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Introduction

In November 2013, Chile held its sixth round of presidential elections since the fall of the dictatorship of General Augusto Pinochet (1973-1990). The two candidates, the former president Michelle Bachelet and the current Labor Minister Evelyn Matthei are daughters of Air Force generals; their fathers’ fates highlight the contrasting experiences of dictatorship. Bachelet’s father was killed by torture soon after the military’s assumption of power in 1973, while in contrast, there is good evidence that Matthei’s father was not only present in the Air Force academy when General Bachelet was killed but may have had something to do with his death.1 Michelle Bachelet herself was detained, tortured, and exiled by the dictatorship, while Matthei spent the era as a member of pro-Pinochet youth organizations.2

Matthei’s and Bachelet’s politics and backgrounds personify the ongoing debate over how to remember Pinochet and his era. The media’s emphasis on the candidates’ conflicting relationships with dictatorship in the months leading up to November’s election represents the strong presence public memory of the dictatorship continues to have in Chile. The year 2013 also marks the 40th anniversary of the September 11, 1973 military coup that overthrew the democratically elected socialist president Salvador Allende and established the Pinochet dictatorship.3 Each year’s recognition of the military coup’s anniversary is defined by the conflicting discourses of celebration and outrage as Chile remembers its past. In Chile, the term memory does not imply nostalgia nor refer to a concluded past. Rather, memory is treated as an ongoing reflective and analytical process through which Chileans constantly evaluate their past and make meaning out of their history.4 The collective process of remembering, public memory, is defined in this essay as the relationship between the Chilean public’s view and treatment of the past within the present and the role of the past in the present moment.
Chileans commemorated the coup’s 40th anniversary in 2013 in new ways that indicated a shift in the public’s treatment of the past and the ways in which the dictatorship’s legacy is perceived. As the Chilean historian Carlos Huneeus notes, the dictatorship had two faces: “The new authoritarian government gave birth to a dual state with two opposing but intimately linked faces: one characterized by political coercion and the other by the promotion of economic freedom.” This political coercion and social repression that began as the military seized power, characterized by human rights abuses and forced disappearances, has been criticized within Chile by religious and human rights groups since 1973. However, the dictatorship’s political and economic legacy, the 1980 constitution and the neoliberal economic reforms that promoted high levels of growth but drastically widened the social gap, was neither questioned nor tied to the dictatorship’s legacy by the Chilean public until a surge of social movements and protests in the year 2011. Through connecting the reflective memory discourse of dictatorship to current social action attacking the system at its foundation, forty years later, Chileans have begun to openly question the both the human rights and economic legacies, a criticism that has come to define the discourse surrounding the coup’s 40th anniversary and the presidential election in 2013.

During the transition from dictatorship to democracy (1990-2006), public memory was defined by efforts to deal with the legacy of social repression. The new democratic government initiated a top-down process to define the history and memories of dictatorship as they moved towards the future. Their focus was reconciling with social repression and trauma through truth commissions and dialogue tables that sought to foster a new consciousness of human rights. The public memory of the transition can be defined as a passive reconciliation with the history and legacy of the Pinochet dictatorship. The government’s acts of reconciliation were more cathartic than reformatory, and were received fairly quietly by Chileans who were still recovering on a
personal and community level from 17 years of repression and trauma under the Pinochet dictatorship. Here, the descriptor passive does not intend to imply inertness or inactiveness, but simply seeks to acknowledge that commemorative action during Chile’s transition to democracy was not at the Chilean public’s initiative.

As the transition came to a close, the sociopolitical backdrop against which the public memory debate played out began to change as the younger generation, born into democracy, took to the streets demanding free and better quality higher education in 2006, and more forcefully in 2011. In the last few years, the students’ demands have escalated into a deeper rooted criticism of the economic model implemented by Pinochet, disrupting the public memory narrative by expanding it to include debate over the dictatorship’s economic legacy. As indicated through current protests and political graffiti, Chilean society is making new connections between the current political, social, and economic institutions and their roots in dictatorship. Led by the generation born into democracy, referred to by older generations as the “generation without fear,”8 Chileans have restarted a comprehensive discussion of the past in relation to the current moment at the grassroots level, changing the public memory narrative by criticizing and actively questioning the entire system put into place by the dictatorship.

The coup, as the event that began the dictatorship, is widely recognized as the moment of rupture from which Chile started to change. If one were to imagine Chile’s current social, political, and economic institutions as a tree, the roots of this tree would be the dictatorship due to the systematic changes it implemented. Just as a tree would not stand without its roots, modern Chile would not exist as it does without the dictatorship. This is a phenomenon examined by the famous Chilean sociologist Tomás Moulian in his book Chile actual: anatomía de un mito in which he argues that “current Chile is a product of dictatorial Chile.”9 The coup’s 40th
anniversary provided Chileans with an opportunity to examine the connections between the divisive past and turbulent present moment and reframe the historical debate over the context of the coup and the realities of dictatorship. In 2013, Chileans are connecting the ongoing reflective process of remembering the dictatorship to current mobilization against a set of social, political, and economic realities they see as unjust, creating a whirlwind of demands for widespread institutional change.

