YOUNG, WELL-EDUCATED AND ADAPTABLE PEOPLE: CHILEAN EXILES, IDENTITY AND DAILY LIFE IN CANADA, 1973 TO THE PRESENT DAY

FRANCIS PEDDIE

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN HISTORY
YORK UNIVERSITY,
TORONTO, ONTARIO
AUGUST 2012

© Francis Peddie, 2012

ABSTRACT

This dissertation describes the challenges and changes to lifestyle and identity experienced by twenty-one Chileans who came to Canada as exiles between 1973 and 1978. It is based largely on the testimony of the exiles themselves, augmented by research conducted at archives in Canada, Chile and the United States as well as primary and secondary sources that focus on modern Chilean history, Canadian immigration history, and the subject of exile. The experiences of the people I interviewed are contextualized by relating them to the events that pushed them out of Chile following the coup d'état of 11 September 1973, and the process by which they gained entry into Canada despite being from the wrong side of the Cold War ideological divide. Once resettled in Canada, the interviewees became part of a community whose primary raison d'être was to denounce the military government that ruled their homeland and denied them their place in the Chilean nation. The development of a culture of exile gave Chileans in Canada both a sense of continued belonging to their vision of the national community and also an outlet to express their condemnation of the regime that had made them outcasts. At the same time, I argue that the Chilean exiles of the 1970s eventually experienced transformations in their sense of personal and collective identity as the years passed and they became connected to their Canadian surroundings through work, family life and a new sense of belonging. The integration of many Chilean exiles into Canadian society, in turn, illustrates how immigration and refugee policy at the time favored the admission of "young, well-educated and adaptable people" who could become successful immigrants and bring benefits to the country, regardless of their ideological beliefs.

Acknowledgements

The completion of this dissertation would have been impossible without the support and assistance of numerous individuals and organizations. First and foremost, I owe an enormous debt of gratitude to my supervisors, Anne Rubenstein and Roberto Perin, who have patiently, professionally and I daresay even compassionately dealt with the difficulties of having a graduate student writing about Chileans in Canada from his home in Japan, of all places. They have handled the logistical problems of having an absentee student who has wanted to be finished yesterday at the latest with grace and kindness, while also giving me the kind of direction and criticism that I very much needed to complete this hydra of a study. My deepest thanks to them both.

I would also extend my thanks to the graduate students and professors from the Latin American Reading Group and the Immigration Reading Group who gave me advice and feedback regarding this study during the years I was still in Toronto. In particular, I would like to thank Brigitte and Tufy Cairus for their friendship as well as their generosity as colleagues; Ben Bryce, who has always asked me great, tough questions; and Eric Payseur, who did so much to encourage us to talk to each other and share what we learned.

Though we all came from very different fields, I would also tip my hat to certain friends in the department who made the experience all the more enjoyable: Brian MacDowall, Ian Milligan, Andrew Watson, and mon 'tit frère Alban Bargain. Next round is on me, gentlemen.

Finally, and most deeply, my thanks to my extended family, who have helped see me through this long, frustrating, exhilarating process: Alison and Martin, the best siblings one could hope for; Paulina, la mejor cuñada en todo el mundo; Amara and Isabella, for being the beautiful little people they are; Sue, Jen, Craig and Tina, for being the wonderful people they are; and most of all to Seri, who has had to put up with my extended absences, my late-night moments of manic inspiration, and my woeful lack of income. Osewa ni narimashita. Otsukare sama deshita.

I dedicate this work to my son, Ewan Peddie, whose joy in greeting every new day is an inspiration to me in ways I cannot even begin to count.

Contents

Introduction 1
The Chilean diaspora 6
Temporal and geographic delimitations of the study 11
Exile, refugee, forced migrant, immigrant? The problem of classification 14
Sources for the study 17
Constructing an oral history 26
Chapter outline 33
Chapter One: Chile and Canada in the Cold War 38
I.Chile, the model and symbol 42
Living the changes: the exiles and their history 51
II.Canada, at home and abroad: Immigration policy, national security and the Cold War 57
Utility and Suitability: Establishing the guidelines for admission 59
Immigration policy after 1945: Open doors closely watched 61
Another kind of immigrant? Refugees in Canada before 1978 64
Canada and Latin America 68
National security and the Cold War 73
Chapter Two: Getting Out, Getting In: The push and pull of exile 79
I.Getting Out 80
"A new stage in the national destiny" 80
The taxonomy of exile: different routes north 90
II.Getting In 102
Solidarity and suspicion: Debating the admission of Chileans to Canada 103
The Special Movement Chile 120
Beyond the SMC 123
Chapter Three: The bonds of exile: Community associations and activism 129
Encountering Canada: The exiles' memories of the journey to Canada, reception and resettlement 131
"I really wanted to go back to being normal again" 146
Orientation and denunciation: the growth of community organizations 152
New groups, new goals 160

Chapter four: The challenges and changes of exile: Work, study, family life and gender roles. 168
Unpacking the suitcase ... 170
Work and study ... 173
Family roles and relationships ... 184
Chapter Five: Staying Put or Going Back ... 203
The end of exile ... 204
Desexilio during dictatorship: returning from exile, 1982 to 1990 ... 210
Choosing between Canada and Chile after 1990 ... 218
Going back to a new Chile ... 225
Conclusion ... 242
The road ahead for the Chilean community in Canada: the waning of the "culture of exile". 245
Postscript: Utility and suitability, forty years on ... 255
Appendix A: Interview template ... 259
Appendix B: Chilean participants' profiles ... 261
Archives Consulted ... 265
Bibliography ... 265
Interviews ... 280
Web Sites ... 282

Introduction

Between 1973 and 1978 six thousand Chileans came to Canada as exiles from the military dictatorship in their homeland. They left Chile for different reasons and arrived in Canada in a variety of ways, but shared the common characteristic of being forced migrants. They had not wished to leave Chile, and were only grudgingly admitted to Canada. Once resettled at the northern extreme of the Americas, exiles had to find ways of coping with an abrupt and violent separation from their homeland that had deep material and emotional repercussions. In the process of reconstructing interrupted lives, they underwent personal and collective transformations in identity and lifestyle that began to tie them to Canada, which in the beginning they had seen as a place of transit, a backdrop to be endured until they could reclaim their places in Chile. When the military regime ceded power to a civilian government in 1990, the principal reason for staying in exile disappeared. Yet most of the exiles stayed. Of those who did return to Chile, many ended up moving back to Canada again. For a group of people who built their collective identity around the idea of returning and restoring democracy and social justice to Chile, their continued presence in Canada after 1990 raises many questions.

In this study, the fundamental line of inquiry revolves around what happened to Chilean exiles between 1973 and 1990 that made so many of them experience a shifting of identities. I argue that it was the everyday reality of exile –the physical distance from Chile and the unavoidable connections to Canadian society –that caused a re-evaluation

of beliefs, values and practices among the exiles. This in turn caused a further distancing from Chile that was not of space, but of feeling. "Home", gradually, became Canada, where they had jobs, where their children went to school, and where they went about all the mundane tasks that make up our day-to-day lives. Most importantly, it became the place where they felt they belonged.

Part of this argument could be applied to any immigrant or refugee group; all newcomers have to rethink to greater or lesser degrees who they are and how they live their lives when they resettle, and Chilean exiles were not an exception to this rule. What is remarkable about the first wave of Chilean exiles is the success many of them have enjoyed as professionals, which greatly influenced their ability to materially integrate into Canadian society. The tangible links they established to the communities where they settled provided the impetus for a gradual social integration, which in turn affected the way Chilean exiles defined themselves and were seen by others. Over the years of exile, we can observe changes in the identity of individual exiles and in the broader exile group. It shows up as a gradual and often painful transition from the identity of the uprooted Chilean leftist to that of a successful immigrant/citizen, who has overcome the challenges of exile and remade a life on the other end of the continent. First-wave exiles remain proud of their Chilean roots and many continue to hold on to the political and social values they associate with their vision of what it means to be Chilean; but their integration into Canadian society has left them with multilayered identities, and a complex relationship with the homeland that forced them to leave.

This work centres on the material and existential changes experienced by twenty-one people who found refuge in Canada between 1973 and 1978. The subjects of this study are people who left Chile against their will, ending up by various paths in Canada, a country about which they knew little or nothing. Their life histories show us both how tenuous is the right to citizenship and how malleable is our sense of group identity and belonging. The exiles in this story were excluded from Chile by a regime that despised them and deemed them enemies of the nation, but they did not surrender the right to call themselves Chilean. Rather than being robbed of their national identity by the Chilean military or having it subsumed into a generic immigrant reality, the exiles re-imagined their sense of self, group and nation while rebuilding interrupted lives in a new country.

These twenty-one people are part of a group was not numerically significant compared to other foreign-born communities in Canada, and they formed only a small portion of the over 960 000 immigrants who arrived in the same six-year period that constitutes the first Chilean exile wave.[1] However, the Chilean case stood out because it was different from other refugee movements to Canada in the decades after the Second World War, being composed of people persecuted for their leftist political ideology and activities. This was in contrast to the admission of refugees who were victims of Communist oppression, such as Hungarians, Czechoslovakians, and Tibetans from the People's Republic of China. The admission of persecuted Chileans from the wrong side of the Cold War ideological divide was controversial, and had an effect on Canadian immigration and refugee policy

[1] Canadian government statistics from 1973-1978 show a total of 967 191 new entrants between 1973 and 1978. To put it in context, Chileans arriving in that period accounted for about 0.6% of immigrants and refugees. Retrieved August 30, 2012 from the Human Resources and Skills Development Canada website, http://www4.hrsdc.gc.ca/.3ndic.1t.4r@-eng.jsp?iid=35

that went far beyond the small number of people who came, establishing a precedent for the admission of left-wing Argentineans after 1976, as well as Salvadorans and Guatemalans fleeing right-wing regimes in the early 1980s.[2]

Many of this exile wave display similar demographic and professional features; they were, in the words of the Canadian Minister of Manpower and Immigration in 1973, "Young, well-educated and adaptable people."[3] This is notable within my interview group as well, and it is not a matter of chance, but a reflection of Canadian immigration policy at the time. The exiles were admitted to Canada because of their perceived ability to adapt and contribute to the economic and social life of the country without posing a threat to national security, a key consideration in immigration policy during the Cold War. The high degree of professional achievement they attained not only helped them overcome the material and emotional difficulties of exile, but also facilitated integration into the surrounding society. They often became active members of solidarity groups which opposed not only the dictatorship in Chile, but also protested human rights abuses in otherLatin American countries and the rest of the world that were linked to American imperial policy. Participation in this collective political process helped the exiles recreate part of their previous lives in Chile, establish a sense of community and identity, and interact with people from the host society. The organizational ability that came from

---

[2] Lisa Kowalchuk, "Guatemalans", in Paul R., Magocsi, ed. *Encyclopedia of Canada's Peoples*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999, p. 627.

[3] This was a phrase used by Minister Robert Andras when announcing the Special Movement Chile in the House of Commons on November 30, 1973. Government of Canada, House of Commons Debates, 1st session, 29th Parliament (henceforth HC Debates 1/29), Volume VIII, November 30, 1973, p 8297.This movement and the parliamentary debate surrounding the admission of Chileans is covered in detail in chapter two.

political activism and their own high levels of professional qualification meant that Chilean exiles often played important roles both within the Chilean-Canadian community and the broader Latino-Canadian population. Their importance in associational life and as providers of vital services–notably medical, psychiatric and educational – to the Spanish-speaking communities where they settled are also distinguishing features of the Chilean exile community. The status they achieved within their communities allowed many to create successful new lives in Canada despite being forced from their homeland.

At the same time, the realities of daily life in Canada led to changes in group and family dynamics that were important challenges Chilean exiles faced because of expatriation. The initial period of exile was often one of personal crisis, as participants attempted to cope with the shock and hurt of being away from the people and life they had known. The personal trauma of exile had an impact on interpersonal relationships, especially with spouses, parents and children. These problems were further amplified over time by changes related to deeper integration into Canadian life, such as the redefinition of male and female gender roles and responsibilities in directions that were new and challenging to Chileans. Divorce, which was rare in Chile, became common, and people whose marriages ended tended to place the blame for this on the challenges of exile. Reconstituting professional lives and adapting to new ways of thinking and behaving combined to make the transition to life in Canada problematic, and for many years, all that most of the participants could dream of was going back to Chile, where life was easier to understand and everyone spoke their language.

However, the largely successful integration of the 1973-1978 exile wave into Canadian society led many to remain in the country, even when the use of exile began to wane from 1982 on, when the military regime began to publish lists of those who would be let back in. Well-established in their careers and unwilling to put themselves or their families through the stress and uncertainty of resettlement, most of the twenty-one participants chose Canada. Others who attempted to return to Chile were disappointed and discouraged by the experience, and ultimately resettled in Canada. Although exiles now constitute a smaller proportion of the broader Chilean community in Canada, in many ways they continue to wield significant influence through their involvement in community organizations and the role they play in defining the Chilean-Canadian collective identity.

In order to better understand how the participants in this study came to be exiles in Canada, let us first look at the Chilean diaspora of the 1970s on its global scale: why so many people left after the 1973 coup d'état, where they went, and how Canada fits into this broader picture of exile.

The Chilean diaspora

The Chilean military seized power on 11 September 1973, toppling a coalition government consisting of left and centre-left parties called the *Unidad Popular* (Popular Unity, henceforth UP). Led by President Salvador Allende, the UP administration was elected on a platform of constructing a socialist system in stages and through legislation, using the democratic institutions of the nation to create a more equitable society. Strong

opposition to this programme, both domestic and external, resulted in political deadlock, economic upheaval and social unrest that by 1973 made Chile a polarized, almost ungovernable nation. Urged on by opposition politicians and the Chilean business and agricultural elites, and backed by the Nixon administration in the United States, the leaders of the three branches of the Armed Forces and the paramilitary national police force executed a coup d'état that ended the UP experiment in democratic socialism in the name of order and national unity. However, rather than restoring the pre-UP political order, the Armed Forces and their supporters embarked on an ambitious and ruthless restructuring of Chilean society. In order to ensure the nation's survival, the military regime saw the cleansing of Marxist elements from society as the vital first step. The accusation of Marxist infiltration was the justification used to close Congress, outlaw leftist parties, declare other political parties to be "in recess", censor the media, and suppress labour unions, social and political organizations, community associations in poor urban neighbourhoods, and student groups. It was a "war of annihilation" that would only be won when the enemy no longer existed, and the influence of Marxism –broadly attributed to all the parties that supported the UP, whether actually Marxist or not –could be eradicated from all parts of Chilean society.[4]

One of the ways that the regime eliminated opposition was through the application of repressive measures, both direct and indirect, that forced hundreds of thousands of citizens to abandon the country. This mass movement of the persecuted and marginalized

[4] Darren G. Hawkins, *International Human Rights and Authoritarian Rule in Chile.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002, p. 51-53.

out of the country has led to the creation of *la diáspora chilena* that scattered Chileans to as many as 140 nations of the world, from neighbouring Argentina and Peru to such far-flung and unexpected locations as Mozambique.[5] Chilean and international sources estimate the number of citizens forced from their homeland for political reasons during the period of military rule to be over 200 000; when the number displaced due to the regime's neoliberal economic policies is included, it could amount to as many as one million Chileans, nearly one-tenth of the population at the time.[6]

In its history as an independent nation, Chile has neither been a prominent destination for immigrants, exiles and refugees nor a producer of them. The mass exodus of Chileans for political or even economic reasons was not something that occurred before the era of the military regime, with the notable exception of the continual presence of Chilean

[5] Rody Oñate and Thomas Wright, *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar.* Second edition. Mexico City: Urdimbre, 2002, p. 11-12.

[6] During the military regime, the Chilean authorities put the number as low as 30 000, while other sources put the number of political exiles only at over one million. In both these cases, there were obvious political justifications for inflating or downplaying numbers. 200 000 seems to be a safe conservative estimate, which appears in several sources: Jaime Llambias-Wolff, "Chile's Exiles and Their Return" in Robin Cohen, ed., *The Cambridge Survey of World Migration.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995, p. 229; United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, "La situación de los refugiados en el mundo 2000. Cincuenta años de acción humanitaria." United Nations, 2000, p 3; Organización Internacional para las Migraciones, "Las Migraciones Internacionales: Análisis y perspectivas para una Política Migratoria." Santiago, 2003, p. 5; a 1993 Chilean Senate statement puts it at 250 000 (Legislatura 326ª, OrdinariaSesión del Congreso Pleno, May 21, 1993); also see Vicaría de la Solidaridad, "Documento de Trabajo", which has the number as 246 526 based on Investigative Police statistics (page 228). Centro de Documentación de la Vicaría de la Solidaridad (henceforth CDVS), Exilio, box 30. The official position of the Archbishopric of Santiago, which ran the Vicaría de la Solidaridad, was that Chileans forced to leave the country due to economic restructuring were as much forced migrants as political exiles and therefore victims of the military regime. According to this view, a million Chileans "have been forced to leave the country or compelled to do so against their will." C.S.C, "El Derecho de Vivir en Su Patria." *Foi et Développement*, No. 56, April 1978, p. 6.CDVS, Exilio, Box 29. This is a newsletter that was published by Centre Lebret in Paris. More recent research puts the number of Chileans who left for both political and economic reasons during the period of military rule at 500 000. Cristián Doña-Reveco and Amanda Levinson, "Chile: A Growing Destination Country in Search of a Coherent Approach to Migration." Migracion Policy Institute Country Profile, June 2012. Retrieved August 30, 2012 from the Migration Policy Institute website, http://www.migrationinformation.org/USfocus/display.cfm?ID=895

workers in Argentina since the nineteenth century and a handful of examples of political exiles.[7] While it is not unusual in other former Spanish colonies of America to find exile used as a means of eliminating political rivals –Sznajder and Roniger assert that "exile became a central mode of conducting politics" for some states –this phenomenon was less prevalent in Chile than elsewhere until the 1973 coup.[8] The use of exile became a tool of repression that had widespread consequences for those forced to leave, and how they would later relate to those who remained when exiles began the painful process of returning.[9] The actions of the junta also had important repercussions in other nations in South and Central America throughout the 1970s and 1980s, as they validated state terror as a method of combating the advances of the political left, either through outright physical elimination (execution, disappearance) or exclusion from the national territory (exile).[10]

The Chilean military regime used exile to ensure control over the nation and suppress opposition to their political, economic, social and cultural projects. While many people were formally exiled during the years of military rule, a much higher number felt obligated to seek refuge beyond Chile's borders even in cases where direct oppression

---

[7] José Del Pozo, *Les Chiliens au Québec. Immigrants et réfugiés, de 1955 à nos jours.* Montréal: Boréal, 2009, p.17-20; Vicaría de la Solidaridad, "Documento de Trabajo", p. 216. CDVS, Exilio, box 30.
[8] Mario Sznajder and Luis Roniger, "Political exile in Latin America." *Latin American Perspectives,* Vol. 34, No. 4, 2007, p. 7.
[9] This is a point made in the 1992 annual report of the Oficina Nacional de Retorno [National Bureau of Return, henceforth ONR], a temporary state body tasked with facilitating the reintegration of returnees after the restoration of civilian rule in 1990. The ONR found a high level of acceptance in Chilean society because nearly every Chilean family had a member exiled at some point during the years of the dictatorship. Oficina Nacional de Retorno, "Memoria anual." 1992, p. 3CDVS, Exilio, box 30.
[10] Thomas C. Wright and Rody Oñate Zúñiga, "Chilean Political Exile", *Latin American Perspectives,* Vol. 34, No. 4, 2007, p. 32.

was not present.[11] Factors that caused this movement included loss of employment for political reasons (known in Spanish as *exoneración,* a term that will appear in the cited testimonies), being blacklisted from jobs because of previous political or social actions, harassment by the military or police, repeated short-term detention, anonymous threats and denunciations, or simply the recognition that life under military dictatorship was personally insufferable. Many of the study's participants left Chile not because they were in imminent peril, but because life had become untenable and there was a constant sense of danger. Some had time to plan their exile, and give due consideration about where to go, and what options were available to them, similar to an economic migrant. Nevertheless, we must not overlook the fact that they were not heading to the other end of the continent by choice, but by necessity.

It is within the context of this forced exodus from Chile that Canada enters this particular story as a country of refuge, albeit not always a willing one. Exile in Canada was a transformative experience on multiple levels that has redefined for many people who and what they are. For some, the long-term results of life in Canada have been characterized as postive, while others have not been so fortunate. Regardless, the changes exiles experienced were not a matter of choice, but of necessity, having been dispossessed of their homeland. One participant decribed exile in Canada as living in a

[11] The regime's own statistics from 1979 put the number of those officially exiled at around 28 000, but this number did not take into account those who left because of fear or blacklisting. The Chilean NGO *Comité Pro Retorno* (Committee for Return) counted 37 434 cases of official expulsion as of 1982. Vicaria de la Solidaridad, "Documento de Trabajo", 1992, p. 221. CDVS, Exilio, box 30.

golden cage –a place of safety and plenty they could not leave.[12] Canada provided the setting where exiles could rebuild their lives, but at the same time people who ached to return to their homeland initially saw it as a prison. How Canada ceased being a prison and began to be a home is the question this study seeks to answer.

Temporal and geographic delimitations of the study

The Chileans in Canada today are far from a uniform group, but rather a heterogeneous community that has roots that precede the arrival of the exiles in the 1970s and branches that have grown after the flow of the politically persecuted waned.[13] However, the Chilean participants in this project belong to a particular wave of migrants who arrived between 1973 and 1978 because of the coup d'état. This span of time encompasses the first period of extreme repression in Chile as well as the years that the Canadian government ran a special programme to aid in the resettlement of exiles from military rule.[14] Though Chileans continued entering Canada for political reasons after

---

[12] Interview by author with Eduardo Boza, Toronto, November 3, 2008 (henceforth Eduardo interview). Interview in Spanish. All translations are by the author unless otherwise noted.

[13] The most recent published census information dates from 2006. It shows 38 180 respondents identified themselves as Chilean, divided into 19,215 single responses and 18,960 multiple responses. Retrieved August 30, 2012 from the Statistics Canada website, http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/hlt/97-562/pages/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo=PR&Code=01&Data=Count&Table=2&StartRec=1&Sort=3&Display=All&CSDFilter=5000#Notes. A different Statistics Canada report outlines the migratory flow of Chileans to Canada by decade or half-decade. The numbers break down in the following way: before 1961, 125;1961-1970, 555; 1971-1980, 10 915; 1981-1990, 4805; and 2001-2006, 2325. The decade which includes the first exile wave saw the greatest number by far, and the Chileans alone represented 17.7% of the total immigration from Latin America for that period, ranking them first in terms of country of origin. Statistics Canada, "Hispanic Spanish speaking population in Canada: a special report prepared for the Canadian Hispanic Congress." 2006, p.31.

[14] The Canadian government's Special Movement Chile (henceforth SMC) lasted from the last month of 1973 until 1978. It is discussed in detail in chapter two. The worst periods of large-scale repression during the military regime were 1973-1976 and 1984-1987. The former period coincided with the targeted elimination of activists from the main parties of the Unidad Popular as well as the Movimiento de la Izquierda Revolucionaria [Revolutionary Left Movement, henceforth MIR], which had not belonged to the

1978, admission restrictions instituted in 1979 reduced their numbers, a trend that continued throughout the 1980s.[15] In effect, the exiles who arrived from 1973 to 1978 became the largest cohort among the Canadian Chilean community for more than a decade, and as I discuss later in the study, they have played a large role in establishing the collective identity of their ethnic group in the country of refuge.

However, the end of exclusion from Chile does not have a clear-cut date. It could be argued that exile ended in 1988 with the official announcement by the military regime that nearly all the expelled were now free to return, in 1989 with the first post-Pinochet elections, or in 1990 with the start of the new civilian administration. It could also come before these dates for people who left without officially being banished, who were technically allowed to return at any time and sometimes did. It could also be said that while exile has ended *de jure*, it continues *de facto* for the thousands of Chileans who were unable or unwilling to return to their country. And what of more recent returnees to Chile, such as two of the people I interviewed? Is their exile just ending now that they have rejoined the Chilean body politic? And what about people who now split their lives between Chile and Canada, like one participant in this work –are they half in exile, half

---

coalition. The Vicaría de la Solidaridad estimated that at least 140 000 people went into exile during this four-year span. Vicaria de la Solidaridad, "Documento de Trabajo", 1992, p. 219. CDVS, Exilio, box 30. The Vicaría statistics do not distinguish between those who left for reasons of direct repression (the legally expelled and released political prisoners, for example) and those who left due to indirect repression (such as being fired and blacklisted).

[15] A visa requirement for Chileans imposed by the short-lived Progressive Conservative government of Joe Clark effectively ended inland refugee claims by Chileans arriving at Canadian airports as tourists. Two other factors should be considered in assessing the slow-down in the entry of Chileans into Canada after 1978: a decrease in the level of repression in Chile, given that most members of the opposition were dead, in prison, or in exile by this point; and the general improvement in the Chilean economy from 1978 until the crash of 1982.

out? These questions make defining an end to exile problematic. In recognition of this, I have extended the time frame of this work to the present, which is open-ended enough to accommodate the fact that exile is continuous and complex, with a defined beginning but no clear-cut end.

The Chilean participants in this study spent most of their exile years in the two central Canadian provinces of Ontario and Québec. While these two provinces housed the largest number of Chileans, there is evidence that their experiences of exile were in some ways considerably different from people who resettled in western Canada.[16] I have relied on the research of others to fill in the blanks left by my lack of testimony from these areas.[17] The difference between Central and Western Canada matters because the Chilean communities across the country ended up reflecting the decentralized, regional nature of the nation of refuge: there was no pan-Canadian Chilean association and little contact or cooperation between regional groups, and at the end of the day the experiences and memories of the members of different communities seem to have important distinctions. There is no 'experience of exile' for Chilean exiles in Canada, but rather various 'experiences of exile' that depend on numerous variables, of which geographical location is one. The reasons for the atomized nature of Chilean groups in Canada are discussed in greater detail in chapter two.

[16] Harry Diaz, "Chileans", in Magocsi, ed. *Encyclopedia of Canada's Peoples*, p. 350.
[17] I would especially extend my thanks to Litzy Baeza Kallens, Raul M. Muñoz, and Matthew Scalena, all three of whom used interviews with Chileans in western Canada in their graduate studies work. See the sources section for bibliographical details.

Exile, refugee, forced migrant, immigrant? The problem of classification

One of the questions I had to address was how to refer to the people I was studying. In documents generated by the solidarity lobby in the 1970s, they are most often referred to as Chilean refugees, because they were seeking refuge from a military dictatorship that was persecuting them for their political activities and beliefs. While this is not an altogether inaccurate label, there are several problems with the term refugee. One is that the use of the word tends to disempower the people it is applied to, branding them as helpless victims of events beyond their control. Calling the Chileans refugees risks having them lose their human faces and become an indistinguishable mass, which is something I precisely wish to avoid doing.[18]

Another problem with refugee is that it is a legal definition of a person's status that brings with it potential benefits and restrictions. The most widely used definition of a refugee is that of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR):

> [S]omeone who, owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.

[18] Marita Eastmond, *The Dilemmas of Exile: Chilean Refugees in the USA*. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1997, p. 6. Eastmond also underlines the fact that exile as a state of mind can outlast refugee status as a legal classification. Becoming a citizen of the country of refuge effectively puts an end to being a refugee, but one still remains an exile.

People who fit this definition can receive UN protection and resettlement assistance in willing host countries, and may be eligible for various forms of economic, social and psychological assistance from the country of refuge. They may also face restrictions when it comes to movement across borders, or forms of discrimination in the job and housing market.[19] While there were Chileans who arrived in Canada under UN auspices, it was more common for them to arrive as landed immigrants or with special Ministerial Permits from the Canadian government. While these programmes also included forms of resettlement assistance, the Chileans who entered Canada in these ways received different treatment and had fewer issues regularizing their legal status. Therefore, to label the entire group of those who left for political reasons refugees is ultimately fallacious. Most of them simply were not, by any legal understanding of the term.

Would it therefore be more accurate to talk about the Chileans as an immigrant group? Again, it would be somewhat true, as the Chileans who came to live in Canada before the coup d'état, as well as many who came in the 1980s and thereafter did not come for reasons of political persecution. Many Chileans fit the profile of the typical immigrant, coming to an economically developed nation for the benefits it offers in the present and future. Also, as mentioned above, many of the politically persecuted were legally no different from other immigrants, so why treat them as such? The answer is that the group I am focusing on were not normal immigrants who chose to leave their country and had

[19] This happened to some Chileans who were issued Social Insurance cards that began with the number 9. This denoted them as people in the process of receiving refugee status, but who still might be refused and repatriated, which made them unattractive as candidates for employment or as tenants. José Del Pozo, *Les Chiliens au Québec. Immigrants et réfugiés, de 1955 à nos jours.* Montréal: Boréal, 2009, p. 121-122, 151-152.

the freedom to pick their destination. None of them wanted to leave Chile: they were banished from their homeland for reasons of punishment and control. To classify them as immigrants would be to deny this fundamental feature of their lives and ignore the traumas that accompanied being ripped away from the world they knew.

In his work on the Chilean community in Québec, José del Pozo –who was also a participant in this project –deals with the problem of what label to use by calling people who came during the dictatorship "forced migrants". This allows him to group together Chileans who settled in Québec for both political reasons and because of economic displacement that resulted from the neoliberal restructuring of the Chilean economy by the military regime.[20] However, as the centre of my work is a group of Chileans who left mostly for political reasons, I do not feel the same need as Del Pozo to find a unifying label for disparate groups within the larger community. With this in mind, I have decided to use the term exile to describe the Chileans who participated in this study. As their personal histories unfold in this work, we shall see that not all of the people I spoke to suffered direct repression for their political activities or beliefs, but all were in danger in one way or another that made life under military rule virtually impossible. Also, people who have experienced the loss of homeland for political reasons prefer the term over the label of refugee: "[D]efining oneself and being defined by others as an exile means overcoming the sense of being merely a victim, a depersonalized member of a category

[20] José Del Pozo, *Les Chiliens au Québec. Immigrants et réfugiés, de 1955 à nos jours.* Montréal: Boréal, 2009, p. 120. Using this term also ties Chileans in Canada to previous waves of forced migrants, especially displaced persons from Eastern and Central Europe in the years immediately after the Second World War who did not wish to live under Communist rule for political and/or economic reasons. Gerald E. Dirks, *Canada's Refugee Policy: Indifference or Opportunism?* Montreal and London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1977, p. 118.

without a name."[21] Someone may be a refugee for political reasons, but also because of factors like natural disasters, environmental degradation, or economic collapse. An exile becomes an exile because of a conscious policy of exclusion.

Sources for the study

The most important primary sources for this consist of the interviews I conducted with twenty-one people who self-identify as exiles, and two non-Chileans who had deep connections to the exiles through solidarity activism and legal representation on their behalf. The transcripts of these interviews provide the testimony about the lived experiences of the exiles that appears in this study. This information is supplemented by other documents and testimony from sources such as solidarity campaign literature, government reports by local, provincial and federal civil servants in Canada, expulsion orders issued by the military government in Chile, and studies produced by non-governmental organizations both in Chile and abroad concerning the effects of exile on individuals, families and broader social groups. The majority of these documents come from the period 1973-1990, when the question of exile was most acute, or from a few years after the end of military rule, when the Chilean government, national and international NGOs were dealing with returning exiles. These sources are not neutral; Chilean and Canadian observers make their arguments based on where they stood in

[21] James N.Green and Luis Roniger, "Exile and the Setting of Future Research Agendas". *Latin American Perspectives*, Vol. 34, No. 4, 2007, p. 106. Ariel Dorfman points out that exile has "No legal significance, no international or technical meaning, no guarantees, no protection", but also describes the rejection of the term refugee as that of a faceless victim. Exile is "Byronic, defiant and challenging", an active rather than passive identity label. Ariel Dorfman, *Heading South, Looking North.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1998, p. 238.

relation to the coup d'état, and whether it constituted a rupture in Chile's political and social traditions, or was an act of national salvation undertaken to save the country from a disastrous deviation into socialism.

The consideration of perspective also extends to some studies I use that would seem, at first glance, to be secondary sources: monographs on Canadian immigration and refugee policy, in particular those of Gerald E. Dirks, or examinations of the Chileans in Canada by historians, sociologists and psychiatrists, among others. In the case of Dirks, he was advocating changes to what he saw as a flawed and biased government policy that put considerations of economic utility and ideological suitability over humanitarian concerns, a criticism that appeared constantly in literature produced by the pro-exile Canadian lobby discussed in chapters two and three of this study.[22] As for studies specifically about Chileans in Canada, they were often authored by Chilean exiles –two of whom also feature in this study as participants, discussed in more detail below –and therefore cannot be considered disinterested observations despite the use of objective methodologies to present their arguments. As such, I have treated them in the same way as primary sources, interrogating not only what they claim or argue, but why they are advocating a particular position over another.

To a certain degree, I have had to take the same care with other secondary sources relating to the question of exile and the Chilean diaspora, for the same reasons mentioned above. Examinations of the exiles come from one side of the debate over the coup and its

[22] Dirks, *Canada's Refugee Policy: Indifference or Opportunism?*; *Controversy and Complexity: Canadian Immigration Policy during the 1980s.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995.

consequences, generated by exiles themselves or people who sympathized with their situation. The perspective on Chilean exile in works such as Rody Oñate and Thomas Wright's *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar* is similar from work to work. All take the basic position that exile was a cruel and unjust punishment inflicted on the supporters of a democratically-elected government, and that being sent into exile resulted in identity crisis and emotional scars that will never heal. While I agree with most of this position, as a student of history I have also attempted to look at these sources critically and not accept the claims they make at face value.

The view of exile in works on the Chileans is influenced by Edward Said's essay "The Mind of Winter: Reflections on life in exile."[23] It centres on mass exile in the twentieth century and how this has affected the understanding and portrayal of the issue in both the real world and in works of literature. Said's vision, informed by his Palestinian roots and his community's experience of unending exile, is pessimistic and refutes the idea that exile can be redemptive or enlightening, a leitmotif that appears in some of the canonical works of Western literature. The conception of exile as a permanent, untreatable wound has influenced the discourse of academics, returnees and exile groups, but it has also served as a position to argue against for other observers who do find evidence of positive, albeit unintended, consequences of forced migration.[24] While I hesitate to claim that exile

[23] Edward W. Said, "The Mind of Winter: Reflections on life in exile." *Harper's*, Vol. 269, No. 1612, September 1984.
[24] Examples of the point of view that exile is a permanent wound can be found in the report from the Seminario Encuentro Metropolitano de Retornados del Exilio (Seminar of Metropolitan Returnees) of the Comité de Retornados del exilio-Chile (Chilean Returned Exiles Committee), held in Santiago in 2003: "The truth is that we are political exiles and continue to be so because we are the product of a dictatorship that tried to exterminate the popular forces in our country. Any policy toward the exiles must start with this

has had redemptive features, I believe my research shows that the image of exile found in Said and many works on the Chileans oversimplifies what is a complex problem. Some of the participants in this study still hurt deeply from the pain of exile, but others do not. They have scar tissue to show for their experiences, but few open wounds.

