

Journal Title: *Wide Screen*

Vol. 7, No.1, March 2018

ISSN: 1757-3920

URL: <http://widescreenjournal.org>

Published by Subaltern Media, 153 Sandringham Drive, Leeds LS17 8DQ, UK

A PAINFUL EDUCATION: THREE EXHIBITION SCENES FOR 1980S CHILEAN ACTIVIST DOCUMENTARY

DAVID GRAY

Abstract: During the 1980s in Chile, activist protest against the Pinochet dictatorship grew in force and number, with street protests and encounters with police becoming regular events. This protest movement also included increased political documentary activity as a number of collectives and activist groups began producing documentary videos and screening them clandestinely as well as distributing them through informal networks. In this paper, I look at three different exhibition sites for 1980s activist documentary in Chile, one in the later years of the dictatorship, and two in the postdictatorship. The three scenes, all educational in nature, are: 1.) The screening of a political documentary in a *población* (shantytown) outside Santiago, as part of a children's cinema workshop, as captured in Ignacio Agüero's film *Cien niños esperando un tren* (1988); 2.) The present-day exhibition of various clips from 1980's video documentaries at the Museum of Memory and Human Rights in downtown Santiago; and 3.) The inclusion of *Por la vida* (Pedro Chaskel and Pablo Salas, 1987) as one of a series of documentaries for which lesson plans were created by the Chilean National Human Rights Institute in 2013, as part of an initiative to guide educators in their use of documentaries to teach the history of the Pinochet dictatorship and facilitate classroom conversations about it. In tracing activist '80s documentary through these three contexts, I argue that some (but not all) exhibition in the context of education risks consigning the events of the 1980s captured in the documentaries too cleanly to a past that is viewed as isolated from the present. I also make a comparison between the idealization of the exhibition space as a site of mobilization during the New Latin American Cinema of the 60s, 70s, and 80s, and the way the representations of the combative spaces of 1980s Chile play out in the contemporary neoliberal spaces of Chile.

During the 1980s in Chile, activist protest against the Augusto Pinochet dictatorship that began in 1973 grew in force and number, with street protests and encounters between police and protesters becoming regular events. Part of this protest movement also included increased political documentary activity. A number of collectives and activist groups began producing

documentary videos, aided by the advent of U-Matic video technology in Chile, screening them clandestinely as well as distributing them through informal networks.¹ One of the first videocassette formats, U-Matic video was released in the early 1970s, and while never cheap enough to take off as a consumer product, it was a technology used in industrial and broadcast contexts. As Germán Liñero writes:

In Chile, after a brief pre-history that began in the 1970s, portable video was rapidly incorporated into the cultural resistance to the dictatorship. Originally conceived as serving the entertainment needs of families in a consumption and comfort scheme whose model was North American, the greatest users of video were the political and social sectors in opposition to General Pinochet's regime.

(Liñero 2010:10)²

The activist collectives that made use of U-Matic in the 80s included Ictus, Teleanálisis, Grupo Proceso, and Fasic, who found in the format not only a relatively inexpensive means of reaching a large audience, but a format which allowed for the clandestine dissemination of recordings. Video appealed to these groups because of its relative portability and lower cost, compared to 35mm or even 16mm film, and also because a number of community organizations, NGOs, and educational institutions were already equipped with U-Matic equipment (Traverso and Liñero 2014: 169).

Ictus is a theater group originally founded in 1955, and which continued to produce theatrical works with a sharp political edge, critical of the dictatorship, in the 1970s and 1980s. Ictus TV was founded in 1978, with the initial intention of turning theatrical productions into narrative videos and reaching a wider audience (173). Many early Ictus videos consisted of narrative fiction, but the group also began to shoot documentaries. The 1983 documentary *Chile's Forbidden Dreams*, produced by Edward Goldwyn for the BBC, contains rare footage of an Ictus screening.³ In a *población* (or shantytown) in the coastal city of Valparaiso a small group of residents are gathered in the living room of a private home to watch the video on a television, and the documentary lingers on their rapt faces. Antonio Traverso and Germán Liñero write that videos produced by activist collectives like Ictus “facilitated the development of a

¹ On this wave of documentary videomaking, see Traverso and Liñero. German Liñero has also created the online *U-Matic Project*, which catalogs an extensive list of productions made in the format between 1975 and 1995, including clips from some of the videos: <http://www.umatic.cl/index.html>.

² Author's translation.

³ The video being screened is *El 18 de los García* (1983), directed by Claudio Di Girólamo.

diverse and critical cultural ‘imaginary’ that countered the dominant picture of the nation as presented to the Chilean public through mainstream media” (169). Crucial to the dissemination of this imaginary were the creation of informal, clandestine or semi-clandestine networks of distribution and exhibition like those shown in the BBC film. These networks were remarkably extensive given their clandestine nature: Steve Stern writes that in “1985 and 1986, the 2,328 known Ictus screenings in Santiago reached 90,840 people” (*Remembering* 309).

State terror in Chile in the 1970s and 1980s relied on spatial control, and operated through the conversion of public space into a space of danger and fear, where some lived clandestinely, unsure of who they could trust, and some would walk by people they knew on the streets and not acknowledge each other out of fear. From Henri Lefebvre, we know that space is socially produced, and thus can never be taken as a given. Lefebvre writes that space produced socially

also serves as a tool of thought and of action; that, in addition to being a means of production it is also a means of control, and hence of domination, of power; yet that, as such, it escapes in part from those who would make use of it. The social and political (state) forces which engendered this space now seek, but fail, to master it completely; the very agency that has forced spatial reality towards a sort of uncontrollable autonomy now strives to run it into the ground, then shackle and enslave it

(Lefebvre 1991: 26)

In many respects, activist and political life in Chile moved into the home and other private spaces, though these spaces were not safe either given that many of the disappearances carried out by the dictatorships involved abducting people from their houses, often in the middle of the night. At the same time, consistent with Lefebvre’s description of how space can evade attempts by power to master it, public spaces were utilized for protest and were turned against state power in actions that were all the more remarkable given the threat of violence that permeated daily life. The portability of U-Matic video allowed for its use in conjunction with protests that were performative and carefully planned for a short period of time so that they could be begun and ended before the inevitable state response. This documenting function of video, coupled with its clandestine distribution and exhibition under dictatorship represents a challenge to the state mastery of these spaces. In the postdictatorship, spaces remained contested, and the instances of exhibition I consider below speak to this contestation.

In this essay, I follow 1980s activist documentary into three different exhibition scenes, one in the later years of the dictatorship, and two in the postdictatorship. The passage from dictatorship to democracy in Chile, secured by a 1988 plebiscite in which voters voted “No” to eight more years of Pinochet’s rule, functioned through the political coalition of several center-left parties into the Concertación party, which controlled the presidency from 1990 until 2010. The memories of Salvador Allende’s democratically-elected socialist government (1970-73), the September 11, 1973 military coup that brought a violent end to Allende’s government (and to Allende’s own life), and the Pinochet dictatorship that followed (1973-1990), were all heavily contested in the post-dictatorship. Steve Stern has characterized the years of transition to democracy in Chile as an impasse:

Cultural belief by a majority in the truth of cruel human rapture and persecution under dictatorship, and in the moral urgency of justice, unfolded alongside political belief that Pinochet, the military, and their social base of supporters and sympathizers remained too strong for Chile to take logical “next steps” along the road of truth and justice. The result was not so much a culture of forgetting, as a culture that oscillated—as if caught in moral schizophrenia—between prudence and convulsion. To an extent this was a “moving impasse.”