This essay seeks to unpack the changing nature of the public memory discourse as it is tied to Chile’s commemoration of the Pinochet military coup’s 40th anniversary and the unique current moment. Stemming from a historiography of “Chile in transition,”10 from both Chile and the United States, this essay seeks to combine the existing scholarship with the emotions, voices, and realities of the current moment in order to extend the historical debate beyond 2010. After a discussion of the historical context of the Pinochet coup and dictatorship, it will discuss the nature of public memory during the transition (1990-2006), and conclude with a section examining the current changing nature of public memory in Chile. This third and final section is based in seven weeks of field work conducted by the author in July and August 2013, including personal testimonies and reflections from 30 Chileans ages 23-71 with varying occupations and political preferences. Some interviewees chose to be identified by a pseudonym while others preferred to use their first name. Names that appear in quotations and those referenced by only their first names are people interviewed by the author; their last names are eliminated in the interests of protecting their identity.

During the 40th anniversary and election year of 2013 Chileans took up the ongoing memory debate as they do every year in recognition of the Pinochet military coup’s anniversary. However, within the social turbulence continuing from 2011 and the politically charged election
year, a shift in the public memory is evident through Chilean society’s conceptualization of injustice, the public perception of the past and its legacy, and the types of commemorative actions and where they initiate. **Forty years after the coup, Chileans’ treatment of the dictatorship has shifted from a passive reconciliation to an active questioning as the entire social and economic system implemented by Pinochet is rocked by criticism and debate.**

*The Allende and Pinochet Eras: The Foundation of the Memory Divide, 1964-1990*

The authors of a 1998 book released as part of the surge of scholarly work designed to help Chile come to terms with its recent past stated, “There could not have been a coup of state without a preexisting state of coup.” As suggested by this play on words, the Pinochet coup did not come out of nowhere, but came from a situation that provoked it. What Roberto Manuel Antonio and Carmen Garretón Merino refer to as the “state of the coup” began with the tidal wave of Marxist revolutionary ambitions that swept across Latin America in the wake of Cuba’s 1959 Communist revolution under Fidel Castro. These rising revolutionary ambitions in conjunction with the worldwide ideological tug-of-war that was the Cold War shaped Chile’s political and social patterns during the era. According to Patricia, a prominent rightist Chilean historian, revolution came into the picture in 1964 after the election of the center-left Christian Democratic President Eduardo Frei Montalva. Frei began a gradual process of structural reform, including agrarian and union reform. While the government began to initiate reforms from above, the demand for social change escalated from the lower and middle class masses in the form of student protests and the rise of leftist extremist groups. Frei’s progressive presidency and the increasing popular radicalization foreshadowed the tension that characterized the late 1960s and early 1970s under Allende.
The growing radicalism was affirmed in the year 1970 when the socialist candidate Salvador Allende of the radical leftist Popular Unity Party (UP)\(^*\) was elected president as part of this wave of revolutionary fervor. As early as his election victory, as he assumed power with just 36% of the vote\(^17\), Allende’s presidency was under a shadow of tension and polarization that grew over the course of his 1000-day term.\(^18\) Although in the 1970 election 36% was the highest percentage of votes received by any candidate, the low number was a product of the political divide that split Chilean society.\(^19\)

The low percentage of votes indicates the political divisions and tensions that charged the atmosphere of the era. Despite these tensions, Allende came into power with lots of popular support as his political project was appealing to a wide-ranging population.\(^20\) Allende, who represented a democratic path to socialism, did not intend to break with the established Chilean democratic traditions.\(^21\) He intended to revolutionize society through a series of structural reforms while keeping the framework of democracy intact. Allende accelerated the revolutionary reforms started by Frei through a series of nationalizations and began a nationwide transition to socialist planned economic policies. The ultimate goal in these processes was to evenly spread economic and financial resources throughout the highly stratified Chilean society.\(^22\) However, by 1972, despite Allende’s good intentions, he implemented his planned economic policies too quickly, and the economy started to spiral out of control, plagued by hyperinflation, extreme shortages of food and goods, and massive workers strikes.\(^23\)

During the latter half of Allende’s presidency, the political and societal divisions that later translated into a divided memory discourse of the Allende and Pinochet eras began to become to come clear. Chile’s ideological students and working class and peasant masses were ecstatic with

\(^*\) The Popular Unity Party was a coalition of Chile’s communist, socialist, and radical parties.
the direction the country was headed, thanks to Allende’s revolutionary platform.\textsuperscript{24} On the other hand, the conservative elite that had until 1970 dominated Chile’s economy and politics weren’t so pleased with his policies. The nationalization campaigns eliminated some of the elite’s wealth while the food shortages and radical climate struck fear in the upper tiers of society.\textsuperscript{25}

By 1973, inflation was soaring, food shortages and long lines for basic goods had become “society’s daily bread,”\textsuperscript{26} and Allende himself was struggling to keep the fraying fabric of Chilean democracy together.\textsuperscript{27} On August 22, the Chamber of Deputies, the lower house of the Chilean Congress, issued a document delegitimizing his presidency through arguing that Allende’s structural reforms violated national law. The document came as part of an extensive debate within Congress to try to find a democratic exit to the crisis. As Ricardo, a former congressman who was present for the debate remembers, the political polarization led to an unsuccessful dialogue.\textsuperscript{28} The possibility of achieving a democratic solution did not seem likely, and before the politicians could find a solution, the military stepped in.\textsuperscript{29}