Rather than relying on interpretations that present exile as an existential problem affecting only individuals or groups, I have made use of the four-point model for examining modern exiles suggested by political scientists Mario Sznajder and Luis Roniger that encompasses not only the expelled, but also the expelling polity and the receiving societies, as well as the transnational global human rights movement that became their voice.[25] I have found this model a useful tool for conceptualizing the forces in play in an exile experience. The life stories of the expelled are the heart of the examination, without losing sight of the fact that the actions of the Chilean and Canadian states were pivotal in their lives, nor that the exiles in Canada were part of an international diaspora that applied pressure on the regime that forced them from their home.

---

truth. Because we are victims whose wounds have not been healed by the Chilean state, as is its responsibility." Bernardo Contreras Muñoz, "Introducción al tema exilio, chilenos residentes en el extranjero, Region XIV." Seminario Encuentro Metropolitano de Retornados del Exilio, 2003, p. 17. CDVS, Exilio, box 32.This type of reflection can be found in a large number of the interviews for this study, as well as sources such as the "Documento de Trabajo" of the Vicaría de la Solidaridad: "However, exile had positive aspects: simultaneous with the isolation of the government at the international level, the most profound international solidarity campaign that has ever been directed toward any country also took place and the driving force of the campaign was the exiles. Exile, from being a negative, became a positive through the incorporation of thousands of Chileans into the ranks of European and American professionals and academics." Vicaría de la Solidaridad, "Documento de Trabajo." 1992, p. 244-245. CDVS, Exilio, box 30.

[25] Mario Sznajder and Luis Roniger, "Exile Communities and their Differential Institutional Dynamics: A Comparative Analysis of the Chilean and Uruguayan Political Diasporas." *Revista de Ciencia Política,* Vol. 27, No. 1, 2007, p. 55.

For Canadian immigration history, I have used secondary sources to analyze the changes over time in who came to Canada, what policies existed regarding settlement, and who were considered apt candidates for citizenship. From the mid 1970s, the tendency in immigration history to view the entrance of foreigners as part of a positive nation-building process benefitting both the newcomers and the receiving society gave way to a more critical perspective that looked at inconsistencies and out-and-out biases in Canadian policy and highlighted the importance of economic considerations to the state when deciding on the guidelines of admittance.[26] The present work is part of the latter historiographical tendency, as I present evidence that shows that the policy toward potential Chilean entrants was shaped by ideological concerns and economic prerogatives rather than humanitarian considerations, as the government of the day claimed.

To date, no historical study exists that looks exclusively at the entry of Chilean exiles into Canada as a whole; the closest to such a work is José Del Pozo's *Les Chiliens au Québec: Immigrants et réfugiés, de 1955 à nos jours* (2009), which analyzes the history of Chileans in that one province, from the first few scattered settlers to the present day, rather than focus on one particular segment of the community. While exiles occupy a

---

[26] Dirks' *Canada's Refugee Policy: Indifference or Opportunism?* has proven influential for examinations of the importance of national self-interest in immigration and refugee issues. Reg Whitaker's *Double Standard: The Secret History of Canadian Immigration* (1987) and Donald H. Avery's *Reluctant Host: Canada's Response to Immigrant Workers* (1995) follow Dirks' trajectory in presenting highly critical assessments of the purposes and rationale behind Canadian immigration policy and practice. Reg Whitaker is also part of a group of scholars who focus on exclusionary practices of the Canadian state in its dealing with potential entrants and policies of control and surveillance of those who are let in. Whitaker and Gary Marcuse's *Cold War Canada: The Making of a National Insecurity State* (1994), along with the compilation *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies* (2000) and *Gatekeepers: Reshaping Immigrant Lives in Cold War Canada* by Franca Iacovetta (2006) are part of this historiographical trend and have influenced my understanding of the Canadian state's reaction in the face of the Chilean exile issue.

significant place in his work due to their numbers and public profile within the broader Chilean community in Québec, Del Pozo considers looking only at exiles to be reductionist in that it fails to take into account the economic, social and cultural ties between Québec and Chile that have developed over time.[27] His approach reveals his view as a historian that Chileans in Canada are not a community of exiles, nor should they be analyzed in that way, a caveat he offered about my own research at the time of our interview. Jaime Llambías-Wolff, who like Del Pozo is one of the interviewees in this study, authored an ethnographic study of the exile population in Québec in *Notre exile pour parler: les Chiliens au Québec* (1988). The time at which he wrote it and the questions he was seeking to answer as a sociologist had a clear influence on his choice of focusing on exiles rather than the community as a whole. While providing historical background and statistical information about the flow of exiles to Canada and other parts of the world, Llambías-Wolff's primary concern was presenting a portrait of the exile community in the late 1980s, with an emphasis on the challenges to identity posed by exile and the relationships between exiles and Québécois. The present study echoes aspects of both of these works, in that it focuses on one part of the Chilean-Canadian community rather than the whole, but does so from a historical perspective, tracing the changes over time experienced by members of the exile community on multiple levels: in their working life, as spouses/partners, as parents, and as members of a highly politicized, activist group culture. The stories of the twenty-one participants feature many problems that are associated with all immigrant cultures, as Del Pozo argues: learning a new

[27] Del Pozo, *Les Chiliens au Québec. Immigrants et réfugiés, de 1955 à nos jours,* p. 8-9.

language, finding work, dealing with nostalgia for the country of origin and deciding whether to remain in the new country permanently, or to go back to their homeland. However, their testimonies also reveal that exile poses problems to individual and group identity in the degree of rupture with the past and lack of plan for the future. Llambías-Wolff uses the image of Janus, the two-headed Roman god, looking both forward and back, to illustrate the particular challenge of exile to identity: people looking back to a past that was physically denied to them, and ahead to a future that was completely unclear and unplanned in an unknown setting.[28] Del Pozo is correct in stating Chileans in Canada should not be reduced to being Chilean exiles in Canada, but neither should exiles be subsumed into a generic immigrant experience.

Historians of modern Chile have argued vigorously over the causes, consequences, and ultimate importance of the coup. . For Chileans of both right and left, the 1973 coup became the defining moment in modern Chilean history, and this is also true of much of the historiography pertaining to the Unidad Popular and the Pinochet regime. Since the end of military rule, debate between historians of different ideological positions has taken place over the reasons for the coup and how to understand it within the broader scheme of Chilean history. For regime supporters such as Gonzalo Vial, the period from 1964 to 1973 represented a dangerous deviation in the course of Chilean history that threatened national unity and security. The military had intervened out of necessity and restored

[28] Jaime Llambías-Wolff, *Notre exil por parler: les Chiliens au Québec*. Montréal: Fides, 1988, p. 19. The Janus image seems to have struck a chord with Chilean exiles writing on their own community, and reappears in other works such as Vásquez and Araujo, *La maldición de Ulises: Repercusiones psicológicas del exilio*. The earliest use of this image I found was from a Parisian journal from the late 1970s featuring an article on Chilean exiles in Europe. C.S.C., "El Derecho de Vivir en Su Patria." *Foi et Développement*, No. 56, April 1978, p. 3. CDVS, Exilio, box 29.

Chilean institutionalism when the country was on the verge of civil war.[29] On the other end of the political spectrum, a number of historians promoted a renewed Marxist historical interpretation and disputed both the necessity of the coup and the historical explanation for it. They identified the roots of the crisis in Chilean society in the nineteenth century and the problems caused by elite rule and the exclusion of the popular classes. The coup d'état had been counter to Chilean democratic traditions consolidated in the 1930s, but had also represented a continuity, that of one faction of society imposing its vision and practices on another.[30] This position can be seen in several of the works of Chilean history I consulted, particular those of Gabriel Salazar and Julio Pinto, and Mario Garcés.[31]

Both sides of this debate reduced the understanding of how and why the coup took place to an either/or proposition: the crisis of the 1970s was either the result of the struggle against communism, culminating in the national catastrophe of the Unidad Popular; or it was because of a century of incompetent oligarchic rule that had continually relied on violent exclusion of the popular classes to maintain the status quo in a deeply classist society. Neither questioned whether they should be looking at other

---

[29] Vial's original articles on this question appeared in the newspaper *La Segunda.* The argument reproduced here is taken from Mario Garcés Duran *et al*, "Manifiesto de Historiadores". Archivo Chile, Web del Centro Estudios Miguel Enríquez (CEME), 1999. p. 3-4. Retrieved August 30, 2012 from http://www.archivo-chile.com/. Many of Vial's arguments are similar to the justifications for the coup and military rule expressed by Augusto Pinochet while under house arrest in London in 1998, though Pinochet went farther back in time to trace the origins of the coup, portraying the conflict as part of the 20th century struggle of the Christian West, human dignity and civilization against the materialistic, enslaving force of communism. Augusto Pinochet, "Carta a los chilenos", December 1998. Retrieved August 30, 2012 from http://es.wikisource.org/wiki/Carta_a_los_Chilenos,_de_Augusto_Pinochet

[30] Garcés Duran *et al*, "Manifiesto de Historiadores", p. 1, 2.

[31] Gabriel Salazar, and Julio Pinto, *Historia Contemporánea de Chile II: Actores, identidad y movimiento.* Santiago: LOM, 1999; Mario Garcés *et al. Memoria para un nuevo siglo: Chile, miradas a la segunda mitad del sigloXX.* Santiago: LOM, 2000.

historical actors or time frames when it came to modern Chilean history. More recent scholarship has challenged the position that all paths of inquiry begin and end in 1973 by approaching Chilean history from new perspectives and focusing on questions that go beyond electoral politics, institutionalism and class struggle. By examining history through the eyes of indigenous people, rural women during the agricultural reform period, or women and men in a copper mining enclave, historians such as Florencia E. Mallon, Heidi Tinsman and Thomas Klubock have introduced new subjects of historical study whose experiences complicate "many of the well-known narratives of twentieth-century Chilean history" and the "closely guarded chronologies and periodizations" espoused by both poles of the historical debate.[32] The Unidad Popular had not made Chile a utopia for most women or indigenous people, who had remained excluded from the project. For doubly marginalized groups such as these, 11 September 1973 and the years of military rule were neither the start nor the end of a project, but part of a continual struggle to have their demands recognized and met. The social mobilization that took place during and because of authoritarian rule even represented a high point for certain movements, which would see their influence and organizational power decline after the restoration of civilian rule.[33] The introduction of new social actors and new areas of study in historical research has called into question the simple explanations provided by both camps in

---

[32] Florencia E. Mallon, *Courage Tastes of Blood: the Mapuche Community of Nicolás Ailio and the Chilean State, 1906-2001.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2005, p. 21. Heidi Tinsman, *Partners in Conflict: the Politics of Gender, Sexuality, and Labor in the Chilean Agrarian Reform, 1950-1973.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2002; Thomas Miller Klubock, *Contested Communities: Class, Gender, and Politics in Chile's El Teniente Copper Mine, 1904-1951.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.

[33] This is the assertion of some Chilean feminists in regard to their activities during the military regime, remembered as the most "heroic" period of the movement. Jadwiga E. Pieper Mooney, *The Politics of Motherhood: Maternity and Women's Rights in Twentieth-Century Chile.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009, p. 164.

Chile's history battle. In this study, I have applied some of the new understandings and perspectives of these historians to the experiences of the exiles I interviewed to show that their lives in Canada cannot be reduced to simple binaries of rupture/redemption, belonging/exclusion, failure/success; and though 11 September stands as a crucial date, it is not the only milestone in their lives. The lives of the exiles, like the history of their homeland, pose difficult and complex questions; it should come as no surprise that there are no easy answers.

Constructing an oral history

The present work draws on many varieties of history. In its fundamental focus on a specific social group composed of average people, their day-to-day life and concerns rather than political or economic elites, it falls within the field of social history. More specifically, it relates to the sub-field of immigration history that looks at human migration between nations and regions. In establishing the context for what happened in both Chile and Canada, I also look at events and historical actors that are more typical of political or institutional history, such as the broader question of changes to Canadian immigration policy over time, or the goals and methods of the Unidad Popular administration. In addition, the view of transnational history expounded by Laura Briggs, Gladys McCormick and J.T. Way informs my work.[34] The physical displacement of exile leads to the breakdown of traditional concepts of national and cultural identity and a loss of a sense of community. This complicates the easy historicizing of exile realities.

[34] Laura Briggs, Gladys McCormick and J.T. Way, "Transnationalism: A Category of Analysis" in *American Quarterly,* Vol.60, No. 3, 2008.

Transnational history in part arises from human mobility and the increasing globalization of peoples, culture, economic systems, and ideas. Many people belong to more than one nation, and this fact leads to the blurring of identities based on national, ethnic or cultural origins. The Chilean exiles are part of this re-imagining of the nation in the context of both Chile and Canada. Going beyond the question of national identity, I also ask what other elements of identity, such as professional activity, group membership, family and gender roles, and political participation, have changed as a result of being forced across borders, and in what ways.

At its core, however, this is a work of oral history, with the personal recollections of twenty-three people who generously shared their stories as its backbone. Their stories help us understand the history of this era and the place of these people within it. We are given a broader picture of what happened by tapping a less-used historical resource: the memories of the exiles "are the living memories of individuals that go unrecorded but could form a vital part of a fuller understanding of how this period was experienced."[35] The use of these testimonies provides us with the perspectives of people who might end up "hidden from history" otherwise.[36] In the case of this study, basing my work around an oral history approach allowed me to compile primary-source "documents" in the form of testimonies that focused on lived experiences. Using oral history also validated the fact that the participants in this study, while not members of social or political elites, are social actors deserving of study. They were (and are) not passive members of "the masses"

[35] Alexander Wilde, "Irruptions of Memory: Expressive Politics in Chile's Transition to Democracy." *Journal of Latin American Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 2, May 1999, p.500.
[36] Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson, eds. *The Oral History Reader.* London and New York: Routledge, 1998. p. ix.

that were simply acted upon by forces greater than themselves, but the subjects of their own histories. In certain cases, such as with José Del Pozo, Jaime Llambías-Wolff and Marlinda Freire, the interviewee is an expert on the Chilean community in Canada as well as a witness to the events they describe as exiles.[37]

The appendix to this study consists of the interview questions used and a series of charts that lay out the demographic and professional data of the participants. This information shows that the majority of the exiles I interviewed were in their mid twenties or early thirties when they came to Canada, and most of them were highly educated professionals with leftist sympathies rather than strong partisan connections. All but one belong to what José del Pozo calls the "Exodus of the Years of Lead", arriving between the fall of 1973 and 1978, when Canada's special programme for Chileans was discontinued.[38] This wave of political exiles did not mean the end of Chileans entering Canada, as the flow continues to this day. However, this wave of exiles was both numerically significant within the Chilean community and tended to occupy leadership roles in its associations. The nature of their arrival in Canada caused many of them to form close bonds that often continue to this day, so that when one participant would refer me to other potential interviewees, these people also pertained to that cohort of Chileans.

The interviews were conducted between October 2008 and April 2010. The majority took place in Toronto, though I also conducted two in Ottawa and three in Santiago,

---

[37] As a way of distinguishing between when these three are speaking as experts from when they are relating personal experiences, I refer to them throughout the study by their family names in the former case and their first names in the latter.
[38] *L'exode des années de plomb* in French, denoting a time of violence. This is the timeline that also appears in Diaz, "Chileans", in Magocsi, ed. *Encyclopedia of Canada's Peoples*, p. 349-350.

Chile. I came into contact with the participants in a number of ways. The first I made were through friends who are the children of Chilean exiles, who arranged interviews with their mothers. One of these individuals, Marlinda Freire, then provided me with a contact list of seven of her friends from the first exile wave, whom I contacted by telephone to ask whether they would be interested in participating. Of these seven, four agreed. Other participants I found through the Centre for Research on Latin America and the Caribbean at York University, whom I contacted via e-mail to request interviews. Of half a dozen requests sent, two responded positively. In one case, an acquaintance passed on information to me about a forum on Chilean exile that took place over a number of weeks in the spring and summer of 2007, at which I reconnected with José Borgoño, who I had briefly met a few months earlier. José and his wife Raquel granted me a joint interview about a year later, and provided me with an extensive list of contacts, four of whom appear in this work. José Del Pozo and Jaime Llambías-Wolff I contacted on my own initiative in order to discuss their academic work, but I was fortunate enough to get them to participate as interviewees as well. The same situation was true with Joan Simalchik, one of the two non-Chilean participants, whom I contacted after reading her studies of the Chilean exile community. My brother's connection to the world of Spanish-language literature in Canada helped me make contact with Jorge Etcheverry, who in turn introduced me to Alfredo Lavergne. Finally, my involvement in Toronto theatre company Alameda Theatre's production of Carmen Aguirre's *The Refugee Hotel* gave me the opportunity share the stage during a panel discussion with Juan Nuñez and Jeff House, the second non-Chilean participant, as well as to speak to Ana María Barrenechea, who

was part of the discussion as an audience member. While my own cold-calling played a role in making contacts with exiles, a certain amount of luck and a great deal of assistance from the participants themselves was crucial to this project.

I chose who to contact based on the criteria of when they arrived, and whether or not they were adults at the time of arrival. Participants and other parties on occasion offered to put me in contact with people who arrived after the 1973-1978 timeframe, or individuals who came to Canada as children during that period. I opted not to include people in the former group in my study, as the circumstances of their migration were different and lay outside the scope of the study's focus. In the case of exile children, while I am greatly interested in how they self-identify and relate to Chile and Canada, I felt that their stories warranted a study of its own that should not be an addendum or supplement to that of their parents. Personal contact with people of this "1.5 generation" –my peer group –suggest that questions about their identities are even more complex than those relating to their parents, and are best tackled as a related but separate topic from the experiences of their mothers and fathers.

The interviews were conducted in Spanish or English, depending on the preference of the interviewee. There were twenty-five sessions in all for twenty-three participants, as I interviewed Carlos Torres and Ana María Barrenechea twice. Sixteen of the sessions were conducted in Spanish, eight in English, and in one case, we switched between the two languages during the course of the discussion. The shortest interview lasted an hour, the longest just over two. On average, the sessions lasted about ninety minutes. All were

one-on-one sessions, except in the case of José and Raquel Borgoño. Thirteen were conducted in the participants' homes, five at people's work offices, and the remainder in restaurants or cafes. The interview scripts for the Chilean participants were all the same, but to the two non-Chileans I addressed questions that covered their areas of expertise. I generally covered all the questions from the script in each session, though I also asked extra questions as the interview progressed that related to the individual's particular interests and activities.

I made written notes of all interviews using the script template, and recorded all but one with a digital recording device. The recordings were used to make partial transcriptions that are the sources of the direct quotations in this study. Other than sporadic contact through e-mail with a small number of the participants, I have had no contact with the majority since the interviews took place, and none of them have seen the partial transcripts. I would have preferred to have conducted follow-up sessions with the Chilean participants to clarify certain pieces of information and have them read over the transcribed parts of the interview to offer corrections or further commentary, but since I have spent most of the last four years living in Japan, this was not possible.

One final point that bears mentioning concerns my own position as interviewer and my status as an outsider from the Chilean community. I suspect, having done the interviews and reviewed the recordings, that many of the participants were less critical of their treatment by the Canadian state, its institutions and inhabitants than they would have been had I been better known to them or part of the community. This tendency is even

more pronounced when the interviews were conducted in English. I make this statement based on comparisons with the more openly critical appraisals of Canada given by Chileans found in other works on the exile community that have used interviews as central evidence, such as Monica Escobar's "Exile Women and National Identity: Chilean Women in Canada" or Raul M. Muñoz's "Separation and National Identity: A Narrative Account of Chilean Exiles Living in Saskatchewan."[39] In both of these studies, the interviewer is part of the community, Escobar being an exile herself, and Muñoz the son of an exile. In my case, I only met a handful of the participants more than once, we had no relationship prior to the interview process, and I am as *gringo* as can be –a white, English-speaking man born in Canada. Did my status as a "typical" Canadian colour the way in which questions about Canada were answered? I think it did. On the other hand, I may have received answers about the inner dynamics of the Chilean community that were more detailed and critical than an insider would have because I had no position within the group and belonged to no side; thus I was a safe person to speak to openly on questions of divisions, tensions and rivalries. At the end of the day, I can prove neither of these suppositions conclusively, but they are considerations I kept in mind during the interview and transcription process, and I would like the reader of this work to keep them in mind as well.

[39] Monica Escobar, "Exile Women and National Identity: Chilean Women in Canada." Doctoral thesis in Psychology, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, 2000; Raul M. Muñoz, "Separation and National Identity: A Narrative Account of Chilean Exiles Living in Saskatchewan." Master's thesis in Sociology, University of Saskatchewan, 2006.

Chapter outline

This study consists of five chapters, along with this introduction and a conclusion. Chapter one is an examination of both Chile and Canada in the context of the Cold War, and how that conflict lay at the root of the coup d'état and the Chilean diaspora. The Cold War also conditioned how Canadian government officials and members of the general public reacted to the humanitarian crisis in Chile after 11 September, and ultimately influenced which Chileans were judged fit for admission. In the case of both countries, I describe developments after the Second World War that are pivotal to understanding the actions and reactions of the 1970s. Using analyses of Latin America in the Cold War era by historian Greg Grandin and political scientist Hal Brands, I situate the crisis in Chile in a broader regional context before looking at the specific problems the country faced as a result of uneven economic and social development. For Canada, I follow the changes to immigration policy using the periodization suggested by Ninette Kelley and M.J. Trebilcock, and the connections between immigration and national security studied by Reg Whitaker, among others. In accordance with Whitaker's thesis regarding exclusionary policies, I see the Canadian federal government playing a large role in deciding who was suitable for membership in the nation, which had serious repercussions for Chileans. However, as Andrew Stuart Thompson and others have argued, humanitarian considerations in a post-Holocaust world also exercised an influence on both immigration officials and members of the public, which limited the state's ability to

completely shut out the less- or undesired. The results of the tension between security concerns and humanitarian policy can be clearly seen in the admission of Chilean exiles.

Chapter two narrates why and how the project participants left Chile, and how they ended up in Canada. The testimony of the participants provides the bulk of the information, supplemented by primary sources generated by Chilean organizations or by Canadian solidarity groups. The participants' experiences show that there were many reasons for going into exile, and that some people stayed on in Chile, by choice or necessity, for months or even years after the coup. Their stories also illustrate the variety of routes they took to Canada, and their migratory status once arrived –refugee, landed immigrant, or holder of a Ministerial Permit. The central role of the Canadian solidarity movement also features prominently in this chapter, as I argue that the pressure this lobby brought to bear on the federal government was vital in ensuring that humanitarian considerations were not sacrificed to Cold War fears about admitting leftists. The chapter concludes with an analysis of some of the numbers relating to the first wave of Chilean exiles: how many people were admitted, where they settled, and what they did for a living.

Chapter three deals with the early impressions of exile life in Canada described by the participants, as well as how they restored a sense of order and purpose to their lives in an unknown setting. I supplement testimony from the participants with reports generated at the time by officials in the various levels of government in Canada that trace patterns of settlement and the assistance programmes available to the exiles, among other things.

This portion of the study shows that, once in Canada, Chilean exiles established a culture of exile centred on community associations that served multiple purposes: providing social networks and mutual support, like the organizations of other immigrant groups, but also as forums for asserting a national and political identity in opposition to the military regime in Chile and its project of national renewal. Chapter three also begins to describe the changes to the exile community over time as it became more integrated into Canadian society. In this chapter, we see the start of a shift away from a collective identity based on exile and association with the political left to a complex set of identities and focuses of community activity. The ideas, goals and activities of the exiles transformed as exile stretched from months into years and even decades, and they became an increasingly established presence in the Canadian multiethnic, multicultural landscape.

Chapter four extends the question of transformations into the realm of work, family and gender. As Diana Kay argued in her sociological study of Chilean exiles in Great Britain, life in exile had effects both on how Chileans lived their lives in public, through their political activism and involvement in community organizations, and in private, where expatriation was portrayed as the cause of conflicts between spouses, parents and children.[40] However, where Kay described a rupture between public and private life, I argue that the changes experienced by individuals and families were closely connected to the same questions of closer integration with and connection to life in Canada that affected associational life. Exile was the context in which changes occurred, but it is not a

[40] Diana Kay, *Chileans in Exile: Private Struggles, Public Lives.* Wolfeboro, New Hampshire: Longwood Academic, 1987.

monocausal explanation. The period in which participants lived exile, and the developments that had taken place in Canadian society especially since the 1960s with regard to work, family and gender roles, cannot be discounted. Exile did not take place in a vacuum.

The final chapter addresses one of the questions that underpin this study: why did so many of the participants choose to stay in Canada after the military regime relinquished power in 1990? In contrast, how did those who returned to Chile negotiate the changes to their homeland and themselves that had happened during the nearly seventeen years of military rule? The question of return is central to the historiography of Chilean exile, where it often serves as a way of condemning the military regime for creating a permanent division between Chile and its unjustly banished citizens. In studies such as Rody Oñate and Thomas Wright's *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar*, exile is unending; the return from exile becomes a second exile, as returnees struggle to find a place in a society they no longer recognize. By extension, choosing not to return is attributed to still feeling excluded from Chile –a two-sided relationship between the nation and the exiled citizen. I submit that this explanation is insufficient to account for why two-thirds of this study's participants opted not to go back, and offer instead the argument that there were many positive, practical and personal reasons why they remained in Canada that went beyond feelings of alienation from Chile. The testimony of those who did go back does reveal the problems encountered by returnees, and their difficult –sometimes impossible –reinsertion into a society still divided by its recent past

and unsure where former exiles fit into it; but these stories also serve to complicate the portrayal of return as a new exile in an unwelcoming environment.

I conclude the study by looking at the participants in relation to the Chilean community of the present, and some of the ways in which a culture of exile continues to be present both in their personal lives and in the identity of the Chilean-Canadian community. History is the study of change over time, but it also looks at what survives over time. Along with the changes the participants have lived through as individuals, as families, and as part of a collective, many continue to identify strongly with a worldview and way of living that they relate to a perception of *chilenidad,* Chilean-ness. Exile has ended, but the values, beliefs and activism that made them exiles persist, after nearly forty years of challenges and changes.

In order to understand the experiences of the participants, we must first situate them in time and space. The following chapter describes the historical context of both Chile and Canada during the Cold War, and how geopolitical realities affected policy and action on the national level. Exile in Canada affected the participants on a personal level, but the explanation of why they became exiles in Canada lies in an examination of national and international events and developments that shut them out of Chile and forced them on a long road north to the other edge of the Americas.

Chapter One

Chile and Canada in the Cold War

The geopolitics of the Cold War was the fundamental force that brought Chilean exiles to Canada in the 1970s. In the conflict that led to the Chilean coup d'état, leftists fought pro-United States factions not only for control of the government and the resources of the country, but also to re-shape Chilean society and the nation's future. Even though Canada was separated from Chile by the length of the Americas, Canada was drawn into the conflict by its geopolitical position in the Cold War, its relationship with the United States, and its humanitarian stance on immigration policy.

Exiled Chilean writer Ariel Dorfman has compared the situation under the Unidad Popular with the 1968 Prague Spring in Czechoslovakia as two cases in which alternatives to Cold War political polarity were "not given the breathing space ... needed to survive by the superpower under whose sphere of influence [they] fell."[1] The United States played a critical role in the overthrow of a democratically elected government in Chile by crippling the economy, engendering political and social unrest, and funnelling covert material assistance to the opposition forces and the military men who plotted the coup.[2] American Secretary of State Henry Kissinger declared "I don't see why we should

[1] Ariel Dorfman, *Heading South, Looking North.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1998, p. 231.
[2] The American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) was accused of plotting against the Allende government by critics in Chile and the United States even before the coup took place. While the US government denied it at the time, the extent of American involvement was corroborated by a congressional investigation, The

have to let a country go Marxist just because its people are irresponsible", which is a telling statement about how American policymakers viewed the UP's model of socialism through election and legislation.[3] It appeared that the U.S. federal government would not tolerate another American nation following Cuba's model by adopting socialism, even if Chileans were trying to achieve their revolution by peaceful, legal means.

At the same time that Chileans were experimenting with an alternative form of government and new vision of society, some Canadians were rethinking where their country stood in the world and policies like immigration that impacted on the nation's future. While Canada shared close political, economic and social ties with the United States, in the 1960s and into the 1970s the bilateral relationship was not one of simply following the American leader. The first administration of Pierre Elliott Trudeau (1968-1972) saw the launch of a "Third Way" foreign policy initiative that attempted to diversify Canada's political and economic ties to offset the dominance of the United States in these areas.[4] Among the regions targeted by this effort was Latin America, a part of the world largely ignored by both policy makers and the general public. Canada also continued to affirm policy independence through its ties with communist Cuba and by sheltering young Americans escaping the draft to fight in the Vietnam War, actions at

---

Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, known as the Church Committee, which published the findings in 1976. United States Congress and Senate, "Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities." Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1976.

[3] This is a quote from Henry Kissinger, originally found in Roger Morris, *Uncertain Greatness.* New York: Harper & Row, 1977, p. 241, cited in Harold Molineu, *U.S. policy toward Latin America: from regionalism to globalism.* Second edition. Boulder: Westview Press,1990, p. 165.

[4] J.R. Stevenson, *Canada, Latin America and the New Internationalism: a foreign policy analysis, 1968-1990.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000, p. 115.

odds with its superpower neighbour and ally. Canadian citizens who wanted the government to act and behave differently from the United States supported these positions for ideological and nationalist reasons.

However, despite certain Canadian efforts and aspirations to take positions contrary to American policy, fears about national security and Communist infiltration exercised a powerful influence on government policy and public attitudes. These fears shaped the immigration and refugee policies of the time. Fear of leftist militants combined with a preference for newcomers who could contribute immediately to the national economy led the Canadian government to admit, in the words of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, "young, educated and adaptable people."[5] The favouring of ideological suitability and economic utility that conditioned the reception of Chileans exiles had strong roots in Canadian immigration and security policies that often predated, but were exacerbated by, the Cold War.

The Cold War provided the historical backdrop for understanding how the twenty-one people at the core of this study transformed from activists or sympathizers of a leftist model of society in Chile to exiles in a country that was physically distant, largely unknown and only grudgingly welcoming. Neither country could ignore the tensions created by the conflict between the US and the USSR nor remain unaffected by them. In Chile's case, American resistance to the socialist alternative led to overt and covert subversion of the Allende government in cooperation with the domestic opposition. For Canada, attempts to distance policy and practice from the American model had important

[5] HC Debates 1/29, Volume VIII, November 30, 1973, p 8297.

limits which were exposed by problems such as how to deal with an influx of leftist exiles that were perceived as potential threats to national security. This chapter examines issues that led to the political contexts in each nation: the rapid but uneven changes in Chile after the Second World War that made it at once a model of development for other Latin American nations, but also a country in need of radical reforms to deal with problems of economic and social inequality; the development of Canada's immigration policy after 1945, with the contradictory pulls of a concern for humanitarian principles and the desire to keep subversive elements out of the country; and the Canadian government's increased interest in ties to Latin America and other parts of the world as part of an effort to strengthen Canada's international position and distance it from the United States.

To begin, let us look at Chile's status as a model Latin American nation for both the West and East after the Second World War. After 1945, institutional maturity and increasing inclusiveness in the political process could not fix its deep economic and social divisions. Competing visions of how Chileans should deal with the nation's problems caused increasing polarization throughout the 1960s and into the years of the UP government. The division of Chilean society led some citizens, such as this project's participants, to support what became the losing side in the conflict and pay the price for their beliefs. Testimony from the interviewees further reveals that the Unidad Popular's socialist programme did not only attract the poor and working classes, but also held a strong appeal for young, middle class professionals committed to social justice and equality and the right to decide the nation's destiny without Great Power interference.

Along with their compatriots from other social classes, they would see this right brutally revoked.

I. Chile, the model and symbol

> Riding on Chile's narrow shoulders was nothing less than a world historical test of whether the transition to socialism could be achieved through democratic, peaceful methods. If it could be done in Chile, then it could be done in Italy or France or...[6]

Since the 1940s, Chile has had a symbolic value that goes far beyond its size. In a region of political instability and military interventions, it was a functioning democracy with solid institutions and political pluralism.[7] It had a mixed economy thanks to the industrial boom that followed the Chilean victory over Peru and Bolivia in the War of the Pacific (1879-1884) and the annexation of territories rich in saltpetre, nitrates and copper. The wealth generated by these resources helped transform Chile by 1930 from a largely rural, agrarian society to an urban, industrial nation, with all the benefits and problems that this process brings.[8] Social tensions and the unequal distribution of wealth generated friction that resulted in sporadic episodes of large-scale unrest and violent repression, but in general, Chileans were able to deal with their conflicts through compromise and the

[6] Steven Volk, "Chile and History: The Meanings of 1973." *NACLA Report of the Americas,* Vol. XXVII, No. 2, September/October 1993. p. 32.

[7] The decade of the 1930s had been notable for its political instability throughout Latin America, closely tied to the effects of the Great Depression. Chile also experienced a coup during this time, but it was of short duration, lasting only twelve days. Military governments in Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, El Salvador, Peru, Guatemala and Venezuela were longer lasting and contributed to a view of the region as undemocratic and unstable. Jesús de Andrés Sanz, "The Coups d'Etat and the International Context". *CPA Estudios / Working Papers,* No. 10, 2004, p. 2-3.

[8] The process of urbanization began earlier, but it was not until 1930 that the number of urban inhabitants surpassed the rural population. Information retrieved August 30, 2012 from www.geographic.org, http://www.photius.com/countries/chile/society/chile_society_urban_areas.html.

incorporation of marginalized groups into the political process.[9] Short-term military interventions had occurred during moments of political deadlock and economic crisis in the 1920s and 1930s, but by the time the Second World War ended and the Cold War began, Chile was a relatively prosperous nation whose political and social development was similar to larger countries in the region, such as Argentina and Mexico.[10]

However, while Chileans thought of themselves as part of an "island" nation isolated from its neighbours by mountains, deserts and oceans, the country was not insulated from the geopolitical conflict that followed the Second World War. The Cold War caused social and political convulsions throughout Latin America. The region as a whole faced four convergent crises in this era: disputes over internal power structures and other domestic situations; changing and conflictive relations between the nations of the region and the United States; the emergence of the Third World and ideas about post-colonialism and dependency; and a strategic and ideological battle waged in the global south between the Cold War superpowers, who used proxy states to forward their own interests.[11] In the case of Chile, relations with Washington generally remained smooth until the election of the UP, and for a decade (1948-1958), the Communist Party was banned and its militants imprisoned in concentration camps, an early example of Cold War considerations entering into the Chilean political arena. However, other internal

---

[9] Ruth Berins Collier and David Collier, *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America.* South Bend, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002. *Cf* p. 360 *ff*, "Brazil and Chile: Aborted Populism".
[10] Joaquín Fermandois, "¿Peón o actor? Chile en la Guerra Fría (1962-1973)." *Estudios Públicos*, No. 72, 1998. p.153.
[11] Hal Brands, *Latin America's Cold War.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2010, p. 255.

issues regarding wealth and power became tied to questions of foreign domination and dependence, turning some sectors of the Chilean population against the vision of society symbolized by the United States and its allies in the Chilean economic and political elite. The early Cold War era saw an increasing acceptance among reformist political parties throughout Latin America that the state had a responsibility "to provide a dignified life and economic justice" for citizens heretofore politically and materially marginalized, either because of the parties' own vision of modern society or because of pressure from below.[12] Such positions were more in line with socialist and social democratic ideas about politics and society, and were seen by those on the American side of the ideological divide as the first steps down the slippery slope to Marxism and Soviet –or after 1959, Cuban –domination.[13] A growing debate within Chile about what route the country should take to prosperity and stability drew the attention of both superpowers.