(Stern 2006: xxix)

The transition to democracy in Chile at once offered relief from the violence and terror of Pinochet’s dictatorship, but also failed to sufficiently work through the events of the dictatorship in the arenas of public memory. Macarena Gómez-Barris writes that in Patricio Aylwin’s inaugural speech, the first president in post-dictatorship Chile “chose to direct attention to the military and its ‘masculine spirit’ as a representation of the nation, rather than propose an open and public process for addressing its abominable role in dictatorship violence.” In the coalitional, consensus-based politics of the post-dictatorship, “[r]econciliation as a form of concealment operated through patriarchal pacts of transition, forcing closure over what had yet to be revealed” (25). This drive towards reconciliation before even allowing competing memories to emerge characterizes the postdictatorship period, especially the years immediately following the transition to democracy. The exhibition scenes studied in this paper, particularly the two in the post-dictatorship, are at once belated challenges to this reconciliation as concealment, and also artifacts of the lingering effects of the moving impasse of the transition to democracy.

The three exhibition scenes, all educational in nature, are: 1) The screening of a political documentary in a *población* (shantytown) outside Santiago, as part of a children's cinema workshop, as captured in Ignacio Agüero's film *Cien niños esperando un tren* (1988); 2) The exhibition, beginning in 2010 and ongoing, of various clips from 1980s video documentaries at the Memory Museum in downtown Santiago; and 3) The inclusion of *Por la vida* (Pedro Chaskel and Pablo Salas, 1987) as one of a series of documentaries for which lesson plans were created by the Chilean National Human Rights Institute in 2013, part of an initiative to guide educators in their use of documentaries to teach the history of the Pinochet dictatorship and facilitate classroom conversations about it. Following these video images of the dictatorship across time and space, and into the classrooms and museums of contemporary Chile, I attempt to show several distinct ways in which similar images are used to read history in the present. In tracing activist '80s documentary through these three contexts, I argue that some exhibition in the context of education risks consigning the events of the 1980s captured in the documentaries too cleanly to a past that is viewed as isolated from the present. Nonetheless, I also demonstrate that educational exhibition can, at its best, draw attention to underseen works, and encourage audiences to approach Chile's fractious history and memory through its present-day political reverberations. I also make a comparison between the idealization of the exhibition space as a site of mobilization during the New Latin American Cinema of the 60s, 70s, and 80s, and the way the representations of the combative spaces of 1980s Chile play out in the contemporary neoliberal spaces of Chile. Finally, a postscript will follow 1980s U-Matic video into a different context, that of its reuse in a fiction film, Pablo Larraín's *No* (2012). Before approaching our three exhibition scenes, a quick detour through the imagination of the site of exhibition in the New Latin American Cinema is in order.

The New Latin American Cinema and the Exhibition Site

The continent-wide movement of politically active filmmaking in Latin America referred to as the New Latin American Cinema, and usually dated from the 1960s to the 80s, typically conceived of the site of exhibition as a site of political mobilization and *concientización* (consciousness-raising).⁴ Perhaps the film that did the most to theorize and articulate this idea of

⁴ On *concientización* (or consciousness-raising) in the context of Latin American documentary see Chanan, 210. Chanan traces the genealogy of this term through the writings of Paulo Freire and the testimonial documentary filmmaking practice of Eduardo Maldonado and Grupo Cine Testimonio in Mexico, and Fernando Birri in Argentina.

the exhibition site was the monumental three-part Argentine film, *The Hour of the Furnaces* (1968), made by Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino, together with the collective *Grupo Cine Liberación* (Liberation Film Group). The film's radical form encompassed both its attempts to raise the consciousness of its viewers, and to include literal space for the viewer's response and discussion within the structure of the film's screening.⁵

The film commits itself to a rejection of spectacle, or any notion of the passive spectator, a form of spectatorship associated in Solanas and Getino's manifesto "Towards a Third Cinema" with First Cinema (Hollywood), which cannot extend beyond "cinema as a spectacle aimed at a digesting object" (42). "In their theoretical works, Cine Liberación developed several concepts, one of the most important of which is the *film-act*, which is based in the notion that the film is an excuse for action" (de la Puente and Russo, 72).⁶ At the beginning of part two of the film, "Act for Liberation," Solanas and Getino assemble a montage of images of imperialist war and anti-imperialist struggle in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, edited together with dynamic titles exhorting a tri-continental revolutionary movement. This opening is consistent with the form of part one of the film, "Neo-colonialism and Violence," which is the most famous and most-screened section of the film. But following this opening montage the screen goes blank, and we only hear the voice of the narrator for several minutes:

Compañeros, this is not just the screening of a film, neither is it a spectacle. It is, above all, an act. An act for Argentine and Latin American liberation. An act of anti-imperialist unity. ... The film is the pretext for dialogue, for searching, for finding volunteers. It is an open report that we put forward for your consideration, to debate it after the screening. It is important above all to create this united space, this dialogue of liberation. ... To end, we hand over to our *compañero*, the narrator, who from the screening hall will bring up to date the present circumstances, and the nature of this act.

An intertitle of a lengthy Frantz Fanon quotation follows, concluding "all spectators are either cowards or traitors."⁷ Then, the message "Space for the intervention of *compañero* narrator" appears on the screen. At this point at a screening in the 1970s, the film would have been stopped, one of the filmmakers or a narrator accompanying the film would have spoken, and a discussion among the audience members would have ensued, converting the site of exhibition into an extension of the film, and a site in which the film might spur the audience on to political

⁵ For a discussion of the film's fusing of avant-garde traditions and its openness, see Stam.

⁶ Author's translation. Original emphasis.

⁷ For a reading of Fanon's significant influence on the film, see Campo, 95-118.

action. This attempt to charge the space of screening is furthered by the fact that, as both Kriger and Stam point out, contemporary screenings of the film were carried out clandestinely, just as had been the case for the film's production. "To write a journalistic report, to transport a copy of the film, or to attend a screening, implied entering into a political participation that could be harshly suppressed by the police" (Kriger, 324). Because of the necessity of clandestine screenings, the exhibition venues for the screening of *The Hour of the Furnaces* were not conventional ones, and would have included "rooms improvised by popular, workers', or student organizations and spaces belonging to the Church of the Third World" (ibid). The mere spectatorship associated with First Cinema becomes impossible when attending a screening can be construed as a political act, carrying a significant risk for the audience. In addition, the unconventional screening venues removed the film from a screening context that audiences were familiar with, and this would also contribute to the film's efforts to work against the form of passive spectatorship that Solanas and Getino associated with First Cinema.