September 11, 1973, a day recognized as a “painful date”\textsuperscript{30} for some Chileans and a “sigh of relief”\textsuperscript{31} for others began when the city of Valparaiso was taken over by the Chilean armada.\textsuperscript{32} In the capital city of Santiago, the day of the coup was extremely tense and violent.\textsuperscript{33} By 12:00 noon the air force had begun bombing \textit{La Moneda}, Chile’s presidential palace, and tear gassing its interior while only Allende and a few of his advisors remained inside.\textsuperscript{34} The change was sudden and dramatic. As the well known leftist historian Sergio describes, “Chile changed radically within a few hours. The Chile that one woke up in that morning and the Chile at the end of the day that September 11th were two absolutely different Chiles.”\textsuperscript{35}

September 11, 1973, ushered in 17 years of a hardliner military dictatorship under General Augusto Pinochet. The violence that characterized the coup foreshadowed the systematic
oppression that would target Allende supporters, leftist politicians and their families, and the poor that had for the first time enjoyed economic resources under the Popular Unity government. It is important to clarify, as the historian Macarena Gomez-Barris notes, the coup was not a decision made by “a few rogue military men.” Rather, it was a reinforcement of the social and economic stratification that had characterized Chilean society since its colonial days as Pinochet’s policies tilted the social balance back in favor of the traditional Chilean elite. For this reason, the coup and dictatorship were welcomed by the elite.

Pinochet’s dictatorship reversed Allende’s reforms by implementing the neoliberal model that still makes up Chile’s political and economic framework. In the late 1970s, Pinochet began a series of economic reforms based on the school of Milton Friedman and the University of Chicago, reforms that have been referred to by Chile’s leftist historians as a “capitalist revolution.” Chilean economists sought to design an economic model based on anti-inflation policies, financial reform, and attracting foreign investment. Thus began what New York Times journalist Larry Rohter describes as the “every man for himself scramble for economic gain.” The plan was referred to as “shock economics” due to its rapid implementation and almost immediate impact. Moulian points to these economic changes as the basis for the greatest success of dictatorship: a complete change in Chilean mentality. The history professor “Lucia” paraphrased Moulian: “We stopped being citizens to become clients.” Everyone I interviewed recognized Chilean society’s change in mentality due to Pinochet’s reforms, indicating Chileans’ clear perception and understanding of modern Chile’s roots in dictatorship.

The second major institutional change Pinochet set into place was a new constitution in 1980. It was designed to consolidate his authoritarian project by establishing a legal basis for his political platform and economic reforms; this is the constitution that still stands in Chile. The
constitution was designed to legitimize his rule that had assumed power through illegal means and was a step down the road to what Pinochet hoped would be an authoritarian democracy under his leadership. To create this semi-democratic façade and build on his constitutional legitimacy, the 1980 constitution called for a plebiscite in 1988 in which Chileans could vote yes or no to decide if Pinochet would continue in office for 8 more years. However, this potential expiration date proved to be what Huneeus calls the Pinochet regime’s “Achilles heel.” Pinochet, who incorrectly assumed that those who didn’t support him were an unorganized “alphabet soup,” lost the plebiscite, and was forced to hand power to a democratically elected civilian president in order to preserve his legitimacy. Elections were scheduled for 1989. The president of the Christian Democratic Party, Patricio Aylwin, won and assumed the presidency in March 1990.

As the experiences of Matthei and Bachelet, the presidential candidates of 2013 illustrate, Chile was and continues to be divided into two groups with regards to how society reflects on the past: those that supported Pinochet and his political project, economically benefitted from his reforms, and comfortably lived behind an elite curtain, and Chileans who did not support Pinochet who spent the dictatorship in fear, under constant repression, mourning disappeared or exiled loved ones, and sadly watching the dictatorship dismantle a political project they had benefitted from. As indicated by intellectuals such as Sergio and Tomas Moulian, modern Chile is firmly rooted in this challenging and divisive era. In order to understand the ways in which Chileans remember the dictatorship, it is necessary to understand the history and polarized experiences of the era.

During Chile’s transition to democracy (1990-2006), Chileans began to acquaint themselves with the atrocities of the recent past. After living under censorship and repression for so long, Chileans began to reflect on and search for answers about what had happened during the dictatorship, giving the challenging history a prominent presence in public spaces. However, 17 years of the Pinochet dictatorship’s repression had marked and traumatized Chileans, many of whom were still unable to talk about what they had seen or experienced. As historian Steve Stern writes, “Chileans use the cultural metaphor of an open wound, an awful hurt that fails to heal.” The transitional government, led by Patricio Aylwin and the Concertación, a leftist political coalition, had to determine whether to shove the past under the rug, or examine it in order to learn and reflect. Defining a memory narrative by creating a place for these memories within society was a task taken up by the new democratic government. Under the Concertación’s leadership, Chileans approached the questions of how to remember the figures and eras of Allende and Pinochet and how to build towards the goal of personal and societal reconciliation.

The transition of 1990-2006 was limited by the strong presence of the past as Pinochet continued as the head of the Armed Forces through 1998. As Stern notes, the legacy of state terror was intact as long as Pinochet was still alive. The reconciliation process was further limited by a few instances in the early 1990s where Pinochet reminded the government through moments of armed uprising that in holding military power, he held hard power in Chile. These instances were stark reminders of the dictatorship’s proximity and the precarious nature of Chile’s newly reestablished democracy.