There were reasons why Chile was a potential model of development for other Latin American nations to follow. From 1938 to 1952, Chile had enjoyed an era of political stability with coalition governments consisting of the centrist Radical Party and leftist allies. Coexistence between the centre and left was predicated on a compromise that saw Socialist- and Communist –led demands for better conditions for urban workers and copper miners met, while national economic policies backed by the middle class were

[12] Greg Grandin, *The Last Colonial Massacre: Latin America in the Cold War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004, p. 6-7.
[13] Steve J. Stern, *Reckoning with Pinochet: the memory question in democratic Chile, 1989-2006.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2010. p. xxvi.

given primacy.[14] These were part of the import substitution economic strategy that began in the 1930s and reached its zenith in the 1950s and early 1960s, in which state investment was used to create an infrastructure for the production of finished materials and consumer goods for the domestic market. The goal was to reduce dependence on foreign imports and generate jobs for the working population. In the case of Chile, the economy was based on primary resources that were controlled by foreign companies that reinvested their profits outside of the country, keeping industrial development stunted and concentrated almost exclusively on extractive processes. By the 1950s, the state was involved in developing industrial plant for metal works, chemicals, cement, electronic goods and rubber, as well as in fisheries and agricultural production.[15] The objective was for the state to develop this infrastructure and then sell it off to the private sector, having created a base for prosperity, consumption and employment that would put Chile in the ranks of the developed nations and help ensure stability through prosperity.

But by the 1960s, the mixed results of this national project were becoming apparent. In a study from the early 1960s, Chile ranked at the top of the table of development in Latin America, just below its neighbours, Uruguay and Argentina. It scored high marks in the level of per capita income, education, the percentage of urban population, and

[14] Labour reforms were particularly notable in the period from 1938-1947, when the coalition government established state welfare programs and a favourable labour code. The close connection between the goals of the government and the labour movement allowed workers to iterate "new languages of nationalism, democracy and citizenship" to frame conflicts with foreign copper company and achieve gains such as collective agreements, wage increases, pensions, cost-of-living raises, and subsidies for workers with families.Thomas Miller Klubock, *Contested Communities: Class, Gender, and Politics in Chile's El Teniente Copper Mine, 1904-1951.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1998, p. 10.

[15] José Del Pozo, *Le Chili Contemporain: Quelle Démocratie?* Québec City: Éditions Nota bene, 2000, p. 37-38.

nutrition, with low life expectancy the only black mark against the country.[16] A national health service had been established in 1952, and illiteracy had been reduced steadily since the 1920s. The number of registered voters and the number of those eligible to vote had increased, a development that had helped the left increase its presence in the corridors of power. Organized labour had also received a boost through the foundation of the *Central Unitaria de Trabajadores de Chile* (Workers' United Centre of Chile, CUT) in 1953, an organization that gave workers a powerful and united voice. In several important respects, Chile in the post-war era was a paradigm of the ideal of state-sponsored social democracy, linking freedom and equality, which Greg Grandin argues was so prevalent in Latin America during this period "that it became for many synonymous with modernity."[17]

At the same time, improved access to the institutions of the state and a greater voice in political affairs could not hide the fact that slow and uneven economic growth kept large parts of the population in poverty. Unemployment levels were high, and underemployment was endemic, especially in agricultural areas. Land ownership in Chile was unbalanced: in the 1960s, 81.3% of arable land was in the hands of 6.9% of landowners, and agriculture was so unproductive that food needed to be imported despite Chile's small population.[18] Agricultural exports amounted to around five percent of

[16] Jacques Lambert, *Latin America: Social structures and political institutions.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967. p. 32-33. Translated by Helen Katel.
[17] Grandin, *The Last Colonial Massacre: Latin America in the Cold War,* p. xxii-xxiii, 7.
[18] Solon Lovett Barraclough, *Agrarian Structure in Latin America. A resume of the CIDA land tenure studies of: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala.* Toronto: Lexington Books, 1973, p.16. In addition, agricultural exports during the 1960s and early 1970s were hurt by the overvaluation of the peso as a result of import-substitution policies. Rex A. Hudson, ed. *Chile: A Country Study.* Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1994., "Economic Policy, 1950-1970". Retrieved August 30, 2012, from http://countrystudies.us/chile/58.htm

Chilean trade, while copper and other minerals accounted for over eighty percent.[19] With its dependence on extractive industries, 19% of the labour force worked in this well-paid and relatively stable sector, but multinational copper mining companies based in the United States like Kennecott and Anaconda made enormous profits that were of very little benefit to the general Chilean populace.[20] Improvements in health were uneven, as rural areas continued to suffer from a shortage of medical professionals and a high infant mortality rate. Urban growth may have brought better access to state services, but it also led to the growth of shantytowns around Santiago that lacked basic sanitation, proper roads and access to electricity and running water. Finally, while women had better access to schooling and could vote, their political presence was almost non-existent and they were legally still under the authority of their fathers or husbands.[21] As Thomas Klubock has shown, women's involvement in the labour market had begun to diminish rather than increase, as a vision of "the moral codes of appropriate female behavior dictated by the gender ideology of domesticity" transformed more women from workers to domestic companions and auxiliaries to their wage-earning husbands.[22]

In short, by the early 1960s, Chile was in the paradoxical situation of having a high level of political integration juxtaposed to uneven wealth distribution that continued to

[19] Manuel Agosin, "Export Performance in Chile: Lessons for Africa". *United Nations University Working Papers*, No. 144, October 1997, p. 11.
[20] Julio Faúndez, *Marxism and Democracy in Chile: From 1932 to the fall of Allende*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988, p 56.
[21] Del Pozo, *Le Chili Contemporain: Quelle Démocratie?*, p. 43-44.
[22] Klubock, *Contested Communities: Class, Gender, and Politics in Chile's El Teniente Copper Mine, 1904-1951*, p. 285-286.

generate social friction and chronic economic disparity. Many Chileans perceived that the country needed a radical change, but what they could not agree on was how to achieve it.

The success of the Cuban Revolution in 1959 provided a new model for people looking for an alternative to Western capitalism and Soviet-style communism. The success of the Cuban revolutionaries proved to be a turning point in the history of the region: "No one knew how it would divide the history of the continent in two, before and after. It is the torch that inflamed the heart of Latin America. No more, no less."[23] For the United States, the presence of a different ideological option was seen as a threat to its influence and to hemispheric security. The administration of John F. Kennedy established the Alliance for Progress in 1961, which pumped millions of dollars into Latin America to help combat the inequality that made revolution attractive. Chile, as "the model 'Alliance for Progress' country of the 1960s...constituted the Kennedy and Johnson administrations' best example of a Latin American society that could stop 'another Cuba' through democratic social reforms assisted by the United States."[24] To Latin American specialists in the United States, Chile represented "the only existing democracy" in the region, and therefore needed to be supported and nurtured as a regional bulwark against the spread of communism.[25] The United States government morally and financially backed the election of Christian Democratic president Eduardo Frei (1964-1970).[26] Frei

[23] Marco Antonio De la Parra, *La Mala Memoria.* Santiago: Planeta, 1997, p. 62.
[24] Stern, *Reckoning with Pinochet: the memory question in democratic Chile, 1989-2006,* p. xxvi.
[25] Fermandois, "¿Peón o actor? Chile en la Guerra Fría (1962-1973)," p.153.
[26] According to documents from the US National Security Archive that were declassified in 2004, "The CIA spent a total of $2.6 million directly underwriting the campaign. An additional $3 million was spent on anti-Allende propaganda activities designed to scare voters away from Allende's FRAP [*Frente de Acción Popular*, Front for Popular Action] coalition." This information retrieved August 30, 2012, from the

advocated a "Revolution in Liberty", a reform programme that contained many measures traditionally associated with socialism that was designed to address the inequities in society without resorting to revolution.[27]

In the analysis of Cold War era Chilean history, the relationship with the United States has dominated the interpretation of events. This is understandable, given the high degree of involvement between the two countries and the recognized American interference in many nations throughout the region. The Cold War was not a one-sided conflict, however. The Soviet Union and Cuba also involved themselves with Chile, especially during the UP administration.[28] Chile interested Communist-bloc governments because of the strength of its leftist parties and popular movements, as well as the electoral success Salvador Allende had enjoyed even prior to 1970. Moreover, the loyalty of the Communist Party of Chile to its counterpart in the Soviet Union was noted in Moscow, which made use of various channels to help support party militants and ensure that they continued in the struggle.[29]

Finally, and vitally, the election of Salvador Allende as President of Chile in 1970 had important consequences in concrete and symbolic terms. The ideological foment inspired

National Security Archive website of George Washington University: http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/news/20040925/index.html.

[27] Fuente de Informacion Norteamericana, "Collision Course: Chile Before the Coup." *NACLA's Latin America and Empire Report,* Vol. VII, No. 8, October 1973, p. 17. The plans of the Revolution in Liberty included the redistribution of the national income, massive social welfare programmes, agrarian reform, banking and tax reform, an end to unemployment and inflation, an attack on monopolies, and increased economic independence through greater control over natural resources.

[28] Brands, *Latin America's Cold War,* p. 105, 147, 150; Fermandois, "¿Peón o actor? Chile en la Guerra Fría (1962-1973)," p. 168-171. Fermandois underlines the fact that Soviet support was directed to the Communist Party of Chile rather than the UP as a whole, even though the USSR by and large supported the goals of the Allende administration.

[29] Fermandois, "¿Peón o actor? Chile en la Guerra Fría (1962-1973)," p. 168-169.

by the rise of the Third World and the Cuban Revolution made many Chileans impatient and unwilling to accept the gradual change offered by the Christian Democrats through the Revolution in Liberty. The Unidad Popular coalition, consisting of several parties but with the Communist Party and Socialist Party at its core, vowed to achieve power through election rather than revolution, and use state institutions and legislation to create a socialist system. The transformation to socialism, the UP leadership claimed, would be in the best interest of the nation: it would make Chilean society more equal and end dependence on foreign interests by using the country's natural wealth for the good of all citizens.[30] This strategy, the "Chilean road to socialism", was unorthodox and unique, and captured the imagination not just of Chileans but of people around the world. As one of the non-Chilean interviewees put it, "I'm not a fan of violent revolution, and Cuba has never called to me ... but the Chilean model was so interesting in terms of its political organizing ... They said it was a revolution with red wine and empanadas, what's not to be attracted to?"[31]

By the time of the UP victory in 1970, Chile had become a battleground for both sides in the Cold War. Could a nation become socialist by democratic means? Would such a programme be accepted by the majority of the country's citizens? How fast would the transformation occur? Would it be allowed to occur? Observers from left and centre-left movements throughout the world looked to the UP in power as a model, and hoped that it

[30] Colin Henfry and Bernardo Sorj, *Chilean Voices*. Hassock, Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1977. p. 21-22.
[31] Interview by author with Joan Simalchik, Toronto, February 15, 2010 (henceforth Joan interview). Interview in English.

could thrive and survive.[32] On the other hand, forces wary of a socialist success story in a democracy like Chile feared not only that it might serve as an example for other countries to follow, but that it was merely the prelude to the destruction of Chilean society, with all its freedoms, pluralism and established state institutions.[33] Mirroring the polarity of the Cold War, the situation in Chile caused people inside the country to split into opposed, uncompromising positions. The Unidad Popular was going to build an egalitarian utopia, or lead Chile into a totalitarian nightmare.

Living the changes: the exiles and their history

Few of the interviewees talked about their own path to involvement in political and social causes, as it was not a question I explicitly asked. Those who did, however, provide us with an idea of what motivated them to align with the left during a tumultuous phase of the Cold War in Latin America. For Juan Nuñez, a government worker involved in agricultural reform in the rural area around Melipilla, his initial connection was to the Christian Democrats through an older brother. When he began to work on the land redistribution programme that was part of the Revolution in Liberty, Juan became disillusioned with the CDP and left to join the Movimiento de Acción Popular Unitario (MAPU):

> We saw that the Christian Democrats had reached their limit...They initiated the agrarian reform, but it was very small. It was only the very, very, very big

[32] Ana Vásquez and Ana María Araujo, *La maldición de Ulises: Repercusiones psicológicas del exilio.* Santiago: Sudamericana, 1990, p. 14. Many European socialists at least felt that the UP project was part of "their own dreams and projects".
[33] Jonathan Kandall, "Plotting the Coup", in Laurence Birns, *The End of Chilean Democracy: An IDOC Dossier on the Coup and its Aftermath.* New York: Seabury Press, 1974, p. 60. The article originally appeared in the New York Times, September 27, 1973, under the title "Chilean Officers Tell How They Began to Plan the Take-Over Last November."

> landholders, and no one else. But it didn't touch many others. There were many exploited *campesinos*, but on smaller holdings, but the CD didn't go any further. Copper needed to be nationalized, but the Christian Democrats didn't do it…There were lots of things like this. So we said no. The solution to Chile's problem was based on Chile taking its riches in its hands, control of its riches.[34]

Juan's affinity for the UP's promise to end foreign dependence and focus on creating wealth for the citizens of Chile reflect the ideological effervescence of Latin America after the Cuban Revolution. Though based around working-class parties, the alternative model of socialism represented by the UP drew support from a broader spectrum of the population. This atmosphere of questioning the validity of both capitalism and Soviet communism appealed to idealists such as Jaime Llambías-Wolff, leading them to the left despite their class position and interests:

> We wanted social justice... It was a very unselfish approach, because most of the MAPU, we had no background in terms of living the suffering of the people, you know, we were mostly intellectuals and petit bourgeois. So we can't say we have a history with worker's movements and peasant movements, we were the Gramscian intellectuals of the left. We were actually intellectuals designing revolution, and not for our interests, material interests, because for us it would be much better to vote for the right![35]

People who were not involved in party politics but still aware of the problems in the society around them, like María Teresa, were also drawn to the UP: "It's hard not to take a position when there's so much inequality, so much poverty, and because of poverty so much human suffering, so I think the socialists developed the best, humane system."[36] Reflections such as this speak to why approximately half of the Chilean population

---

[34] Interview by author with Juan Nuñez, Toronto, November 21, 2009 (henceforth Juan interview). Interview in Spanish. The MAPU was founded by former Christian Democrats from the party's left wing.
[35] Interview by author with Jaime Llambías-Wolff, Toronto, November 23, 2009 (henceforth Jaime interview). Interview in English.
[36] Interview by author with María Teresa, Toronto, October 3, 2008 (henceforth María Teresa interview). Interview in Spanish. She requested that her family name not be used.

looked toward the UP to address the country's problems and make it a more equal, inclusive place.

The memories of this study's participants reveal that the social division that was an increasing focus of concern during the 1960s remains vivid after more than three decades. Statements focus on tension between and among classes more than on political deadlock or economic instability. Commenting on classism in Chile, Juan Nuñez stated:

> There is a saying in Chile, of bourgeois Chileans, "*Gente como nosotros*" (People like us). "These aren't people like us", the protester, the poor in the street, the Communist, "Oh, these people aren't like us", they say. The middle class. And this is a way of controlling. "People like us."[37]

After the fall of the UP government, the military regime justified the use of exile and murder to "cleanse" the country of undesirable elements with similar language, meant to delegitimize Allende's supporters and exclude them from "good" Chilean society

However, not all the interviewees felt they were part of the class conflict of the time. Some tried to remain aloof from the divisions that were increasingly affecting the country. Most of the participants were from the middle class, and so they were not insulated from the "enemy" like the workers in their *poblaciones* (poor neighbourhoods) or the wealthy in their *barrio alto* (rich neighbourhood). They lived in close proximity with people from the other side, and often tried to keep themselves and their families above the fray, as Raquel Borgoño stated:

> I wasn't political...I didn't belong to a party...[D]uring the whole Allende period, which was quite hard, there was a lot of hatred, it caused a terrible clash, and I

[37] Juan interview.

> prevented the child [her son] from sensing this…We had a lot of *momia* friends, and I didn't want the children to hate each other… [Her son] didn't have any idea of the tragedy we were living… He found out here [in Canada] about all that.[38]

Other testimony indicates that people were becoming increasingly distrustful of the other side. In Juan's small town, there was a real fear of communism among many inhabitants, who thought that it would rob them of their businesses and eliminate religion. The UP programme was not just seen as a threat to the large, resource-based industries, but to medium- and small-businessmen who UP leaders had hoped to integrate into their movement: "We wanted to work with the petit bourgeoisie. If we, the workers and *campesinos*, were allied with the petit bourgeoisie…it would have made the coup much more difficult." In Juan's view, it was the *Movimiento de la Izquierda Revolucionaria* (Movement of the Revolutionary Left, MIR, which had remained outside the UP coalition) which was to blame for turning this vital group against the government, because it encouraged agricultural workers to occupy unused land in a process known as *tomas.* The atmosphere of lawlessness that pervaded Chile before the coup pushed people into extreme positions: "In the three years of the Unidad Popular, you were with the government or against the government. I was with the government, but my friend was against it."[39]

When the coup happened, for many the strongest emotion was shock; one of the pillars of a perceived Chilean exceptionalism –stable, constitutional government –had

[38] Interview by author with Raquel Borgoño, Toronto, October 21, 2008 (henceforth Raquel interview). Interview in Spanish. *Momia* (mummy) was a derogatory term the left used to describe people on the other side.
[39] Juan interview.

fallen. Yet even with the taboo of military intervention broken, many participants reasoned that the Armed Forces would soon be forced to restore civilian rule:

> [W]e thought that it was going to come to an end, that it was absurd, that Chile's not like that, these things don't happen here, we've never had coups...We were all saying that, I think even people on the right were saying that...I even had an aunt who was very right wing, and who was quite happy...but she really genuinely thought that it was kind of nonsense, that "It would be over soon, that we just wanted not to have this government, and Frei will come and he will be the president."[40]

For citizens of a country that had not experienced direct military intervention for over forty years, there was little to prepare them for the scale of repression that would follow the 11 September coup. The ferocity of reprisals taken against Unidad Popular members and supporters would soon show Chileans that the Armed Forces would not behave as they had during the 1920s and 1930s, as a moderating or even progressive force in times of political division or economic crisis.[41] Rather, the Chilean military established a system of state terror that resembled other authoritarian regimes in Latin America during the Cold War, "aimed not only at repressing political opposition but at obliterating political alternatives as well."[42] The military authorities saw the Unidad Popular supporters not just as members of an opposing side that needed to be removed from power, but as cells of a "Marxist cancer" that needed to be excised from the body of the nation.[43] The dehumanizing of fellow Chilean citizens facilitated the explosion of violence that followed the coup and served to physically eliminate opposition and silence

[40] Interview by author with Marcela Duran, Toronto, October 30, 2008 (henceforth Marcela interview). Interview in English.
[41] Alain Rouquié, *The Military and the State in Latin America.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989. Second edition. Translated by Paul E. Sigmund. p. 229.
[42] Grandin, *The Last Colonial Massacre: Latin America in the Cold War,* p. 170.
[43] This was a phrase used Air Force General Gustavo Leigh on the night of 11September, 1973, when the junta members addressed the nation to explain and justify their actions.

those who were not caught up in the net spread by the Armed Forces. Forced quiescence through violence and intimidation allowed the military dictatorship and its civilian supporters in turn to implement wide-ranging political, economic and social changes that would substantially alter Chilean society and make a substantial part of the population – up to one-tenth of the 1973 total –unwelcome or redundant in their own nation.[44]

Between 1973 and 1978, direct and indirect oppression by the military regime forced the twenty-one Chilean participants in this project to seek shelter outside their homeland, eventually landing in Canada. In the next chapter, we will examine their reasons for leaving and their different roads to exile. However, before doing so, the remainder of this chapter is devoted to looking at changes in Canada during the same Cold War era that affected both immigration policy and relations with the United States and Latin America. These changes conditioned the way representatives of the Canadian state and members of the public reacted to the coup d'état in Chile and the subsequent arrival of exiles, and are thus necessary considerations when accounting for the why the admission of Chileans provoked controversy and debate.

[44] The *Vicaría de la Solidaridad* [Vicariate of Solidarity] of the Santiago archdiocese, in its criticisms of the military regime, cited a figure of 1 675 558 Chileans displaced out of a population of approximately ten million at the time of the coup. The Vicaría did not draw clear lines between those who were forced out for political or economic reasons. Centro de Documentación de la Vicaría de la Solidaridad (henceforth CDVS), Exilio, box 30. Vicaría de la Solidaridad, *Documento de Trabajo*, 1992, p. 221, 236.

II. Canada, at home and abroad: Immigration policy, national security and the Cold War

Immigration has been one of the cornerstones of nation-building in Canada since Confederation in 1867. A consistent feature of Canadian immigration policy throughout the country's history has been the primacy of economic and labour concerns in setting the agenda. Canadian industrialists and business leaders have normally supported large-scale immigration to meet labour needs and contribute to the expansion of the economy. At the same time, there has been a constant tension regarding what kind of immigrants are suitable. The corollary to this question, of course, is who is not suitable. Over the years, there have been large changes in the question of admission and exclusion that bear examination, as they played central roles in how Chilean exiles were perceived and processed as potential entrants to the Canada, and the treatment they received once landed.

By the 1960s, racial considerations which had excluded a large part of humanity from consideration for settlement in Canada had largely disappeared, and a movement to codify refugee admission was gaining strength. At the same time that the definition of who could become Canadian and how they would be admitted was expanding, there was also an effort to deepen ties with countries and regions beyond the traditional European and American limits of national interest. In an attempt to diminish Canada's dependence on and identification with one Cold War superpower, the federal government initiated diplomatic, trade and aid policies directed at Latin America, Asia, and Africa –an

expansion of Canada's role in the world to accompany the reality of an increasingly diverse country as a result of changing sources of immigration.[45] An immigration policy that expanded eligibility for admission, a more codified approach to refugee issues and the increased importance given to Canadian-Latin American relations were all factors that would work in favour of the Chilean exiles by the time they began arriving in 1973.

However, important tensions in the country's immigration and security policies that would complicate the Chilean question continued to militate against admitting exiles tied to a leftist movement. The Cold War heightened concerns that had influenced admission policy since the early twentieth century about immigrants who might pose a threat to the internal security and stability of Canada. This domestic concern was reinforced by pressure from the United States government that Canada help keep North America safe from Communist infiltration, and kept ideological suitability in place as a criteria for admission after other grounds for exclusion had been eliminated. In short, when Chileans fleeing military rule arrived in Canada, they encountered a society that reacted to them in paradoxical ways that reflected Canada's position in the polarized world of the Cold War: an internationally engaged nation with a relatively open-door policy to immigrants and refugees, but one that was also deeply tied to one side of the superpower rivalry and concerned with the effects that newcomers could have on the stability and security of Canadian society. These tensions would become an open matter of debate after the 11

[45] Andrew Stuart Thompson, *In Defence of Principles: NGOs and human rights in Canada.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2010, p.19.

September coup in Chile, when the admission of fugitives from the military regime came to the fore.

Tensions about who to let in and who to keep out have long been central to the immigration debate in Canada, though they have been subject to change over time as projects and methods for nation-building have come and gone. As such, it is useful to start from the beginning of post-Confederation immigration policy to illustrate some of the continuities, as well as the changes. As we shall see, two fundamental questions influenced admission policy from the nineteenth century into the 1970s: what could the newcomer do *for* Canada? And what might s/he do *to* it?

Utility and Suitability: Establishing the guidelines for admission

There have been several major shifts in immigration and settlement policies since Confederation that reflect the changing needs and goals of Canadian society. In the first decades after 1867, admission rules favoured white settlers from Great Britain, the United States and Europe, with farmers and agricultural labourers preferred over immigrants to urban industrial centres. This period of settler influx, which lasted until the outbreak of the First World War, saw an enormous growth in the Canadian population through immigration.[46] It reflected a vision of Canada as a white, agricultural dominion, but this

[46] Ninette Kelley and M.J. Trebilcock, *The Making of the Mosaic: a history of Canadian immigration policy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998, p. 111-112. In this 18-year period, the population increased by three million, and six of the ten largest immigration levels by year were recorded during this span.

pastoral image would soon be displaced by the reality of industrial growth caused by the First World War and the growth of Canadian cities that went with it.[47]

The period from the beginning of the First World War to the end of the Second World War saw changes in immigration policy and practice that reflected the tensions between more open procedures and exclusionary guidelines. The "tap-on, tap-off" fluctuations in admission policies responded to changing situations in the country. A lenient policy was followed in the 1920s due to pressure from leaders of industry who wanted more people admitted to fill labour needs. On the other hand, moments of economic crisis, such as the depression of the 1930s, saw stringent entrance requirements put in force to protect Canadians from the economic competition of foreigners, as well as to deal with the potential spread of communism as a result of the crisis.[48] An exclusionary policy continued throughout the Second World War, when concerns relating to enemy infiltration and the disruption of human mobility saw the number of new immigrants fall to the lowest level in Canadian history.[49]

Canada's participation in the two world wars expanded its industrial base and accelerated a process of urbanization that helped fuel a sustained economic boom after 1945. This expansion was accompanied by a changing consciousness regarding

---

[47] John Mercer, "Canadian Cities and Their Immigrants: New Realities." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 538, March 1995. p. 170.

[48] Kelley and Trebilcock, *The Making of the Mosaic: a history of Canadian immigration policy*, p. 216-217. Elected prime minister in 1930, R.B. Bennett's campaign platform included a promise to stamp out communism domestically "with the iron heel of ruthlessness".

[49] See the appendix in Valerie Knowles, *Strangers at Our Gates: Canadian Immigration and Immigration Policy, 1540-2006,* for statistics on the number of immigrants to Canada per year, 1852-2005.Revised edition. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2007, p. 273-275.

immigration that altered the debate from being about an open or closed policy to being a "question of an open or much more open door policy."[50] However, the Canadian state and its security apparatus also had to work within the new framework of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union, and this would in turn influence who would be let in, and under what conditions.

Immigration policy after 1945: Open doors closely watched

Since the end of the Second World War, the doors to Canada have been open, but they have not gone unwatched, as efforts to keep out undesirable immigrants have continued throughout. The use of screening techniques to gauge the threat aspiring immigrants might pose to Canadian society is one of the constants in a policy area that experienced many changes during the post-war period.

After 1945, immigrants were by and large Europeans who were leaving the war-ravaged continent for a country that was experiencing a prolonged economic boom. In the immediate post-war era Canada played an active role in the newly-founded United Nations and its efforts to find new places to live for the millions displaced by the war. However, there was also a process of selection that took place in Displaced Persons camps that favoured people with skilled trades and white-collar professionals to fill needs in the domestic labour market.[51] The reopening of Canada to Europeans had strong

[50] Freda Hawkins, *Canada and Immigration: Public policy and public concern.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988, p. 71.

[51] The way Canadian representatives went about deciding who would be recruited from the DP camps is outlined in Donald H. Avery, *Reluctant Host: Canada's Response to Immigrant Workers, 1896-1994.* Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1995, p. 151-157.

elements of national self-interest. Nor was it ideologically neutral: from 1946 to 1958, the number of overseas applicants refused for security concerns was approximately 29 000 and the number of deportations of recently arrived immigrants in the same period was 8572, with more concern being shown to weeding out communists than former Nazis.[52]

Nevertheless, post-war policy did manifest a "surge of egalitarian idealism" that followed the horrific revelations of the Holocaust and inspired the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. [53] This was reflected in the continued transition toward a more open immigration policy. The preferred types of immigrants also changed during this period, with more manufacturing, mechanical, managerial, professional, clerical and technical workers admitted.[54] The department's change from Citizenship and Immigration to Manpower and Immigration in 1966 was an acknowledgement of the ongoing emphasis on labour needs as a guiding principle of policy. While the points system introduced by the governmental White Paper on immigration from that same year continued a trend of codifying admissions procedures rather than relying on vague guidelines and discretionary measure, it clearly favoured

[52] Kelley and Trebilcock, *The Making of the Mosaic: a history of Canadian immigration policy*, p. 314. The fact that former Nazis responsible for crimes against humanity have been discovered in Canada over the years has led to a perception that immigration officials in Europe after the war were lax in screening people who had connections to Hitler's Germany. This position was refuted by Howard Margolian in his study on the screening process for European refugees in the post-war decade. Margolain argues that the Canadian officials were very diligent about excluding Nazi sympathizers. Howard Margolian, *Unauthorized Entry: the Truth about Nazi War Criminals in Canada, 1946-1956*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000. Margolian's argument and methodology have been strongly criticized by commentators who see his work as an apologia for the 2000 or so Nazis who did get in. See Dr. Janine Stingel's review of Margolian in *Canadian Jewish Studies*, Vol. 9, 2001.

[53] Carmela Patrias and Ruth A. Frager, "This is Our Country,These Are Our Rights: Minorities and the Origins of Ontario's Human Rights Campaigns." *Canadian Historical Review,* Vol. 82, No. 1, March 2001, p. 2.

[54] Kelley and Trebilcock, *The Making of the Mosaic: a history of Canadian immigration policy,* p. 348.

immigrants perceived as easily employable.[55] The criteria for admittance was based on the following areas: education and training; personal assessment; occupational demand; occupational skill; age; knowledge of English or French; relatives in Canada; and employment opportunities in the destination area. A score of 50 points or over out of 100 would qualify a person for admittance. Less than that would mean the individual was "Not suitable for permanent residence" and would be refused entry, or if the person was already in Canada, denied the chance to change migratory status.[56] It is important to keep the criteria of the points system in mind, as they would be applied to Chileans who solicited entry to Canada after the coup.

Another development that would have a bearing on the Chilean exiles was the increasing involvement of different interest groups in the formation of immigration policy, starting with the 1966 White Paper. Aside from business, industry and organized labour, there was a great deal of input from special interest groups such as churches, ethnic associations, concerned individuals, and academics, which led to more coverage than usual by the media.[57] A higher level of public involvement meant a more democratic process, and more voices expounding different points of view. One of the ideas that began to circulate increasingly was the need for a defined refugee policy based on

---

[55] Thompson, *In Defence of Principles: NGOs and human rights in Canada,* p.19.

[56] This was the case for an Ecuadorean wanting to stay in Toronto who had been rejected under the points system when he tried to go from a tourist visa to landed immigrant status in 1973. A 19-year-old unemployed student with poor English skills and no relatives in Canada, he scored only 39 points. His age and education worked in his favour, but everything else did not. Archives of Ontario, International Institute for Metropolitan Toronto fonds (henceforth AO/IIMT), MU 6565, IIMT Records "V" 1972 to "A" 1974, 1973 A-C folder.

[57] Kelley and Trebilcock, *The Making of the Mosaic: a history of Canadian immigration policy*, p. 349.

humanitarian principles –a vital consideration for the Chilean case and a foreshadowing of the 1976 immigration reforms that the arrival of the exiles would help propel.

Another kind of immigrant? Refugees in Canada before 1978

Given Canada's reputation as a country that welcomes refugees, it may seem surprising that there was no recognition of them as a distinct class of entrant until the 1976 Immigration Act went into force in 1978. Refugee movements to Canada pre-date Confederation, but a formalized policy never existed, and refugee movements were dealt with on an ad hoc basis. Humanitarian concern certainly played a role in granting refuge to persecuted peoples, but state representatives were always careful to consider the economic and social impact they believed such admissions would have, which resulted in asylum being temporary or offered to only a small number of people.[58] Until 1969, when the federal government ratified the United Nations 1951 Convention on Refugees and the 1967 Protocol, Canada was under no internationally recognized legal obligation to provide shelter, and therefore when it did act, the guidelines for admission were based on the immigration policy that was in place at the time of the crisis.

[58] Historically this can be seen in three specific cases: that of escaped American slaves before Confederation, Armenians fleeing genocide in the Ottoman Empire during the First World War, and Jews trying to escape Nazi-controlled Europe. The transient nature of the slave refugee presence in the Canadian colonies is examined in Robin W. Winks, *The Blacks in Canada: A History*. Montreal and Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997. Second edition. In the case of the Armenians, only 1300 were admitted due to bureaucratic obstacles stemming from the fact that they were classified as Asians, and therefore belonged to a non-preferred racial group. Isabel Kaprielian-Churchill, "Armenian Refugees and Their Entry into Canada, 1919-1930". *Canadian Historical Review*, No. 71, 1990. In the 1930s and 1940s, Canadian policy toward Jews had tragic consequences for people fleeing Nazi persecution, as is illustrated in Irving Abella and Harold Troper, *None is Too Many: Canada and the Jews of Europe, 1933-1948.* New York: Random House, 1983.

As with immigration policy in general, however, the Canadian approach to refugee questions underwent many changes after 1945. Canada was involved with the International Refugee Organization in the immediate aftermath of the war and later with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the IRO's successor. Canada cooperated closely with the organization, and of the displaced persons who were admitted between 1945 and 1955, twenty percent were refugees who did not want to return to the USSR or other socialist countries of Eastern Europe, who became known as the Iron Curtain refugees.[59] This cohort was followed by Hungarians who had rebelled against Soviet domination in 1956, who were admitted en masse, with over 37 000 arriving in only 10 months.[60] Humanitarian considerations certainly played a role in Canada's accommodation of these refugees, but so too did ideology: the Hungarians were presented as heroic freedom fighters opposing totalitarian tyranny and championing the "democratic decency" of the West.[61] The Cold War invested the admission of Hungarians with a significance that went beyond humanitarianism.

The favourable treatment received by the Hungarians would find an echo in 1968-69, with the entry of 11 943 Czechoslovakians fleeing the Soviet crackdown after the brief attempt at political liberalization and reform known as the Prague Spring.[62] In both cases, humanitarian considerations combined with the propaganda value of admitting

---

[59] Gerald E. Dirks, *Canada's Refugee Policy: Indifference or Opportunism?* Montreal and London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1977, p. 100.

[60] According to UNHCR statistics, the number of Hungarians who arrived in Canada as refugees in 1956-1957 was 37 149. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (henceforth UNHCR), *Refugees*, No. 38, February 1987, p. 21.

[61] Franca Iacovetta, *Gatekeepers: Reshaping Immigrant Lives in Cold War Canada.* Toronto: Between the Lines, 2006. p. 44.

[62] UNHCR, *Refugees*, p. 21.

persecuted people from the enemy camp to ensure that admission to Canada was much faster and easier than usual. It is vital to note at this point that these two refugee movements would be used by pro-Chilean pressure groups both as precedents to be followed by the Canadian government in the admission and settlement of the exiles, and as proof of the ideological bias among government officials who were reluctant to admit Chileans.

The entry of the Czechoslovakians served to focus attention on the need to codify the refugee process, and in 1969 Canada finally ratified the 1951 UNHCR Refugee Convention. This marked the first time a definition of what qualified an individual as a refugee appeared in Canadian law. At the same time, the government maintained the system of Ministerial Permits and ad hoc Special Movements that had been used in cases like that of the Hungarians. This accommodated the admission of people who were not outside their country of origin, as the Convention definition stipulated, or who in some other way did not meet the terms of the UNHCR designation. This allowed the Canadian state to maintain a flexible approach to humanitarian crises, as was illustrated in the case of ethnic South Asians forced to flee Uganda in 1972-73 but who were not outside their country of origin, as the Convention definition stipulates. Though members of a visible minority that had been traditionally considered unsuitable for admission, the fact that they were English-speaking professionals with financial means from a Commonwealth nation worked in their favour. Eventually 7069 would be brought to Canada under relaxed admissions criteria over a short period of time in a special movement that

included the use of airlifts.[63] Like the cases of Hungarians and Czechoslovakians, the special treatment afforded the Ugandan refugees would be cited by supporters of Chilean refugee admission as an example of what the Canadian government was capable of accomplishing for refugees when it had the interest in doing so.

