Relations intends to promote and protect democracy according to the following guiding principle: “Democracy backsliding anywhere is a threat to democracy promotion everywhere: failure to check democracy backsliding in any given country harms democracy promotion efforts worldwide” (Lugar 2). In “Nongovernmental Organizations and Democracy Promotion ‘Giving Voice to the People’: A Report to Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations United States Senate,” Richard G., Lugar, Chairman discusses the current political situation in Chile and suggests they still remain a developmental democracy. According to Lugar, the committee’s staff traveled to Chile to evaluate their political situation and found that, “since the return to democratic rule in 1990, Chile has made significant progress toward rebuilding the institutions of democratic government, but more is possible” (6). Lugar continues to identify the particulars that could improve Chile’s democratic situation suggesting that, “Chile’s legislature lacks the capacity and resources to represent fully the interest of its people . . . Elected officials rely heavily on think tanks as foundations for technical and political advice” (6). The problems Lugar identifies as obstacles of democracy seem to be problems that all democratic societies face. Also, it would be arrogant to suggest the United States is a perfect democratic society that represents the wishes of its entire people. Clearly, the problems the committee has identified with Chile’s democracy are problems that all democratic societies struggle with and share. Additionally, the fact that Chile relies heavily on think tanks demonstrates their commitment to continuing dialogue in the country, a strategy they worked hard to develop after Pinochet and has proven to be successful in the past.

Saying “no” became more than merely a step or movement it became the cultural and national identity of the people and influenced the current reality in Chile. The metaphors the

No campaign developed gave the oppressed citizens of Chile a voice to safely and silently speak out against Pinochet's violence. For Chile, metaphor proved to be the silent facilitator of peace and democracy. Because Pinochet's regime silenced their voices through violent oppression, the No campaign successfully employed metaphor to spread the truth and vote Pinochet out of power during the 1988 election. In the streets of Chile, the people still sing the jingle from the No campaign's commercials now that they are a free, democratic nation once again.

When speaking to my former host family in Chile about the fulfillment of No campaign's vision, they feel that their country is similar to the vision the campaign embraced; however, no democracy is perfect and the country still strives to reach that "utopia" they hoped for after Pinochet's dictatorship ended. It seems the people felt betrayed by Pinochet who had stolen their dignity and inflicted unnecessarily harsh punishment upon the people. Currently, the people are free, but that does not mean that there are not problems in the country. They still have not reached their desired level of democracy. Many people in Chile still feel frustrated about the unresolved past, with loved ones "disappeared" as the Chilean people say. Many missing prisoners and citizens vanished from their families in their own country and even now, remain unaccounted for by the new government. The people may never get answers to their questions, leaving an air of permanent frustration. The only certainty is their loved ones are unrecoverable. The hope of the No campaign still remains with the people today, the people detect little change in their day-to-day lives. Many promises of the government remain unfulfilled. There is democracy and arguably peace compared to the past, but without answers and closure, there is no peace of mind.

Although emerging forms of technology enable us to connect and continue dialogue towards peace, the world seems to exhibit as much violence as ever. Technology has progressed and created a new scene for more agents to act than ever, but have we, as communicators and members of the world community caught up with this advancement and taken advantage of the opportunity to facilitate change? As Doshier suggests, we can aid the resolution of problems worldwide by joining the discussion, but have we really utilized these new tools for entering into the international dialogue and making progress towards our ultimate purpose, peace?

When I heard of the political unrest occurring in Iran recently, it struck me as a chilling reoccurrence of the violence, censorship, and political turmoil Chile experienced in the 70s and 80s. As I am writing this, the Iranian people have been isolated to their country. Just as Pinochet did so many years ago, the Iranian government shut down communication with the outside world and even banned the use of internet. We consider ourselves a civilized, humanitarian world, but, like Iran, nations across the globe experience similar censorship and oppression daily.

When reflecting on what Chile overcame with limited technology and censored communication, it is clear that the actions of its citizens have international application. Every nation and citizen of the world can learn from the actions of Chilean agents and their artistic, nonviolent reaction to oppression. Currently, the Iranian people, like the Chileans, have courageously defied their government's censorship, acting as agents and speaking out against a government who has tried to silence them. The Iranian people refuse to be censored or silenced, and because of new scene created by modern technology, they are able to speak out against their government through the internet. Using Twitter, an internet communication and

networking site, Iranian people are anonymously sharing art forms illustrating the violence in their country, such as photos, video footage, and first-hand descriptions of human rights abuses, opening up the scene on an international level, providing onlookers from other nations, the opportunity to act as agents as well. Like the No campaign and the oppressed Iranian people, refuse to be victimized and can share their art with the world and speak up against censorship and violence using television and the internet. With advancing technology there is no reason for any person to passively accept oppression in any society. Every individual can become an agent, take action, and join the dialogue. Just as Chileans said “no” to Pinochet in 1988, we can join the conversation they initiated and honor their revolutionary step by saying “NO” to censorship in Iran and throughout the world.