* The Concertación or the Concert of Political Parties for Democracy is a political coalition comprised of the Christian Democratic Party, the Socialist Party, the Socialist Democrat Radical Party, the Party for Democracy, and as of 2013, the Communist Party. It held executive power in Chile from 1990-2010 and will likely return to power in 2014.
As Chile moved into democracy in the early 1990s, Chileans perceived the dictatorship’s legacy as Pinochet’s continued presence as the head of the Armed Forces and the sense of fear that still perpetuated their lives. Its legacy additionally continued in the form of Pinochet’s economic model and constitutional reforms however these legacies were not recognized in the public sphere such as the media, the street, public spaces, and academia. During the transition, the still traumatized Chileans did not question nor discuss the economic face of the dictatorship as pointed to by Huneeus.

The differences in the actual legacy of dictatorship and the legacy Chileans perceived are reflected in Chilean society’s conceptualization of injustice during the transition. Injustice was personified by the military figures that had been part of the state-sponsored apparatus of torture. Chileans did not connect the institutional legacy, the economic model and constitution, to their idea of injustice, reflecting the predominant concern with recovering from social repression and human rights violations. The Concertación government’s reconciliatory actions also reflect this concept of injustice as they also did not include the economic and constitutional legacies in their approach to themes of dictatorship.

Despite Chileans’ desire for knowledge, the memory debate during the transition passively entered the public sphere as the government was propagating the narrative of the moment. The memory debate did not develop at the public initiative, as the ways in which the Chilean public viewed and treated the past were influenced by President Patricio Aylwin and the Concertación’s top-down efforts to come to terms with 17 years of social repression and political coercion. The silence on the streets, the gradual healing process of looking for answers, and the emphasis on personal reconciliation with the dictatorship’s legacy of social repression defined the transition as a time of passive reconciliation with the memories, experiences, and history of dictatorship.
Public memory as a passive reconciliation refers to the fact that top-down efforts to construct the memory discourse were both intended by the government and calmly received by Chileans as part of a cathartic process with the goals of personal recovery and illuminating the atrocities of the dictatorship.

The Concertación made a number of symbolic efforts at reconciliation, however, the impact of these projects was limited by Pinochet’s continuing shadow. For example, in 1991, Aylwin called for Chile’s first Truth and Reconciliation Commission that sought to find out how many Chileans were detained and disappeared under the Pinochet dictatorship. The report, locally known as the Rettig report after the commission’s chairman Raul Rettig, concluded that 3,197 Chileans had suffered forced disappearance at the hands of the dictatorship. The Rettig Commission was a symbolic milestone that reflects the Concertación’s human rights discourse and society’s search for answers about the past. However, the commission fits the pattern of government initiated top-down memory making and reflects Chilean society’s passive reconciliation with the dictatorship’s social repression as it was received in the public sphere as simply part of a healing process and had a limited impact on greater reconciliation.

Additionally, as the title of the Rettig Truth and Reconciliation Commission reflects, the focus was on truth and reconciliation rather than justice. The military and police officers who had committed human rights crimes during the dictatorship had not been arrested even though Pinochet had failed to put into place a Chilean equivalent of Argentina’s final stop law* so the generals and military officers responsible for torture, disappearance, and other forms of human rights violations were not immune from prosecution. Yet, neither Aylwin nor his successor

---

* Argentina’s “Punto Final” or “Final Stop Law” made those who had worked within the institution of the military government immune to persecution for the crimes they had committed while wielding power. See Huneeus, The Pinochet Regime, 434.
Eduardo Frei Ruiz-Tagle initiated an all-out justice process due to Pinochet’s threatening presence and continued monopoly on military power. The Concertación’s lack of judicial action led many Chileans to point to the Rettig as a commission that did not advance the reconciliation process on more than an educative and therapeutic level.

Chileans’ view and treatment of the past in the 1990s was characterized by a gradual increase of personal testimonies of torture and historical works on the subject of dictatorship. Each new work, according to historian Steve Stern who was conducting field research in Chile at the time, almost immediately sold out of stores, indicative of a thirst for answers. Despite the thirst for answers, Chileans were merely absorbing information about the dictatorship rather than publicly debating or questioning the era and its legacy.

In addition to testimonies, as a means of personal and community reconciliation, human rights groups spearheaded the construction of memorials and museums that served to integrate this divisive and painful past into public space such as a monument to the disappeared in Santiago’s General Cemetery. Following the Aylwin government rhetoric of reconciliation with the dictatorship’s legacy of social repression, these monuments and memorials served a cathartic process through which Chileans could come to terms with the traumatic experiences of dictatorship. While these actions are not passive in the sense of being inert or inactive, their cathartic purpose and reflective nature served to bandage a societal wound rather than question or dispute the legacies of dictatorship. In this sense these actions can be seen as a passive reconciliation with the trauma and repression of dictatorship.

Pinochet’s shadow over the Concertación-led transition limited Aylwin’s ability to move forward from the traumatic past on more than a symbolic level. Despite efforts such as the Rettig Commission on Truth and Reconciliation, the Concertación’s desire to move forward led
to the formation of an official memory narrative, or as Leopoldo, a very sweet older man who is a guide at the public memory site and former clandestine torture center Londres 38 describes, an “oligarchic memory,” that sought to push the past under the rug. As the Chilean historian and theorist Nelly Richard writes, the official rhetoric “cancels its horrible past, increasingly separating and distancing the historical memory from an emotional network that previously resounded collectively.” To many Chileans, especially those who had experienced or witnessed torture, the official rhetoric of memory felt empty as it did not adequately capture the horrible experience nor seem to penetrate into Chilean society.