As this brief examination shows, Canada has been a country of refuge for the persecuted, but it has not opened its doors for purely altruistic reasons. While humanitarian considerations have often been present, there has also been an element of opportunism, whether in making use of the skills and benefits that people brought with them, or in the case of the Iron Curtain refugees, the ideological victory to be gained by welcoming them. As the experiences of the participants in this study will show, Canada's recognition of them as acceptable and legitimate refugees was often an uphill battle.

At the same time that issues of suitability, utility and security in immigration policy and the treatment of refugees became matters for renewed debate, the nature of the country's relationship with the Latin America –a region which would soon become a source of refugees and, increasingly, immigrants –began to change. By the late 1960s, in an attempt to both redefine Canada's place in the world and recognize the increasing diversity of the Canadian population, the first Trudeau administration embarked on a trade and foreign policy reform plan that aimed at connecting the nation more

---

[63] Ibid. The Citizenship and Immigration branch official history, *Forging Our Legacy*, puts the number of refugees from Uganda at 5698. Retrieved August 30, 2012 from the CIC website: http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/publications/legacy/chap-6a.asp#chap6-13. According to a1974 United Church of Canada report, the evacuation of the Ugandans was accomplished through 27 charter flights, and a 40-member immigration and health unit was sent to process the claimants. Cathy Carroll, Bob Carty and John Foster, "Chilean Refugees- Canada's reluctant response." United Church of Canada newsletter #3, March 1974.

substantially with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In a Cold War environment in which Canada was paradoxically more open to trade with and immigration from previously excluded or undesired regions, yet more concerned about the impacts newcomers might have on the receiving society, Latin America gradually entered into the Canadian conscience.

Canada and Latin America

Since Canada gained dominion status and began to establish independent foreign, trade and immigration policies, its dealings with the countries of Latin America can best be described as "peaks and valleys of involvement."[64] The longest-standing contacts between Canada and the region revolved around French Canadian missionary activity and the contributions they made to the education of local children.[65] English Canada, however, tended to only look as far south as the United States in its international dealings, or east to Great Britain and Europe, preferring to identify with the British Commonwealth and later the Francophonie as well as its southern neighbour.[66] In addition to a cultural prejudice against all things Spanish that was a holdover from British imperial attitudes, there was a concern among politicians and high-level civil servants that getting involved in Latin America would be an affront to the United States, which saw the area as part of

---

[64] James A. Rochlin, *Discovering the Americas: Evolution of Canadian Foreign Policy towards Latin America*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1993, p. 3.

[65] Peter C. Dobell, *Canada's Search for New Roles: Foreign Policy in the Trudeau Era*. London: Oxford University Press, 1972, p. 118. The "fellow-feeling" shared by French Canadians and Latin Americans identified by Dobell is echoed in testimonies found in Llambias-Wolff, *Notre exil pour parler*, p. 97, and the reasons for it described in José Del Pozo, "Exilio e identidad: El caso de los chilenos de Montreal, Canadá. Observaciones preliminares." *Revista Universum*, No. 17, 2002, p. 67.

[66] John D. Harbron, "Canada Draws Closer to Latin America: A Cautious Involvement", in Roger W. Fontaine and James D. Theberge, eds. *Latin America's New Internationalism: The End of Hemispheric Isolation*. New York: Praeger, 1976, p. 109.

its sphere of influence. [67] Ministerial missions from Canada to various Latin American countries took place in 1941, 1953 and 1958, but ultimately did not accomplish much in terms of deepening ties. Canada did not join the Organization of American States (OAS) when it was established in 1948, and trade and investment increased only slightly over time.[68] By the early 1970s, the whole of Latin America amounted to only 5% of Canada's economic activity –receiving 4% of exports and contributing 6% of imports –well behind the United States, Western Europe, Great Britain and Asia.[69] Ties outside of the economic sphere were negligible, aside from the missionary links mentioned previously. The presence of the United States between Canada and Latin America, as well as a simple lack of interest in each other, kept relations between the two sides fairly minimal.[70]

[67] Ibid, p 114-115. According to this prejudice, everything associated with Spain was "cruel, corrupt and Catholic." In 1947, future Canadian Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson dismissed the idea of deeper ties with Latin America on the grounds that it was both far away and dictatorial; see Rochlin, *Discovering the Americas,* p. 28.

[68] Dobell, *Canada's Search for New Roles*, p. 115-117.

[69] Norman Hillmer and Garth Stevenson, eds. *Foremost Nation: Canadian Foreign Policy and a Changing World.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977, p. 219. It should be further noted that Venezuelan oil accounted for ¾ of the total imports from Latin America, underlining even more the lack of economic links between Canada and the region.

[70]The distance, in more than just physical terms, between Canada and Latin America is summed up well in J. C. M. Ogelsby "A Trudeau Decade: Canadian-Latin American Relations 1968-1978." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, Vol. 21, No. 2, May, 1979. "Canada is obscured from Latin America by the presence of the United States." (p.190): "However, they [Latin American countries] are rarely curious about their more immediate neighbors, or even the United States, so Canadians should not be surprised at their lack of interest."(p.202) "Canadians forget that until the thriving 1960s there was little scholarly professional interest [in Canada] about the United States, let alone other parts of the world outside Britain or France."(p.203) However, recent scholarship has also shown that even if official state-to-state relations and trade remained minimal, links between Canadian and Latin American groups were gradually developing based on shared affinities and a sense of common identity. The relationship between Québécois and Mexican Catholic organizations explored by Maurice Demers illustrates how non-state actors tried to establish pan-American connections that could be used to promote deeper international linkages. Maurice Demers, "Pan-Americansim Re-Invented in Uncle Sam's Backyard: Catholic and Latin Identity in Quebec

In many ways, 1968 was the moment when Canada began to "discover" Latin America. The recently-elected government of Pierre Trudeau embarked on a major foreign policy review that included a large-scale mission to nine Latin American states - Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Peru, Venezuela, Mexico, Costa Rica and Guatemala. This was part of a "Third Option" strategy that was meant to reduce Canada's dependence on the United States and Western Europe, expand its market influence in the world and forge closer links with the Third World nations.[71] While there was no arguing that close diplomatic, economic and cultural links tied Canada closely to United States, the 1960s saw instances of Canada attempting to forge moderate, sovereign positions on issues such as the trade embargo on Cuba and the Vietnam War and not simply be "pulled in the wake of the great American battleship."[72] Deepening ties to Latin America was seen by Trudeau in particular as one way of making Canada a more significant and independent international force with an identity distinct from its southern neighbour.[73]

The report that resulted from the mission recommended deeper cultural ties and the provision of greater development assistance as well as a call for increased trade. It also urged Canada to join the OAS as an observer nation, a first step in recognizing that Canada was a part of the Americas and would benefit from greater involvement in the

---

and Mexico in the First Half of the Twentieth Century." Doctoral dissertation in History, York University, 2010.

[71] Bruce Thordarson, *Trudeau and Foreign Policy: a study in decision making.* Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1972, p. 48, 109; Rochlin, *Discovering the Americas,* p. 5.

[72] Reg Whitaker, "'We Know They're There': Canada and Its Others, With or Without the Cold War," in Richard Cavell, ed. *Love, Hate and Fear in Canada's Cold War.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004, p. 41.

[73] Stevenson, *Canada, Latin America and the New Internationalism: a foreign policy analysis, 1968-1990,* p. 115.

continental system.[74] While the increased attention paid to Latin America still mostly revolved around issues of trade, the region had become more than just a blip on the radar of national interests.

At the same time that Canadian industrialists were looking to expand overseas markets and Canadian diplomats were attempting to establish new international relationships, the Canadian state was also rethinking immigration policy in relation to Latin America. The post-war economic boom meant that Canada could absorb larger numbers of people, and in this context, immigration from Latin America began to appear where before it had been practically non-existent.[75] Even still, the numbers remained very small: between 1946 and 1955 Latin Americans constituted only 0.2% of total immigration, numbering 1872 recorded individuals. They never amounted to more than two percent of the total number of immigrants until 1963 and never exceeded 2000 people a year from the entire region until 1964.[76] However, over time the rate of immigration from Latin America steadily increased to the point where it has been described as "galloping", leading into the 1970s when it would start "rocketing".[77] If the galloping was due to labour needs, the rocketing was due to the "Coup Wave" of newcomers from 1973 to 1980, among whom

[74] Thordarson, *Trudeau and Foreign Policy,* p. 170-171. Canada had avoided OAS membership because of the influence of the United States in the organization, and feared not having its own distinct voice and independent policy. There is also evidence in the early post-war era that the US opposed Canadian involvement in Latin America, thinking that Canada would act as a mouthpiece for Britain. See Hillmer and Stevenson, *Foremost Nation,* p. 207-213, and Rochlin, *Discovering the Americas*, p 16-17.
[75] In a study prepared for the Canadian Hispanic Congress by Statistics Canada using data from the 2001 census, only 10 040 Hispanics are found to have come to Canada before 1961, among whom there were 125 Chileans. Statistics Canada, "Hispanic Spanish speaking population in Canada: a special report prepared for the Canadian Hispanic Congress." 2006, p. 31, 36. The report does not state from what year the counting of Latin American immigrants begins.
[76] Fernando Mata, "Latin American Immigration to Canada: Some Reflections on the Immigration Statistics". *North-South,* Vol. 20, No. 20, 1985, p. 32.
[77] Ibid, p. 31.

the Chileans were the largest single group.[78] In short, at the same time that Canada was tentatively beginning to forge stronger state-to-state ties with Latin American nations through increased trade and investment, migrants from the region also began establishing a presence in Canada that would deepen the human bonds with the rest of the Americas. The Chilean exiles who are the subject of this study have contributed significantly to the forging of those bonds.

Deepening ties with Latin American, however, brought with it a series of complications. Latin America (with the exception of Cuba) was a region dominated by the United States, and the Canadian government was cautious in its dealing with its hemispheric partners for fear of offending its neighbour. In addition, the Canadian state was subject to pressure both from within and without to conform to American policy when it came to questions of national security, and as a country of large-scale immigration, the exclusion of potential known or suspected leftists was part of the strategy to keep Canada safe from enemy infiltration.[79] The volatility of politics in Latin America, and the strength of leftist parties and movements, meant that many people from the region would automatically be judged as potential threats to the stability of the nation. Though exclusion from Canada on ideological grounds has a history that predates the Cold War, it became a stronger guiding principle during this era, and formed a key part of the argument against admitting leftist Chileans after the 11 September coup.

---

[78] For Mata's periodization of Latin American immigration waves, see p. 36 of his study. While there is overlap, his basic breakdown is into four waves leading to the time his article was published: Lead, 1957-1972 (varies by country of origin); Andean (Ecuador and Colombia), 1971-1975; Coup, 1973-1980; and Central American (especially Salvadoran), 1980 onwards.
[79] Whitaker, "'We Know They're There': Canada and Its Others, With or Without the Cold War," p. 45.

National security and the Cold War

Up to now in this section, I have looked at questions of immigration and foreign policy. Closely tied to both of these is the issue of national security and Canada's international role in the Cold War era. Historically, ideological considerations have played a part in the immigration admission process. As early as the 1910 Immigration Act the Canadian state sought to bar people who would spread anti-British or anti-Canadian ideology, and this tendency increased after the Bolshevik victory in the Russian Revolution and the upsurge in labour militancy that followed.[80] The Winnipeg General Strike of 1919 provoked a fear of communist sedition and subversion that would remain a hallmark of Canadian national security concerns until the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991. During the Second World War, most internal censorship and surveillance was directed at leftist organizations and publications, even though the USSR was an ally.[81] The control of potential internal threats also resulted in the internment of Japanese, Italian and German nationals, as well as Japanese-Canadians. Such measures are seen by some historians as evidence of a state more interested in control than in guaranteeing the civil liberties of its residents, though this is not a monolithic view.[82] During the Cold War, a

[80] Iacovetta, *Gatekeepers: Reshaping Immigrant Lives in Cold War Canada*, p. 261.
[81] Reg Whitaker and Gary.Marcuse, *Cold War Canada: The Making of a National Insecurity State, 1945-1957.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994, p. 10.
[82] This historiographical debate is present in several of the chapters of Franca Iacovetta, Roberto Perin, and Angelo Principe, eds, *Enemies Within: Italian and Other Internees in Canada and Abroad.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000. Contributors such as Luigi Bruti Liberati ("The Internment of Italian Canadians") and Reg Whitaker and Gregory S. Kealey ("A War on Ethnicity? The RCMP and Internment") take issue with the thesis put forward by other historians such as J.L. Granatstein and Gregory A. Johnson that internment was justified for reasons of state security and that re-evaluation of internment by historians is evidence of present political correctness rather than historical analysis. See Granatstein and Johnson's chapter in Norman Hillmer, Bohdan S. Kordan and Lubomyr Y. Luciuk, eds, *On Guard For Thee: War, Ethnicity and the Canadian State, 1939-1945.* Ottawa: Canadian Committee for the History of the Second World War, 1988.

fundamental tension existed between Canada's engagement on the international stage as an active member of multinational organizations with opposing missions, such as the UN and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). By the same token, Canada faced a paradoxical situation when it came to the admission of immigrants and refugees. On the one hand, the government wanted newcomers for their skills and the economic growth they helped spur, but on the other, immigrants were also potential subversives out to sow discord within ethnic communities or even attempt to overthrow the nation-state.

While Canadian troops stationed in Europe were part of NATO efforts to contain the spread of communism abroad, the defence against subversive "vectors of infection" on the home front was led by state agencies like the RCMP and the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.[83] The early Cold War era saw the emergence of a consensus view that the Soviets posed a threat to the prosperous way of life provided by capitalism in democratic societies. This threat was used to justify screening policies that kept undesirables out of the country. During the period from1947 to 1958, when the largest influx of immigrants came from communist-controlled areas, the right of entry was denied to anyone with a history of leftist involvement, however slight it might have been.[84] The Citizenship branch of the department worked closely with security agents to ensure any communist refugees who slipped through were blacklisted. In their professional activities, "these gatekeepers drew clear links between their reception and

[83] Gary Kinsman, Dieter K. Buse and Mercedes Steedman, eds., *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies*. Toronto: Between The Lines, 2000, p. 283.
[84] Whitaker and Marcuse, *Cold War Canada*, p. 18.

citizenship work with the newcomers and the battle against communism."[85] Citizenship agents directed their efforts toward teaching newcomers the "ideology" of being Canadian through classes and visual propaganda like pamphlets and films. They also put effort into identifying and reaching out to isolated, marginalized immigrants who could be targeted by communist proselytizers. Their efforts aimed at inculcating "proper" roles and "correct" values and behaviours.[86] By default, not displaying an appreciation of the values and practises promoted by Citizenship officials could cause recent immigrants to face censure for not behaving appropriately, and even in extreme cases be considered a threat to national security. In an era when dissent and non-conformity was seen as a sign of disloyalty, being in the bad graces of the Citizenship branch could result in surveillance, being blacklisted from government employment, or even subject to deportation.[87]

During the Cold War, the interests of national security trumped the human and civil rights of groups and individuals. Some people seemed unworthy of Canadian citizenship. Some were deemed a threat to the health of the nation –a metaphor that was also used by the Chilean military to justify its repression of the left in that country. Canada's concerns with keeping the country clean of subversive elements meant that the main security

[85] Iacovetta, *Gatekeepers: Reshaping Immigrant Lives in Cold War Canada*, p. 12-13.
[86] Ibid. Iacovetta describes the roles promoted as "bread winning fathers, homemaker mothers, and well-adjusted (and rapidly Canadianizing) children [who] performed their assigned duties or appropriate roles." (p. 58). The values and behaviours mentioned are "devotion to the family, an active interest in neighbourhood issues, friendliness, the ability to live in harmony with others, self-control in social interactions, loyalty to friends and associates, pride in work, knowing and obeying the rules of healthy living, and appreciating art and culture. This process of acculturation included political behaviours, such as having an awareness of and engagement in political issues at the municipal, provincial and federal levels, and an interest in the wider world." (p. 61)
[87] Whitaker and Marcuse, *Cold War Canada,* p. 4.

agency, the RCMP, was given the freedom of action to conduct secret initiatives against anyone considered a threat.[88] This preoccupation with internal stability and quelling dissent was part of a long Canadian tradition of valuing peace and order, and it was exacerbated by Canada's close and subordinate relationship with the United States. Despite the Trudeau administration's search for a "Third Option" and differences concerning the war in Vietnam and the embargo of Cuba, defence and immigration – described by Reg Whitaker as the two cornerstones of the Canadian "insecurity state" – were deeply influenced by American policy.[89] There was significant pressure from the US for Canada to "impose uniform anti-leftist controls on immigration" and "to conform to U.S. standards with regard to political policing of the movement of peoples across borders."[90] Canada was still very firmly in the American camp on questions of immigration and internal security when the Chilean exiles began to arrive.

In October 1970, three years prior to the arrival of the Chilean exiles, official vigilance against internal threats to Canadian security was reinforced , when a Québec provincial cabinet minister and a British diplomat were kidnapped by the Front de Libération du Québec (FLQ), a separatist movement that used violence to fight for independence from Canada. The cabinet minister, Pierre Laporte, was subsequently killed by his abductors. One of the demands of the group was the publication of their manifesto, a leftist document which identified Québec as a subjugated, pseudo colonial society

---

[88] Kinsman et al, eds., *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies*, p. 280.
[89] Whitaker, "'We Know They're There': Canada and Its Others, With or Without the Cold War," p. 35.
[90] Ibid, p. 45.

exploited by English Canada.[91] Both its actions and its ideology put the FLQ beyond the pale in the eyes of the Canadian government, which invoked the War Measures Act, a statute dating from 1914 that gave the authorities broad emergency powers in the event of a real or apprehended war, invasion or insurrection. At the height of the crisis, the Sûreté du Québec (the provincial police force), the RCMP and 15 000 troops from the Canadian Armed Forces had virtual carte blanche to detain and search anyone considered suspicious.[92] In the dangerous world of the Cold War, extremist acts would be met with extreme reactions, and human and civil rights would be subordinated to the security of the nation.

In addition, elements of the ideology of the FLQ –anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, economic nationalism –were seen as typical of post-Cuban Revolution leftist thought, and would be present in the beliefs of the UP supporters who began arriving three years later. The fear of communist infiltration and domestic upheaval caused by the FLQ crisis reinforced the reluctance of Canadian security and immigration officials to accept people from the political left as suitable candidates for citizenship.[93] In the next chapter, we will examine how the participants in this study got out of Chile and into Canada, and how their association with the left made them a target in one country and initially unwelcome in the other. In Cold War Canada, the fear of "a coalition between extreme separatists in

---

[91] Laurier LaPierre, "Quebec: October 1970." *The North American Review*, Vol. 256, No. 3, Fall 1971, p. 32. The FLQ manifesto reflected the influence of decolonization theory among Quebec intellectuals and activists in the 1960s, manifesting also the idea of anti-colonial resistance that was influential in Chile during the same era. See Sean Mills, *The Empire Within: Postcolonial Thought and Political Activism in Sixties Montreal.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010.

[92] LaPierre, "Quebec: October 1970", p. 28.
[93] Mata, "Latin American Immigration to Canada: Some Reflections on the Immigration Statistics," p. 30.

Québec and the leftist refugees from Chile" constituted an important reason why acceptance of Chilean political refugees was problematic on both the government and public level.[94]

By 1973, the latent conflict between the two superpowers had erupted in Chile, making life precarious for a large portion of the population. The rivalry between the US and USSR also affected how the expatriated would be received in Canada, which found itself pulled between the contradictory forces of security and humanitarianism. The historical backdrop of the Cold War provides the context for understanding why the Unidad Popular administration was such a polarizing force within the boundaries of Chile and in the international arena. The geopolitical situation of the time was at the root of the crisis in Chile that led Canada to become a country of refuge for thousands of people from the other end of the Americas.

[94] George Hanff, "Decision-Making Under Pressure: A Study of the Admittance of Chilean Refugees by Canada." *North-South, the Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 8, 1979, p. 125.

Chapter Two

Getting Out, Getting In: The push and pull of exile

In this chapter, I turn my attention from the larger historical contexts of Chile and Canada to look in more detail at the paths into exile of the study participants and the tensions that surfaced in Canada because of the Chilean crisis. The "Getting Out" section deals with the circumstances which forced the participants into exile, connecting the events of their lives to the exclusionary project initiated by the military regime. It also outlines the diverse routes taken into exile and the different timelines for escape that individuals followed. Not all exiles took asylum in embassies right after the coup; exile was in many cases a last option taken after years of living under dictatorial rule. "Getting In" looks in detail at the controversy that surrounded the decision to admit leftist Chileans. On the one hand, the Canadian government tried to deal with the problem by enforcing an admission policy that often treated Chileans as normal immigrants rather than fugitives from a repressive regime. On the other hand, the federal authorities faced effective pressure from a diverse domestic lobby that coalesced in solidarity with Chileans targeted by the regime, which resulted in Canada opening its doors wider to exiles than some government officials ever intended.

To begin, I will first briefly describe the situation immediately after the coup d'état, and how the establishment of a state of terror, oppression and exclusion would lead

hundreds of thousands of Chileans –including twenty of the twenty-one exiles I interviewed –to unwillingly leave their homeland for the precarious safety of exile.

I. Getting Out

"A new stage in the national destiny"[1]

The campaign of state terror unleashed by the Chilean military regime on its fellow citizens has been extensively documented and examined almost from the moment it began. For the purpose of this study, a brief examination of the repressive actions that characterized the early years of the dictatorship explains how and why exile became so widespread.

When the Chilean Armed Forces overthrew the Allende government, it had been 40 years since the previous direct military intervention in political affairs. The Cold War context, however, meant that it would not become what many expected –a short intervention to restore stability, to be followed by the status quo of democratic elections and civilian rule. Instead, Chileans found themselves living for sixteen and a half years under an authoritarian government that used a variety of direct and indirect methods of repression, ranging from assassination and disappearance to blacklisting and isolation, to rid the country of those it considered threats to the survival of the nation and to quell

---

[1] This phrase is from the "Declaración de Principios del Gobierno de Chile" (Declaration of Principles of the Government of Chile), in which the junta set forth its vision of Chilean society. "Declaración de Principios del Gobierno de Chile" March 11, 1974. http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Congress/1770/declaracion-de-principios.html , p. 9. This website is no longer active.

dissent among those who remained behind.[2] The essence of the authoritarian project in Chile was to achieve prosperity through "the substitution of 'real' economic liberty in the free market for the old political freedoms which, it was claimed, had merely served to impede the country's development."[3] The restructuring of the way Chile functioned entailed not merely curtailing the political and social opposition, but eliminating or replacing it altogether through coercion and exclusion.

Military control in Chile was part of a phenomenon in Latin America from the 1960s to the 1990s that saw democratic rule replaced by authoritarian governments. The armed forces of many nations formed alliances with civilian supporters to run their countries through a technocratic and bureaucratic decision-making process, without having to submit to democratic consultation and compromise. Proponents felt this approach would accelerate economic development, and thus reduce the social problems that had led to political instability in the first place.[4] In the case of Chile, the regime's vision of reform

---

[2] The direct and indirect methods of repression used by the regime were described by the Comité de Defensa de los Derechos del Pueblo (CODEPU, the Corporation for the Promotion and Defence of the People's Rights), one of the non-governmental organizations in Chile that emerged in the years after the coup to contest the authoritarian control of society. Direct repression included assassination, kidnapping, disappearance, detention, torture, exile, internal exile [*relegación*], home searches without warrant, imprisonment, and intimidation (threats, surveillance, continuous harassment). Indirect repression referred one or more of the following: dismissal from work; the deprivation of housing, health and food; severance from social, political, and labour organizations; censorship, distortion of facts, and systematic manipulation of information; the limitation or the loss of the right to due process; total or partial loss of individual and collective freedom of expression, imposed at times by the pretence of legal principles and at other times by self-censorship provoked by fear. Comité de los Derechos Humanos del Pueblo, "The Effects of Torture and Political Repression in a Sample of Chilean Families." *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol. 28, No. 7, 1989, p. 736.

[3] Pamela Lowden, "The Ecumenical Committee for Peace in Chile 1973-1975: The Foundation of Moral Opposition to Authoritarian Rule in Chile". *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, Vol. 12, No. 2, May, 1993, p. 189.

[4] Fernando Henrique Cardoso, "The Characterization of Authoritarian Regimes", in David Collier, ed. *The New Authoritarianism in Latin America.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979, p. 48.

involved profound changes in the political, economic and social life of the country that would come to encompass "protected democracy", neoliberal economics and the abandonment of state-sponsored projects for the reduction of inequality. The use or threat of force was one of the fundamental ways in which regimes such as the one in Chile ensured their national projects would go unopposed.

The people excluded from the project for restructuring Chile were those who had supported the UP project, even if only as sympathizers rather than activists. According to their opponents, leftists were a "cancerous tumour" to be cut out of the Chilean national body.[5] As Darren G. Hawkins suggests, "In the military mind, Marxists were dehumanized creatures who betrayed their country and God to insidiously spread Soviet imperialism to all corners of the Earth. Marxism, in this view, corrupted the moral cornerstones of Western society such as the family, Christianity, and patriotism."[6] In a very short time, a substantial portion of the nation's population found itself defined as dangerous to the Chilean national family, and therefore unworthy of occupying the national territory.

The highest level of violence and direct repression occurred in the half-year immediately after the coup, after which time the regime began to use more indirect methods to control dissent and crush the elements that survived the initial crackdown.[7]

---

[5] Joan Simalchik, "The Material Culture of Chilean Exile: A Transnational Dialogue." *Refuge,* Vol. 23, No. 2, June 2006, p. 95.

[6] Darren G. Hawkins, *International Human Rights and Authoritarian Rule in Chile*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002, p. 53.

[7] Early 1974 seems to be the moment when direct forms of repression that were observable by the general populace, such as the mass detentions in the Estadio Nacional and Estadio Chile, or the open reporting of executions, began to give way to the clandestine techniques of the secret police, the DINA (Dirección

However, the indirect repression exercised in the first months of military control set the stage for sixteen years of authoritarian rule that fundamentally changed Chilean society and made a substantial part of its population unwelcome in their own nation. As we shall see, most of the participants in this study left Chile due to indirect repression rather than more direct methods, such as arrest, prolonged detention and torture, though several interviewees faced these horrors as well.

While the number of killed in the initial crackdown is a matter of debate, it was at least two thousand, along with up to 80 000 people detained for at least 24 hours between September 1973 and January 1974.[8] In addition to purging UP supporters from the public service and the educational sphere –a process known in Spanish as *exoneración* –the junta imposed other measures to block opposition and silence dissent. The media was subject to severe scrutiny, and any publications or radio stations sympathetic to the defeated government were closed down. Under the states of war, siege and exception decreed by the junta, the rule of law was effectively suspended, and dubious legal footing was provided for the increased authority to detain, search and question used by the regime. In a short time, the new rulers of Chile had managed to sweep away the previous

---

Nacional de Informaciones, National Intelligence Directorate). These included surreptitious arrests without charges, incommunicado detention, systematic torture and disappearances. For descriptions of this transformation in the methods of state terror, see Eugenio Ahumada et al, eds. *Chile: la memoria prohibida.* Fourth edition. Santaigo: Pehuén, 1990. Vol. I, p. 389-398, and Vol II, p. 44-46.

[8] Chicago Commission of Inquiry into the Status of Human Rights in Chile, "Report of the Chicago Commission of Inquiry into the Status of Human Rights in Chile. Santiago, Chile, February 16-23, 1974". Chicago, 1974, p. 3-4.

government and began to rid the country of the individuals and groups who were the "enemies of liberty."[9]

A report by Professor Lionel Vallée on behalf of the Canadian University Committee for Refugee Chilean Professional and Students –one of the solidarity organizations discussed later in this chapter –gives us an idea of the kinds of measures taken by the regime. His fact-finding mission to Chile took place between 30 November and 23 December 1973, and while many of Vallée's findings were based on hearsay and some are of questionable veracity, they illustrate the atmosphere of fear and desperation prevailing at the time.[10] He commented on the continuing violence and psychological warfare being waged on Chile's inhabitants, as well as describing a media campaign to discredit the Allende government and justify military rule as the defence of Chile from external attack. According to Vallée's sources, nearly everyone in the country seemed to have a friend or relative dead, imprisoned, taking asylum in a foreign embassy, seeking refuge, on the run, or at the very least being harassed by the authorities.[11] It was not a simple equation of crime and punishment that caused people to "voluntarily" opt for

[9] This phrase comes from a description of the 1980 Constitution imposed by the military regime, which created a "protected" democracy that included military- appointed senators and the exclusion of all Marxist parties, to name two of its well-known elements. The actual wording is that the constitution gives Chile "a new and solid democracy that makes possible the participation of community members in the knowledge and solution of large national problems and provides mechanisms that defend it from the enemies of liberty, those who, under the cover of a misunderstood pluralism, only hope for its destruction." Quoted in the Comisión Nacional de Verdad y Reconciliación, "Informe de la Comisión Nacional de Verdad y Reconciliación". Santiago: la Nación, 1991. Part two, chapter two, p. 342.

[10] I refer specifically to his assertion that "definitely 20,000 and perhaps even more" people had been killed since the coup (p. 2). The number was closer to one-tenth of that. Lionel Vallée, "Report on a trip to Chile, December 1973". Social Science Research Council of Canada, Ottawa, 1974.

[11] Ibid, p. 4-6.

exile; it was also a menacing environment, in the words of William Rowe and Theresa Whitfield, "the darkness of secrecy and suspicion, of anonymous threats and the disappearances of friends and acquaintances."[12] Raquel Borgoño recalled the pervading sense of fear and tension she felt in the last months of 1973:

> I think it's difficult to understand ...We showed up at a friend's house, and his wife said "Get away from here right now, the DINA [the secret police] has just been here"...We could be sitting around, just like we're sitting now, and anyone could just show up, it was agonizing, a kind of terror...We never knew when we went off to work if we were going to come back, because they took you away at your work, they took you away at your house, because the neighbours would talk...There was a curfew, and you knew if a vehicle was passing, that it was one of theirs...You'd wake up and say, "Oh, where's it going to stop?" Is it going to stop by your house?[13]

A good part of the Vallée report examines the actions taken against the universities and their faculties –an important consideration for this study, as a considerable number of the exiles with whom I spoke were educators affected by these measures.[14] He described how the regime was "buying" university professors to ensure they followed the orders of the newly-appointed military rectors and controlled volatile students. With regard to the process of *exoneración* that was applied to seven people who participated in this study, Vallée stated:

> Professors are dismissed merely upon denunciation by an ambitious colleague, without regard for their years of service, without being presented with any formal

---

[12] William Rowe and Teresa Whitfield, "Thresholds of Identity: Literature and Exile in Latin America." *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 9, No. 1, January 1987, p. 229.

[13] Raquel interview.

[14] Eight of the twenty-one interviewees were university professors at the time of the coup, all of whom lost their jobs in the months that followed. Another exile, Willy Behrens, who was resident in Canada at the time of the coup, had a job offer at a Chilean university disappear as a result of the restructuring. Interview by author with WillyBehrens, Ottawa, February 17, 2010 (henceforth Willy interview). Interview in Spanish.

> accusation, and without being able to submit to a fair hearing. There is no appeal against dismissal. This practice is very widespread.[15]

Manuel Jofré's case is typical of the treatment educators associated with the UP project faced. When I asked if he had suffered from direct repression, he answered: "Yes, in a double sense. I was only detained for a day, not with torture but with physical abuse, and at the same time the fact of being discharged for political reasons and fired from the university is a second important aspect." He had been detained by the investigative police on 23 September; within four months, he was officially *exonerado.* His troubles did not end after his first detention, however, and by the time he was officially discharged, he had already begun preparing for exile: "At first I thought I'd try to stay in the country, but then I was arbitrarily detained for being a professor at the University of Chile. I decided to leave Chile for any academic job I could get."[16]

In addition to the oppressive treatment meted out to educators, Vallée describes the transformation of curriculum by order of the new authorities and the elimination or severe curtailment of programmes teaching sociology, social service, political science, anthropology, journalism, fine arts, and, to a lesser degree, law and medicine.[17] Any centres of critical reflection about society were seen as potential forums for the

---

[15] Vallée, "Report on a trip to Chile, December 1973", p. 9.
[16] Interview by author with Manuel Jofré, Santiago, 16 April 2010 (henceforth Manuel interview). Interview in Spanish.
[17] Vallée, "Report on a trip to Chile, December 1973", p. 10.

opposition. The goal was the "purification of the universities" through the "the utter eradication of Marxism"[18]

The authorities also had no compunction about sending soldiers to schools in the poor neighbourhoods, where support for Allende's government had been strong. As a teacher in one of these schools, S.V.P. witnessed first-hand the methods used against the population, and had a traumatic confrontation with soldiers in her own classroom:

> That was difficult [teaching in the *población*], because it was one of the areas the police invaded most. In fact, when I was teaching classes police came in, soldiers, and I was pregnant...They came to take away students, and I stopped them in the door to the classroom, because they had this tactic of taking away students to the bases to get the parents...So I stopped them, and I was pushed to the ground by a soldier, and he pointed his bayonet here, at my big stomach, and said "Bitch, I'll kill you later", and pointed his pistol at my stomach, at the baby. Well, they didn't do it, they just scared me, but the shock was great enough that I had [her daughter] prematurely. She was born the next week.[19]

Like educators, physicians also came under the close scrutiny of the military authorities after 11 September, and in his account Vallée reports on the division among doctors because of an anti-UP strike just before the coup.[20] Immediately after the takeover, many physicians were banned from practising despite a doctor shortage in the country, including two of this study's participants, Marlinda Freire and Ana María Barrenechea, and the husband of a third interviewee, María Teresa. Their testimonies

[18] "Communication Addressed to the Chairman of the Executive Board by Professor Sergei L. Tikhivinsky", UNESCO, June 19, 1974, p. 3.United Nations Archive (henceforth UNA), Waldheim Series S-0904, Box 89, file 9ACC. 91/5.

[19] Interview by author with S.V.P., Toronto, 31 October 2008 (henceforth S.V.P. interview). Interview in Spanish. She requested that only her initials be used.

[20] Vallée, "Report on a trip to Chile, December 1973 ", p. 10.

describe the dangerous situation faced by health care professionals who had supported the UP project.

Ana María was put under house arrest for her involvement in public health projects suspected of being influenced by communist ideas, and many of the doctors she worked with were detained and mistreated. After the coup, she was sent home from her hospital, and on 16 September she was suspended from practising. Along with other psychiatrists, she had to present herself every day to the local authorities, until she was eventually spirited out of the country to Mexico disguised as a nun, with no luggage and only ten dollars and a passport.[21]

Marlinda was also at risk because of her support for the UP. During the anti-Unidad Popular doctors' strike a short time before coup, she and others kept working, so it was well known where her sympathies lay. Her testimony reveals how close she was to being detained by the military:

> Immediately after the coup, it was we doctors who had kept working during the strike that were detained, disappeared, who had to go into exile…In my case I had a lot of luck… The military came to my house four times, but I wasn't there, neither were my children. So they searched the house and took stuff, but I wasn't there. But the fourth time they came to the house, I decided I wouldn't stay there anymore. I put the children in the car and started going north… I wasn't detained or tortured, but I suffered the same repression that other members of the Chilean population suffered, interrogated, house searched, there was an order to present yourself at work every day.[22]

[21] Interview number one by author with Ana María Barrenechea, Toronto, 21 December 2009 (henceforth Ana María1 interview). Interview in English. There is no audio recording of this interview.
[22] Interview by author with Marlinda Freire, Toronto, 22 October 2008 (henceforth Marlinda interview). Interview in Spanish.