This conceptualization of the screening hall as a space fraught with both danger and potential, and the goal of creating "a united space" out of the act of screening a film, is characteristic of the Third Cinema call for the creation of a new, revolutionary cinema. The goals of Solanas and Getino's film also exemplify the tendency that Jane Gaines has referred to as "political mimesis," the idea that she uses to think through the potential for documentary films to produce social change. "Political mimesis begins with the body. Actualized, it is about a relationship between bodies in two locations—on the screen and in the audience—and it is the starting point for the consideration of what one body makes the other do" (90). Drawing on Linda Williams' discussion of body genres, Gaines argues that documentaries can have a similar mirroring effect on their audience although instead of making them "scream", "cry", or "come", as with body genres, they would "make audience members want to kick and yell, ... make them want to do something *because of the conditions of the world of the audience*" (ibid).⁸ In the case of *The Hour of the Furnaces*, however, there is an additional mediation, at least if we consider the ideal screening environment envisioned by the filmmakers at the time of the film's making. The film—and the screening conditions it posits—stages a mimetic relationship between bodies in two locations, but it is not only the singular link between the bodies on screen and those in the audience. There is also the figure of the "*compañero* narrator," the representative of the film in

⁸ Original emphasis.

the screening hall who interrupts the film, and potentially continues the film's historical narrative chronologically beyond the events covered by the film. The fact that the film includes planned stoppages for audience interaction also suggests the importance placed on the relationship *between* the bodies in the audience, and the emphasis on the film as a vehicle for both dialogue and other political action that will follow from the *concientización* of the audience.

This *compañero* narrator, the film's representative, spokesperson, or interpreter, has an analogous figure in a film by another stalwart of the New Latin American Cinema, the Chilean filmmaker Patricio Guzmán. *Chile, Obstinate Memory* follows Guzmán as he returns to Chile after the end of the dictatorship with a copy of his earlier film *The Battle of Chile* (1975-79). *The Battle of Chile* documents the final months of Allende's government in Chile, and films, *verité*-style, the events leading up to the September 11 coup that installed Pinochet's dictatorship. Because it was completed after the coup, when Guzmán had fled the military dictatorship into exile, the film had not had any official exhibition in Chile by the time Guzmán brought it back for the filming of *Chile, Obstinate Memory*. For my purposes here, I will focus only on those moments in *Chile, Obstinate Memory* in which Guzmán films audiences in the 1990s watching the earlier film. Whereas *The Battle of Chile* was a film at least partially intended, like *The Hour of the Furnaces*, to spur its viewers into political action,⁹ the purposes of its screening in *Chile, Obstinate Memory* are very different. Rather than prompting self-consciously political action, the screenings of the film elicit memories and affective response, memorably in the case of its screening for a group of students at the School of Gesture and Image, one of whom stares into the camera and sobs uncontrollably after the screening. Given the students' program of study, Juan Carlos Rodríguez entertains "the possibility that the students may have been performing for the camera" (72). This may be the case, but if so, it fits with the performative aspects of the film, which finds a wide variety of ways to perform memory, to bring the events of the past into the present-day spaces of Santiago, from which their traces had been so thoroughly eradicated, particularly at the time of filming in the mid-nineties.

In *Chile, Obstinate Memory*, we watch people on screen watching *The Battle of Chile*, but these screenings are staged for various different purposes. First, there are scenes in which Guzmán shows the film to former militants, activists, and bodyguards of Salvador Allende, and

⁹ Jane Gaines proffers *The Battle of Chile* as an example of political mimesis for its images of the "sensuous struggle" of masses of protesting bodies (91).

asks them to identify themselves or those they know in the footage. These identifications lead either to scenes in which those who recognized themselves reenact their activities—as in the case of the bodyguards, who then are filmed walking alongside a car moving slowly down an empty road, intercut with the footage of them in the same positions around a car carrying Allende—or in which those who appear in *The Battle of Chile* are confronted with their own images in the earlier film.

When Guzmán shows *The Battle of Chile* on a small television monitor to a group of former Allende supporters and asks them to identify anyone they recognize, two women identify Carmen Vivanco, whose face the camera pans over briefly. The film cuts to a shot of Carmen Vivanco in 1996, looking across a table at a monitor with the image of her face frozen in a frame from *The Battle of Chile*. Hesitant to recognize this image of herself, Vivanco says “It could be [me], but I have my doubts,” and seems to make manifest Elizabeth Bruss’ statement that “like frames around a picture, screens are simply the concrete manifestation of a barrier between the site of the perceptual stimulus and the site of the response; their presence underscores the cinematic lesson that objectivity ends where subjectivity begins” (308). The doubts that Vivanco expresses, which fly in the face of the certainty with which people who know her identify her younger image (and indeed, the audience’s own certainty seeing these two images of Vivanco side by side), might caution us against presuming to know how any cinematic image might be read by its audience. However, Vivanco’s inability, or unwillingness, to identify herself in the earlier image stands also in the film for Chile’s complex relationship with memory, particularly of the events before, during, and immediately following the coup. The film suggests that these events lurk, repressed, in Chile’s collective unconscious. Prompted by Guzmán’s offscreen voice, Vivanco lists the five members of her family who were disappeared—her husband, son, brother, sister-in-law, and nephew—each of their names recited slowly and in full, without any doubt. As Jorge Ruffinelli writes, “The time between the contemplated image of the past and her present includes the names of the five victims. In this interval, they ‘disappeared’” (292). Apart from clarifying why it might be painful or impossible to recognize an image of herself during the period captured in *The Battle of Chile*, her litany of names demonstrates those memories which are held close versus those from which she deliberately distances herself. Guzmán shows Vivanco’s face superimposed with her younger self in an image metonymic for the film’s

project, an attempt to hold together these two selves, the one young and idealistic, the other having lost her family, unwilling to recognize her younger self.

Solanas and Getino viewed the act of screening as a political act, and one that charged the screening site with potential, educating the audience and bringing them into revolutionary consciousness. In Guzmán's *Chile, Obstinate Memory*, the screening sites for *The Battle of Chile*, television monitors in ordinary rooms, become spaces of memorialization, a configuration that allows a temporary eruption of the past into the present. In a city in which most of the traces of the dictatorship had been destroyed or hidden—just as had the bodies of the disappeared—these fleeting and temporary memory spaces, made possible by the first film, and the way that Guzmán's onscreen figure shapes their representation in the newer film, express a resistant politics of their own. We shall see now how the screening of 1980s Chilean activist documentary in the context of education retains the usage of various interlocutors, but uses them in different ways to mobilize footage across historical and spatial gaps.

Scene One: Alicia Vega and the Children's Film Workshop

Ignacio Agüero's 1988 film *Cien niños esperando un tren* ("One Hundred Children Waiting for a Train"), relatively unknown outside Chile and Latin America, is one of the most celebrated documentaries within Chile.¹⁰ Made in the final years of the Pinochet dictatorship, the film follows film historian Alicia Vega and her *taller de cine para niños* (Children's Film Workshop). Vega would go into the *poblaciones* around Santiago, and invite children to join a workshop that would meet for 20 consecutive Saturdays. In the workshop documented in the film, the students would meet in a church, reconfigured as a classroom and screening hall; the opening scene of the film shows worshippers singing in the church as the sacristans take down the altar and replace it with an unfurled sheet to make a screen. The film then cuts to the same screen, now in darkness and surrounded by excited children awaiting the projection of a film. Over the course of the workshop, Vega gives the children, many of whom have never been to the cinema, a course in film history, showing films by the Lumière brothers (the film's title comes from a sequence in which the children watch *The Arrival of a Train at La Ciotat*), Georges

¹⁰ Agüero has made a number of documentaries, including *No Olvidar* (1982), a film signed pseudonymously about the discovery of bodies of the disappeared at Lonquén, and *Agustín's Newspaper* (2008), a film that follows a group of students at the University of Chile investigating Chile's largest daily newspaper *El Mercurio*, and its publisher Agustín Edwards, for their support of the 1973 coup d'état and complicity with the Pinochet dictatorship. On *Cien niños esperando un tren*, see also Mouesca, 98-99.