The Transition Transitions: From Passive Reconciliation to Active Questioning, 1998-2006

Although the pattern of top-down memory making continued to characterize the development of the debate, by the late 1990s, the public memory discourse from below had begun to change. The catalyst of this shift was October 1998 when while visiting Margaret Thatcher in London, Pinochet was arrested by a Spanish Judge for “crimes against humanity.” Pinochet’s arrest dramatically called up the ever-present question of how to remember him, the dictatorship, and the preceding chaos of Allende and the Popular Unity era. As Stern describes the impact of Pinochet’s arrest on public memory, “the reactivating of memory was like a relentless storm, hurling wind, rain, and objects against the wall of silence.” As the Chilean theorist and historian Nelly Richard writes, Pinochet’s arrest “brought the benefit of converting memory into a new zone of political enunciation and social intervention...opened memory to public use (the street, the press, the TV) as it critically rearticulated the texts of (history, social sciences) that fit suspiciously under the hegemonic official discourse.” Pinochet’s 1998 arrest changed the
public memory narrative as his involvement in torture and disappearance could no longer be denied and the theme of dictatorship became more prominent in public spaces.

Although Pinochet was eventually released and brought back to Chile to be tried at home where he was indicted and placed under house arrest, his criminal status served to jumpstart the justice process and led to a further investigation of human rights crimes which had previously been very limited. For example under the presidency of the second Concertación leader Eduardo Frei Ruiz-Tagle, the head of the secret police, Manuel Contreras, was jailed along with a few of his cohorts. Additionally, in conjunction with the new character of public memory, in 1998 Congress declared that September 11 was no longer a national holiday. This provided Chileans with the opportunity to dramatize their own memory narratives on the symbolic date of the coup. September 11, 1998, saw a nationwide candle vigil, marches, and protests contesting the past and its legacy in addition to cocktail parties and celebration. The activities on the coup’s 25th anniversary began an annual tradition of marches and protest on September 11.

The commemorative action and the ways in which the past was discussed in the coup’s 30th anniversary year of 2003 reflected the shift that had occurred as a result of Pinochet’s 1998 arrest. By 2003, Chileans felt that it was all right to publicly discuss issues of dictatorship. The entire year saw a surge in media coverage of the Allende era, the coup, and the dictatorship. According to “Javier,” a history professor in Santiago, “This was the first time that they commemorated [the coup] so massively and with such a huge media presence in the postdictatorship.” Throughout 2003, commemorations of the Popular Unity era, the coup, and the dictatorship monopolized scholarly work and the media. However, the general sentiment on the coup’s 30th anniversary was that Chile had overcome its difficult and divisive past, pointing to Chile’s position in 2003 at the peak of development under the continued neoliberal economic
The economic model was seen as the source of positive change rather than reviled as the backbone of an unjust system.

Despite the new climate of expression Chileans enjoyed in sharing their varied memories, the Concertación government continued to lead commemorative action as they had under Aylwin. In recognition of the anniversary year 2003, the Concertación President Ricardo Lagos launched a second truth commission on political imprisonment and torture, the Valech Commission. Its goal was to identify, provide a voice for, and make monetary reparations to Chileans who had suffered political imprisonment and torture during the dictatorship. The commission concluded that 33,221 Chileans had suffered political imprisonment and torture. The release of the Valech Commission report meant that the past the dictatorship had kept hidden had become common knowledge. The Valech was a major milestone for human rights groups who were given a voice through the Valech report. However, as Morelia, a torture survivor whose testimony is part of the Valech Report explained to me, the results had a limited impact as they weren’t widely published, left a huge amount of information out, and were treated as a conclusion rather than an opportunity to spark discussion. Morelia’s reflections show that despite the shifts in the public memory discourse after Pinochet’s arrest and the coup’s 30th anniversary, the memory debate was still a top-down reconciliation process that was met by the Chilean public in a quiet, non-confrontational manner.

The end of Chile’s transition to democracy was in part marked by the decline in Pinochet’s health and reputation. In 2004, a United States Senate subcommittee investigated all foreign bank accounts in the US in the wake of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. The subcommittee report shows that between 1994 and 2002 Pinochet stored $8 million in accounts, and had “taken illegal actions to prevent their discovery by US and Chilean authorities.”
more detailed investigation showed that Pinochet had over $27 million USD in accounts under his wife’s name, in tax havens, and under names taken from stolen passports in the Chilean civil registry.\(^8\) This fact sent his public image on a downward spiral as those that had continued to justify his rule throughout the transition began to separate themselves from him. The aging dictator’s image continued to decline until his death from natural causes in 2006.\(^9\) Pinochet’s death marked the end of an era as the shadow that had been cast over transitional Chile lifted, shedding light on the problematic aspects of the system he left behind.

Throughout the transition, the public memory discourse evolved and incorporated new information. However, the rhetoric of the era ignored the second face of dictatorship signaled by Huneeus. It dealt only with social repression and themes of torture and reconciliation but left out a discussion of the economic and constitutional legacies. In spearheading symbolic reconciliatory action, the governments of the transition neglected to address the dictatorship’s economic reforms and the growing social divide that grew out of them. As historian Macarena Gomez-Barris notes, “The Concertación transition solidified the capitalist economy.”\(^\)\(^1\) This fact has led many historians to point to the transitional era as a “restricted democracy,”\(^2\) or more humorously, “diet democracy.”\(^3\) Even as Pinochet’s arrest in 1998 challenged the public memory discourse and Chileans began to feel more comfortable talking about themes of dictatorship, efforts at reconciling with and commemorating this challenging past came from above in the government. Reflective of the Concertación’s approach to memory, the ways in which the Chilean public viewed and treated the past within the transitional moment was geared towards emotional reparation and personal understanding of the atrocities of dictatorship. By the year 2006, Pinochet’s decline and the rise of a younger generation born in democracy began to undo the transition’s memory discourse through mobilization at the grassroots level that actively
questioned modern Chile’s roots in dictatorship, a discussion that integrated the dictatorship’s economic legacy.