As part of its determination to crush all potential opposition and eliminate Marxism, the regime also targeted the public administration. Juan, who worked for a government agency responsible for rural planning and agrarian reform, faced unemployment and personal risk from the day of the coup until he left the country. He was fortunate enough to have local connections with the police that kept him relatively safe and unharmed, but on 1 November he received a government decree declaring him expelled from post, and proscribed for life from public service as a "peasant agitator."[23]

The same situation was true for union activists, such as Alfredo Lavergne:

> As I was a union leader in the year 1973, in that September, all union leaders were ordered to present themselves for questioning, and many of those who went were caught by the dictatorship and put in concentration camps, like the *Estadio Nacional*, for example, the *Estadio Chile* was a concentration camp, and many other places. Because of the advice of an old union leader...I didn't go, and this made me into something that was, at that time, outside of the system... I had to survive clandestinely for two years.[24]

The Vallée report concludes with a series of recommendations of how to help Chilean professionals and students, while also stating that Canada's contribution to the alleviation of the humanitarian crisis gripping the country left much to be desired. The picture it painted of post-coup Chile provided evidence of the crusade to completely remake society that the military had embarked on after 11 September 1973. A report by a Chilean NGO later summed up the goal of the regime in these terms:

---

[23] Juan interview.

[24] Interview by author with Alfredo Lavergne, Santiago, 12 April 2010 (henceforth Alfredo interview). Interview in Spanish.

> The historical project imposed after the 11th of September, 1973, had two intersecting logics: the first was the containment of social and political mobilization and the disarticulation of all organizational expressions that were not those of the dominant groups, along with the reorganization of the economic base.[25]

The taxonomy of exile: different routes north

The junta and its allies used many techniques to impose or encourage exile, and the variety of reasons why people left and the different times of their departure show that exile was not a singular phenomenon. At first affected through intimidation and outright violence, it was later enforced with laws to back its exclusionary measures. A study from 1994 of 8 698 returning exiles by the *Oficina Nacional de Retorno* [National Bureau of Return, a governmental agency established to assist returnees after the return to democratic rule in 1990] illustrates the different escape routes and reasons for leaving. Among this group, 3.02% left under Decree 504, a law dictated by the junta that let prisoners convicted of offenses but considered not particularly dangerous commute their prison sentences to "voluntary" exile if they so wished. 11.42% left through taking asylum at a foreign embassy. 5.08% were expelled under Decree 81, which declared that the regime could remove from the country Chileans or foreigners for situations arising from the State of War or in the interests of state security. Former prisoners amounted to 21.83% of those polled, while 30.89% claimed to have faced direct persecution. Other reasons for leaving were given as loss of work or being blacklisted, 8.97%; barred from

[25] Fundación de Ayuda Social de las Iglesias Cristianas, "Programa de Reunificación Familiar: Reencuentro en el exilio." Santiago, 1991. CDVS, Exilio, box 29.

studies, 1.32%; family reunification, 0.58%; and undefined other reasons, 7.7%. The study shows that Chilean exile was very much a family phenomenon: 76.15% of exiles left the country with family members, and 79.35% of this group left with two to four family members. It also reveals that 66.82% of exiles were men, and 33.18% women.[26] While these numbers only represent a sample of people who returned, and cannot be taken as perfectly demonstrative of the demographics of Chilean exiles, they do illustrate the many different methods for getting out –or being pushed out –of the country during military rule.

In the immediate aftermath of the coup, and in the months that followed, thousands of Chileans and foreign residents took asylum in foreign embassies. Many people did so due to their well-known affiliation with the political left or their direct involvement with the Unidad Popular government. They were targets of the initial crackdown and had to abandon their jobs and homes and either go into hiding or seek asylum. The embassies of Latin American countries, among which Mexico and Argentina played particularly prominent roles, became important havens from persecution, along with the legations of France, Switzerland, Sweden, Italy and Great Britain. By contrast, the Canadian embassy admitted very few, but among them was one of the participants in this project, Marcela Duran. She was a member of the Communist Youth, though not particularly active. Her husband, on the other hand, came from a prominent leftist family and was immediately targeted for his beliefs and actions. During the coup, the democratic openness of Chilean

[26] Oficina Nacional de Retorno, *Informe Estadistico final*, July, 1994. Statistics reproduced in Carmen Norambuena Carrasco, "Exilio y retorno: Chile 1973-1994" in Mario Garcés *et al. Memoria para un nuevo siglo: Chile, miradas a la segunda mitad del sigloXX.* Santiago: LOM, 2000, p. 178.

society that so many had pointed to with pride became a source of danger because people had been very open about their party affiliations. After 11 September, Marcela never returned to her work as an assistant professor at the Universidad de Chile; she would later discover that she had been *exonerada*. She stayed with her parents for about a week, while her husband went into hiding. Sometimes she didn't know where he was, and it was clear they were in danger:

> You know, we were academics, and so we didn't have safe houses in case something happened, so we were basically in relatives homes, or in friends, and it became very clear to [her husband] that he was endangering friends by being there, and that the wise thing to do was to try to leave any way we could.

On 17 September or thereabouts they were interviewed by the consul, who invited them to stay at ambassador's home: "He said we could bring a small group of people, that were like [her husband], were [high] profile people, basically I think non-threatening people...So we told him the story, and he said 'Yes, I think I want to help you'." Marcela remembered that ten Canadians and between ten and fifteen Chileans sought shelter in the embassy. A telex from Ottawa on 5 October advised that they were to be issued Minister's Permits valid for 3 months, undergo a medical exam in Canada and be given work permits for up to a year "on the understanding they remain law abiding and engage in no international subversive political activity" and the condition that they had not been involved in criminal activity.[27] Within two weeks of the issue of the permits, 16 of the 17

[27] Telex, Ottawa to Santiago, "Re: 17 asylum seekers." October 5, 1973. Library and Archives Canada (henceforth LAC) RG 76 Vol 986 File 5781-3-1 Refugees-Chilean Movement. Processing of Applications –General. Due to privacy protocols for documents from RG 76 and RG 77, I am not allowed to disclose the names of authors of documents or their positions within the Canadian government, therefore the attributions from these sources may sometimes seem vague and/or incomplete.

asylum seekers were in Canada, with one Cuban-Canadian still in Santiago waiting for permission to leave.[28]

Marcela concluded her account of getting out of Chile with a reflection on the importance of status and connections in their escape, something that we will hear again in other testimonies:

> Our story is very different. It was harrowing –we had family in prison, we had friends killed, we were in a dramatic personal situation –but our story in terms of getting out of Chile, it's quite an easier one…Our story is an upper-middle class story. It's a story of people with contacts. And that's what happens in coups...People knew and tried to help. But I think that needs to be said, because sometimes in the refugee stories people are clumped, and class matters. In sad ways, it helps.[29]

Though she did not receive asylum at the Canadian Embassy, Patricia Godoy's story mirrors some of the urgency felt by Marcela Duran to get out of Chile. At the time of the coup, she was working for the Unidad Popular government in the Ministry of External Relations and was denounced by a disgruntled co-worker, which along with her UP connection and involvement in the Socialist Party put her at risk. Like Marcela, Patricia was also lucky enough to have connections that helped her in her escape:

> I worked in the chancellery of the Ministry of Exterior Relations and I had many foreign friends, so they offered me asylum and refuge. And a Canadian friend spoke with a sister of the Canadian ambassador in Chile at that time, so they interviewed me at the embassy…They said I had to wait until they gave me a refugee pass. But I had to leave earlier, so they told me to fly to Argentina or Peru and wait, because it was going to be issued in a month or two months. So...in October I left Chile.

---

[28] "Status Report- Chile." October 17, 1973. LAC RG 76 Vol 986 File 5781-1 Refugees-Chilean Movement General.

[29] Marcela interview.

Like many other Chilean exiles, Patricia spent a brief time in neighbouring Peru while her Ministerial Permit to enter Canada was being arranged. She finally arrived in Toronto on 18 December 1973.[30]

A second category of exiles were those who commuted their sentences using Decree 504, like Luis Cortés. Between1973 and 1975, only 75 people were exiled this way, but from 1976 to 1979, 1 228 political prisoners were deported to willing countries.[31] Having been prisoners, these exiles often had suffered great privations before being "humanely" expelled. Luis's story illuminates this route to exile and offers a glimpse into the situation of repression that existed in Chile.

Luis was a leader of the Baker's Union in the northern city of Iquique, an area with a large military presence. Almost immediately after the coup, he was detained, brutally tortured and interned in a concentration camp. His testimony reveals the summary and arbitrary nature of military justice in dealing with its opponents: in his hearing, he was tried at the same time as 120 other detainees, with nearly no time to confer with a lawyer about his defence. He was sentenced twenty-five years in jail, but his lawyer managed to get it reduced to fifteen. When he was offered the opportunity to commute his sentence and go into exile in Canada, he put his name forward. He would eventually arrive in

[30] Interview by author with Patricia Godoy, Toronto, 31 October 2008 (henceforth Patricia interview). Interview in Spanish.
[31] Vicaría de la Solidaridad, "Documento de Trabajo", 1992, p. 219. CDVS, Exilio, box 30.

Canada in 1978 as part of a special government programme directed toward political prisoners that ended that year, which is examined later in the chapter.[32]

A third category of exiles is those who were expelled as threats to national security using Decree 81; between 1973 and 1975, 777 people were exiled in this way.[33] Though his expulsion happened later, Carlos Torres was expatriated from Chile under these conditions. He characterizes his activity in Chile as being a student leader and "conspirator" until the regime finally decided it had had enough of him:

> I was expelled. I was given 72 hours to leave the country after being in jail twice, and I ended up in Argentina...It was terrible as well there, but I wasn't known in Argentina... and there we had the High Commission of United Nations for Refugees under which purview we were protected but then I was again expelled, and I was given two weeks to leave Argentina. And a mission from the Québec government during the René Lévesque years rescued a hundred families of Chileans from Argentina in different cities.[34]

However, most exiles were not part of these three groups, and not subject to legal exile. They left by personal means rather than through asylum, expulsion or commutation. Most of the participants in this study left Chile between 1973 and 1978 along with approximately 140 000 other exiles, one of two large exoduses during the military dictatorship.[35] The departure stories of some exiles show that they were pushed to leave through indirect repression. Some study participants endured months or years under the military regime before departing for exile. Often these people were fired from their jobs

[32] Interview by author with Luis Cortés, Toronto, 4 November 2008 (henceforth Luis interview). Interview in Spanish.
[33] Vicaría de la Solidaridad, "Documento de Trabajo", 1992, p. 218. CDVS, Exilio, box 30.
[34] Interview number one by author with Carlos Torres, Toronto, 21 October 2008 (henceforth Carlos 1 interview). Interview in English. René Lévesque was the leader of the Parti Québécois and premier of the province of Québec from 1976 until 1985.
[35] Vicaría de la Solidaridad, "Documento de Trabajo", 1992, p. 219. CDVS, Exilio, box 30.The other big phase was between 1984 and 1987, when a further 140 000 are calculated to have left for exile.

and blacklisted for their known support for the Unidad Popular project or their party affiliation, and their subsequent economic precariousness led them to seek refuge abroad.

This was the case of journalist and Communist Party member Alfonso Álvarez, who was detained for three or four days following the coup and questioned by the police. While many of his friends were tortured at the *Estadio Nacional*, a sports stadium in Santiago that became synonymous with brutality, he was released, but fired from his job at a radio station. In the six months following the coup, he had no income and had to depend on his son. Eventually friends helped find him some work in which his political history was not an obstacle: "A job that wasn't much, but at least helped me face life there, in the midst of all my comrades who suffered much greater punishment in this regard." Alfonso was forced to do everything from driving a bus and working in a factory to selling books on the street while he tried to survive and continue in his clandestine work for the party. He was finally sponsored to come to Canada in March, 1977.[36]

Fellow Communist Eduardo Boza also tried to continue under the dictatorship, despite the dangers: "The situation was terrible, and we were totally aware of what was the reality, of the risks...we knew that people were disappearing and everything." In October, 1973, Eduardo was fired from his government post and blacklisted. He had written a manual on price controls and participated in community organizing, but as

[36] Interview by author with Alfonso Álvarez, Toronto, 4 November 2008 (henceforth Alfonso interview). Interview in Spanish.
[37] Interview by author with Eduardo Boza, Toronto, 3 November 2008 (henceforth Eduardo interview). Interview in Spanish.

Eduardo himself was aware, people had been killed for less. Because he was known to the authorities, he was unable to find work, and the situation steadily deteriorated:

> Until May [1975, when he and his spouse arrived in Canada] we were doing a bit of everything. Selling things, selling shoes...It was an interesting experience for me, but you couldn't make any money. At first there was money, but after a couple of years things became more and more difficult.

Despite his efforts to remain in Chile, the military regime's indirect repression finally pushed Eduardo into exile:

> Things were terrible in Latin America back then...You didn't have a chance if you lived there...They were changing the whole social system and I thought, if I stay here, I have nothing, I had no future there in Chile, because I had been marked, I had a record.

He was eventually sponsored for permanent residence status by his brother-in-law, one of the few Chileans to arrive in Canada before the coup.[37]

José Borgoño, also a member of the Communist Party, worked at the Universidad de Chile, but overt pressure from the military-controlled university administration and anonymous warnings to resign finally drove him into exile along with his spouse and child. They approached the Canadian embassy and applied for admission under the relaxed criteria of Special Movement Chile, which is described later in this chapter. They left for Canada in March of 1974, arriving not as refugees, but as landed immigrants.[38]

---

[38] Interview by author with José Borgoño, Toronto, 21 October 2008 (henceforth José B. interview). Interview in Spanish.

Like José Borgoño, Manuel Jofre had been harassed because of his profession and his party affiliation, and decided to get out of Chile while he still could. To that end, he started to look for work at foreign universities:

> I wrote letters to Paris, Budapest and Toronto, and in Toronto there was a committee to help Chileans...[They] took my resume and put it forward to professors at Carleton University. And there in Carleton, in the Hispanic Studies department [they] offered me work as a part-time lecturer. And with this offer they told me that I didn't need to get enter on a tourist visa, but that ... I could start the process to be a landed immigrant, which is what I did, and this [process] ended positively in the middle of December, and I left Chile the 24th of December, 1973, with the job offer and with the status of a landed immigrant.[39]

José Del Pozo faced a similar choice as Manuel, and decided on exile. During our interview I asked him why he left Chile:

> Because I decided to leave. Because I didn't want to live under a dictatorship. What's more, they had cut off my work at the Universidad de Chile... At that time they didn't give explanations...I was *exonerado*, but I was never subjected to a review, no, I was just told that would be my last pay cheque, with no explanation.[40]

Del Pozo refers to himself as an *auto exiliado*, a self-exile, because he could have continued to live in Chile. According to regime guidelines for categorizing UP sympathizers, he would have been considered redeemable, but he chose not to become what Marco Antonio de la Parra calls an "internal exile" and live a life in Chile that would have been "smooth as long as you don't think too much".[41] Rather than live under barely tolerable conditions, Del Pozo left:

---

[39] Manuel interview.

[40] Interview by author with José Del Pozo, Santiago, 19 April 2010 (henceforth José D. interview). Interview in Spanish.

[41] Marco Antonio De la Parra, *La Mala Memoria.* Santiago: Planeta, 1997, p. 46-47. De la Parra invents the verb "*pinochetizarse*", to Pinochet yourself, to describe the choice of abandoning the public sphere out of

> I could have stayed. Of course, I didn't have work at the university, but I could have worked in other schools, in fact I had applied [for a teaching post] and I had been accepted, so I could have worked, I could have survived, and my wife had kept her job. So rather, we're dealing with another type of analysis, that of the forced migrants. Like in my case, I was an immigrant, but not a normal one. It was forced, or self-exile...I didn't lose my rights...And there were a lot of people like me who could have stayed but didn't want to...There were refugees, people who were in real danger, and others who exiled themselves.[42]

For some, it was not their activities but those of their partners or spouses that obliged them to leave Chile. Three of my interviewees became exiles because of repression directed at their spouses. For María Teresa, the disappearance and torture of her husband forced her and her three young children to seek protection. After the release of her spouse from over four months of detention, they left the country for Argentina where they came under the auspices of the UNHCR. The family eventually ended up in Canada as UN refugees in October 1974.[43]

Nidia Rivera, who was not herself political, ended up in exile because of her husband's activism in the Socialist Party:

> He was in jail. He was in the *Estadio Nacional*. And then he was free. They were following us and they told him he had to get out...Friends or party members or

fear and turning inwards to cope with life during the dictatorship. In relation to how the regime classified UP sympathizers, a document from 11 October, 1973, divides the "enemy" into five categories: extremists, highly dangerous and intelligent activists, ideological activists, militants and sympathizers. Del Pozo would have fallen into the category of militants and sympathizers, who were viewed as people who are "redeemable" and potentially useful in the labour force. They did not require rigorous controls or monitoring, and had been "duped and defrauded" by the UP. Professor Doctor Augusto Schuster Cortes, "Re: Policy to Be Followed With Members of the Popular Unity (UP)." "Report of the Chicago Commission of Inquiry into the Status of Human Rights in Chile. Santiago, Chile, February 16-23, 1974", Document IV, p. 11.

[42] José D. interview.

[43] María Teresa interview.

> someone told them they had to get out, because it was very dangerous for them, for us to stay there.[44]

Her husband found asylum in the Honduran embassy, and they spent several months in Honduras before arriving in Canada in February 1974. They had to leave behind the eldest two of their four children, aged five and six, in the care of Nidia's parents; they were not reunited as a whole family until 1977. For S.V.P., it was the militancy of her MIRist husband that made her family a target of the military:

> He appeared on the list of those being sought, so he had to hide, and in fact my family hid him. My family wasn't with Allende, they were on the other side, but out of respect and affection for me...they hid him, and for many months he was sheltered by my family in the country... Later I did all the paperwork at the Canadian Embassy. I was registered as the head of the family, because he wasn't present, and we were given political refuge, and left March 19.[45]

While all three of these women characterize themselves as having been sympathetic to the UP government, none of them were active participants. Nevertheless, they ended up sharing the crisis of exile with their spouses and children as the full force of repression came down on the heads not only of the prominent and active members of the political left, but on nearly anyone associated with the Allende government.[46]

Physician Marlinda Freire eventually managed to escape to Honduras with the help of the Catholic Church. However, the political situation in Honduras was also tense, and her husband had no documents, which in a sense rendered them stateless: "We didn't have citizenship. We were citizens of nowhere. Because basically Chileans didn't have

---

[44] Interview by author with Nidia Rivera, Toronto, 9 November 2008 (henceforth Nidia interview). Interview in Spanish.
[45] S.V.P. interview.
[46] Rody Oñate and Thomas Wright, *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar.* Second edition. Mexico City: Urdimbre, 2002, p. 51.

passports, Chileans didn't travel, except for the three percent of the population that had economic power." As in Nidia's case, Marlinda and her family would be admitted with Ministerial Permits after being processed in Honduras.

Marlinda's testimony also echoes Marcela Duran's words quoted earlier about who was able to find shelter: professionals with resources, knowledge and connections. Others were not so lucky:

> The common people on the left in Chile couldn't get out. They didn't have the possibility or the means. This happened throughout the years, they were murdered, disappeared. They didn't have any concept of claiming asylum or the United Nations, international bodies, so they didn't make use of them.[47]

This final point is an important consideration as we turn our attention to the debate which took place in Canada over the question of the coup d'état and the admission of Chileans. As I argue in the next section, tensions between immigration and security criteria on the one hand, and humanitarian considerations on the other, played a large role in determining how governmental and non-governmental actors responded to the crisis in Chile. Concern over what kind of Chilean would get in, if any were admitted at all, became a central concern of agents of the federal government. Meanwhile, their counterparts in the Chilean solidarity lobby strove to ensure that entry to Canada was available to a large number of people, regardless of their age, economic activity or political affiliation. This contest between distinct visions of who should be admitted, and under what conditions, would profoundly affect the composition of the 1973-1978 Chilean exile wave, and how those who got in rebuilt their lives in Canada.

---

[47] Marlinda interview.

II. Getting In

Up to this point in the study, I have made cursory mention of the problems the Chilean exiles encountered in trying to be admitted to Canada. The disagreement that existed within Canada regarding the Chilean crisis was at its most intense between September and November 1973, and bridged two crucial moments in the existence of the Chilean exile community in Canada: the coup itself, and the establishment of a special program to assist in the resettlement of Chileans fleeing the military regime. This section examines the issues surrounding admittance by looking at the two principle sides in the debate: agents of the federal government who tended to look on the UP and its supporters with a mixture of mistrust and distaste, and the diverse domestic lobby that condemned the coup d'état and argued in favour of welcoming Chileans imperiled by the military regime. Admission eligibility criteria that gave preference to immigrants perceived as economically productive, national security concerns in the context of the Cold War, and greater awareness of Latin America were factors in the Canadian reaction to the coup in Chile and the subsequent exodus. Some representatives of the Canadian state were against the admission of Chilean exiles, but many individuals and groups pressured the government to deal with the issue in a humane and unbiased manner. The tensions between these positions would frame the discussion within Canada and ultimately affect who could get in, and under what conditions.

Solidarity and suspicion: Debating the admission of Chileans to Canada

Canada became involved in the Chilean crisis soon after the coup d'état due to the presence of a small number of asylum seekers in the embassy. Consular officials gave them shelter on the grounds that they were fleeing from rebellious soldiers attacking a democratic government recognized by Canada. However, the acceptance of these fugitives set a precedent of assistance that some officials in the diplomatic corps, the Department of External Affairs and the Department of Manpower and Immigration found troubling.

One major influence on Canadian officials was the attitude of the ambassador himself. As was later leaked to the public, Ambassador Andrew Ross, who was in Buenos Aires at the time of the coup, quickly advised the government to recognize the junta:

> [O]n [the] present reading and at this distance I can see no useful purpose in withholding recognition unduly. Indeed such action might even tend to delay Chile's eventual return to [the] democratic process. From my knowledge of [the] views of senior military officers unlike Brazilian or Peruvian models they would intend to turn [the] government back to [the] civil authority with [the] minimum delay feasible.[48]

Andrew Ross had been with the Department of External Affairs since 1947 and had previously served in Venezuela, Brazil and the Dominican Republic before becoming ambassador to Chile in 1971.[49] He was later cast as a villain by people in Canada closely involved in the Chilean issue, and his statements were not sympathetic to the plight of

[48] Telex, Ross to External Affairs, 13 September 1973. North American Congress on Latin America Archive of Latin Americana (henceforth NACLA-ALA). Chile, Roll 26, File 138, Solidarity Organizations: Canada. Miscellaneous documents, 1973-1989. Telex, Ross to External Affairs, 13 September 1973.

[49] A biography of Ross can be found on Archivescanada.ca, http://www.archivescanada.ca/english/search/ItemDisplay.asp?sessionKey=1126738539034_206_191_57_196&l=0&lvl=1&v=0&coll=1&itm=258748&rt=1&bill=1. Retrieved August 30, 2012.

those in danger or fully acknowledge the seriousness of the situation. While Marcela Duran, who had first-hand contact with him, does not portray him in a negative way in her testimony, some said the Chilean social circles he moved in strongly influenced his view of the UP administration and the actions of the military.[50] His characterization of the Allende administration as "surely one of the most incompetent of recent times" echoed the accusations of the anti-UP Chilean media, as did his assessment regarding the military that "only with [the] greatest reluctance did they decide that [the] institutional disintegration and political madness of recent months had to be arrested by shock treatment."[51] As the junta consolidated control and began a defamation campaign against the overthrown government, Ross seems to have uncritically accepted reports of leftist guerrilla armies and the rampant misuse of state funds by UP politicians as true. However, his most infamous statement concerned foreigners in Chile in imminent danger due to the coup, and as we shall see later, it came back to haunt him:

> With almost [the] entire leadership dead or in custody Chile's Marxist left is decapitated and on [the] run...Reprisals and searches have created [a] panic atmosphere affecting particularly expatriates including [the] riff-raff of [the] Latin

---

[50] This is an argument made by historian George Hanff in an early examination of Canada's actions in Chile. Hanff feels that Ross' performance was probably judged too harshly, but also acknowledges that critics both within the embassy and outside often made the accusation that "Mr. Ross was too close to members of the Chilean upper middle and upper classes." George Hanff, "Decision-Making Under Pressure: A Study of the Admittance of Chilean Refugees by Canada." *North-South, the Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 8, 1979, p. 131, footnote 12. Marcela Duran stated that "With us, he [Ross] was the diplomat that he was. He was gracious, he socialized with us...the ambassador would come, and he would socialize with us." Ross was also helpful in reuniting the Durans with their infant child, who had been left in the care of relatives, before they left for Canada. Marcela interview.

[51] Telex, Ross to External Affairs, 20 September 1973. NACLA-ALA. Chile, Roll 26, File 138, Solidarity Organizations: Canada. Miscellaneous documents, 1973-1989.

American left to whom Allende gave asylum. These "activists" are running out of countries willing to accept them.[52]

If the embassies of the world represented the first sources of solidarity for the fugitives of the coup d'état, the attitude of the senior official on the ground gave little hope that Canada would play a constructive role in the Chilean crisis. However, while Ross was calling for recognition of the junta and diminishing the severity of the developing humanitarian crisis, back in Canada progressive secular and religious groups began mobilizing to contest the ambassador's interpretation of events, and to pressure a reluctant federal government to assist the victims of the military regime.

Ambassador Ross' view was emblematic of the disregard felt for the Allende government and the crisis spawned by the coup in certain government circles, but it was far from being representative of the opinion of Canadians as a whole. The "Chilean road to socialism" had captured the imagination not just of Chileans but of people around the world. In Canada, religious bodies such as the Ecumenical Forum (formerly the Canadian School of Missions) and organizations interested in political and social issues, like the Latin American Working Group in Toronto, looked at what was happening in Chile as the birth of, in Joan Simaichik's word, "an egalitarian, humanistic society without the violent methods used elsewhere".[53] For New Leftists who sought a different option than American-style capitalism, with its acceptance of inequality, or Soviet-style communism, with its rigid system of control and lack of freedoms, the UP project represented a third

[52] Telex, Ross to External Affairs, 24 September 1973. NACLA-ALA. Chile, Roll 26, File 138, Solidarity Organizations: Canada. Miscellaneous documents, 1973-1989.
[53] Joan Simalchik, "Part of the Great Awakening: Canadian Churches and the Chilean Refugees, 1970-1979." Master's thesis in History, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, 1993, p. 12.

way, combining participatory democracy with social justice.[54] Furthermore, the peacefulness of its methods and its efforts to alleviate poverty and other social ills made the UP attractive to Christians of all denominations, especially given the influence of liberation theology on small but vocal groups within the churches who manifested, as Andrew S. Thompson explains, a "sense of Christian activism that coincided with Canadians' growing acceptance of pluralism and more liberal social norms."[55]

A diverse collection of groups and individuals in Canada had watched the developments in Chile after 1970 with great interest and hope, but also with trepidation as the situation inside Chile deteriorated. Even before the coup, the Latin American Working Group established a special Chile Project committee, anticipating a bad end to the crisis.[56] On 12 September, this group met in Toronto with other sympathetic organizations, such as representatives of the Canadian Council of Churches (CCC), to form an Ad Hoc Committee on Chile, which would later operate under the name Chile-Canada Solidarity. The Committee set as its immediate goals lobbying the federal government to withhold recognition of the junta and to admit refugees.[57] The following day in the House of Commons, New Democratic Party (NDP) member John Rodriguez

---

[54] John Cleveland, "New Left, not new liberal: 1960s movements in English Canada and Quebec." *Canadian Journal of Sociology and Anthropology* 41, No. 4, 2004, p. 69-70.
[55] Liberation theology emerged in Latin America in the 1950s and 1960s, and is concerned with the association between the teachings of Jesus Christ and the liberation of the poor from unjust economic, political, or social conditions. Andrew S. Thompson, *In Defence of Principles: NGOs and human rights in Canada.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2010, p. 22.
[56] Simalchik, "Part of the Great Awakening: Canadian Churches and the Chilean Refugees, 1970-1979", p. 19-20. The Latin American Working Group in Toronto was founded in 1966, and described itself "an independent research, education and action collective" interested in promoting greater understanding of Latin America among Canadians.
[57] Ibid, p.23. The CCC is the Canadian branch of the World Council of Churches, an organization founded in 1948 which facilitates cooperation between many Christian denominations.

brought the Ad Hoc Committee's positions into the political arena by introducing a motion that the government of Canada refuse to recognize the junta and withdraw financial support for the Chilean government.[58] Though the motion failed, it served to bring the Chilean question to the fore and show that the NDP would be the parliamentary standard bearer for this cause.

In Québec, meanwhile, union leaders voiced their concerns for the safety of Chilean workers targeted by military repression and called on the federal government to offer asylum, thus making clear that organized labour would also play the role of advocate.[59] In the province most noted for pro-Chilean lobbying, unions such as la Confédération des syndicats nationaux, la Fédération des travailleurs et travailleuses du Québec, and la Central des Enseignants du Québec united with le Secrétariat Québec-Amérique latine, a group interested in political, labour and social issues, "to provide material and moral support against the military regime in Chile."[60] A few weeks later, twenty-nine journalists working for *Le Devoir* donated a day's wages to the Québec-Chile solidarity committee, amounting to over $1000 to be used "to actively support the struggle of the popular forces in Chile."[61] The inter-organizational cooperation on Chilean issues seen in Québec and Ontario became one of the strengths of the lobby, and the high level of activism shown by diverse groups in Québec from the beginning of the crisis would earn the

[58] HC Debates 1/29, Volume VI, 13 September 1973, p. 6495. Despite his surname, John Rodriguez was born in Guyana and is not considered of Latin American descent.
[59] No author cited, "Les syndicats experiment leur consternation devant la fin tragique du régime Allende." *Le Devoir*, 13 September 1973, p. 7.
[60] No author cited, "Quebec labor seeks support for Chileans." *Montreal Gazette*, 18 September 1973, p. 11.
[61] No author cited, "Journalists vote day's wages for Chileans." *Montreal Gazette*, 4 October 1973, p. 12.

people of the province special praise from both Chileans and involved Canadians, as we shall see later in the chapter.

On 14 September, leaders of the Anglican, Roman Catholic and United Churches addressed a telegram to Mitchell Sharp, the Minister of External Affairs, which emphasized concerns over recognition and the humanitarian situation. The communiqué introduced one of the arguments why Canada should assist Chileans affected by the coup, that of the illegality of the junta's actions in overturning a government chosen by the Chilean people:

> One thing is clear, that a democratically-elected government has been violently overthrown...We caution against precipitous recognition of an unconstitutional regime. We request the Canadian government to do its utmost to so that constitutional government be restored as soon as possible...We urge the Canadian government to offer safe conduct and assistance to...refugees, and any Chileans who may wish to come to Canada.[62]

On 17 September, the Canadian Council of Churches continued the campaign to pressure the government to act. In a press release, the organization underscored the position that action should be based on humanitarian considerations, and began using an argument to precedent that would become a constant refrain in the Chilean solidarity campaign:

> Since these refugees are in danger of their lives, under a very repressive military regime, we have only one option: to do what we can to save these lives. Canada opened her doors to refugees from Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Uganda. If we refuse to open our doors to people who are in danger under another type of political

[62] Text reproduced in Cathy Carroll, Bob Carty and John Foster, "Chilean Refugees- Canada's reluctant response." *United Church of Canada Newsletter*, No. 3, March 1974, p. 3.

> regime, this would mean that we had acted from political rather than humanitarian motives.[63]

The appeal to past practice with regard to Iron Curtain and Commonwealth refugees would serve as a weapon in the solidarity movement's arsenal when trying to convince the government and members of the public to do more to help displaced Chileans. In effect, it was a strategy to defuse Cold War-era fears of leftist infiltration by framing the Chilean situation as a humanitarian crisis that went beyond ideology.

The use of this strategy was evident in statements and questions in the House of Commons by the NDP's Andrew Brewin. The day after the CCC press release, Brewin asked Minister Sharp if he would accept the advice of the church leaders regarding refugees and also withhold recognition of the regime until human rights and international principles were accepted. Sharp assured Brewin that the situation was being monitored and no precipitous decision would be made, but also underscored that diplomatic recognition was not based on emotional but rather pragmatic considerations: "Our policy is not one of approval if and when we give recognition, but we want to make sure that we have a government that we can deal with confidently and that is in effective control."[64]

Soon after, Chileans themselves became involved in the solidarity effort. On 20 September, a group of Chilean students studying in Canadian universities demonstrated in Ottawa to petition the federal government to grant asylum to political refugees, but were given a cool reception by unidentified officials who thought they were part of an

[63] Quoted in Gerald E. Dirks, *Canada's Refugee Policy: Indifference or Opportunism?* Montreal and London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1977, p. 246.
[64] HC Debates 1/29, Volume VI, 18 September, 1973, p. 6667.

extremist group.[65] Distrust of reports from Chilean sources regarding military brutality was endemic among federal representatives, who accepted the claims emanating from Ambassador Ross and his staff in Santiago that the violence was being exaggerated by "radicals" and that the situation in Chile was returning to normal.[66] It appears the embassy personnel even ignored first-hand testimony by Canadians on ground in Santiago –mostly Quėbecois nuns and priests –of finding bodies on banks of Mapocho River, which runs through the Chilean capital.[67] Federal employees on both ends of the continent seemed determined to view the 11 September takeover as little more than another Latin American palace coup, despite the mounting evidence that it was something altogether more violent and far-reaching.[68]

Chilean exchange students were not the only actors from the academic world engaged in the asylum question. Local and national student and faculty groups were formed to advocate for the Chileans. At York University in Toronto, approximately twenty students and teachers banded together to form the York Committee for the Defense of a Democratic and Independent Chile. The members also called on Canada not to recognize the junta, but to provide asylum, and to raise and support censure motions in the United Nations.[69] On the national level, the World University Service Canada started the

[65] No author cited, "Chilean students parade in Ottawa to protest junta." *Toronto Star*, 21 September 1973, A10.
[66] Simalchik, "Part of the Great Awakening: Canadian Churches and the Chilean Refugees, 1970-1979", p. 28.
[67] No author cited, "Trois prêtres canadiens font le récit du cauchemar qu'ils ont vécu au Chili." *Le Devoir*, 28 September 1973, 1.
[68] Simalchik, "Part of the Great Awakening: Canadian Churches and the Chilean Refugees, 1970-1979", p. 28.
[69] Robin Enders *et al*, "York Committee protests military takeover in Chile, concerned student says." *Toronto Star*, 24 September 1973, C5.

Canadian University Committee for Refugee Chilean Professionals and Students (the group which sent Lionel Vallée to Chile), which worked in conjunction with the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and the National Union of Students to secure spots in Canadian post-secondary institutions for sponsored professors and students.[70] As an ongoing project, the sponsorship placement effort had fairly modest results; however, as an act of solidarity, Julie D. Shayne explains, it served a wider purpose, as "it sent a clear message to Chilean exiles and Canadian government officials that the Canadian intelligentsia was committed to this politically contentious cause."[71] The Chilean solidarity question was attracting participants across a broader front than traditional leftist parties and labour unions.