Méliès, Émile Cohl, Charlie Chaplin, Laurel & Hardy, Walt Disney, Dušan Vukotic, Albert Lamorisse, and the Taviani brothers. In addition, the children create paper versions of pre-cinematic toys like the thaumatrope and the zootrope, and create their own “films” by drawing on pieces of paper marked with the borders of film frames.

The children react excitedly to many of the films they are shown watching, but among the films that seem to capture their interest most is the one that is closest to their own reality, and the only Chilean film that we see them watching. Vega shows the students a portion of Agüero’s earlier film *Como me da la gana* (“This is the Way I Like It,” 1985). This film consisted of interviews with five Chilean directors making films in 1984 and 1985, and Agüero appears on camera asking them questions like “Why are you making this film?” and “Who do you think is going to see it?” One of the five films documented is Andrés Racz’s *Dulce Patria* (“Sweet Homeland,” 1984), the first film to document the protests against the dictatorship that was signed in the filmmakers’ own names. While shot on 16mm film and not video, *Dulce patria* is contemporaneous and similar in spirit to some of the activist video documentaries mentioned above. *Cien niños* shows the students watching a short passage from *Como me da la gana*, in which Racz and his crew can be seen filming protesters running away from the *carabineros* (police). Students can be heard shouting excitedly and reacting to the scene as it plays. Onscreen, we see protesters running from the police, carrying a wounded man to safety, and a *carabinero* is shown kicking a protester who cowers on the ground.

The film (or at least the fragment of it that we see) clearly captures the imagination of the students. *Cien niños* repeatedly reminds the viewer that the children have a lived experience of state surveillance and military and police presence. The students create their own storyboard images for invented films, and many of those shown in the film are of violent scenes involving police or military shooting at people. Agüero and his crew interview many of the children from the workshop, and ask them what they want to be when they grow up. One wants to be a carpenter, another a doctor, but several say that they want to join the military. An eight-year-old boy, interviewed on camera with his family, replies that he wants to be a soldier, but he uses the word “milico,” derogatory slang for the military. In the scene preceding the screening of *Dulce patria*, Agüero interviews two young girls in their home, one twelve years old and the other eight. Agüero asks them whether they have ever been filmed or recorded before. One of the girls responds that they have not been filmed, but have been recorded, by agents of the CNI (*la*

Central Nacional de Informaciones/National Information Center, the Chilean secret police, formerly known as the DINA) who had come to their house two years earlier when the younger girl was six years old. They reveal that the CNI agents interviewed them on audiotape, without their parents present, and asked them questions including whether anything was hidden in the house, and what their mother did for a living.

Cien niños is in most respects a joyful film. It captures Alicia Vega and the young students' enthusiasm for film with evident affinity, as when parents of the students visit the class to see what their children have been up to, and look on with surprise as their children show off their knowledge of precinematic toys. But the film also repeatedly manifests the memory and omnipresent threat of state violence and its particular targeting of the poor and working-class inhabitants of the *poblaciones*.¹¹ And in demonstrating the ways that images of protest speak to the experience of the children in the film, and the way they convert those images into their own "films," it shows a striking example of political mimesis.

In screening a fragment of *Dulce patria* for a group of children in the *poblaciones*, Vega functions as interlocutor, showing the children images of a kind that they recognize and identify with as part of their own lived reality. They then spin these images into their own invented filmic images, captured by Agüero's camera and thus entering the *mise-en-scene* of his film. In the process, we see an example of the transformation of a space (the church-cum-screening hall)¹² and the political activation of that space through its use for both the exhibition and creation of images, all mediated by the interventions of Vega and Agüero.

Scene Two: El Museo de la Memoria y los Derechos Humanos

The work of Pierre Nora, and his study of *lieux de mémoire*, or sites of memory, has been extremely influential, particularly for consideration of institutional spaces of memorialization. Nora writes that the acceleration of history in the 20th Century caused a definitive split between history and memory, and has meant that "memory has been torn—but torn in such a way as to pose the problem of the embodiment of memory in certain sites where a sense of historical

¹¹ Jacqueline Mouesca writes of the film's reception in Chile, which though "warm and enthusiastic among the public that was able to see it, was cold or openly hostile on the part of the authorities." Mouesca goes on to point out that while the film was not banned outright, it was screened with a rating that classifies it as only appropriate to audiences 21 and up, a rating that was later removed after the return to democracy in 1990 (99).

¹² Shades here perhaps of Solanas and Getino's description of the third cinema screening, where "the showing can be turned into a kind of political event, which, according to Fanon, could be a 'liturgical act, a privileged occasion for human beings to hear and be heard'" (53).

continuity persists.” All this has led *lieux de mémoire* to replace *milieux de mémoire*, “real environments of memory” (7). *Lieux de mémoire* include physical spaces, like museums, monuments, archives and cemeteries, but also other realms of memory, like books, dates, generations, pilgrimages, and national flags. *Lieux de mémoire* have a fundamentally substitutive function, they are the “ultimate embodiments of a memorial consciousness that has barely survived in a historical age that calls out for memory because it has abandoned it” (12). Or, as James Young puts it, summarizing Nora in his study of Holocaust monuments, and writing in particular about the increasing exteriorization of memory in an age of mass media:

there seems to be an inverse proportion between the memorialization of the past and its contemplation and study. For once we assign monumental form to memory, we have to some degree divested ourselves of the obligation to remember. In shouldering the memory-work, monuments may relieve viewers of the memory burden.

(Young 1993: 5)

Nora’s cautions should be heeded, but, as Steve Stern has pointed out, Nora’s distinctions are too strict and Manichean: “[Nora’s] framework is deeply flawed. It sets up too rigid a dichotomy between the ambience of living memory (his *milieux de mémoire*) and the sites that gain meaning as a repository precisely because living memory has died (his *lieux de mémoire*)” (Stern 2006: 199).¹³ Furthermore, Stern finds Nora’s framework particularly ill-suited to the context of the Southern Cone.

Nora’s dichotomy is especially problematic for a theme such as memory of recent violent military dictatorships, in countries such as Chile and Argentina, between the 1970s and 1990s. For this specific memory theme, an environment of living remembrance—more accurately, an ambience of contentiousness about memory and forgetting, and of dialogue between personal (“testimonial”) remembrance and collective remembrance—has greatly defined the political and cultural experiences of at least two living generations.

(Stern 200)

Where then do museums and monuments memorializing state violence in Chile fit in relation to this environment of living remembrance, and do they participate in, or take the place of active remembrance?