_Beyond the Transition: Challenging the Framework of the Past, 2006-2013_

In the year 2006, Chilean students took to the streets in protest of the education system. This protest, dubbed the penguin revolution after the school uniforms worn by the young protestors, was the first instance in which efforts to contribute to or change the memory debate came from below on the streets, rather than from above in the government. This was the first burst of public outrage directed at the model implemented by the dictatorship and maintained by the Concertación. The education system under fire has strong roots in dictatorship as Pinochet extensively privatized the education system as part of his economic reforms. A pamphlet put together by the Coordinating Assembly for High School Students connects current social goals to their roots in dictatorship: “we are the children of an individualistic and segregating model implemented in one of the darkest moments of our history;” the “darkest moments of our history” refers to the dictatorship. In attacking the education system, the students were protesting aspects of the continued economic and constitutional model implemented during dictatorship.

The penguin revolution provoked a shift in the public’s view and treatment of the past as it prompted Chileans to view the dictatorship as a model that had continued through the transition rather than a historical period with a concrete end date. As the fiery human rights activist Juana described to me, Pinochet and the dictatorship had come to be seen as a “system of installed abuse” that had inflicted pain and torture on Chileans’ physical bodies during dictatorship and continued to deprive Chileans of access to essential rights as detailed in the International Declaration of Human Rights. Through attacking the system at its core, the penguin revolution
brought the economic and constitutional legacies of the dictatorship into question in addition to the existing discussion of the human rights legacy. This event marked a shift in the public memory discourse as the debate began to move away from a passive reconciliation towards an active questioning of the legacy and institutions of the dictatorship.

The explosive sentiments of 2006 were reignited in the year 2011 when students again took to the streets contesting the privatized education system that stems from neoliberal reforms under dictatorship. Led by the younger generation born into democracy, these social movements have highlighted the extent to which Chile’s institutional model is rooted in dictatorship and repression. In drawing continuities between the dictatorship and the current moment, the social mobilizations have started to change Chileans’ view and treatment of the past. As “Javier” explained, “talking about free education or education as an implicit right dismantles a type of neoliberal subjectivity that the dictatorship left installed.” As the coup’s 40th anniversary in September 2013 drew closer, the social criticism raised by these social movements came to define the public memory discourse, one that paints the past as negative and problematic, emphasizing a need to break with the model of dictatorship. In approaching the overlap between memory and social action, as Pabla, a spirited student leader studying education in Santiago describes, there is a need within Chile to view memory as a basis for action. In reflecting on the past and the past’s role within the present, Chileans can learn and use that knowledge as a basis for enacting social change.

In contrast to 2006, the social movements that took to the streets in 2011 were challenged by a different political presence than what had defined the transition as Chile elected Sebastian Piñera, the most conservative president since the fall of the dictatorship in 2010. Piñera is an avid supporter of the model that came out of dictatorship and continues to justify the 1973 coup.
Piñera’s background and desire to boost the neoliberal system clashed with the anti-system demands of the protestors, creating a political tension around the social issues of the moment.

The social movements of 2011 began as movements contesting issues of education, environmental conservation, and indigenous rights with a specific set of demands, for example free and better quality education. In a conversation with Sebastian, a history student and the president of the student association at the oldest university in Valparaiso, it became clear that free education is the Holy Grail for Chilean youth. He sees the protests that attack the education system is an attack on the “privatization of social rights,”\textsuperscript{106} that includes basic services such as healthcare and education. As Sebastian described, “The dictatorship projects into today as the government conceives education as a consumer good…we say no. It has to be a universal right and treated as such. And it has to be guaranteed by the state.”\textsuperscript{107}

The social mobilization, led by Chile’s younger generations, has redefined Chilean society’s conceptualization of injustice. While during the transition, injustice was personified by the former military officials that committed crimes against humanity, the social movements have redefined injustice as a reality that perpetuates every aspect of modern Chilean life and stems from the neoliberal model implemented by dictatorship.\textsuperscript{108} The new desire to combat the system’s injustices has manifested itself as a strong desire to break with the model and implement change. Since 2011, protests have expanded to incorporate issues such as workers rights and access to healthcare. The demands put forth in 2011 have become more universal, contesting issues such as the continued and deepened social divide and the economic system that perpetuate a system that reproduces inequality.\textsuperscript{109}

Based on my field work, one of the dictatorship’s legacies that most concerns Chileans protesting today is the privatization of basic goods and services such as education and healthcare,
whose price tags are beyond what many Chileans can afford. As the 17-year old student Fernando Gonzalez articulated, “Ever since Chile returned to democracy we’ve seen how little by little they’ve sold off all of the services that we should have access to, and that includes education.”

This student refers to the consolidation of Pinochet’s economic model during the Concertación transition and the increasing inaccessibility of basic goods and services for Chile’s lower and middle class majority. The protests that have taken the streets since 2011 have adopted a very anti-system nature, calling for a break with this model established by dictatorship. As “Juan,” a younger history professor articulated, the mobilization is not tied to a political agenda. It is rather of an anti-institutional character; it is apolitical but radical.