To the disappointment of the burgeoning Chile lobby, the federal government recognized the military regime on 29 September, which was characterized by NDP leader David Lewis as "indecent haste" but justified by Minister Sharp as being consistent with past Canadian practice and done only after neighbouring Latin American countries and nations such as Sweden, Denmark and the Vatican had recognized the junta.[72] The recognition issue soured the 3 October meeting between CCC representatives and Minister Sharp. The first of three delegations sent by the CCC to Ottawa between October and January 1974, the group encountered the same skepticism the Chilean

[70] Julie D. Shayne, *They Used to Call Us Witches: Chilean exiles, culture, and feminism.* Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2009, p. 82-83. This programme helped place two of this study's participants, Manuel Jofré and Marcela Duran, in academic posts or graduate programmes.
[71] Shayne, *They Used to Call Us Witches: Chilean exiles, culture, and feminism,* p. 83. By September 1974 the programme had succeeded in placing approximately 20% of its candidates.
[72] Lewis' quote is from the *Ottawa Citizen,* October 1, 1973. Quoted in John Saywell, ed., *Canadian Annual Review of Politics and Public Affairs.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974, p. 271. Sharp's statement regarding recognition of the junta comes from a reply made in the House of Commons. HC Debates 1/29, Volume VII, 15 October 1973, 6858.

student group had faced two weeks earlier. Mitchell Sharp used press clippings from Chile to claim that the situation was improving, stating that "these people don't want to come to Canada", and casting doubt on the credibility of the CCC sources.[73] With recognition of the junta, one of the pillars of the solidarity movement's position had fallen, and the prospect of humanitarian action seemed dimmer now that the military regime in Chile had the Canadian government's tacit approval.

Despite the setback represented by recognition, the groups coalescing around the Chilean question remained undeterred, and began to see some results for their labours. On 7 October, sixteen of the seventeen asylum seekers from the Santiago embassy, including Marcela Duran and her family, arrived in Montreal with their Ministerial Permits in hand. In addition, evidence shows that the External Affairs department was beginning to take the issue more seriously, and on 10 October a high-ranking immigration officer was tasked with going to Santiago to assess the situation and report back on the potential need for a special movement program for Chile.[74] The combination of domestic pressure and the growing evidence of the violence of the military regime pushed Sharp and other government officials to take more concrete actions.

Recognition of the military government occurred during Parliament's summer recess, from 22 September to 14 October. When the House of Commons sat again on 15 October, Andrew Brewin immediately raised the issue by introducing a motion that the Commons express regret that the government had not withheld recognition, and for the government

[73] Carroll *et al*, "Chilean Refugees- Canada's reluctant response", p. 3.
[74] HC Debates 1/29, Volume VII, 15 October 1973, p. 6858.

"to do all in its power to undertake a humanitarian effort to save the lives of political refugees who had taken refuge in Chile."[75] The motion, needing unanimity, failed, but Brewin pressed the attack later in the day by directly confronting Minister Sharp. In remarks criticizing Ambassador Ross' justification of the coup, the MP also asked Sharp whether the government was willing to assist refugees by granting asylum, safe conduct and travel assistance, as had been done in the past. Sharp responded that the asylum seekers from the embassy had already safely landed in Canada, that officials from Ottawa and Buenos Aires were going to Santiago to assess the situation, and that if further action were taken, it would be in accordance with past actions: "I think the honourable gentleman can be sure we shall act with humanity in these matters as we always do."[76]

While Brewin continued to raise questions about the government's response to the refugee crisis throughout October, at the end of the month Chile-Canada Solidarity issued a call for individual Canadians to step forward to sponsor Chileans as immigrants. The group promised help both in the process of matching Chileans to sponsors and with filling out the necessary paperwork for the formal declaration required by immigration authorities, and outlined the responsibilities of sponsorship.[77] Sponsorship removed the need for Chileans to prove to doubting embassy staff and immigration officers in Santiago that they were in danger. The call also mentioned the establishment of a special immigration assistance fund being planned in conjunction with, and under the

[75] HC Debates 1/29, Volume VII, 15 October 1973, p. 6828.
[76] HC Debates 1/29, Volume VII, 15 October 1973, p. 6858.
[77] No author cited, Chile-Canada Solidarity Newsletter, No. 7, 25 November 1973, p. 3. NACLA-ALA.Chile, Roll 26, File 139, Solidarity Organizations: Canada. Miscellaneous documents, 1973-1989.

administration of, the CCC. This fund would materialize the following month as the Canadian Fund for Refugees from Chile.[78]

By the end of October 1973, the various groups involved in the Chilean solidarity movement had developed a plan of action, arguments and tactics, and established a degree of cooperation between different entities. Although their call to withhold recognition of the junta had gone unheeded, there were small signs that they were making headway on the humanitarian issue of refuge for the persecuted. Progress on this front, however, was slow. Mitchell Sharp might claim in Parliament that Canada would act from humanitarian impulses, but in reality distaste for the UP and suspicion about it adherents continued to inform the actions of government officials, as the scandal involving Ambassador Ross would make clear.

On 5 November, NDP MP John Harney put forward a motion in the House of Commons for the recall of Andrew Ross, on the grounds that the ambassador had betrayed "a bias that makes it impossible for him to carry out stated government policy on political refugees in Chile."[79] The motion did not pass, but it marked the beginning of an episode that caused the government embarrassment and provided the Chilean lobby with ammunition in its fight to open Canada's doors. The fallout from the publication of leaked telegrams between Ambassador Ross and the department of External Affairs made government representatives rethink Canada's approach to the crisis in Chile, and in the end contributed to the establishment of a special program to help Chileans in peril.

[78] Carroll *et al*, "Chilean Refugees- Canada's reluctant response", p. 3.
[79] HC Debates 1/29, Volume VII, 5 November 1973, p. 7504.

Harney's motion was influenced by a series of confidential communiqués, which had passed between Santiago and Ottawa in September, starting just before the coup and continuing until 29 September, the day Canada announced it would recognize the junta as the government of Chile. Harney passed on a number of the communiqués to the LAWG, which promptly published them in a November issue of the *Chile-Canada Solidarity Newsletter*. While the "riff-raff of the Latin American left" statement would become the most well-known, other statements also pointed to Ambassador Ross welcoming the coup as a necessary evil, and characterized the UP as responsible for its own demise for having allowed "leftist extremists [to have] almost free rein."[80] The fact that the top Canadian government representative in Chile seemed to support the coup caused Harney and others concerned with the issue to wonder whether the government was treating the refugee question as a humanitarian issue, or whether Ross' distaste for "leftist extremists" was leading to government inaction.

The revelations of the telegrams led activists both in Canada and on the ground in Chile to look more closely at how the embassy and the Department of Manpower and Immigration were dealing with asylum seekers and refugee claimants, and their findings were not encouraging. On 7 November, two Chilean churchmen and the foreign correspondent from the left-leaning nationalist newspaper *Québec-Presse* met with Ambassador Ross to discuss the refugee issue the role Canada could play to alleviate the problem. Ross refused to consider granting asylum to a group of one hundred fugitives

[80] Telex, Ross to External Affairs, 24 September 1973. NACLA-ALA. Chile, Roll 26, File 138, Solidarity Organizations: Canada. Miscellaneous documents, 1973-1989.

from the junta for whom the church officials were seeking shelter. Ross was also quoted as saying that Canada would accept Chileans who wanted to immigrate and met the criteria but not asylum seekers, whom he would even turn in to the authorities under certain circumstances.[81] His comments indicated that, despite claims to the contrary, Canadian officials were treating requests for admission to Canada as an immigration issue rather than a humanitarian crisis.

Ross' stance reflected government practice on this issue. On 5 October, Foreign Minister Mitchell Sharp's made a public statement of Canada's "desire to co-operate in the movement of refugees and the abatement of personal suffering in [Chile]."[82] However, from September to December the Canadian government insisted on sticking to the letter of the law, especially where it pertained to security clearances provided by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP). Known as "Stage B" checks, they involved scrutinizing an applicant's background after it was determined whether he or she met the minimum level under the points system, and was often quite time-consuming. These checks were designed to weed out anyone with a criminal background, a history of mental health problems or anti-social behaviour, and potential revolutionaries or terrorists. Because of checks such as these, Chileans encountered delays and missed opportunities to take shelter in other nations while waiting for permission to enter Canada. Directives from External Affairs to Santiago and San José, Costa Rica, throughout October and

[81] Serge Mongeau, C.B and F.N., "Interview with Andrew Ross", November 7, 1973. The transcript was reproduced in the Chile-Canada Solidarity Newsletter, No. 7, 25 November 1973, 7-11. NACLA-ALA.Chile, Roll 26, File 139, Solidarity Organizations: Canada. Miscellaneous documents, 1973-1989..

[82] Quoted in John Saywell, ed., *Canadian Annual Review of Politics and Public Affairs.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974, p. 271.

November 1973 continually underline that all Chileans and foreigners seeking entry to Canada were to be processed under normal immigration procedures, including security and health checks, and that none should be treated as refugees without prior approval from Ottawa. A policy directive was reported to be forthcoming, but in the meantime, consular officials were to continue as if no special movement for refugees was envisioned.[83]

A Manpower and Immigration internal memorandum from 8 November reveals that immigration section officials were aware of the growing scrutiny from the solidarity movement regarding the admission of Chileans. It advised officials not to use the term "Stage B" publicly, as it was policy to keep secret the presence of RCMP officers posted abroad for security screening purposes.[84] Similar instructions were given to the legation in Costa Rica, even though the Chileans and foreign refugee claimants in that country, Panama and Honduras could have been dealt with under the 1951 United Nations Convention on Refugees guidelines because they were outside their countries of origin. The communiqués from Ottawa also stressed that "Stage B" should be enforced, along with medical and civil examinations, to determine if the people fleeing the coup satisfied the criteria for acceptance as landed immigrants.[85]

---

[83] Telexes, Ottawa to Santiago, 15 and 19 October, 1973. LAC RG 76 Vol. 986 File 5781-1 Refugees-Chilean Movement General.

[84] "Subject: Stage 'B'- Status Adjustment Program", 8 November 1973. LAC RG 76 Vol. 986 File 5781-3-3 Refugees-Chilean Movement. Processing of Applications, Stage "B" (Security) Vol. 1.

[85] Telexes, Ottawa to San José, 26 October and 5 November 1973. LAC RG 76 Vol. 986 File 5781-1 Refugees-Chilean Movement General.

The leaking of the Ross telegrams put the federal government on the defensive and led the cabinet to reexamine the way Ross, External Affairs, and Manpower and Immigration were dealing with Chileans on the run from the military regime. On 15 November, cabinet called for a complete review of policy on Chile. A solidarity movement source interpreted this as showing that senior government officials were "upset by increasing evidence that what it hears from its 'intelligence' in Santiago is not an accurate description of the true situation in Chile."[86] Three fact-finding teams were then dispatched, one to Santiago and the other two to Panama and Honduras, where refugee claimants (such as Marlinda Freire and Nidia Rivera from this study) had congregated. The next day in the House of Commons, John Harney continued press the issue. He motioned that

> [T]his House instruct the government immediately to follow the measures adopted toward political refugees from Hungary...Czechoslovakia...and Uganda, thereby respecting the traditions which the Canadian wish to have respected, and to instruct our embassies and affected departments to act accordingly.[87]

Harney insinuated that representatives of the Canadian government were not obeying instructions nor acting according to humanitarian principles. Though his motion failed like the other NDP initiatives before it, it underscored the contradictions between Canada's stated policy and what was happening in practice.

The gap between humanitarian rhetoric and the reality on the ground was further illustrated by a radio broadcast of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC)

---

[86] No author cited, Chile-Canada Solidarity Newsletter, No. 7, 25 November 1973, p. 6. NACLA-ALA.Chile, Roll 26, File 139, Solidarity Organizations: Canada. Miscellaneous documents, 1973-1989.
[87] HC Debates 1/29, Volume VII, 16 November 1973, p. 7862.

program *As It Happens* on 19 November. The correspondent reporting from Santiago disclosed the presence of two agents of the RCMP, screening of people applying for entry to Canada who might pose a threat to national security. The presence of these agents had heretofore been unannounced, and their exact role seemed unclear. Minister Sharp had said Canada would treat Chileans in the same way it had treated the Hungarians and Czechoslovakians, who were admitted without having gone through many of the mandated security and health checks. Commenting on the information, the Chile-Canada Solidarity Newsletter accused the federal government of putting political considerations ahead of compassion:

> This news makes clearer the reason why the embassy filters in Santiago had approved fewer than 10 applications for immigration to Canada in the two months since the coup. If Canadian official paranoia about Communist and Socialists is applied to a situation where 40-50% of the population voted Communist or Socialist in the last few years, and where precisely these people are "under the gun", it becomes easy to explain the lack of response by Canadian officials: compassion blinded by ideology inappropriate to the circumstances.[88]

Details coming out of Chile reinforced the accusation that the situation was not being addressed adequately and that processing procedures and security screening were particularly intensive due to ideological concerns. The embassy in Santiago did not have enough translators or immigration operatives to deal with the number of applications, which sometimes reached over 1000 a day.[89] With the NDP leading the way in Parliament and bodies like the CCC and the LAWG lobbying continuously, pressure of the federal government was mounting just as evidence of institutional bias and perhaps

---

[88] No author cited, Chile-Canada Solidarity Newsletter. No. 7, 25 November 1973, p. 6. NACLA-ALA.Chile, Roll 26, File 139, Solidarity Organizations: Canada. Miscellaneous documents, 1973-1989.
[89] Simalchik, "Part of the Great Awakening: Canadian Churches and the Chilean Refugees, 1970-1979", p. 37-38.

incompetence was building. The Chilean lobby ensured that the issue was not going to disappear quietly and that the government would have to do more to alleviate the refugee situation and do it transparently.

The Special Movement Chile

On 29 November, Hortensia Bussi, the widow of Salvador Allende, attended the parliamentary session and had a brief private meeting with Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau. Though her pleas to make Canada a haven for "Chileans who wish to flee their country" received only a "non-committal nod", she reported afterward that Trudeau "promised an announcement today [30 November] of plans for bringing Chilean refugees to Canada."[90] The Prime Minister was speaking the truth. On 30 November, Manpower and Immigration Minister Robert Andras announced in the House the establishment of an emergency refugee admission program called Special Movement Chile (SMC). After two and a half months of constant pressure, the Chilean lobby had secured a major victory: Canadian action with regard to Chileans would now be part of an official program that would operate under guidelines similar to those of previous crises in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Uganda.

In his speech, Robert Andras began by praising the Canadian historical record in accepting people seeking refuge and mentioned the precedents that government critics had continuously used in arguing the Chileans' case. The minister announced that selection criteria would be relaxed, meaning that individuals normally ineligible for

[90] No author cited, "PM asked to help Chilean refugees." *Toronto Star*, 30 November 1973, A18.

immigration under the points system would not be automatically excluded, although medical and security checks would continue. Andras promised accelerated immigration processing, along with language training, job placement services, and assistance to cover the costs of transportation, accommodation, winter clothing and "other such special support necessary to facilitate early establishment." He stated that special immigration teams were being dispatched to Santiago, Buenos Aires, Panama and Honduras to begin processing "those people who wish to settle in Canada as a result of the coup" under the Special Movement provisions, and that the government expected "some hundreds" would end up in the country. In the conclusion of his statement, he called on the lobby groups that had pressed for government action to now take the initiative:

> In the past, individuals and groups have always rallied to provide local support and assistance in welcoming displaced people to their new communities and helping them to become established quickly. For these efforts many thousands of Canadians deserve special praise. In the case of Chile, large numbers of Canadians in Church groups and other organizations have expressed their genuine concern in the welfare of those affected by the events in that country. We hope that again interested individuals and groups will join with the Government in the provision of special assistance for these people by contacting their nearest Canada Immigration Centre or Canada Manpower Centre. Many of the individuals now coming forward are young, well educated and adaptable people who, with a little help, can be expected to add their contribution to the richness and variety of Canada.

Reaction to the announcement of the SMC in the House reflected a number of ideological positions present in the country. Jake Epp of the Progressive Conservatives voiced the Cold War concern about security, inquiring about the nationalities of the applicants and whether proper background checks would continue. Gérard Laprise of the right-wing Social Credit Party insisted that the applicants continue to be treated as normal immigration applicants and meet all requirements "to prevent Canada from becoming a

refuge for all the riff-raff from all parts of the world". Speaking for the NDP, Andrew Brewin accused the government of not doing enough, an argument that would continue to be made by the Chilean lobby both immediately after the establishment of the SMC and in the years to come. Brewin commented that the complacent nature of the government response up to that point had only been changed by the work of "a large section of the Canadian people. I refer particularly to the people in Québec and people in the churches who communicated with the government...indicating their deep concern about this matter." While acknowledging the need for background checks, Brewin stated that he hoped they would be done quickly and not be influenced by ideology:

> I hope that a generous attitude will be taken and that political grounds will not be advanced as a reason for keeping these refugees out of Canada. It is all very well to call a person a Marxist and condemn him for that reason, but we are dealing with people whose lives are in danger and I hope political judgments will not be used to keep people out.

He also added that he hoped measures used in the special movements of Hungarians, Czechoslovakians and Ugandans, such as the waiving of document requirements and conducting airlifts in the evacuation of accepted refugees, would also be applied to the Chilean case.[91]

The establishment of the SMC was an important development for the exiles I interviewed. A large majority of the people I spoke to –eighteen of twenty-one –arrived between December 1973 and the end of 1978, when the SMC was discontinued. Though not all of them were equally affected by the program, its existence did normalize and simplify the process to admit Chileans and, solidarity activists hoped, divorce the

[91] HC Debates 1/29, Volume VIII, 30 November 1973, p. 8297-8299.

question of ideology from the procedure. However, the announcement of the SMC did not mean the end of the controversy surrounding welcoming Chilean exiles into Canada, as tensions continued between security and humanitarian concerns in the years that followed.

Beyond the SMC

Far from being the end of the debate over admitting Chileans, the SMC ultimately represented a large but only partial victory. The lobby groups who advocated on behalf of the Chileans had achieved some important goals, and the minority status of the Liberal government at that time did make officials more willing to listen to groups with links to the NDP, which held the balance of power in Parliament. While it is not clear that fear of government falling played a significant direct role in spurring the government to adopt a more positive approach to the Chilean refugee crisis, it did inform and give weight to the arguments of the domestic pro-refugee lobby and serve to push the government to take action.[92]

However, while the admission process did indeed become more transparent and codified, and Chileans gained admission to Canada received material support from federal, provincial and municipal authorities, there continued to be questions about how humanitarian the Canadian effort truly was. Just days before the announcement of the

[92] George Hanff, for one, argues that it was the combination of internal pressure and external shaming by entities like the UNHCR that caused the government to act, not out of fear for its own stability, but out of a concern for upholding Canada's image as being a nation with an "internationally responsible attitude". To him, the acceptance of Chilean exiles was ultimately a symptom of Canada's identity crisis, an interesting, if difficult to substantiate, argument. Hanff, "Decision-Making Under Pressure: A Study of the Admittance of Chilean Refugees by Canada," p. 129.

SMC, Robert Andras had confirmed that the practice of sharing of confidential information about potential immigrants with the American Central Intelligence Agency would continue; Cold War concerns about protecting national interests from foreign subversives remained at the fore.[93] While perhaps less opposed to the UP government and the Chileans who supported it than the American authorities, Canadian immigration officials still had to conform in part, as Reg Whitaker puts it, to "U.S. standards with regard to the political policing of the movement of people across borders."[94] As such, lobbying by the Chilean solidarity coalition did not stop, but of necessity grew more vociferous as evidence that Canadian immigration officials were continuing to treat refugee claimants like normal immigrants and were still obsessed with weeding out people they considered terrorists. With the question of recognition a non-issue, attention was turned instead to the complicity of the federal government in economically supporting the Chilean military regime through loans, credit and investment from domestic entities, such as the Export Development Corporation, and multilateral organizations such as the International Monetary Fund.[95] Canadian banks and businesses, such as Falconbridge Nickel Mines Ltd., also faced criticism for their financial dealings with a government characterized by solidarity representatives as "a fascist or near-fascist regime".[96] Along with pressing for humanitarian treatment of Chileans seeking refuge in

---

[93] No author cited, "Andras won't stop giving U.S. secret data." *Toronto Star*, 27 November 1973, A7.
[94] Reg Whitaker, "'We Know They're There': Canada and Its Others, With or Without the Cold War," in Richard Cavell, ed. *Love, Hate and Fear in Canada's Cold War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004, p. 45.
[95] The Coalition on Canadian Policy toward Chile, "Canada and the Rights of Chilean People." March 1974, p. 5-6. NACLA-ALA.Chile, Roll 26, File 139, Solidarity Organizations: Canada. Miscellaneous documents, 1973-1989.
[96] Ibid, p. 6-7.

Canada, the condemnation of economic cooperation became a facet of the solidarity movement's strategy.

The solidarity groups had to maintain their level of engagement to ensure the Chilean issue remained a matter of debate. The United Church of Canada, an active CCC participant, published newsletters that decried the lethargic rate at which Manpower and Immigration processed claimants, and the small numbers of applicants accepted.[97] Church delegations continued to meet with Ministers Andras and Sharp to make sure the federal government did not reduce its presence in Chile, which Andras had announced would happen in February 1974, claiming that all the "most urgent cases have been dealt with and the...need for special efforts is passed."[98] Groups such as LAWG publicized information about the Chilean situation, while solidarity groups across the country organized speaking tours by former UP members as well as Chilean exiles resident in Canada, concerts and *peñas* (traditional Chilean parties) to raise money for political prisoners in Chile and awareness among the Canadian public.[99] While individual solidarity groups ran their own events and focused on a particular aspect of the solidarity campaign, at certain moments the diverse entities would ban together to petition the government.[100] Joint action was particularly notable in October 1974 and March 1976, when solidarity movement representatives from a wide range of bodies presented

[97] According to March 1974 statistics, 36% of refugee claimants and 94% of those applying as immigrants had been rejected by immigration authorities in Santiago. Carroll *et al,* "Chilean Refugees- Canada's reluctant response", p. 1.
[98] Ibid, p.3.
[99] Shayne, *They Used to Call Us Witches: Chilean exiles, culture, and feminism,* p. 109.
[100] Simalchik, "Part of the Great Awakening: Canadian Churches and the Chilean Refugees, 1970-1979", p. 43. She gives the example of the CCC focusing on government lobbying and press liaison, the Toronto Welcome Committee taking charge of refugee reception, and the Canada Chile Fund being responsible for the financial aspect of the campaigns.

collective reports to the federal government dealing with questions of human rights, financial relations and immigration. In both reports, the solidarity lobby appealed to the Canadian government to do more to help Chileans in danger and to relax admission criteria for refugee claimants. Even three years into the crisis, ideological concerns continued to restrict the number of Chileans accepted: "We are concerned, as we have stated in the past, that because of traditional security criteria, Canada has rejected or participated in the rejection of such a large proportion of applicants for refugee resettlement in Canada. We are dealing with refugees and not normal immigrants."[101] The SMC may have set the stage for the admission of larger numbers of Chileans, but it was only a temporary victory. Until the SMC ended, members of the solidarity movement had to keep the Chilean issue in the public eye to keep the government working on the problem in a manner that was consistent with the humanitarian approach it espoused.[102]

However, focusing only on the recalcitrance of Canadian officials would unfairly deny the eventual results in resettling Chileans. While government ministers were unwilling at first to set a quota for the number of Chileans to be admitted, it was eventually pegged at 7 000, which compared very favourably with other nations sheltering exiles.[103] The number of Chileans in Canada reached over 10 000 by 1980, whereas before 1971 there

---

[101] The Coalition on Canadian Policy toward Chile, "Canada and the Rights of Chilean People." March 1974, p. 23. NACLA-ALA.Chile, Roll 26, File 139, Solidarity Organizations: Canada. Miscellaneous documents, 1973-1989.

[102] Simalchik, "Part of the Great Awakening: Canadian Churches and the Chilean Refugees, 1970-1979", p. 40.

[103] Oñate *et al* state that Canada and Sweden both gave shelter to 9% of the total exile population, exceeded only by France at 10%. They do not, however, provide solid numbers or explain how they define who is an exile, which leads me to believe that they have chosen to include most people who entered Canada during the years of the military government. Rody Oñate *et al*, *Exilio y retorno.* Santiago: LOM, 2005, p. 44.

had been only 555.[104] A late 1976 Manpower and Immigration report gives us some idea of the rate of acceptance of applicants to the SMC to that point, their destinations in Canada and their occupations. From September 1973 to the end of February, 1976, 5 620 Chileans had applied for entry to Canada as refugees or as members of an Oppressed Minority (OM), a special term used to cover persecuted individuals not eligible for refugee status under the 1951 UN Convention definition of a refugee. Of this number, 4 420 had already been authorized to enter, 3 501 had landed, 970 were still in process, 100 political prisoners had been accepted, and 7 390 applicants had been refused or withdrawn their requests. Refusal for 590 cases included these general reasons: civil or settlement issues, 100; security reasons, 470; and health reasons, 20 cases. Of 3 097 landed Chileans, 12 were in Atlantic Canada, 695 in Québec, 920 in Ontario, 1 328 were in the three Prairie provinces (most of these in Alberta), and 142 Chileans had settled in British Columbia. Occupational information is very general, but breaks down in the following way: Skilled/professional, 645; semi-skilled, 398; unskilled, 207; and non-workers (dependents), 1 847.[105] Effective lobbying by concerned groups did eventually ensure that a substantial group of mostly young, often highly educated and skilled Chileans did escape the repression in their homeland and find a space in which to recover from the trauma of their lives being turned upside down.

[104] Statistics Canada, "Hispanic Spanish speaking population in Canada: a special report prepared for the Canadian Hispanic Congress", 2006, p. 36. This census report places the exact number at 10 915; another source puts the number of Chileans at 15 697 in 1980, amounting to 3.85% of the Chilean exile population. Vicaria de la Solidaridad, "Documento de Trabajo", 1992, p. 230, 233. CDVS, Exilio, box 30.
[105] "Chilean Refugees Accepted for Permanent or Temporary Resettlement." No date, most likely late 1976. LAC RG 76 Vol. 986 File 5781-1 Refugees-Chilean Movement General.

The next chapter focuses on the early experiences of the interviewees once they arrived in Canada. We will see how the personal features which had made them seem suitable to Manpower and Immigration agents –their youth and high level of education and training, in particular –helped them to restart violently interrupted lives. On their other hand, their experience with political and social organization was also vital to reconstructing a sense of self-worth and community, even though this aspect of their backgrounds had been looked on with suspicion by Canadian authorities. In a relatively short time, many of the people I interviewed managed to reset personal goals, recover a collective identity, and find a sense of purpose working with others in the exile community to denounce the regime in Chile and act in solidarity with oppressed people who remained behind. Despite the travails they faced because of exile, the "young, well-educated and adaptable people" who had come to Canada began to rebuild their lives and their community in a new land.

Chapter Three

The bonds of exile: Community associations and activism

While the military regime thought up ways to eliminate the "Marxist cancer" from Chile and Canadians debated recognizing the new regime and admitting refugees, the people whom I interviewed experienced unwilling expatriation. This chapter focuses on the testimonies of the exiles, examining the process by which they ended up in Canada and their initial experiences in a new and largely unknown setting. Contained within this narrative is evidence that exiles themselves realized that their admission was not based purely on altruism. The demographic profile of those who arrived in the first wave of exiles between 1973 and 1978 casts light on how Canadian authorities approached the Chilean crisis, and how questions of professional training, age and political affiliation shaped who would end up getting in to Canada.

Once they were admitted, Chilean exiles could count on the same support other immigrant and refugee groups received from state entities, which helped materially to smooth the difficult transition to exile. In addition, because of the public scrutiny of their situation and the activism of the domestic solidarity lobby, newly-arrived Chileans benefited from assistance provided by non-governmental organizations. In time, a great deal of support came from associations made up of other Chilean exiles, who worked not only to denounce the situation in their homeland, but also to help their compatriots resettle in their new communities in Canada. The rapid growth of Chilean community groups was a result of the history of social and political activity of the exiles, despite

efforts by federal authorities to keep out "extremists" closely tied to leftist political parties in Chile. While the politically motivated activities of Chilean organizations were notable, in most ways the associations fulfilled community needs seen in other immigrant and refugee groups, in that they aided the adjustment process by creating a self-help network that provided orientation and material assistance. In addition, they created a space in which Chileans could affirm their national identity and act with a collective sense of purpose.

In the short term, Chilean groups made up largely of exiles acted with a high degree of cooperation and consensus. As the term of exile stretched from months to years, however, old and new differences surfaced that diminished the ability to act collectively. This chapter concludes with an examination of how challenges and changes within the Chilean community and among exiles contributed to a decline in group solidarity and alterations in the focus and purpose of communal activity.

I begin this chapter with accounts of how the exiles recalled their route to Canada and some of their initial impressions of the country. Neither the Chileans nor the Canadians knew much about each other beyond a few superficial facts, which at times led to problems and misunderstandings. At the same time, the welcome offered by some people and groups in this moment of crisis left a profound impression on the recipients and continues to shape their memories of the early days of exile. Their testimonies also reveal how little weight the controversy surrounding their admission has in the recollections of the exiles, who were much more concerned with events occurring thousands of

kilometers away than what was happening around them in a new and strange setting. Exile meant being physically outside of their country, but in the early phase of the experience the people forced out by the military regime continued to "live" in Chile.

Encountering Canada: The exiles' memories of the journey to Canada, reception and resettlement

In the course the interviews, participants talked about how they ended up in Canada. They spoke of the process of gaining admittance to the country, how they were treated, and whether the controversy surrounding their arrival had left an impression on them. Insofar as the admittance of Chileans appears in works on Canadian immigration history, the focus is almost always on the reluctance of government officials to let leftists into the country. As such, it might be expected that the participants would have described cold-hearted immigration officials grilling them about party affiliations and past political actions, pro-UP Canadians welcoming them enthusiastically, and rejection from others because of their ideological beliefs. While these kinds of experiences did occur, they were mentioned infrequently, and seemed to occupy only a small place in the collective memory of exile. The exiles were much more concerned about their immediate circumstances and the situation at home to pay attention to whether or not Canadians welcomed them with open arms. In the early days of exile, places like Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa were more a backdrop than an integral part of people's initial experiences. What mattered was not where the exiles were, but where they were not.

One question that relates to the issue of forced relocation was whether Canada was their first choice as a country of asylum. The responses give us an idea of how and why Canada ended up being a place of refuge, ranging from factors like the relatively open immigration policy associated with the SMC (despite criticisms to the contrary from domestic activists), to as basic a reason as there was no other choice. In most cases Canada was simply the best available option. For some, Canada was preferable over other alternatives for practical reasons, such as knowledge of one of the official languages and the potential for employment. Previous connections to Canada were also sometimes a factor, but in general, participants had little knowledge about the country and went there by necessity rather than choice.

For Jaime Llambías-Wolff, refuge in Canada was based on geographic proximity. He explained how he had been in the United States at the time of the coup and decided to cross the border and claim refugee status. He knew that the US would not be welcoming to people of his openly leftist political background and that going back to Chile would be dangerous. He ended up in Québec virtually empty-handed: "I had no diploma, no work, no family, no money. Nothing. I had just forty dollars. Forty dollars, a backpack and a suitcase, that's it." He obtained a temporary health card and social assistance. Though at first he believed, like many other Chileans, that the military would not remain in power long and that he would soon return home, his father advised him to stay in Canada. He

was fired in absentia by the university where he had been teaching, giving him even less incentive to return to a dangerous environment.[1]

Marlinda Freire, Nidia Rivera and María Teresa came to Canada from third countries where they were processed as refugees or supplied with ministerial permits. Their stories give us a glimpse of the activities Canadian officials during the crisis, but more than that their testimony speaks to their state of shock. Under the conditions they faced, they would have gladly gone anywhere safe. María Teresa claimed that it was usually the men that made the final decision where to go, and that her heightened stress level and disorientation at the time has left her with very few memories of the process. In her family's case, the choice was between Panama, Algeria and Canada:

> Why Canada, I don't know. [Her husband] made the decision…There are moments in life that you live like an automaton. There are things that you do that leave you, that go unnoticed by your conscious, by your unconscious, I don't know, but there are moments when you realize that you have to live, you have to pick yourself up… and there are many things that I did because I had to… I know I spoke to people, I know I was interviewed, I know I did exams, they took photos, etcetera…it's something you had to do, so I wasn't thinking oh great, I get to go to Canada.[2]

Nidia Rivera focused on the economic problems her family faced, and how these led them to Canada:

> We were in Honduras for three months, I think. And the Canadians went to Honduras to interview people. [Her husband] tried to get a job there, and he couldn't get a job…So we had to move on. So the Canadians came and we went for the interview and then they called us and they said they were going to take us out of the city and bring us to Canada. But we didn't know where. We didn't know where

[1] Jaime interview.
[2] María Teresa interview.

> we were going, because there were other embassies open and interviewing people, but we went to the Canadian one. They accept us and we flew out.[3]

Marlinda Freire, her husband and children had fled from Chile to Panama without any papers. The UN representatives in Panama gave them documentation to get into Honduras, where they stayed for four or five weeks. They wanted to get visas for Cuba, but so did many others; instead, they applied to enter Canada because of the SMC, and were granted ministerial permits.[4]

Those who faced indirect rather than immediate repression had more opportunity to think through where they would go, and in such cases practical considerations such as ease of entry, language skills and a degree of familiarity made Canada appear as an option. S.V.P. emphasized linguistic and employment considerations:

> I had the opportunity, because my father was Croatian, to go to Europe, to Croatia. But the fact that I was an English teacher, that I spoke English, and that my ex-husband spoke English, made it easier to come here. I would have liked to go to Montreal, but they told me that I'd have better job opportunities in Toronto than in Montreal.[5]

Familiarity with the language and an idea about what Canadian society would be like were factors for the Borgoños:

> J: There were few countries –it was either Canada or Australia –that still had their doors open at that time.
>
> R: Trudeau.
>
> J: Trudeau, of course. Trudeau made it a lot easier.
>
> R: Pepe's English.

[3] Nidia interview.
[4] Marlinda interview.
[5] S.V.P. interview.

> J: So I said, "OK, I'll go to Canada", because it was a culture between the British, and I went to a British school...and because I was an English teacher and everything, so I said, "OK, I'll go to Canada, because it's a culture between British and American." And Australia seemed to me so far away.[6]

For Patricia Godoy, English ability and connections to Canadians proved decisive in her choice of where to take refuge:

> I chose, because I was offered asylum in the embassy of the Netherlands. So I said, at least I know a bit of English, and I was friends with several Canadians. They called me when the coup happened...and said, with two other friends, they were going to send me the money for a ticket so I wouldn't have any problems, because I didn't want to take asylum at an embassy...So that's how I left. They paid my passage, an American, an English person and her. So I came with her, and I lived the first few months in her house.[7]

For José Del Pozo, Canada seemed to be the best option given the circumstances. Because he was not in immediate danger he didn't need to flee to an embassy and could take some time to decide where to go. Like many other participants, he didn't know much about Canada, but he spoke English and French already. By the time he and his partner started the paperwork to leave Chile, the SMC was already in operation, which substantially sped up the process. They chose to go to Québec City, thinking that it would be easier to adapt to life in a smaller city and because they wanted to speak French rather than English, the "imperialist" language associated with the United States.[8] Alfredo Lavergne also found the process of getting into Canada relatively painless due to the government programme:

> I followed the normal course of immigration, but tremendously quickly, because I got out in October [1975]. One day they contacted me, someone, and they gave me

[6] José B. and Raquel interview.
[7] Patricia interview.
[8] José D. interview.