Inaugurated in 2010 as one of the central legacy projects of Michelle Bachelet at the end of her first term as President, the Museum of Memory and Human Rights is a large, multi-story

¹³ This critique is located entirely within a very lengthy endnote in Chapter Four, “From Loose Memory to Emblematic Memory.”

museum dedicated to the memory of the Pinochet dictatorship. Andrés Estefane describes the museum “as a striking glass and steel box clad in prepatinated copper . . . mounted on robust concrete bases rising out of two reflecting pools” (Estefan 2013: 158). It is located next to the Quinta Normal, a park in Santiago, and in close proximity to several other museums. The museum offers a tour that is both loosely chronological and thematic as the visitor moves upstairs from the lobby to the upper floors. The museum uses video very prominently, from the downstairs screening room and archives accessible to the public (which include a large collection of documentaries, and of the activist videos of the 80s) to the plethora of video screen displays throughout the museum. Clips from documentaries play a major role in the museum’s organization of the narrative of the dictatorship. The trajectory of the space leads from a central room on the first floor where a series of video screens show footage from September 11, 1973, the day of the military coup, under a timeline of the day’s events, to the final room on the floor above, where video screens show commercials from the “No” campaign leading up to the 1988 plebiscite that removed Pinochet from power, as well as the celebration of the transition to democracy and Patricio Aylwin’s presidency in the National Stadium.

In this chronological trajectory, a visitor to the museum passes a multitude of video screens and installations. On the first floor, in a section dedicated to repression and torture, there is a video touchscreen where visitors can access testimonies about torture from various sources, including documentaries like *La venda* (Gloria Camaruaga, 2000), *The Judge and the General* (Elizabeth Farnsworth and Patricio Lanfranco, 2008), and *Piececitos de niño* (Hernán Fliman Kiblsky, 1986), as well as a 1991 TVN news report on torture, and various video testimonies gathered by the museum. Adjacent to this video screen, and in one of the museum’s darkest rooms, there is a large video display made up of 12 screens, each showing survivor testimonies about torture. Sound directs the visitor’s attention to particular screens at different times, and graphic, violent details are emphasized. Below the multi-screen display is a *parilla* (grill), one of the most ubiquitous instruments of torture, a metal bed frame attached by wires to a box controlling the application of electric shocks. In his analysis of this section of the museum, Estefane is critical of the emphasis on individual narratives devoid of larger context:

By atomizing the experience of survivors and victims of state violence and representing that very violence in terms that obscure its connection with, for example, the distribution of power and resources within Chilean society, the

museum's narrative tends to fix a discourse that reinforces a compartmentalized vision of the catastrophe, promotes isolated rituals of mourning and remembrance, and detaches the past from the contemporary legacies of the dictatorship.

(Estefan 2013: 164)

This critique certainly resonates with the museum's narrative as a whole, which seems overly careful, in its compartmentalization, to reflect a consensus view of the past characteristic of postdictatorship state transition politics, and its reticence to link the current neoliberal state to its development under dictatorship. However, the museum does have merit as a highly visible platform for the elaboration of events that have not had this same visibility within the city's architecture previously, and as a place of encounter for a diverse sector of the Chilean and international public.¹⁴

The museum's displays give particular prominence to the activist political documentaries of the 1980s. On various screens through the museum, alongside clips from TV broadcasts and postdictatorship documentaries, are clips from videos by activist collectives such as Teleanálisis no. 30 *La verdad del disparo* ("The Truth of the Gunshot," 1987), which documents a *carabiniero* (police officer) shooting Maria Paz Santibañez in the head at a student protest, a shooting that Santibañez miraculously survived. Other Teleanálisis videos are featured, as is a clip from Ictus's *Andrés de la Victoria* (Claudio Di Girólamo, 1984), one of Ictus's first forays into documentary, which relates the death of the priest André Jarlan, who was killed in his house by a *carabiniero*'s bullet, and the large protests that followed this event. This clip is accompanied by footage taken of the same protests by Chilean filmmaker Gonzalo Justiniano. Justiniano was detained by CNI (Chilean Secret Police, formerly known as DINA) agents, and had his footage confiscated, but the clip-on display is among the footage not found by the CNI.

One of the most powerful clips, and one that I saw museum employees call up for guided tours on multiple occasions, is a video fragment titled *Una flor para Santiago* ("A Flower for Santiago," 1985) shot by brothers Pablo and Francisco Salas.¹⁵ This three-minute *verité* sequence powerfully captures the bravery of a group of widows who stand up to *carabineros* in their effort

¹⁴ Zachary McKiernan writes of witnessing a large variety of people, young and old, Chilean and international, grade students and academics in his visits to the museum. "Call it a consensus, but this, I believe, is what is special at the museum: an open-ended encounter that cuts across language and cultures, disciplines and principles, politics and people."

¹⁵ The clip is available for viewing, as are many of the clips on display at the museum, at the Museo de la Memoria's Digital Library: <http://www.bibliotecamuseodelamemoria.cl/gsdcl/cgi-bin/library.cgi> (Accessed April 26, 2015).

to mourn their murdered husbands, who became known as the “three professionals.” José Manuel Parada, a worker at the Vicaría de la Solidaridad, Manuel Guerrero, a professor, and Santiago Nattino Allende, a publicist, were all kidnapped over two days on the 27th and 28th of March, 1985. On March 29th, their bodies were found, throats slashed, in a rural area outside Santiago. All three were associated with the Communist Party, and the government attempted to explain away the deaths as being the result of a purge within the Party. This ruse was seen through by most members of the public who saw this clearly as the work of the CNI.

The video records one of the weekly memorial protests that Estela Ortiz, Owana Madero, and Elena Reyes, the widows of the “three professionals,” would enact every Friday. The three widows would bring roses and posters demanding justice for their murdered husbands and attempt to lay them on a patch of grass in front of la Moneda, the presidential palace in Santiago. The camera focuses in particular on Elena Reyes, the widow of Santiago Nattino, and her young son, as they attempt to cross a street, their path blocked by a group of *carabineros*. Reyes confronts them without fear, her arm around her son, and says “I have the right to walk. This is my country, just as it is yours.” As Reyes, her son, and another of the widows try to walk toward the grass, the *carabineros* shuffle in a group to block their way. Reyes continues to confront the policemen, saying that her husband was killed, and that she only wants to leave an homage to him. Eventually, the *carabineros* let them pass, and they walk to the grass and leave several roses and two posters on the ground. The *carabineros* immediately walk up behind Reyes and her son, and snatch up the posters and walk away with them. The video ends with Reyes walking down the street, away from the camera, with her arm around her son.

It’s no surprise that this video is given prominence in the museum, given how it shows a moment of courage in the face of state power, and that it also reads as a sort of portent: there is something almost hapless in the *carabineros* stumbling over themselves to block a mourning woman and her child, aware of the camera picking up their every move. The footage encapsulates the way that the memory struggles that defined the 1980s were starting to swing away from Pinochet and toward the popular groups who were mobilizing their power to protest in the streets, and also shows the ways in which U-Matic video was central to the documentation and dissemination of these struggles.

The Museum of Memory excels at telling the story of these struggles between the populace and the state, at making its visitors *feel* the effects of the dictatorship’s violence

(through video testimonies of survivors), and at providing a platform for the exhibition of activist video documentary of the 1980s. This makes it all the more disheartening that the story told by the museum ends in 1990, with the end of the dictatorship, as though the story could not be told any farther without damaging the fragile consensus on which the museum rests. Visitors will learn very little here about the continuing efforts to bring perpetrators to justice or about Pinochet's continued position through the 90s as commander of the army and his arrest in London in 1998. In this way, memory is too neatly separated from the present, as though it were possible to mark the start and end dates of the dictatorship and cleanly slice it out of Chile's history. While the museum still stands as a potential site of encounter, and indeed it has provoked public debate since its creation, its atomization of experiences and its relegation of events to a past entirely separate from the present seem to suggest a consensus already achieved before the museum's visitors arrive, rather than an interest in facilitating the difficult, and still needed, engagements with the legacies of the military dictatorship and the Allende government that preceded it. The museum thus comes too close to what Pierre Nora criticizes in *lieux de mémoire*: a place that keeps memory contained so that it doesn't need to remain active. But U-Matic videos of the kind featured here can also be screened in ways that try to create spaces for active memory, as we'll see in our final exhibition scene.