The other main legacy that concerns Chileans today is the social and income gap. As the Chilean historian Manuel Gárate writes in his book *La revolución capitalista de Chile*, the economic reforms carried out by Pinochet created a new elite, commonly referred to as the “business class.”

This business class includes Chile’s oldest and wealthiest families and those that supported and therefore benefitted from Pinochet’s regime and policies. Within this business class, as a geography professor I interviewed who insisted his pseudonym be “Pumpkin Head” put it, there is a “perverse marriage between political, economic, and communicational power.” As “Pumpkin Head” suggests, there is not just a wealth imbalance but an imbalance of power in modern Chile, a legacy he and many others I interviewed connect to the dictatorship.

Another of the dictatorship’s legacies currently under fire is Pinochet’s 1980 constitution. As Pabla explained, “it [the constitution] didn’t change when we supposedly returned to democracy. We are under laws they made during dictatorship.” To Pabla, this suggests that Pinochet’s reforms remain at the core of the modern Chilean system, despite the democratic political system. As the leftist history professor Sergio told me, “the years of social movements-- of social
protest movements has generated a more empowered citizenship who is more reflective and more politicized.” This newly empowered citizenship Sergio describes seeks to break with the current model that has grown out of dictatorship. In criticizing the current model and its roots, the younger generation of Chileans has helped Chilean society as a whole understand the extent to which the dictatorship’s legacy perpetuates modern life and actively questioning the second face of the Pinochet regime as pointed out by Huneeus.

The connection between the economic and political realities and the legacy of dictatorship is one that has been made only recently as a result of a generational change. The younger generation leading current social action was born into democracy. As Chileans of the intermediate and older generations describe, this is the “generation without fear.” As the social work students Sara and Daniela explained to me, “we didn’t have that same fear to talk about what was happening.” As a generation that did not experience the climate of fear faced by their parents and grandparents, the younger generation of social protagonists has not been limited by the sense of fear the dictatorship installed in daily life, as their parents and grandparents have been. For the older generations who have struggled with this sense of fear, the younger generation represents hope. As Juana proudly exclaimed, “when there is a different generation, that is born and grows up without fear, it is a generation that can bring up these themes again…This is what they have been able to crystallize since the penguin revolution of 2006 and in 2011. This group of student leaders has pointed to this system which is a system designed to gain profit for a few people.” With their unique generational perspective and through their role as the leaders of Chile’s social mobilization, they are working towards one goal, a goal that Sebastian clearly summarized as “the goal is to put the brakes on neoliberalism.”
During the symbolic anniversary year of 2013, Chileans have connected the reflective and analytical process of memory to the realities the social mobilization and the generation without fear have clarified. As the historian “Mane75” explained, the connections between memory and social action have brought a unique character to the 40th anniversary of the coup: “I think that the 40th anniversary is special. Not because it’s 40 years but because Chile is seeing for the first time since the military coup a questioning of the economic model.”

Public memory in this anniversary year was shaped by what the Chilean novelist and screenwriter Roberto Brodsky described as a “climate of dissidence,” brought about by continuing social mobilization and the political debate leading up to the presidential election.

The anniversary’s overlap with a presidential election year created a unique context in which to reevaluate memory. As Isabel, the history professor and expert on the Chilean political right explained to me in July 2013, “I am under the impression that it [the 40th anniversary] will look at the past but as a projection towards the future. And in this context, the theme of the mobilizations and the demands will achieve significance in regards to the question of how we will construct a more just, more egalitarian, and more transparent society with greater access to opportunities-- a more democratic society.”

As “Pumpkin Head” described, the overlap between the coup’s 40th anniversary and a presidential election is an opportunity to reinforce the pillars of democracy and make further reparations with society. During the anniversary, Chileans actively questioned the past in recognition of the coup’s anniversary as society was forced to rethink the roots of the current economic and political model and the era from which it stemmed.

As the coup’s anniversary approached, connections between the social demands and the coup’s 40th anniversary became clear through the political graffiti plastered on walls and spray painted on the streets of Santiago, calling Chileans to participate in a national strike on July 11 in
the name of “all of us who have been screwed over these last 40 years.” 124 This graffiti uses the symbolic 40th anniversary year as a reason to demand institutional change. This “climate of dissidence” 125 and the merging discourses of public memory, social movements, and the presidential election gave the memory discourse in the military coup’s 40th anniversary year a distinct character and came to symbolize a set of goals for the future, goals actively contested in the public sphere.

These indications of change and the increasingly negative view of the dictatorship were explicitly presented in the results of a survey carried out by the Center for Studies on Contemporary Reality (CERC). This survey was a sequel to one carried out in 2003 that indicated that one third of Chilean society remembered the coup as salvation from Marxism, and 29% remembered the dictatorship as “good” or “very good.” 126 In contrast, the 2013 results indicated that 56% of Chilean society saw the dictatorship years as “bad” and only 8% remembered the era as “good.” 127 While a tiny percentage still justifies the coup through the dictatorial rhetoric of salvation from communism, a majority of society holds Pinochet responsible for breaking with democracy. As Huneeus, who is also the director of the CERC said, “the image of Pinochet has been worsening and the negative view of the regime has stayed.” 128 This is further indicated through the 76% of those interviewed that consider Pinochet a dictator as opposed to the slim 9% that consider him one of the greatest 20th century leaders. 129 The results of the CERC survey indicate the extent to which the public memory debate changed between 2003 and 2013 and has been influenced by the social mobilization since 2011.