> an appointment at the Canadian embassy, they gave me forms, I filled them out, and very quickly I was interviewed. If I remember right there was a specialist who had come from Canada to help out given the dynamic of the times, I'm sure this person was someone who didn't work in the embassy but who had come to help out with this international program...And I got out in four or five months, which was really fast.[9]

It must be underlined, however, that often exiles did not have the time to think through where to go in any detail, or at all. As previously described, Carlos Torres was expelled from Chile because of his anti-government activities. For him, there could be no planning where to go into exile:

> Canada wasn't a choice. I didn't have no option. I ended up here and the only thing I knew about Canada was about the Mounties and the FLQ. Beside that I didn't know what Canada was or nothing. No idea. I ended up in Montreal because I had no place else. I mean, it wasn't an option.[10]

Literature generated by the pro-Chilean lobby from the time commonly asserted that applicants were subjected to hostile interrogations by representatives of the Canadian state.[11] However, only Eduardo Boza openly criticized his treatment during the interview process, blaming the negative attitude of the agents on the fact that he was a member of the Communist Party: "They treated us really badly...It was a terrible experience."[12] Most of the other testimonies on this subject were neutral: the immigration agents were

---

[9] Alfredo interview.

[10] Carlos 1 interview.

[11] "Resume of Meeting, March 19, 1974 with Charles Harper, Co-ordinator of the Chile Emergency Task Force for the World Council of Churches held at the United Church Board Room." LAC R 649 File 894-4-E. Chilean Refugees - Correspondence up to December 1974. In the minutes of this meeting, Harper lists some of the questions Chileans taking refuge in Peru were being asked, among them fairly straightforward ones such as "Did you work as a trade union activist?" to inflammatory ones like "How many military men have you killed?" (p. 4 of document). Harper also reports that refugee applicants in Panama reported being frightened by the questioning, which inquired about, among other things, their political activities in Chile or other countries. According to Harper, honest answers were apt to result in refusal (p. 7).

[12] Eduardo interview.

"Polite, but very cold" or very professional despite the RCMP screening process.[13] In other cases, such as Nidia Rivera's, the dealings with Canadian officials have not remained strong or important memories: "I don't remember them talking to me, I think they talked to [her husband], because he was the one that took asylum. They didn't talk to me. I was there, but they didn't ask me anything."[14] Patricia Godoy admitted to being very scared about the RCMP interview and taking pills for her nerves; she had no problems in the end, though, because "My friend prepared me for the interview, what I should and shouldn't say."[15]

In some cases, the screening process does not seem to have left a bad impression at all. Alfredo Lavergne had a largely positive experience. He recounts doing the interview at the embassy in Spanish with an official who knew a lot about the situation in Chile and seemed sympathetic:

> I remember that, because I was a union leader, they asked me during the first interview if I belonged to some kind of social organization, and I said I didn't belong to any, and if I'd been a union leader, and I said no. It wasn't something guaranteed, going to an embassy and leaving again, you didn't know who they were. But this guy had a lot of experience, and in the end, using his experience he managed to free me of this sense of intimidation and fear I had.[16]

Manuel Jofré also had nothing negative to say about his dealings with the Canadian embassy:

> It was never a negative experience. There were people taking asylum in the embassy, there were guards and soldiers, the difficult part was with the soldiers,

[13] José D. interview; Marlinda interview.
[14] Nidia interview.
[15] Patricia interview.
[16] Alfredo interview.

> not with the personnel of the embassy...[they were] extraordinarily polite and courteous. I have a very positive opinion of all of them.

He was very forthcoming when asked about his ideological beliefs: "I told them what my political affiliation was, my professional situation, the ideas I held at that moment...I told them the truth about my situation at that time, because a Canadian friend had told me it was fundamentally important to tell the truth." When I asked for further details, such as whether he had been questioned by RCMP agents, Manuel stated (as did other participants) that if security agents had been present, he did not know it or did not remember it: "I don't know. It's possible. I had three or four interviews during that time, and it's possible that there was someone from the RCMP there, but I wasn't able to distinguish them, or they didn't introduce themselves according to their institutional role."[17]

In dealing with this question, S.V.P. focused on the issue of how the selection of suitable candidates for entry took place rather than the actual attitude of government officials. Her comments echo an accusation made by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in late 1973 that Canadian officials seemed more interested in recruiting immigrants than helping refugees:

> There were a lot of people who wanted to come, and in fact when the first wave arrived... we were all professionals. I think there was a [process of] selection in the consulate, a selection when you did a formal request to the government...There weren't any workers, they were highly qualified people. Doctors, engineers, professors, from all areas, and we were all professionals...I don't want to be critical, because I'm very grateful for what Canada did for us, and the opportunities that it's given, but I do think there was a selection...because Canada didn't invest in us. We were already educated, we arrived directly to work...And many of us who had

[17] Manuel interview.

> higher education, you learn the language faster than someone who has less schooling, so they didn't have anything to lose. Canada knew it was investing in people who, for one, came educated and could quickly immerse in Canadian society, because we had the intellectual means.[18]

If S.V.P.'s observation is correct, it would suggest that even when operating from humanitarian motives, the Canadian government continued treating the admission of Chileans as an immigration issue based on the economic benefits newcomers might bring with them. This argument was made by critics of the government policy at the time, and there is documentary evidence to support it.[19] The thesis that admission was subject to considerations of utility and adaptability to the Canadian labour market is further

[18] S.V.P. interview. Ernest Schlater, the chief of the UNHCR mission to Chile, complained of Canada's lack of action and attitude toward the problem, treating it as an immigration issue rather than a humanitarian concern and approaching the camps as if they were a marketplace to recruit highly qualified immigrants rather than a place of temporary shelter for persecuted individuals and families. A telex from Santiago to Ottawa on December 31, 1973 quotes the UNHCR telegram expressing disappointment in Canada's efforts: "[R]esults so far achieved are most disappointing. Your staff has been extremely active in interviewing applicants, arranging for medical exams, having them fill out forms to be checked out etc., but much of this effort appears to be wasted if norms which are being applied are based mainly on political and security considerations." Telex, Santiago to Ottawa, December 31, 1973. LAC RG 76 Vol. 986 File 5781-3-3, Refugees-Chilean Movement. Processing of Applications, Stage "B" (Security) Vol. 1.

[19] A Manpower and Immigration document reveals a policy of directing Chileans to the Prairie provinces: it states that UNHCR designated refugees and Oppressed Minority candidates as identified by international groups are to be prioritized and directed to Winnipeg, Regina, Edmonton unless they have relatives elsewhere or a job offer exists. The Chileans were to be told that reception facilities, language instruction and job opportunities were better in Prairies. The Winnipeg Manpower and Immigration office was put in charge of getting job offers from Prairie businesses for Chileans "in occupations in demand." Telex, Ottawa to Santiago, December 30, 1974. LAC RG 76 Vol 986, File 5781-3-1. Refugees-Chilean Movement. Processing of Applications –General, part II. Academic studies of the Chileans in Western Canada also discuss this feature of government policy: "The Chileans who came to Edmonton from Chile did not choose their destination, but were rather designated by the Canadian government. During this period, from 1973 to 1980, Alberta needed the manpower of immigrants and was considered a rich and prosperous province." Litzy Baeza Kallens, "Voces del exilio: testimonios orales del exilio chileno en Edmonton, Canadá." Master's thesis in Latin American Studies, Universidad de Chile, 2004, p.41. In his dissertation, Raul Muñoz mentions the arrival of 120 Chileans to Vancouver on July 15, 1978, who were later dispersed to Edmonton, Saskatoon, and Winnipeg, though he does not explicitly relate this to a government policy. Raul M. Muñoz, "Separation and National Identity: A Narrative Account of Chilean Exiles Living in Saskatchewan." Master's thesis in Sociology, University of Saskatchewan, 2006, p. 78.

reinforced by the observations of Marlinda Freire, who in her capacity as a psychiatrist has had a high degree of contact with a large number of fellow exiles: "According to a study I did, 78% of us were professionals or had technical training. It was a highly educated population."[20] Humanitarian motives were only one consideration when deciding who got into Canada, and who did not.

On the other hand, another topic of discussion during the interviews was the assistance the exiles received on arrival in Canada and in the immediate period following, its contents and its origin. The responses about this issue reveal that once Canada decided to let exiles in, political exiles received the same kind of resettlement assistance as other immigrants. In addition, those coming later in the 1970s benefited from the Chilean organizations that were up and running by the time they arrived, which we will look at in greater detail later. In the case of people arriving in Toronto, they were often put up at the Walker House Hotel, near the main train station, a place that appears in several of the testimonies. Nidia Rivera was sent right from the airport to Walker House, which, despite apparently having been rather decrepit, became an oasis to her: "I went through so much that to me it seemed like a palace!" She recalls that "It was very, very cold, and we had no clothes, because we had nothing." She and her family were met at airport by Jesuits who had been in Chile and a translator:

> They told us that we could get an apartment, and they took us to Ontario Welcome House [a Government of Ontario-run settlement assistance centre for newcomers], which was behind the hotel...to get clothes and stuff, because we had no clothes.

[20] Marlinda interview.

> And then they told us that we can go and look for apartments...I think the government gave us some money to get an apartment.[21]

Like Nidia, Marlinda Freire arrived from Honduras, but in her case there was no reception committee waiting:

> There were large numbers of Chileans arriving, so there were people waiting, and assistance groups, and other Chileans who had arrived earlier, but because we had left from Honduras we arrived by ourselves, and we arrived in Canada as the only refugee family on that flight, so there was nobody there. But there were vouchers for the Walker Hotel [sic], and they gave us tickets for a taxi. And when we got to the hotel we realized it was full of Chileans.

Freire and her family stayed only one night at the Walker House. The next day they were taken to an apartment where they would live and given some money and clothes. She recalls that the Scarborough Mission and a group of Quakers gave her family clothes and furniture for their apartment, but the real help in understanding things came from Chileans who had already been in the city at the time of the coup, studying at the University of Toronto.[22] This group of students formed the nucleus of the welcome committees for exiles arriving in Toronto in the first months after the coup, and are often remembered with gratitude by the participants who arrived in 1973 and early 1974.[23]

Exiles in the Province of Québec also received support from both government agencies and private groups. Jaime Llambías-Wolff was one of the first to arrive in Québec and recounted the following:

---

[21] Nidia interview.

[22] Marlinda interview.

[23] Marcela refers to the "wonderful" support from these Chileans, as well as Canadians who supported the UP project in her interview, and states that the Chileans at the University of Toronto were from the universities where she and her husband worked before coming to Canada. Marcela interview.

> Then the winter was coming…I had no clothes. So they gave me, I do remember very well, a hundred dollars. And with the hundred dollars I went and bought boots –plastic, you know, the cheapest you can get –gloves, a sweater, I bought a coat…I bought used stuff, and with the one hundred dollars I was able to buy winter clothes. And then they gave me one month's rent, for renting something for the first month. So I got a little basement one-bedroom apartment, and I said to myself "OK, I have one month to find something." And they gave me forty five dollars for my food. So with forty five dollars, they said "Now you have one month ahead of you. You have food, you have an apartment for one month, and you have clothes. Now get a job."[24]

José Del Pozo recalls similar support from the Québec government. He and his family received a loan for airfare and financial assistance upon arrival. The airfare had to be paid back after one year, by instalments. Like many exiles, he mentions being outfitted to deal with the cold winter: "I remember we went with an official from Immigration to a big store to buy winter clothes." As with newcomers in Ontario, who were given money to support themselves while studying English, José received money to go to French classes at one of the Centres d'Orientation et de Formation des Immigrants (COFI) in the province, and given help in finding an apartment.[25]

Alfredo Lavergne arrived a couple of years after Jaime and José, and his testimony reveals that assistance had expanded from purely governmental sources to encompass Chilean solidarity associations as well. He relates being met at the airport by friends already in Montreal. Within days of arriving he was enrolled at COFI and receiving financial support. The Catholic Church in Chile had loaned him the money to get to Canada and given him three years to pay it back. Alfredo spoke a bit of French already because of a French grandfather and his educational background, and had also studied

[24] Jaime interview.
[25] José D. Interview.

basic English, so he claims he was better prepared than most for life in Québec. His memories of resettling are on the whole quite positive:

> I was very well-received despite my personal experiences, because I arrived as an immigrant but with a lot of help because I was a Chilean immigrant, because Chilean immigration was also exile, it was an expulsion or flight from here. There were French courses when we got to Montreal for my wife and I for six months, with the money that they gave us we could rent an apartment, and an honorarium for six months that allowed me, like in Chile, to study and work in order to integrate myself into Canadian society.[26]

For Manuel Jofré, who settled in Ottawa, assistance also came from public and private sources. He received $200 for rent, plus free winter clothes, shoes, a suit, and a parka through Manpower and Immigration. In this instance, however, his airfare to Canada was paid not by the government, but by a former student living in Hawaii, which he paid back over a six-month span after arriving.[27] This mix of governmental and non-governmental support seems to have been the norm throughout Canada, with state agencies providing for transport costs, financial assistance for rent and subsistence, language classes and work orientation, while private organizations assisted in many other ways, from supplying furniture and utensils, to helping the Chilean newcomers get oriented to their surroundings.[28]

---

[26] Alfredo interview.

[27] Manuel interview.

[28] Assistance in the Prairie provinces appears to mirror that provided in central Canada. One document describes a meeting in which a Manpower and Immigration official from the Prairies states that the "economic conditions, job vacancies and availability of language training along with the probable co-operation of the provinces were all positive factors" in the resettlement of Chileans in that region. "Notes-meeting held Dec. 27, 1974 in the Board Room of the ADM Immigration re: Special Program- Chile". LAC RG 76 Vol 986 File 5781-1 Refugees-Chilean Movement, General. Baeza states in her study of the exile community in Alberta that in Edmonton there was a Chilean committee there to welcome newcomers, money for clothes and rent was provided, as well as $5 coupons for food, and people were put up at YMCA

One final question that bears consideration here relates to the issue of xenophobic or xenophilic reaction to the Chileans. I asked participants to describe the treatment they received from native-born Canadians. I expected to hear stories of a polarized reception, part frosty rejection, part enthusiastic welcome. However, most of the participants never noticed if people were unhappy with their presence, or if there was controversy surrounding their admission, they were largely ignorant of it. This was mostly due to the preoccupations of the exiles themselves for what was going on back in Chile that made Canada appear almost as mere scenery to their lives. Thus, in the memories of their arrival and early life in Canada, the question of acceptance or rejection plays a very small part. There are, however, a few examples. María Teresa claimed that the Canadian authorities and people were always very nice but that her husband had some problems with a Manpower official who was either Russian or Ukrainian, and hated Communists. This person refused to let him take the English course that was supposedly open to newcomers, with no reason given.[29] Alfredo Lavergne was aware of the tensions produced by the entry of Chilean exiles, and the reasons for them, but did not feel them personally because he fit the profile of a useful immigrant:

---

for three weeks. Baeza Kallens, "Voces del exilio: testimonios orales del exilio chileno en Edmonton, Canadá", p. 42.

[29] María Teresa interview. This does not seem to be an isolated incident. Llambías-Wolff also reports Chileans in Québec encountering unpleasant bureaucrats who gave contradictory messages or treated the exiles as criminals or low-class people (Jaime Llambías-Wolff, *Notre exile pour parler: les Chiliens au Québec.* Montréal: Fides, 1988, p. 75). This attitude on the part of some official functionaries is in keeping with actions identified by Iacovetta by "gatekeepers [who] drew clear lines between their reception and citizenship work with the newcomers and their battle against communism." Franca Iacovetta, *Gatekeepers: Reshaping Immigrant Lives in Cold War Canada.* Toronto: Between the Lines, 2006, p. 13.

> I know there was a rejection. Unfortunately we were living in an age before globalization, so there were economic things, the Cold War. There were big differences. But in my own case, I didn't feel it, or I wasn't seen as being someone who was dangerous, because of my youth, my studies, my state of health...And no political party, but they knew that my wife was a socialist.[30]

As a lawyer intimately involved in refugee claims by Chileans, Jeff House was heavily involved with the community in Toronto. When asked about negative treatment or reactions toward the Chileans, he instead focused more on why there was not more controversy and how willing the exiles were to work:

> It was out there in some ways [rejection of the Chileans due to their ideology]. I mean, if you'd tuned in to CFRB [a Toronto radio station] you probably would have heard someone saying that. But the communist thing didn't really get very far because it was a democratic government...And then we were getting all these reports about how terribly they were being treated, I mean, even a communist shouldn't be tortured to death, most Canadians would say, or dropped in a bag of acid somewhere. So I don't honestly remember that. And I can remember, for example...people used to step off the plane, Chilean refugees, they would come in on Sunday, say they were refugees, set up their appointment, and Monday they're working...knocking down buildings. And it was rough work, but they wanted to do it. They were very, very work-friendly. So that kind of made an impression, I think, on people.[31]

If representatives of the Canadian state felt uneasy about the Chilean exiles, there were many people among the Canadian public, as we have seen, who disagreed with their government's policy and made efforts to challenge or to change it. While this took place throughout Canada, it was particularly notable in Québec, which had a longer and deeper history of ties with Latin America. Jaime Llambías-Wolff attributed the warm welcome to political factors: Québécois supported the Chilean struggle for independence from external domination, which echoed their own desire to shake off Anglo Canadian control.

[30] Alfredo interview.

[31] Interview by author with Jeffry House, Toronto, 11 February 2010 (henceforth Jeff interview). Interview in English.

This sympathy was reciprocated by the exiles in Québec and led many Chileans to support the independence movement. The feeling of shared beliefs and goals also led Chileans to learn French rather than English and integrate with their francophone neighbours, which Jaime claims "absolutely astonished" their hosts and helps to explain why the exiles there had fewer problems socially in their new environment.[32]

In general, however, most participants in this project had little specific to say about the way they were treated by Canadians soon after their arrival. This is partly attributable to the shock of exile that caused most of the Chileans to turn inward rather than attempt to immediately explore their new environment. At the same time, historically other immigrant groups to Canada also have lived within their community in the early stages of settlement, with broader association with the society around them coming later.[33] As such, it is unsurprising that most early memories of exile revolve around what happened to the participants at a personal and family level, and how they began to build new forms of communities in Canada. This argument is prominent in the next section, which examines the ways the participants reconstructed their damaged and dislocated lives.

"I really wanted to go back to being normal again"[34]

Not all of the exiles experienced the problems of dislocation in the same way. In a few instances, the professionals who made up my interviewee group had an almost seamless

---

[32] Jaime interview.

[33] John Zucchi, *A History of Ethnic Enclaves in Canada.* Ottawa: The Canadian Historical Association, 2007, p. 5. Zucchi focuses on ethnic neighbourhoods in Canadian cities, which the Chileans never developed due to their relatively small numbers, a point touched on by José Del Pozo later in the chapter. However, Zucchi's description of ethnic institutional development to serve the needs of both sojourners and more permanent immigrants is applicable to the Chilean exiles despite the lack of geographical spaces associated with their community.

[34] Marcela interview.

transition to working life in Canada, as we shall see in the next chapter. However, work was not the only aspect of life that concerned the exiles. The initial trauma of dislocation was a distant memory for the participants when we did the interviews, but even more than three decades after the fact, they recalled the pain and insecurity they felt when first in Canada, interspersed with positive memories of the help they received. The first feeling on arrival in exile was often one of extreme relief bordering on euphoria, which Llambías-Wolff identifies as part of the first stage of exile.[35] The calm, security and lack of chaos in the land of refuge often combined with a sense of excitement at making new discoveries.

However, the euphoria quickly gave way to the difficult reality of the situation. Despite having had the time to take steps to go into exile with her family, S.V.P. still was deeply affected by her departure from Chile. Her early days in Canada were marked by a critical attitude and negative feelings toward the country:

> I hated the bread, I hated the milk, I hated everything because it didn't have the smell of Chile. I wanted Chilean bread, Chilean scents, or Chilean fruit, whatever. I think it's because we weren't prepared mentally to arrive, it was this more than anything. And I'll say again, the empathy you receive is so important... And this is what we didn't feel when we got here. We felt...it's the Anglo Saxon thing. We touch, we hug and everything, and suddenly, the ice curtain.

Like many other exiles, S.V.P. socialized mostly with other Chileans in an effort to have some sense of normalcy and camaraderie in their new and alien environment: "We got together at my house every weekend to cry, to dance, to drink, to eat. To survive."[36]

---

[35] Jaime Llambias-Wolff, "Chile's exiles and their return" in Robin Cohen, ed. *The Cambridge Survey of World Migration.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995, p. 229.
[36] S.V.P. interview.

Patricia Godoy recounts similar feelings of grief, tempered by the help and support she received both from Canadians and other Chileans:

> We had a lot of help, a lot...All types [of help]...It was incredible. Spiritually, the church talked to you, people talked to you. We were all in bad shape, we were all crying, and what's more is that I have problems with depression. So I was always walking around crying, and everyone thought I was so little, so skinny, even though with all the clothes I looked like a bear! ...In February [1974] the English course started, and we were all in George Brown [a community college in Toronto], so we started to meet each other. There was like 150 of us in the school. A big group. And we'd get together on the weekend at someone's house, and we'd get together to cry, we always ended up crying. We would buy Kentucky Fried Chicken and wine, and cry.[37]

Interaction with other Chilean exiles led to the formation of new emotional bonds that helped to make up for the absence of blood relatives and social networks in Canada. These were important first steps in rebuilding a sense of community and belonging, which brought a degree of comfort to people whose lives had been interrupted by the coup d'état and its aftermath.

Some of the assistance that allowed Chileans to regain a sense of normalcy in their daily lives came from Canadians. Marcela Duran described the high level of solidarity they experienced when first picking up the pieces of their lives –sometimes beyond what they were comfortable with:

> We had a loan, and help, you know, there was wonderful solidarity. Canadian people who were horrified by the coup and only too happy to help. We were like the first refugees, which was very uncomfortable for us, or for me, because one, we were under such stress, and being sort of the object of solidarity, and in some cases curiosity, which was not ill intentioned, was really hard, and [my husband] and I really wanted to go back to being normal again. Most people did, but for us it was very hard because we were the first ones...We had some help from immigration for

[37] Patricia interview.

rent. You know, some people, there were gifts from the Canadian community, we were received in wonderful ways. In wonderful ways.

Marcela fondly recalls the assistance her family received from university solidarity groups, and especially a professor from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education who helped her to resume her studies in January 1974, even though she didn't have any papers proving her academic history. While it was hard to go back to living the frugal life of students after having worked as professors in prestigious Chilean universities, she and her partner began to integrate relatively quickly into Canadian society and made many new friends in the solidarity movement.[38]

Survival in Canada meant first of all that practical needs had to be met, such as feeding oneself, securing appropriate clothing, and finding housing. S.V.P. described the process of settling in:

> We had to go to the government offices every day to orient ourselves for work...They gave us references for where to find apartments...so we went to an apartment building...where eight Chilean families all lived in the same building....And we didn't have anything, zero, an empty apartment. And there was another organization, Welcome House, which gave us plates and used stuff, plastic bowls for soup, two spoons, two forks, two knives, glasses, old sheets to start. And they gave us two hundred dollars to buy furniture, so we bought a green plastic table with four chairs, a pot, and mattresses for sleeping on the floor. And that's how we lived for a long time. We didn't have anything. The churches visited and brought cribs for the babies, clothes. We got clothes in bags, all used of course, but enough to keep going.[39]

Some of the stories of settling in have moments of humour, like that told by Carlos Torres in our first interview together:

[38] Marcela interview.
[39] S.V.P. interview.

> We were taught how to buy, you don't have to speak to go to the market, the grocery store, you pick up what you need and you buy. But of course like what happened to many other people, you know, when we used to see the can for cat food, it was cheap and looked interesting, and I almost bought that a couple of times, and people at the cashier would say, "You know, this is not what you want to eat, do you have a cat?"[40]

The social assistance provided by Canadian groups and institutions and fellow Chilean newcomers reflects the fact that the exiles did not arrive in a country that had a large Spanish-speaking population that could provide them with orientation and support in their mother tongue. Chileans had to form their own self-help networks in the absence of a large-scale, organized Latin American presence. Joan Simalchik, who was a solidarity activist in Toronto and has written about the Chilean exiles in her academic career, asserted that Chileans in fact played a key role in the formation of social services for Spanish speakers already in Canada, and those who came later: "And they did [form organizations]. Quickly. Quickly. And that's something else that really stands out about the exile community, to see how fast they translated their organizational skill."[41] However, until that infrastructure was in place, it was more a matter of groups of Chileans informally assisting one another in any way they could, as S.V.P. recounted:

> The truth is that very few people spoke Spanish then. In fact, I remember in my building where there were eight Chilean families, I was the only one who spoke English, and my ex-husband who spoke quite a bit less than me. Any time a child got sick, and they wanted to go to Sick Children's [Hospital, in Toronto], I had to go with them as the interpreter. And in fact the government contracted me as a Spanish-English interpreter for the community…There were people who spoke Spanish, but not like now, today many people speak Spanish. But it was a very united community, so if someone said "Is there *maicena*? How do you say *maicena*

[40] Carlos 1 interview. The cat food story appears in other sources, like José Borgoño's *Torn Between Two Worlds,* and was mentioned by Juan in our interview as well.
[41] Joan interview.

> in English?" "Cornstarch." "OK, look for something that says 'cornstarch'. Ah, here's the *maicena*." People helped each other a lot.[42]

The assistance Chileans rendered to each other in the early phase of exile led to deep bonds between people who had been strangers until circumstances had forced them together. These friendships evolved into new forms of families, to help deal with the forced separation from their biological kin. The relationships formed in exile continue to be cherished to this day, as Patricia Godoy stated:

> We helped each other out a lot. This group became very close, still is. Some of them are in other places, or have gone back to Chile, but we continue. For me, it's my family, because since '73 or '74, we're still friends…What's more, I came here alone. I was 26 or 27 when I arrived, but I was really immature…So for me it was pretty hard, because I couldn't do anything, I wasn't strong, I wasn't useful. And emotionally I was badly off.[43]

Patricia's experience was echoed by Juan Nuñez:

> The family that we had in Chile that we lacked here, we formed among ourselves. There are people here who are like my brothers, my sisters, nieces and nephews. People I've known for thirty, thirty-five years, they call me uncle, I've known them since they were six or seven.[44]

The creation of new bonds of affection and support was a key element in making life in exile more normal, and thus more bearable. A sense of once again having an extended family, a place to live and the meeting of life's necessities helped to fill the physical and emotional void caused by dislocation. However, dealing with the rupture of the individual's attachment to her or his society or nation would not be done through an informal network of friends, but by the organized denunciation of the military regime that had forced the exiles from their homeland.

---

[42] S.V.P. interview.
[43] Patricia interview.
[44] Juan interview.

Orientation and denunciation: the growth of community organizations

The formation of Chilean groups to help the newcomers and denounce the military dictatorship was an important development of the early phase of exile. Participation in such associations allowed people with a history of political activism to reassert this facet of their identity, while creating interpersonal bonds and a space in which they could provide mutual assistance on a practical and emotional level. Re-establishing avenues for collective political action allowed many exiles to make use of their organizational skills, reassert their ideological beliefs, and form a powerful counter-argument to the military regime's characterization of them as un-Chilean. While the focus and nature of community groups would change over time, the initial phase of community organization was a vital step in rebuilding a sense of community and identity.

On the most basic level, the emergence of Chilean groups repeated a normal pattern among immigrant communities, as they served the practical purpose of providing guidance and solace to new arrivals, who were often completely disoriented in their new surroundings:

> More than anything it was Chileans [who helped her family], those who had arrived first. I remember the first day we arrived, we went to a hotel that Manpower sent us to…and that night a group of Chilean doctors showed up, knocking on the door, saying "Hi, I'm So-and-So"… We were among the first to get together to form groups to help the people who were arriving, to maintain the language, preserve customs.[45]

[45] María Teresa interview.

The provision of a space in which Chileans could simply be Chileans was an important consideration. As with other groups outside their countries of origin, community organizations allowed people to preserve a sense of their national identity – a shared historical origin, including language, culture, and in the case of the Chilean exiles, political activism. Group activity also enabled Chileans to enjoy elements of their material culture like food, folklore and traditional arts, while satisfying existential needs like the feeling of belonging to a community where their beliefs and values were validated by others. Being a member of one of these early groups had a function beyond "eating *empanadas* and dancing the *cueca* on September 18."[46]

Dr. Jorge Barudy –an exiled Chilean psychiatrist living in Europe –emphasized the important role community organizations played in the recuperation of identity based on observation of his compatriot patients:

> Besides their specific activities, these groups organize meetings to denounce the existence of organized violence and its consequences in their country of origin. Additionally, these meetings are important 'rituals' which permit the group to organize and communicate, to reconstruct the atomized and fragmented social tissue which they experience in exile.[47]

Statements by exiles corroborate Barudy's assertions about the therapeutic value of collective activity for restoring a sense of connection to Chile, and thus to their identity as Chileans:

---

[46] Del Pozo, "Exilio e identidad: El caso de los chilenos de Montreal, Canadá. Observaciones preliminares", p. 68. September 18 is Chile's National Day, celebrating independence from Spain, and the *cueca* is the national folk dance.

[47] Jorge Barudy, "A Programme of Mental Health For Political Refugees: Dealing with the invisible pain of political exile". *Social Science and Medicine,* Vol. 28, No. 7, 1989, p. 725.

> This type of organization [the Chilean Association in Saskatoon] helped you maintain your sanity. It was like you were close to home – working politically from afar. Mentally and emotionally it kept you very close with your country and the Chilean *pueblo*. Once we regrouped we did a lot a work in the area of solidarity. For examples we worked with women who had their husbands and sons disappear, we assisted with syndicates working in clandestine [sic], we worked with the Catholic Church.[48]

In her studies of the Chilean community, Joan Simalchik underlines the connection between a sense of identity and political and cultural activity, reconstituted in exile but different because of the new setting. Traditional outward signs of Chilean identity –such as peñas, the cueca, empanadas, songs, the national flag and anthem –were valued and used symbolically by the exile groups to assert the validity of their vision of Chile, and confirm them as true Chileans as opposed to the military usurpers. New rituals were also developed to affirm the *chilenidad* –the Chilean-ness –of the exiles: opening meetings by singing the national anthem of Chile, something never done while they were in their homeland; the display of photos of other "true" Chileans, like Salvador Allende, or the poets Pablo Neruda and Gabriela Mistral; using 11 September as a day of commemoration used to raise funds for resistance to the regime, affirm faith in the eventual victory of their cause, and demonstrate their continued determination to restore democracy to Chile. This date was also used to mourn the fallen, by reciting their names while attendees shouted "*presente*" –present –as a way to connect the here-and-now to the past, and preserve the memory of the martyrs of the cause.[49] Simalchik underlines the role of the early groups in both the question of identity and in the creation of a place for

[48] The testimony of Pedro, from Muñoz, "Separation and National Identity: A Narrative Account of Chilean Exiles Living in Saskatchewan", p. 89.
[49] Joan Simalchik, "The Material Culture of Chilean Exile: A Transnational Dialogue", *Refuge,* Vol. 23, No. 2, June 2006., p. 99.

the Chileans in the country of refuge: "Through their resistance, solidarity strategies, and commemorative practices, Chileans created and inhabited a newly devised distinct space."[50]

Community organizations emerged throughout Canada. Membership was mostly made up of the professionals with leftist political beliefs and a history of involvement with the Unidad Popular who represented the bulk of the Chilean population in the country at that time. Denunciation activities included marches, public acts, letters to the editor of newspapers and magazines, and conferences or seminars designed to educate Canadians about the situation in Chile.[51] Peñas were often used as ways of collecting funds to send back to Chile and as another way to inform Canadians about the brutalities of the military regime. Many of the participants in this study were involved in these kinds of activities, and their description of how the associations came to be and what they did shows us how exiles attempted to reassert their identities through collective action:

> When we arrived, we quickly formed the Toronto Chilean Society. It was made up of members of all parties. There were Communists, Socialists, people from the MIR, the whole gamut of the political left. And we had peñas, not every weekend but at least two times a month where we got together on the weekend in distinct groups...All the profit from these we used to pay for the place, and the rest for solidarity with Chile, which was done through the church network. ...It was a way to get us together, to pass along information...and cooperate economically, to the point we were able, with solidarity in Chile. And this went on for many, many years.[52]

---

[50] Ibid, p. 102.

[51] José Del Pozo, "Las organizaciones communitarios de chilenos en la provincia de Québec, Canadá" in José Del Pozo, ed. *Exiliados, emigrados y retornados: chilenos en América y Europa, 1973-2004.* Santiago: RIL Editores, 2006, p. 131-133. Del Pozo's study focuses exclusively on Chilean organizations in Québec, but my research has shown that his conclusions are applicable to exile groups throughout the country.

[52] S.V.P. interview.

Juan Nuñez's memories of the solidarity activities of the early days also show the paradoxes of the situation. On the one hand, community organizations were developing in the Canadian setting, with the active support and participation of local citizens. At the same time, he describes how the associations helped maintain a distance from Canadian society, which was a defence mechanism to protect a threatened sense of identity:

> First, keep the Canadian public informed about what was going on in Chile, denounce everything, and secondly send money...Canada is a developed country, so many of us had access to better jobs, more money, friends with more money, organizations with more money...We worked with Canadians on solidarity, of course, but we had very little contact. We worked together in the factory, but you can't really talk in a factory, right? So the contact we had with Canadians was very slight. The big contact that we had was among ourselves. We were organized, we were friends with each other, we got together every week, we had meetings every weekend...This was a type of therapy, a very good therapy. First we formed a family, a group of friends, a community. And at the same time we were doing something positive for Chile. And we were protecting ourselves against the bad that could happen in this society. Contact with the *gringos*, for example.[53]

Conversely, other participants gave very different accounts of the solidarity work of the groups that stressed how they brought Chileans and Canadians closer together. Manuel Jofré described how he was contacted by a local solidarity committee in Ottawa soon after arrival. Activities focused on solidarity and denunciation, with meetings on Fridays or Saturdays in downtown churches or in Hull, Québec (now Gatineau). He remembered that both English and French Canadians participated along with the Chileans and other Latin Americans, most of the native-born being progressives and committed

[53] The desire to maintain a buffer between the community and the host society was not a phenomenon confined to Canada:"The creation of these kinds of 'ghettoes' responds to a need for security and the preservation of identity, but at times also interfere in the adaptation of the subject to new conditions." C.S.C., "Foi et Développement", No. 56, April 1978, p. 4. CDVS, Exilio, box 29; Juan interview.

church members. He described part of the work as a "big, continuous effort" aimed at the federal government and the Chilean Embassy to bring more Chileans to Canada.[54]

Carlos Torres was an active participant in Chilean organizations in Montreal, and like Manuel stressed the integrated nature of the groups rather than the distance they helped maintain from Canadian society:

> [Participants were] [p]eople from other regions of the world who were sympathetic to the Chilean process. It became a very important process in those days, trying to reach a different form of society with peaceful means. In that regard, the Chilean process was seen as being a very interesting proposal, in those days, so people from different regions were involved in solidarity with Chile…It was basically donations by individuals…And sponsors from unions and base community church, as well, and that happened here as well, in English Canada. It was basically the same thing that we experienced in Québec, although unions were more active there, because the unions in English Canada were more involved in the anti-communist campaign… so they were not, as a union, so involved in the solidarity campaign, but locals were, locals did support.[55]

In order to understand the contradiction in the testimonies that painted Chilean organizations as either open or hermetic, I asked José Del Pozo if he considered the exiles to have been introverted during their early days in Canada. He replied that, at least as far as Montreal and Québec City were concerned, they were, but only in a very specific way:

> The leadership was in the hands of the most politicized, and for these people the principal concern was what was happening in Chile. So all social or cultural activity centred around this, to raise funds for Chile, to help the clandestine political parties. So you could say that it was introverted in the sense that people were invited in, but to work for Chile…so you can say there was a kind of introversion, but it was because of the circumstances. The weight of the dictatorship was so heavy, this preoccupation dictated the rhythm of things.