Scene Three: Exhibition in the Context of Education

The Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos (INDH/National Human Rights Institute) is an institution created by a Chilean law, first proposed in 2005 under President Ricardo Lagos, but not passed until 2009, under President Michelle Bachelet. In 2010, the INDH was created, with the mission “to preserve and promote the full effect of human rights in Chile.”¹⁶ On March 7, 2013, in anticipation of the upcoming 40th anniversary of the coup that began the Pinochet dictatorship, the INDH announced the release of “Recordar y Conversar para un Nunca Más” (Remembering and Discussing for Never Again) a series of lesson plans for the classroom use of documentaries to “promote reflection on the massive, systematic, and institutionalized violations of human rights during the dictatorship.”¹⁷ Eight total lesson plans were released, each one associated with a particular film, and designed for one of three levels of education. There are two

¹⁶ <http://www.indh.cl/mision-vision-y-objetivos-indh-2> (Accessed April 25, 2015).

¹⁷ <http://www.indh.cl/atencion-docentes-indh-presenta-materiales-didacticos-para-educacion-en-derechos-humanos> (Accessed April 25, 2015). I first received these materials in October 2012 from Enrique Azúa, who works in the Education section of INDH.

for Educación Básica (students from age 6 to 13), centered on the films *Images of a Dictatorship* (Patricio Henríquez, 2004) and *Los niños prohibidos* (“The Forbidden Children,” Augusto Góngora, 1986); three for Educación Media (students from 14 to 17), *The City of the Photographers* (Sebastián Moreno, 2006), *El astuto mono Pinochet contra la Moneda de los cerdos* (*The Astute Monkey Pinochet vs. La Moneda’s Pigs*, Bettina Perut and Iván Osnovikoff, 2004), and *Reinalda del Carmen, mi mamá y yo* (Lorena Giachino Torrén, 2006); and three for informal educational settings or adult education, *Por la vida* (“For Life,” Pedro Chaskel and Pablo Salas, 1987), *No olvidar* (“Not to Forget,” Ignacio Agüero, 1982), and *El mocito* (Marcela Said and Jean de Certeau, 2010). I will focus primarily on *Por la vida*, for its emergence from the same 1980s activist video context as the other works considered here.

Por la vida, a 27-minute video documentary shot on U-Matic, follows the protests of The Sebastián Acevedo Anti-Torture Movement. Sebastián Acevedo was a father who, in desperation after the kidnapping of his two sons in November 1983, poured gasoline over his clothes and burned himself to death in the main plaza in Concepción. Steve Stern writes that Acevedo’s action struck a particularly strong chord in predominantly Catholic Chile. “Symbolically, he was a devoted father devastated by the plight of his children, a person of faith forced to break the Catholic taboo on suicide, and a martyr who sacrificed himself to redeem life in a world gone to sin” (*Battling*, 257-258). The group Anti-Torture Movement had actually begun in September 1983, but after Acevedo’s death they took on his name. The group, which contained a number of priests and people of faith, practiced non-violent resistance, and staged short, evocative protests in highly symbolic sites. *Por la vida* captures a number of these protests over a period of several years from 1984 to 1987, and edits them together with interviews with members of the group. The protests were planned in secrecy to try to gain the element of surprise; a time would be set, and the group would suddenly appear, interlocking arms, stopping traffic, holding banners and posters with the names of victims of torture, singing songs, chanting a litany of names of those who had been tortured, posting fliers, and scattering them in the air. Then, after the protest was complete, usually within 20 minutes, the group would disperse from the scene. The protests were often at sites where torture was taking place or had taken place, or at other symbolic locations. In the video, we see a protest held outside the former clandestine detention center Londres 38 (which had been redesignated as Londres 40 in an effort to erase the site’s sordid history), where members of the group spraypaint an arrow onto the building’s wall, marking it as a site in which

torture took place. Another protest takes place inside the halls of the building housing Chile's Supreme Court. The video also captures protesters standing together and pointing, in unison, toward sites of torture, "outing" them, in a gesture similar to those that appear in the postdictatorship actions of *funa* and *escrache*.¹⁸

In a recent interview, Pablo Salas describes the challenges involved with shooting the film. He, Chaskel, and the other members of the crew would have to be close to the scene, but remain inconspicuous until the moment that the group materialized; then they would need to quickly appear and start shooting.¹⁹ Despite the brevity of the protests, *carabineros* did often arrive before the group could disperse, and the video captures *carabineros* hitting protesters with batons, shooting tear gas canisters into their midst, and tearing down posters.

The INDH lesson plan for *Por la vida* is 16 pages long, and contains materials for use as handouts, as well as suggested activities and discussion questions to accompany the screening of the film. In a section that appears in all 8 of the INDH lesson plans, the importance of the role of the conversation's moderator is stressed, because of the difficulty of the subject matter. Tips are given for discussing difficult material, including a suggestion that teachers be aware that there may be students with family members who are either in the film being shown or may have had similar experiences, as well as a caution against oversimplifying complex issues. *Por la vida*'s lesson plan also contains quotes and questions about the active non-violence practiced in the film, as well as a timeline of events related to the film and the dictatorship, and a handout designed for students to take notes during the screening based on certain themes and elements.

The final page of the lesson plan addresses torture, and begins with a lengthy quote from the film of the words of José Aldunate, a Catholic priest, and member of The Sebastián Acevedo Movement featured prominently:

What concerned us was the idea that a practice of this type (torture) is in reality the practice of all Chile, of the entire nation, some for executing it, others for remaining silent, in a way we all will be accomplices before posterity. . . . I think that after many

¹⁸ *Escrache* is a form of protest created in Argentina by the group H.I.J.O.S., or "Hijos por la Identidad y la Justicia Contra el Olvido y el Silencio" (Children for Identity and Justice and Against Forgetting and Silence). *Escraches* reject the ease with which many former torturers and repressors had been able to slip into anonymity in the postdictatorship. H.I.J.O.S. would locate these agents of state violence and organize a large gathering, usually of several hundred people, "outing" them in the neighborhoods in which they lived or worked. These gatherings are performative, theatrical, and festive, and include songs, chanting, drums, and flutes. *Escraches* function to provide some measure of justice where the legal system has failed. A few years after Argentina's *escraches* began, children of the disappeared in Chile began their own outings of former torturers and murderers, called *funas*.

¹⁹ See video interview with Pablo Salas at *El Desconcierto.tv* <https://vimeo.com/84040447> (Accessed April 26, 2015).

years have passed, perhaps an entire generation, those of us who have lived in this time will feel ourselves, and I will feel myself, culpable for all those years in which there was torture and other atrocities. And us, what have we done? What account can we give to the new generations? . . . We, the priests, are sometimes good for talking, but we are not effective in action. Well then, let us go to the street.²⁰

This quotation is followed by three discussion questions that ask students to reflect on what function torture served during the dictatorship; on what portions of the complicity described by Aldunate were shared by institutions such as the judiciary, the media, and the Catholic church; and on Aldunate's question about his generation's responsibility to future ones. Students who are part of one of those future generations are asked to think about the legacies of torture and of acts of resistance like Aldunate's as presented in the video.