In addition to the shifting social climate that has been forcing Chileans to critically view their country’s history in order to learn and enact change, numerous unprecedented commemorative acts took place in 2013, pointing to the unique nature of public memory this year. The Chilean
media approached the themes of memory, history, and dictatorship with a new openness that received enormous readership and viewership. One example is the TV miniseries *Chile: The Prohibited Images*, aired by the private channel *Chilevisión* to commemorate the coup’s 40th anniversary. The series doesn’t shy away from raw emotion and brutal honesty as it tells the story of many Chileans affected by torture and disappearance.¹³⁰ According to the social historian Pablo, this openness and honesty was reflected in the public sphere as well as the media: “I think that the over-exposition of themes of coup, dictatorship and above all of human rights violations brought about a level of discussion, conversation, and reflections in more daily circles. I had only seen this openly discussed on basic levels a few times before.”¹³¹

In the weeks before the anniversary itself, Chile was hit by a deluge of commemorative action in the form of official apologies. The flood began when the former head of the armed forces Juan Emilio Cheyre admitted that he’d handed over Ernesto Lejderman, the child of murdered left-wing activists for adoption during a string of Operation Condor¹³² disappearances.¹³³ Cheyre had spoken of the case before, but his declarations hadn’t been published until August 2013 upon which they went viral.¹³⁴ Shortly following news of Cheyre’s declaration, the senator from the ultra-rightist Independent Democratic Union (UDI) party, Hernán Larraín formally apologized for “not having sufficiently collaborated with the reconciliation”¹³⁵ and for his support of the Pinochet dictatorship.¹³⁶ Larraín represents the elite class of Chileans that supported the dictator and greatly benefitted by Pinochet’s economic program¹³⁷ which gives his apology a symbolic weight. His apology shows the extent to which conservative Chile has isolated itself from the dictator, but also highlights the greater questioning of Chile’s system and institutions implemented during dictatorship. Less than a week later, the Supreme Court issued an apology for the judiciary’s lack of action during the 1970s and 1980s with regards to human rights.¹³⁸
This unprecedented string of apologies was an unexpected turn in the public memory discourse, reflecting the convergence of the social movements and the reflective memory debate.

Leopoldo described memory as a battleground. His metaphor refers to the fact that in the significant anniversary year of 2013, the term memory refers to both a constant reflective process and a social responsibility to break with the past and enact change. Through actively remembering and analyzing Chile’s past, recognizing and calling attention to the roots of current social problems, in 2013, memory has become the arena in which Chileans dispute social problems rooted in dictatorship.

The overlap between the process of memory with Chile’s current social mobilization and the election year’s political debate makes clear the stakes of this memory debate. In looking back at the past and remembering Chile’s history of dictatorship, society has identified ways to move away from the pervasive model of dictatorship. The outcome of this heightened and changing public memory debate rests in the presidential election and whether or not Bachelet, who has been reelected as president, will follow through with her campaign promises. Although her platform has incorporated the popular call for constitutional reforms, many Chileans do not see Bachelet as coinciding with the sentiments put forth by the wave of social mobilization. Many Chileans are skeptical since in her first term as president, she continued the transition’s trend of consolidating the neoliberal model. The question at hand is whether or not Bachelet will be limited by the political situation or if her platform will embrace this reactionary discourse from below. Regardless of what will happen next, the 40th anniversary of Chile’s military coup and its convergence with the discourse of political and social change forcefully reopened the memory debate in a way that has actively questioned the legacy of dictatorship and the ways in which that legacy remains in Chile’s current system.
Conclusion

As Roberto Brodsky writes, “Chile lives these days in a way which a psychotherapist could easily describe as a mid-life crisis.”\textsuperscript{143} Chile’s public memory debate over how to remember Pinochet and his era has been constantly evolving since the transition to democracy, and now in 2013 finds itself in a position it has never been in before. As the transition from dictatorship to democracy progressed, the ways Chile publicly remembered its 1973 military coup, the dictatorship, and the figureheads of Allende and Pinochet shifted from a passive reconciliation with atrocity to an active questioning of the entire system.

Throughout the transition, the public memory discourse was linked only to the legacy of social repression and human rights violations as it sought to reconcile with personal trauma. However, as the justice process gained steam and Pinochet faded from the picture in the wake of his 1998 arrest, the public memory discourse has grown to incorporate a criticism of the economic model implemented by the dictatorship that perpetuates an unjust system. Through recent social mobilization, Chile’s younger generation has incorporated a debate of the dictatorship’s other face, the economic reforms that sparked growth but at a high social cost. Chile has come to realize, as the Chilean social historian Pablo puts it, that “we are playing on the court of dictatorship.”\textsuperscript{144}

The year 2013 was charged with a multi-faceted discourse of anti-system protest, election debate, and public memory. Converging with the discourses of social and political change, the memory debate served as a lens through which to view the political, legal, economic, and social foundations of modern Chile. The flood of commemorative material that occurred in late August and early September indicated a new societal awareness of the history and memories of the Pinochet dictatorship. Although the political, social, and economic impact of this changing
memory discourse remains unclear, the character of the debate has led to an active questioning of the system implemented by dictatorship and consolidated through the transition. The unprecedented quantity and unique nature of commemorative action in the Pinochet coup’s 40th anniversary year indicated that the tectonic plates of memory are shifting in the seismically active country of Chile.
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