Works Cited

- Ackerman, Peter and Jack DuVall. "A Force More Powerful." St. Martin's P 2000.
<www.aforcemorepowerful.org>.
- Adams, Jacqueline. "Art in Social Movements: Shantytown Women's Protests in Pinochet's Chile." Sociological Forum. 17. (March 2002): 21-53. Academic Search Premier. EBSCO. Western Carolina University, Hunter Lib. 6 Nov. 2007.
- A Force More Powerful. Screenplay by Steve York. Dir. Steve York. Perf. Ben Kingsley, narrator. York Zimmerman Inc, 2000.
- Anderson, Jon Lee. "The Dictator." The New Yorker. 19 Oct. 1998.
<www.newyorker.com/archive/1998/10/19/1998>.
- Aristotle. "Rhetoric." Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. The Rhetoric and the Poetics of Aristotle. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.
- Aylwin, Azócar, Patricio. Personal Interview (unpublished) August 1, 2002. Michael J. Lazzara "Memory Scripts in the Making: Chile's 9/11 and the Struggle for Meaning." A Journal on Social History and Literature in Latin America. 5.1 (2007): 243-252.
<www.ncsu.edu/project/acontracorriente>.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. Art and Answerability: The Early Essays. Trans. V. Liapunov. Ed. Michael Holquist and V. Liapunov. Austin: U of Texas P, 1990.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "From Marxism and the Philosophy of Language." Ed. Patrician Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. The Rhetorical Tradition. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001.
- Burke, Kenneth. "A Grammar of Motives." Ed. Patrician Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. The Rhetorical Tradition. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001.

Benjamin, Walter. The World of Art in the Age of its Technical Reproducibility and other Writings on Media. Ed. Michael W. Jennings, Brigid Doherty, and Thomas Levin.

Cambridge, Massachusetts: the President and Fellows of Harvard College, 2008.

Brown, Juanita, David Isaacs, and The World Café Community. The World Café. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2005.

“Canción del Si.” 7 July 2008

<<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bT4XmoBdQ6E&feature=related>>.

“Chile- Defeat of a Dictator.” A Force More Powerful.com. 17 May 2009.

<<http://www.aforcemorepowerful.org/films/afmp/stories/chile.php>>.

“Chile: 16,000 Secret U.S. Documents Declassified.” 13 November 2000.

<<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/news/20001113/#docs>>.

Chile’s Transition to Democracy: The 1988 Presidential Plebiscite. Washington, D.C.: The National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, 1988.

Dosher, Anne W. “Can We Talk in Through?” Juanita Brown, David Isaacs, and the World Café Community. The World Café: Shaping our Futures Through Conversations that Matter. San Francisco, California: Berrett-Koeler Publishers Inc., 2005.

Duchamp, Marcel. The Writings of Marcel Duchamp. Ed. Michel Sanouillet and Elmer Peterson, New York: Da Capo Press, 1989.

Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc., 2007.

Garnica, Gabriel. “The Significance of Seven.” The Daily Catholic. 17 Dec. 2005.

<<http://www.dailycatholic.org/issue/05Dec/dec17gab.htm>>.

Haynes, Deborah J. “Bakhtin and the Visual Arts.” A Companion to Art Theory. Ed. Paul

- Smith and Carolyn Wilde. 292-302. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing Company, 2002.
- LaMay, Craig L. "Civil Society and Media Freedom: Problems of Purpose and Sustainability in Democratic Transition." The International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law. 7 (2004). <http://www.icnl.org/knowledge/ijnl/vol7iss1/special_2.htm>.
- Lugar, Richard G., Chairman. "Nongovernmental Organizations and Democracy Promotion 'Giving Voice to the People': A Report to Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations United States Senate." 22 Dec. 2006. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office. <http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2006_rpt/democracy.html>.
- Muravchik, Joshua. Exporting Democracy: Fulfilling America's Destiny. Washington, D.C.: AEI Press, 1991.
- Neruda, Pablo. "The Dictators." Against Forgetting: Twentieth Century Poetry of Witness. Ed. Carolyn Forché. 574. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1993.
- Reed, T.V. The Art of Protest. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 2005.
- Reposos. Ed. Antonia Thompson. Dec. 2008. The Hemisphere Institute. <<http://www.hemisphericinstitute.org/cuaderno/reposos/index.html#>>.
- Richards, I.A. The Philosophy of Rhetoric. London: Oxford UP, 1936.
- Richards, Nelly. The Insubordination of Signs: Political Change, Cultural Transformation, and Poetics of Crisis. Durham: Duke UP, 2004.
- Running, Thorpe. "Responses to the Politics of Oppression by Poets in Argentina and Chile." Hispania 73. (Mar. 1990): 40-49. Academic Search Premier. EBSCO. Western Carolina University, Hunter Lib. 6 Nov. 2007 <<http://search.ebscohost.com>>. <<http://www.hemisphericinstitute.org/cuaderno/reposos/index.html>>.

Spooner, Mary Helen. Soldiers in a Narrow Land: The Pinochet Regime in Chile. Berkeley: U of California P, 1994.

Stern, Steve. Battling for Hearts and Minds: Memory Struggles in Pinochet's Chile, 1973-1988. Duke UP: Durham, 2006.

Stern, Steve, Remembering Pinochet's Chile. Duke UP: Durham, 2004.

Suarez, Adolfo. "Statement of International Observer Delegation." 6 October 1988. Chile's Transition to Democracy: The 1988 Presidential Plebiscite. Washington, D.C.: The National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, 1988.

Tironi, Eugenio and Guillermo Sunkel. "The Modernization of Communications: The Media in the Transition to Deomocracy in Chile." Richard Gunther, trans. Democracy and the Media. Richard Gunther and Anthony Mughan, ed. Cambridge UP: New York, 2000.

Verdugo, Patricia. Chile, Pinochet, and the Caravan of Death. Trans. Marcelo Montecino. Miami, Florida: North-South Center Press of University of Miami, 2001.

"Video del NO." 7 July 2007 <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B7AswZukDvM&NR=1>>.

Winn, Peter. 'Without Yesterday There is No Tomorrow': Richard Lagos and Chile's Democratic Transition." Footnotes: Newsletter of the American Sociological Association. 35.2 (Feb. 2007).
<<http://www.asanet.org/footnotes/feb07/indexone.html>>.