Like the *Museo de la memoria*, the INDH pedagogical materials create important potential exhibition opportunities for documentaries. But unlike the museum, the lesson plan also encourages viewers, even if in limited ways, to think about the events of the past in relation to the present. This is done, like much of the human rights activism in Chile and throughout Latin America, under the banner of *Nunca más* (Never again), which is oriented toward the present and future. But it also takes steps toward the thinking through of what the present-day legacies of the dictatorship are, and how the reverberations of torture and state violence in the 70s and 80s are still being felt.

Finally, the INDH's choices of films are interesting in their determination not to shy away from films that might present controversial discussion or that might escape the boundaries of a state-sponsored human rights framework of discussion. In this respect, the decision to include *El astuto mono Pinochet contra la Moneda de los cerdos* among the films intended for educational purposes is particularly interesting. This film, which features wild, often factually inaccurate recreations by grade students of the events of the September 11th coup seems both the perfect film to screen to high school students, and the kind of film that, given its ambiguous presentation of history, a group like INDH could easily shy away from. Unlike the bracketing of the past from the present characteristic of The Museum of Memory and Human Rights, the choice of films that productively maintain an openness in relation to history suggests the political

²⁰ Instituto Nacional de Derechos Humanos, "Por la vida" Serie Recordar y Conversar para un Nunca Más: 15. <http://bibliotecadigital.indh.cl/bitstream/handle/123456789/471/Ed.%20No%20Formal%20-%20Por%20la%20vida.pdf?sequence=1> (Accessed April 26, 2015).

potential of the INDH's choices to disrupt the closing-off of memory from the present.

Postscript: Using U-Matic to Recreate the No Campaign

Pablo Larraín's 2012 film *No* builds its narrative around the 1988 plebiscite that asked Chileans to vote "Yes" or "No" to eight more years of Augusto Pinochet's government. During the weeks leading up to the election, the Yes and No campaigns were each allotted 15 minutes of airtime on National TV at 11pm. The film *No* follows a fictionalized advertising man, René Saavedra (Gael García Bernal), hired to produce videos for the No campaign. Although a number of those on the left were suspicious of the validity of the election (and with good reason, after the evidence of corruption surrounding a similar plebiscite in 1980), the No campaign eventually was successful, winning with almost 56% of the vote and leading to Pinochet stepping down a year later, and the country's first democratically-elected government in 17 years with the election of Patricio Aylwin.

The film was extremely successful at the Chilean box office and internationally, garnering an Academy Award nomination for Best Foreign Language Film. It has provoked discussion and controversy on several different fronts, with some criticism arising from those who feel that the film minimizes other grassroots contributions to the No campaign, painting the ad campaign as more significant than it actually was. Others have targeted Larraín's own background, and his family ties to right-wing figures in Chile. Debate has also circulated around the question of whether the film itself is celebratory of the No campaign, or critical of the campaign as representing an extension of the neoliberal capitalism of the dictatorship, an extension that would persist into the democratic transition.

Leaving aside these debates, for my purposes I want only to say a few words about the film's use of U-Matic video. In a very rare decision for a theatrically-distributed film, the film was shot in its entirety on U-Matic video, using obsolete technology and cameras that had to be scavenged from various places, and assembled with various working parts. The decision to shoot the film in an outdated, non-theatrical format derived from the extensive use the film makes of the video archive of the original campaign spots. As Larraín states:

We used a lot of archival footage. When they use that kind of footage, most movies usually do it for a couple of minutes, so it doesn't really matter that you are shooting in a format that is way different from that. But since one third of the film is archival footage, we thought we would be constantly breaking the illusion for the audience and the audience would be in and out trying to reconnect with

our material if we shot it in film or state of the art HD. We started to realize that the best way was to shoot in the same format that it was made which was an early 80's analog video system, which is completely obsolete and was risky at the beginning.²¹

This risk is met head-on with the first images seen in the film, as the opening credits accentuate the visual limitations of the U-Matic format, the letters of *No*'s opening titles appearing to have a green and yellow halo around their edges.

In *No*, visual markers (like outdated or inferior image formats) that typically cue the viewer of a narrative film that the footage they are viewing is archival and documentary do not exist, and often the presence of Gael García Bernal or other actors from the film's cast is the only way for the viewer to determine whether the footage they are watching is archival or created for the film. Nonetheless, at times the film does not seem all that interested in maintaining the illusion that Larraín describes above. For instance, in one sequence, Patricio Aylwin appears as himself in the film, showing up at a TV studio to appear in one of the "No" campaign spots. As Aylwin sits down to begin his appeal to voters to vote "No", the camera tracks in on a video monitor, where we see archival footage of the same scene, featuring a younger Aylwin, as he looked in the 1980s. The film at once maintains its illusion, through its emulation of the grain of its archival footage, and points to its artifice, with its juxtaposition of the two bodies of Patricio Aylwin, younger and older. Here, one appeal to realism, the effect of the use of U-Matic, is temporarily sacrificed in favor of another documentary appeal, that of the witness (Aylwin) who was there, and who tacitly sanctions the film's representation by virtue of his presence.²²

Caetlin Benson-Allott writes that "[b]y matching his video medium to that of the original No campaign, Larraín emphasizes that both are constructions and suggests that there can be no unmediated access to the history of the No campaign, because the No itself was a media creation" (62). *No* features many of the same videos that are featured on the top floor of the Museum of Memory and Human Rights. Here, then, we can perhaps think of the fictional character of René Saavedra as another mediating figure, analogous in some distant way to the *compañero* narrator of Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino's film, Patricio Guzmán's onscreen presence in his own film, Alicia Vega in Ignacio Agüero's film, the tour guides at the Museum

²¹ Interview accessed from: <http://collider.com/gael-garcia-bernal-pablo-larrain-no-interview/>

²² I thank Niall Ó Murchú for discussing this film with me, and for this observation about the effect of this scene and three others like it in the film.

of Memory and Human Rights, or the teachers making use of the INDH's lesson plans. Saavedra's presence, as a character portrayed as an outsider to the movement he is representing and linked to a capitalist ideology, tempers the euphoria of the crowds seen celebrating the No's success at the end of the film, and encourages the viewer to consider the historical events portrayed in relation to Chile's present-day landscape, one that has in many ways continued the neoliberal processes set in motion under Pinochet.

The success of *No*, the creation by German Liñero of the online *U-Matic Project*, and the creation of both an on-site archive and a collection of clips viewable online at the Museum of Memory and Human Rights, all point to a recent resurgence of interest in the U-Matic activist video of the 1980s. At the same time, more and more of the sites of memory associated with the violence of the Pinochet dictatorship have been recuperated by human rights groups and converted into memorial spaces.²³ While these memorial spaces draw pointedly on the particular histories of sites, the examples detailed in this essay attempt to create (temporary or permanent as with, respectively, the classroom and the museum) spaces of memorialization through their use of video and film screening as the pretext for an encounter, one that carries traces of the "film-act" of the New Latin American Cinema. In tracing examples of 1980s activist documentary into three separate educational spaces, I've shown some of the ways in which this activist practice can reverberate across time and space, and speak to varying degrees to both the memories of state violence and its resistance, as well as to the potentiality for activating that footage in the spaces of present-day Chile.

About the author: David Gray is Lecturer of Cinema Studies and Public Humanities at Northern Arizona University. He previously taught at Western Washington University. He completed his PhD in 2015 in the Film and Media Studies Department at the University of California Santa Barbara, where he wrote a dissertation on post-dictatorship documentary from the Southern Cone. He has also published in *Studies in Documentary Film* and *Media Fields Journal*.

Contact: davidwinksgray@yahoo.com

²³ See also my article "What to do starting from this place."

Works Cited

- Andermann, Jens. "Showcasing Dictatorship: Memory and the Museum in Argentina and Chile." *Journal of Educational Media, Memory, and Society* 4, no. 2 (Autumn 2012): 69-93. Print.
- Benson-Allott, Caetlin. "An Illusion Appropriate to the Conditions: *No* (Pablo Larraín, 2012)." *Film Quarterly* 66, no. 3 (Spring 2013): 61-63. Print.
- Bongers, Wolfgang. "No y las enunciabilidades del cine posdictatorial chileno." *Travesías por el cine chileno y latinoamericano*. Ed. Mónica Villarroel. Santiago: LOM Ediciones, 2014. 197-206. Print.
- Bruss, Elizabeth W. "Eye for I: Making and Unmaking Autobiography in Film." *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*. Ed. James Olney. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980. 298-320. Print.
- Campo, Javier. *Cine documental argentino: Entre el arte, la cultura y la política*. Buenos Aires: Imago Mundi, 2012. Print.
- Carter, Jennifer. "Human Rights Museums and Pedagogies of Practice: The Museo de la Memoria y los Derechos Humanos." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 28, no. 3 (2013): 324-341. Print.
- Chanan, Michael. "Rediscovering Documentary: Cultural Context and Intentionality." *New Latin American Cinema, Vol. One: Theory, Practices, and Transcontinental Articulations*. Ed. Michael T. Martin. Detroit: Wayne State University Press: 1997. 210-217. Print.
- Cronovitch, Paula T. "'No' and *No*: The Campaign of 1988 and Pablo Larraín's Film." *Radical History Review* 124 (2016): 165-176. Print.
- de la Puente, Maximiliano Ignacio, and Pablo Mariano Russo, "La exhibición como instancia de reflexión y construcción de las memorias de las luchas de los movimientos sociales." *Cine documental, memoria y derechos humanos*. Ed. Javier Campo and Christian Dorado. Buenos Aires: Nuestro América, 2007. 69-87. Print.
- Dzero, Irina. "Larraín's Film *No* and its Inspiration, *El plebiscito*: Chile's Transition to Democracy as a Simulacrum." *Confluencia* 31, no. 1 (Fall 2015): 120-132. Print.
- Estefane, Andrés. "Materiality and Politics in Chile's Museum of Memory and Human Rights." *Thresholds* 41 (Spring 2013): 158-171. Print.
- Gaines, Jane M. "Political Mimesis." *Collecting Visible Evidence*. Ed. Jane M. Gaines and Michael Renov. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999. 84-102. Print.
- Gómez-Barris, Macarena. *Where Memory Dwells: Culture and State Violence in Chile*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009. Print.
- Gray, David. "'What to do starting from this place': documentary film and official memorialization in Argentina and Chile." *Studies in Documentary Film* 9, no 3 (2015): 235-249. Print.
- Hodge, Polly J. "Maestros de la manipulación: Titiriteros de la memoria histórica en *No* de Pablo Larraín y *La niña de tus ojos* de Fernando Trueba." *Hispania* 98, no. 3 (2015): 431-441. Print.

- Howe, Alexis. "Yes, No, or Maybe?: Transitions in Chilean Society in Pablo Larraín's *No*." *Hispania* 98, no. 3 (2015): 421-430. Print.
- Kruger, Clara. "La hora de los hornos." *Cine documental en América Latina*. Ed. Paulo Antonio Paranaguá. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 2003. 320-325. Print.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1991. Print.
- Liñero Arend, Germán. *Apuntes para una historia del video en Chile*. Santiago: Ocho Libros Editores, 2010. Print.
- Lyon, Cherstin M. "Museo de Memoria y Derechos Humanos and Parque por la paz Villa Grimaldi." *The Public Historian* 33, no. 2 (Spring 2011): 135-144. Print.
- Margulis, Paola. "Tecnologías de lo real: un primer acercamiento a los usos del video en el documental chileno y argentino en la década de los ochenta." *Travesías por el cine chileno y latinoamericano*. Ed. Mónica Villarroel. Santiago: LOM Ediciones, 2014. 207-216. Print.
- McKiernan, Zachary. "The Museum of Memory and Human Rights: Making Consensus Matter?" *Public History Commons* (2012). Web. 24 Oct. 2016.
<http://publichistorycommons.org/the-museum-of-memory-and-human-rights-making-consensus-matter/>
- Mouesca, Jacqueline. *El documental chileno*. Santiago: LOM Ediciones, 2005. Print.
- Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*." Trans. Marc Roudebush. *Representations* 26 (Spring 1989): 7-24. Print.
- Opotow, Susan. "Historicizing Injustice: The Museum of Memory and Human Rights, Santiago, Chile." *Journal of Social Issues* 71, no. 2 (2015): 229-243. Print.
- Rodríguez, Juan Carlos. "The Postdictatorial Documentaries of Patricio Guzmán: *Chile, Obstinate Memory; The Pinochet Case and Island of Robinson Crusoe*." Diss. Duke University, 2007. Duke Space,
http://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/bitstream/10161/203/1/D_Rodriguez_Juan_Carlos_a_052007.pdf. Web. 24 Oct. 2016.
- Ruffinelli, Jorge. *Patricio Guzmán*. Madrid: Cátedra/Filmoteca Española, 2001. Print.
- Solanas, Fernando, and Octavio Getino. "Towards a Third Cinema: Notes and Experiences for the Development of a Cinema of Liberation in the Third World." *New Latin American Cinema, Vol. 1: Theory, Practices, and Transcontinental Articulations*. Ed. Michael T. Martin. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1997. 33-58. Print.
- Stam, Robert. "The Two Avant-gardes: Solanas and Getino's *The Hour of the Furnaces*." *Documenting the Documentary: Close Readings of Documentary Film and Video*. Ed. Barry Keith Grant and Jeannette Sloniowski. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1998. 254-268. Print.
- Stern, Steve J. *Battling for Hearts and Minds: Memory Struggles in Pinochet's Chile, 1973-1988*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006. Print.
- . *Remembering Pinochet's Chile: On the Eve of London 1998*. Durham: Duke University

- Press, 2006. Print.
- Traverso, Antonio, and Germán Liñero, "Chilean Political Documentary Video of the 1980s." *New Documentaries in Latin America*. Ed. Vinicius Navarro and Juan Carlos Rodríguez. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. 167-184. Print.
- Wilson, Kristi M. "Building Memory: Museums, Trauma, and the Aesthetics of Confrontation in Argentina." *Latin American Perspectives* 43, no. 5 (2016): 112-130. Print.
- Young, James E. *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993. Print.