[54] Manuel interview.
[55] Carlos 1 interview.

At the same time, he cautioned me against imagining the exile community as somehow isolated. He used the examples of mixed Chilean/Québecois(e) couples, and the fact that, due to the community's relatively small size, no Chilean ghetto developed in Montreal: "I think you have to be careful [not to over emphasize introversion] and make the distinction, because there was never a tendency to just live among Chileans, or marry among Chileans, no."[56]

Given the apparent contradiction between testimonies like Juan's and those of Carlos or Manuel, it seems that the early Chilean organizations played different but simultaneous roles in the settlement process. In their earliest stages, they acted as a bulwark for the protection of "Chilean values" from "capitalist contamination" and provided a safe space for the reassertion and recuperation of a sense of identity; but they were also a means of greater involvement with the wider Canadian community, which was a step towards integrating into the host society.[57] In this regard, the Chilean experience in Canada mirrors that of other immigrant groups, which used their community organizations for both cultural preservation and as a vehicle for interacting with Canadian society. In a sense, the act of asserting themselves as distinct communities

---

[56] José D. interview.

[57] One of the main Chilean organizations in Montreal expressly stated that it opposed the dominant culture, and emphasized education that would distance the children of the community from its values. José Del Pozo, "Exilio e identidad: El caso de los chilenos de Montreal, Canadá. Observaciones preliminares." *Revista Universum*, No. 17, 2002, p.71. Del Pozo identifies the contradictory goals of identity preservation and integration among Chilean associations in the province of Québec, noting that these points were difficult to reconcile and changed over time and depending on what organization one was looking at. Del Pozo, "Las organizaciones communitarios de chilenos en la provincia de Québec, Canadá", p. 145. I would argue that these contradictory objectives were present from the genesis of these groups, because no matter how dedicated to sheltering the community they might have been, they still existed in a physical context that brought them into regular contact with representatives from the host society, which started the process of integration by default.

began a process that saw the Chilean exiles increasingly integrated into the wider world around them.

Another aspect of the associations bears examination. In his work on the Chileans in Québec, Jaime Llambías-Wolff observes that the exiles, by virtue of being uprooted from their homeland, could only ensure the survival of their cultural values through solidarity activities, but that political activity was also the root of the resurgence of "divisions and sterile ideological battles about more-or-less secondary questions" between the different groups that had made up the Unidad Popular.[58] The partisan disagreements that had weakened the UP project in Chile appeared again in Canada, as is shown in a number of interview excerpts in which the rifts are part of the narrative around the organizations. While a set of common causes helped keep the Chilean exile community unified in the short term, Willy Behrens states that the strong identification with specific political parties was also centrifugal force that carried the seeds of future division:

> People started arriving, so we got together with the idea of forming a Chilean association. The main motive was to denounce torture, the repression of human rights, the disappeared, the dictatorship...At the start there were twenty or twenty five people, but there were problems as well. There was a change of executive. As I wasn't that committed to any political party, I assumed a fairly important role. You know that Allende supporters had come from different parties on the left, but there had been a lot of animosity between them. Now they were blaming each other for having provoked the coup, in such a way that they didn't trust each other.[59]

[58] Llambías-Wolff, *Notre exil pour parler*, p. 121.
[59] Willy interview. He had arrived in Canada in 1970, and because he was non-partisan he ended up as a go-between and mediator within the Ottawa exile community. Even in a relatively small community like Ottawa, all the major left political parties were represented –the Communist and Socialist parties, the MIR, and the MAPU.

The individual exile's relationship to her or his fellow Chileans in the new environment was of paramount importance in coping with the pain and stress caused by exile. While Canadian institutions and community organizations helped facilitate settlement and their role cannot be overlooked, it was really the exiles themselves who helped each other begin rebuilding a sense of normalcy and purpose that had been stripped away by expatriation. The formation of organizations to help fellow exiles and fight against the regime allowed the first wave arrivals to confirm to themselves and the community around them that they were still true Chileans, an identity that could not be taken from them. At the same time, the very unity and capacity for collective action that helped the exiles to start on the road to recovery was also the origin of later conflicts within the community, which is one of the changes that we will examine in the next section.

New groups, new goals

One of the results of prolonged exile was a change in the way Chileans organized themselves and the objectives of their associations. The relationship of these groups to the society around them also altered over time in important ways, from structures that preserved cultural values and identity to ones that promoted greater involvement in national and world affairs.[60] The promotion of Chilean and Latin American arts and culture, the education of Spanish-speaking children, and a greater commitment to human rights campaigns in general, not just the Chilean case in particular, were all causes that

[60] Sociala Missionen-Diakonia, "La problemática del retorno de los refugiados latinoamericanos", p. 13. Centro de Documentación de la Fundación de Ayuda Social de las Iglesias Cristianas (henceforth CD-FASIC). While the findings of this study applied to Chileans in Sweden, the assertions are applicable to Canada as well.

began to be more prominent within the community. The exiles, with organizational skills and a commitment to social and political causes, were also important contributors to the growth of services and organizations to help other people who had suffered the traumas of dislocation and maltreatment. A change in identity can also be noted over time, as Chileans began to have a greater consciousness of being part of a broader Latin American community, which in turn often meant a shift in focus of social and political activity. José Del Pozo's research has shown that Chilean associations in Québec went through a shift over time, from a focus on assisting newcomers and denunciation of the military regime to a more social and cultural direction, though solidarity campaigning continued throughout.[61] While no comparable study exists for English Canada, the related experiences of my project participants support the premise that a similar change in associational life and objectives took place there as well.

Whatever other changes occurred, solidarity work to assist people in Chile affected by military rule continued to be a central activity of the groups, but gradually the form of mobilization changed from meetings and marches to cultural events that served to raise funds for Chilean causes and promote and preserve Chilean culture. Nidia Rivera reflected on her family's involvement in promotional activities:

> Yeah, we were all the time doing empanadas, parties to raise funds to send home...Toronto Chilean Society was the one that was doing everything together, because my children were dancing there, and we were in Harbourfront [in downtown Toronto],we were running all over the place to promote our culture. The cueca and everything.[62]

[61] Del Pozo, "Las organizaciones comunitarios de chilenos en la provincia de Québec, Canadá", p. 131.
[62] Nidia interview.

The presentation of Chilean culture was an important way of appealing to the largely apolitical English Canadian population, and in fact often served a political purpose under the guise of artistic expression.[63] The conflation of cultural and political action among the Chilean exile community was in fact a natural outcome. As Jorge Etcheverry explained to me, drawing a line between political and cultural activities was fallacious: "In Latin America, or in Chile at least, culture was always on the left."[64] In 1979, he founded the publishing house *Ediciones Cordilleras* in Ottawa, the first establishment for Spanish-language publications in Canada. Jorge underlined that the publishing house served both an artistic and political purpose, raising money through art exhibits and peñas while also promoting the language and culture of the homeland. Ediciones Cordilleras became an open space for discussion of culture, solidarity, and for people to get together and express themselves. Fellow writers Manuel Jofré and Alfredo Lavergne spoke of similar experiences in Toronto and Montréal, where literary workshops attended by both Chilean

---

[63] This phenomenon was also noted by Baeza in the case of the Chileans in Alberta. Cultural activities there were used as a way of introducing the human rights issues in Chile in a covert way, contrasting the civilized, cultured exiles with the barbarism of the military regime. Baeza Kallens, "Voces del exilio: testimonios orales del exilio chileno en Edmonton, Canadá", p. 71.

[64] Jorge interview. His claim that culture was always on the left is hyperbole, but there was a very strong connection between the Unidad Popular, leftist politics in general and Chilean cultural icons such as Pablo Neruda (an avowed Communist) and the musicians of *la Nueva Canción* movement. Chilean professor of art history Isabel Jara Hinojosa describes the UP cultural project as the second pillar on which the Chilean left hoped to build a socialist society. Workers were to be both creators and subjects of cultural production, and culture would be a forum to critique capitalism, underdevelopment, and cultural colonialism while positing a collective national culture as an alternative. Isabel Jara Hinojosa, "Imagen-País' de la Unidad Popular y de la Dictadura chilena: la disputa de los proyectos editorials." Prácticas del territorio: Arte, Crítica e Historia colloquiam, 23 November 2011, Centro GAM, Santiago, Chile, p.3. Retrieved August 30, 2012 from
http://www.informepais.cl/descargas/Ponencia_mesa1_JARA_Isabel_Imagen_Pais_de_la_Unidad_Popular_y_de_la_Dictadura_chilena.pdf

and Canadian writers served the double purpose of cultural diffusion and denunciation of the military regime.[65]

S.V.P. also talked about the ways in which Chilean groups expanded their range of activities. She remembered taking part in poetry nights, book releases, photo exhibits, cueca classes and peñas that were open to all ethnic groups and which were well attended by other Latinos and Canadians, as well as soccer tournaments played on grounds lent to the Chileans by the Ukrainian community of Niagara Falls. In her view, the cultural and recreational activities of the Chilean community helped open the eyes of Canadians who knew little about the world south of the United States. She recalled being surprised by the lack of knowledge of Latin America among her fellow university students when she was retraining, who asked her questions like "Why don't you speak Latin if you're from Latin America?" Her observations show that apart from the political and cultural roles they played, Chilean organizations also helped to educate the people around them.[66]

Another consequence of long-term exile in a multicultural society was that many of the politically active Chileans began to be involved in other human rights campaigns, whether focused on troubled Latin American nations like El Salvador, Guatemala or Nicaragua, or such distant places as South Africa. After adapting to life in a new country, Patricia Godoy created a network through her activism that went far beyond the Chilean group:

---

[65] Alfredo and Manuel interviews. In Manuel's case, he was part of a study group with other Chilean writers in Toronto that cooperated with the Toronto Chilean Society, while Alfredo was involved with the Union des Écrivains Québécois (UNEQ), which published bilingual French/Spanish editions.
[66] S.V.P. interview.

> I was always doing thousands of things. I worked with organizations, with the Communist Party, an Italian group, with a group of Caribbean women who were going to be deported. I worked in a lot of solidarity activities. Of course I was in the [Chilean] women's group here in Toronto...I think all of us who arrived in that era got involved in everything. So I participated a lot with the Uruguayans, the Argentineans, we helped the *Madres de Mayo* [Madres de la Plaza Mayo], I was involved in all that kind of thing. We had fiestas, and through the fiesta we'd raise money to send to the countries. The last work I did here was with political prisoners in Chile, we had a fiesta. We mostly made food and had dances to raise money for political prisoners...I was very active in everything that had to do with solidarity. I got to know Toronto well because I was walking all over the place![67]

At the same time that Chilean exiles were becoming more engaged with other human rights issues, their organizational skills were also proving to be integral to the formation of an infrastructure of Spanish-language services throughout Canada. José Del Pozo commented that no services had been available in Spanish when he arrived, meaning that he and other French speakers had served as interpreters. Latin American organizations with Chilean roots now exist even in smaller cities like Québec City, including a Latin American library and a Hispanic association at Laval University.[68] In Montréal, Chileans were instrumental in founding soccer teams that served as an important socializing forum, a senior citizen's group for Spanish-speakers, a Latin American women's group, and a successful Chilean professionals association that has forged many contacts outside the group itself.[69] The active Chilean community in Edmonton was responsible for giving birth to Spanish-language Saturday schools, cultural and artistic groups, TV and radio programmes, various Spanish publications, literary salons, religious groups, sports clubs, and no less than five housing cooperatives that long ago expanded beyond their original

---

[67] Patricia interview.
[68] José D. interview.
[69] Del Pozo, "Las organizaciones communitarios de chilenos en la provincia de Québec, Canadá", p. 136-144.

Chilean base. This development of ethnic infrastructure generated what Litzy Baeza calls the first Latin American heritage in Canada.[70] In Saskatoon, the original Chilean Association admitted Canadians and became the Chilean-Canadian Association, and opened a Spanish school named for Salvador Allende, with counterparts in Toronto and Montréal.[71] In Toronto, Chileans started the Arauco housing cooperative, which now serves a broader community, and physicians like Ana María Barrenechea were involved with the Canadian Centre for the Victims of Torture (CCVT), which was founded in 1981 to treat torture victims, initially mostly from Chile and El Salvador. Chileans were also key players in starting education and community services for the Spanish-speaking population in Toronto, as Marlinda Freire observed:

> Chileans have participated in tons of events and organizations designed to help people. In the Latino community there have been a number of community centres that were created by Chileans... The Centre for Spanish Speaking Peoples was just starting when we arrived, but for many years was run practically totally by Chileans. There's Casa Salvador Allende, which offers cultural programmes in English and Spanish, for children to get a second language.[72]

Chilean professionals like Marlinda Freire and José Borgoño have also served over the years as counsellors, helping Hispanic newcomers with paperwork and establishing network connections to help high-risk populations in educational and social matters. Toronto's Salvador Allende school, which is now open to all Latin Americans, promotes cultural and language preservation. S.V.P. pointed to the fact that most of the first

[70] Baeza Kallens, "Voces del exilio: testimonios orales del exilio chileno en Edmonton, Canadá", p. 75-87.
[71] Muñoz, "Separation and National Identity: A Narrative Account of Chilean Exiles Living in Saskatchewan", p. 89.
[72] Marlinda interview.

generation of Chileans born or mostly raised in Canada still spoke Spanish as evidence of the success of the school in helping to preserve the Spanish language.[73]

During the course of our second interview, Ana María Barrenechea talked a great deal about the nature of associative life among the Chilean exiles. She felt it served a need to confirm their identity:

> We started the *Escuela* Salvador Allende, but it was for our needs, using the children as an excuse. It was good, because it was a project that functioned absolutely voluntarily, and people were there. The parents, because it was one of the few places where we could justify getting together. We couldn't just get together for a coffee, but fighting for *la patria*, and the children learning and singing.[74]

Her observations suggest that while the forms and goals of Chilean associational involvement changed over the years, at the root activity within and beyond the exile community continued to address needs of personal and group identity. Ana María's analysis of her community points to the fact that people continued to look to associational life –whether it was political, educational, social or cultural in focus –as a way of affirming their past and giving meaning to their future. The names and objectives of the groups changed over time, reflecting a higher level of interest in matters beyond mutual aid and denunciation of the political situation in Chile, but remained important forums that preserved a tie to the wider community and the homeland they were denied.

The re-establishment of a sense of community and purpose through activism and participation in collective activities was an important need for the exiles I interviewed. At

[73] S.V.P. interview. José Del Pozo made a similar observation for the children of exiles in Québec.
[74] Interview number two by author with Ana María Barrenechea (henceforth Ana María 2 interview). Toronto, 14 February 2010. Interview in English and Spanish.

the same time, rebuilding their lives and coping with changes precipitated by forced relocation went beyond questions of group identity and endeavour. Chilean exiles often had to cope with serious personal and family crises while also trying to restart professional careers or find a new space in the labour market that would help them succeed in Canada. Chilean women and men had to adjust to new gender roles and responsibilities that were often challenging, causing changes in interpersonal relations that may not have occurred in Chile. In the next chapter, we will look at the effects of life in exile on some vital areas of everyday life: human relationships, family, and work.

Chapter four

The challenges and changes of exile: Work, study, family life and gender roles

> The first years we were emotionally living in Chile, and our suitcases were packed to go back at any moment. This meant living in a kind of ghetto and living almost exclusively in relation to solidarity work and what was happening in Chile. During the first few years that was fine, but after five years I started to understand that if I wanted to restart my career in this country, I had to integrate and start to live in a different way.[1]

Despite the dream of an early return to Chile, the exiles of the first wave had to face the fact that the military regime was more resilient than they had anticipated. This obligated them to make a difficult choice: return to Chile, or change their way of life in Canada. For most of this study's participants, it was not legal impediments, but rather their revulsion for life under the dictatorship that discouraged their return. They chose to remain in the country of refuge, and thus faced a number of challenges and changes, both as individuals and as a group. This chapter deals with the long-term adjustments which Chileans made as their Canadian exile extended over time.

Several participants talked about the moment in which they began to truly "live" in Canada, rather than simply "be" there. The realization that exile would last longer than they hoped led individuals and families to metaphorically –and in some cases, literally – unpack the suitcase and admit that their stay in Canada would be long. Exiled Chileans found it difficult to admit that cities like Toronto, Montréal and Ottawa were new homes rather than temporary havens. Consequences of this admission included settling in to

[1] Montreal filmmaker Patricio Henriquez, quoted in Rody Oñate, Thomas Wright, Caroline Espinoza, Andrea Soto and Ximena Galleguillos, *Exilio y retorno.* Santiago: LOM, 2005, p. 28.

permanent housing, securing or training for better jobs more suited to the exiles' professional backgrounds, and renegotiating family and gender dynamics impacted by both dislocation and the new Canadian culture around them. Some of these issues were common in Chilean exile communities throughout the world, while others were more specific to Canada, or in the case of employment questions, the province of residence. All of them took place against a backdrop of historical developments that influenced work prospects, such as the oil shock of 1973 and the economic downturn it provoked. The exile community also felt the effects of the increasingly prominent role of women in the work force in Canada, and the way this changed gender roles and family dynamics. The participants in this study often identify marriage breakdown and generational conflict as a by-product of exile, though this may be more a question of perception than reality. In some ways, the challenges and changes faced by the Chilean exiles are typical of the broader immigrant experience; they were certainly not the first group of newcomers who had to rethink work activities, or re-evaluate gender and family roles after resettling. However, the interviewees often expressed the opinion that these changes, for good and ill, would not have happened if they had stayed in Chile. Over time the participants underwent alterations in their lives and their sense of identity that would affect them on a personal and a group level. Work, study, family life and gender roles illustrate a range of the changes experienced by the participants as they transformed from temporary visitors – a culture of exile –to long-term inhabitants of their places of refuge –a culture of immigration.

Unpacking the suitcase

After the initial shock of forced migration and period of recuperation, the exiles had to come to terms with their unwilling presence in a foreign country and decide what to do next: risk returning to the country that had forced them out, with no guarantees of finding work or even of personal safety, or admit that exile was not going to be the transitory experience they had hoped it would be. For those who made this admission, the next step was to put down more permanent roots in Canada, whether through buying a home or reviving their pre-exile careers rather than settle for menial jobs that allowed them to survive but kept them detached from the society around them.

In S.V.P.'s case, recognition of the military regime's grip on power spurred her to leave the "mourning" phase of exile and begin to retrain as a teacher. She returned to Chile in 1976 "to get myself together spiritually and mentally", but the re-encounter with her homeland in the end confirmed her status as an exile:

> I cried a lot for two years. And it was always, Pinochet falls and we go, we were all going back. After two years...I heard from my uncle who was in the Air Force, who told me "You and the children can come back, I'll meet you in the airport, but your husband can't get in. He's on the list of the ones they're looking for, the black list." So I went, and I was there for two months...When I went back, I realized Pinochet was going to be in government for a long time. I needed to start moving, and to do something with my life, and to stop crying...So that's when I started doing all the applications for U of T, and I graduated in 1979 with my BA, studying part time and working full time, two jobs. Later I went to OISE, and did my Master's, and then I started working as a teacher.[2]

Taking the decision to make a life in Canada, as S.V.P. did, was not easy or without complications. Any sign of settling down could be interpreted as abandoning the cause of

[2] S.V.P. interview.

returning to free Chile from dictatorship. When I asked him about the exiles living with suitcases packed, Eduardo Boza said "This is something that was really notable in the beginning. Many people wanted to go back, so even buying a house made you a traitor…selling out to imperialism! It reached that level of stupidity."[3] In a later interview, I asked Ana María Barrenechea if there were social sanctions for becoming too "Canadian": "Of course. The first person who bought a house was told that he was a traitor because he was going to stay."[4] The concrete act of establishing a more permanent presence in Canada contained a symbolic meaning for the exiles that could cause friction even between family members, as Raquel Borgoño related:

> [José] didn't want to buy anything new, nothing. But one day I rebelled…I went and bought a living room set. And this guy here, he was going crazy. But he accepted it…Later I rebelled and bought a colour TV. I was moving forward…I think I was the initiator for putting down roots...It was very unstable to me, one foot here, the other foot there…I said, "Let's put down roots here, and if we have to cut them, we cut them"…We bought an apartment, then a townhouse.[5]

In many of the nations where Chileans took shelter, a pragmatic approach appears to have developed over time that justified laying down roots as part of a long-term return strategy. Rather than considering purchasing a home or investing in their own or their children's education as a sign of betrayal, it could be portrayed as a way of amassing resources to survive the initial period of resettlement in Chile.[6] Beyond this, and despite

---

[3] Eduardo interview.
[4] Ana María 2 interview.
[5] José B. and Raquel interviews.
[6] Marita Eastmond, *The Dilemmas of Exile: Chilean Refugees in the USA.* Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1997, p. 143. While they do not discuss the question of settling down as part of a return strategy, oral testimony in Oñate and Wright from a number of different countries (Costa Rica, Sweden, and Belgium, for example) indicates that the changing perception of exile as a transitory to more long-term state affected the issues of property acquisition and professional retraining or requalification. Rody Oñate

the threat of criticism and even ostracism from other exiles, there came a point where many Chileans realized they had to "stop living in Chile and in exile at the same time" and come to terms with life in Canada beyond fulfilling the basic necessities for survival.[7] Marlinda Freire summed it up this way:

> There is a turning point, I would say around the five-year mark, and it's the same for refugees and for immigrants, that people stop thinking of going back to their countries. For the first three to five years, the people live here but emotionally they're still in their country, regardless of whether their country had maltreated or tortured them. But their mothers are still there, siblings, close friends, who knows, but in terms of daily life, people are living to go back. But at around five years, they stop talking about going back. A few years later, people begin to say "I'll never go back."[8]

The decision to unpack their suitcases was a significant one for political exiles, and one which would affect many other facets of their lives in Canada. One consequence of settling in more permanently was an increased desire to resume work in pre-exile careers, both as a way of attaining greater financial stability reflective of the class and professional status they had before exile, and to restore a personal sense of purpose. In addition, the resumption of professional activities contributed to the well-being of the exile community, and helped Chileans escape from the margins and integrate successfully into Canadian society. The high levels of education and professional development that had made the exiles suitable for admission to Canada also helped them establish themselves in their places of refuge when it became clear that they might be there for a long time.

---

and Thomas Wright, *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar*. Second edition. Mexico City: Urdimbre, 2002, p. 141-190.

[7] Exile Luis Ortega, quoted in Oñate and Wright, *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar*, p. 189.

[8] Marlinda interview.

Work and study

Attaining better jobs sometimes necessitated returning to school, as S.V.P. did, to either learn a new line of work or acquire the necessary Canadian certification for professions they had already practised in Chile. In some cases it meant venturing into the workplace for the first time. Exiles who had been professionals in Chile remained outside of the Canadian mainstream as long as they lacked access to meaningful employment. Many of them faced unemployment or underemployment, or were trapped in menial jobs, either because their Chilean training did not transfer easily to Canada, or because they arrived in Canada without documents demonstrating their training and prior experience.[9] In the earliest days of the exile movement, Chileans also had to try to fit into a difficult labour market that was affected by the 1973 oil shock and the economic instability it caused. Despite these challenges, the exiles had a growing awareness that better employment would ease material concerns. Meaningful work also served as another way in which exiles could restore their professional and class identities and sense of self-worth.[10]

Many of the earliest exiles in Canada were highly educated young professionals whom the military regime had marginalized and expelled as potential sources of opposition. Often the first years of exile marked a dramatic step down in their socio-economic

[9] The importance of the work issue was also highlighted in Sweden, where it was listed as one of the seven main problems facing exiles. Sociala Missionen-Diakonia, "La problemática del retorno de los refugiados latinoamericanos". Stockholm, 1987, p. 13-14. Centro de Documentación de la Fundación de Ayuda Social de las Iglesias Cristianas (henceforth CD-FASIC).
[10] C.S.C., "El Derecho de Vivir en Su Patria", p. 4. CDVS, Exilio, box 29.

position. A small number of them established relations with the society around them quite quickly and resumed their careers in the new setting. Both Marcela Duran and Manuel Jofré benefitted from the job/study placement programme run by the Canadian University Committee for Refugee Chilean Professional and Students, one of the solidarity organizations mentioned in the previous chapter. Manuel was working at Carleton University in Ottawa soon after arrival and Marcela began courses at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in January, 1974, three months after landing.

Their experience of a quick reinsertion into the academic world was not a common story among the exiles, however. Most had to accept menial jobs at first that had little or nothing to do with their professional activities in Chile until they were able to gain experience in Canada, make connections, or prove their qualifications. Some, like former civil servant Patricia Godoy, experienced manual labour for the first time in their lives while in exile:

> [In] Chile I couldn't work in a factory, it was a social thing. As I considered myself revolutionary, I said, go with the people, experiment here. He [a Manpower agent] didn't want to send me, he said "What? Are you crazy?"...I only lasted one day, I nearly fainted. The work was horrible!...I sweated so much, I had never sweat that much, and when I left the factory, with the cold, I got sick. And the guy said "I told you you shouldn't go work in a factory."[11]

It was not unusual for even skilled workers from Chile to experience difficulty breaking into the Canadian labour market at a level commensurate with their training. Alfredo Lavergne, who was a skilled autoworker, worked as a busboy, an assembly line worker at a bicycle factory, in a chemical factory, and dealt with periods of

[11] Patricia interview.

unemployment until 1977, when he got a job at the General Motors plant in Sainte-Thérèse, near Montréal.[12]

As a young academic with a law background, Jaime Llambías-Wolff tried to find work in his field in Montréal, but encountered many obstacles:

> So I had one month to find a job. So what I did was try to find something in [my] area, which was probably what everybody would do. So I started going to law offices...So I started for the first week knocking at all the offices. I said...I want to do anything possible, as an assistant, secretarial, administration, and it was not successful, I didn't get anything, nobody hired me...And then I started looking in the newspapers, and I went to interviews for positions that were available at the very low level of administration...I didn't get anything. And I was told then by a human resources officer that my problem was my curriculum [vitae] for those type of positions. He said "You are overqualified and the problem is, we're not going to give you a job, you're going to quit in a few months. In some cases you're even more qualified than the people who are going to...supervise you. You are not a good candidate, we're not going to train you for three months."...I ended up in a restaurant washing dishes.[13]

In time, Jaime would successfully re-enter the academic world and establish a successful career, but like many exiles, he had to endure a period of "demotion" until he was better oriented and connected in his new home.

For other exiles, finding a job meant taking on a new role out of practical necessity. Because her husband could not practise his profession immediately upon arriving in Canada, and was physically and emotionally fragile from the torture he had endured, María Teresa made the decision to enter the workforce:

> My major concern was my children, and [her husband], of course, on top of everything I was with a man who had been badly tortured... he wasn't very well

[12] Alfredo interview.
[13] Jaime interview.

> emotionally, so…What were my priorities at that time? Work, to find work…first, learn the language, and second find work, and that's what I did.

She took whatever jobs she could find, working in a coat check, as a waitress, and a cleaner. When I asked what she had felt during this time, she responded:

> An immense solitude, but you also had to live. And it's like I said, being an automaton. You do things because you have to, and I was the mother of three young children, the spouse of a man who had been badly tortured, so I had to be the strong wall of the household. So I had to learn English and I had to work. In what? In whatever. You have to survive, you have to put food on the table. You have to survive.[14]

For some people, reinsertion into the professions they had practised in Chile was fast and easy: Manuel Jofré and Marcela Duran are cases in point, as is Luis Cortés, who found a job as a baker almost immediately. For many others, the process was more time-consuming and frustrating. María Teresa's husband, a doctor, had a hard time getting certified to practise in Canada because of his lack of English. He passed the medical exam in January, 1975, but failed the English exam, which he did not pass until 1978. The inability to practise his profession pained him greatly: "For him, more than anything, it was truly very very hard, very sad, demoralizing…He would go for lower-level jobs, and be told he was overqualified, and he wouldn't be given work. Fortunately a Spanish-speaking doctor gave him a job, so he could make a bit of money."[15] When he finally did pass, in order to find work the family moved first to Halifax for four years, and then to Hamilton for four more, before finally resettling in Toronto in the mid 1980s.

---

[14] María Teresa interview. She had worked briefly before her marriage and had helped out with her husband's medical practice, but entry into the Canadian labour market marked a mostly new experience for her.

[15] María Teresa interview.

For Marlinda Freire, the challenges in resuming her medical career related to institutional biases that assumed that the male member of a married couple was the head of the household.[16] To have her Chilean diploma recognized, she had to pass the Ontario medical exam and an English proficiency test. When she asked the local Manpower office for permission to take the English course offered under the Special Movement Chile, she was refused because her husband was registered as the head of the household, and thus the only one eligible to take the class. A similar problem occurred when she was interning at the University of Toronto. A program to help refugees existed but only would pay and provide books to the head of the family, so she was ruled ineligible for the assistance. The Ontario Medical Association also called into question the validity of her Chilean credentials because she had been obliged to use her husband's family name once she had arrived in Canada, whereas all her documentation from Chile was in her family name, as is customary in Latin America.

In some instances, she encountered blatant sexism from both Canadian and Chilean men. During an employment advising session, a counsellor in Manpower told her she should give up the idea of practising medicine in Canada: "Ma'am, forget about being a doctor in Canada. There are a lot of ladies' jobs, jobs in hotels, you can make beds or do this and that." This attitude was apparently not confined to men from the host country:

[16] Marlinda's experience of institutional gender discrimination is not unique. In the doctoral thesis of Monica Escobar, interviewee Emma relates having encountered the same problem of being denied the English course by virtue of not being the head of the household, while another exile was assessed as not being the head of the household even though she was single. Monica Escobar, "Exile Women and National Identity: Chilean Women in Canada." Doctoral thesis in Psychology, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. 2000, p. 86, 202.

> At one point I found out about a Chilean who was doing very well as a doctor in the Addiction Research Foundation. He was helping Chileans with medical or science backgrounds get jobs at the Addiction Research Foundation, not as doctors, but in the laboratories, taking blood, so … I went, and the guy was very friendly and said he'd help, so we went to the restaurant, the kitchen of the Research Foundation. So he said "I've got a friend here who you can help working in the kitchen, washing dishes and taking coffee to the tables, they'll treat you well here."

Marlinda recognized that if she had taken just any job, she would not have been able to learn English and prepare for the medical exams. She was not willing to accept a menial job for the sake of short-term economic security, nor the limitations that men in both the host society and her own community were trying to put on her:

> There were a series of barriers that weren't just Canadian, they existed within the group itself, among the Chileans…It was the same in Chile, because in Chile, even now, when you have a political meeting, it's the *compañeras* who clean the place, who make the coffee, who bring the bread. It's the women. Here things started to be a little bit different, because the women started to say no. We want a different level of involvement in the process, and if you want the place clean, then we all clean it, but it took years for us to become aware of how to respond to this series of barriers.[17]

Marlinda eventually passed both exams and resumed her career, and has spent the years since serving the psychological needs of both the exile community and those outside it. Her observations about tensions in relations between Chilean men and women, along with the comments of other exiles on this subject, are discussed at greater length later in this chapter.

José Borgoño had been a professor in Chile, but ended up retraining as a social worker for the Toronto District Board of Education. First, however, he went through a period of doing whatever jobs he could find: assembling parts in a trophy factory, or working

[17] Marlinda interview.

nights as cleaner while taking a postgraduate course at the University of Toronto during the day. His remembrances show us some of the challenges middle-class Chileans faced in adjusting to different working realities: "There was a whistle to start at eight in the morning, a whistle to have a coffee, whistles here, whistles there. I was accustomed to a different kind of working environment...so it was a bit of a shock, and it affected me."

José recognized in his testimony that part of coping with the realities of life in Canada involved a reinvention of the self, and new work projects were part of this process that helped give life in exile more meaning:

> We had reconstituted and reinvented ourselves professionally, in professions which we didn't have backgrounds in...Even though I was doing something different from what I'd done in Chile, I was able to use the skills I'd learned...I had a background that made me a person of interest for Canadians, so I had a very advantageous position from the start, because I had ten years of teaching experience, and this was recognized... It was very rewarding work, and I felt fulfilled working with people who I could help.[18]

Whereas professionals like Marlinda Freire and José Borgoño were able to either restart their previous careers or retrain for new ones, for people like Nidia Rivera, living in Canada meant becoming a permanent member of the workforce for the first time. She recounts how she and her husband at the time began their working lives in Toronto:

> I went to school, I finished the six months in George Brown [the free English course], and then I looked for a job. I was a maid in the Harbour Castle hotel. It was just finished building. All the Chileans were working there...He worked washing dishes while he was at school, and he was studying to be an engineer, so he worked for the company that made the CN Tower. He made the CN Tower! His signature is there, I know.

---

[18] José B. interview.

While working and raising four children, Nidia continued to improve her English reading and writing ability, studied data entry, and for a time worked as dishwasher at the Hudson's Bay Company department store. She ended up working there for 30 years, mostly as a clerical worker in the payment processing centre.[19]

By and large, establishing or restarting fulfilling working lives was a challenge that the majority of the participants were able to overcome. Of the twenty-one people I interviewed, ten had ended up in the same professions in Canada that they had in Chile, and five, like José Borgoño, were in different lines of work but were still professional positions where they could use their education and training. This pattern seems to hold true throughout English Canada. Litzy Baeza states that the Chilean community in Edmonton experienced economic hardships similar to their Central Canadian counterparts in the early years, but in time the exiles generally achieved good levels of education and economic integration.[20] The story was quite different in Québec, however, where despite the sympathy for the UP project and the welcoming attitude toward the exiles, professional integration was much more difficult. During our interview, José Del Pozo explained this province-specific issue, which he has studied as an academic:

> Work was an important challenge, and this stands out a lot… In Montréal, all the journalists describe the Chileans as a very well-integrated community. And this is both true and untrue at the same time, because I distinguish between social integration, which has been good…But on the economic level, it's been bad. The unemployment rate has been very high, extremely high, and it's high among all Latin Americans.

---

[19] Nidia interview.
[20] Litzy Baeza Kallens, "Voces del exilio: testimonios orales del exilio chileno en Edmonton, Canadá." Master's thesis in Latin American Studies, Universidad de Chile, 2004, p. 52-54.

His research on the Chileans in Québec has shown that there was much more acceptance of the exiles in the labour market in Ontario than Québec. He speculates that this might be due to an unconscious prejudice in the job market in Québec, pointing to an unemployment rate among Latin Americans that is more than double the provincial average.

Marginalization in the unstable Québec labour market of the time, beset by high unemployment and slow growth, extends to the professionals of the 1970s exile wave. Del Pozo considers himself lucky to have landed a teaching job so quickly. He was going to do a Masters degree –he had started graduate studies prior to going into exile, but only his undergraduate degree was recognized in Canada –but a specialist in Latin American history at Université Laval had just resigned so he was asked to teach part-time. Eventually he ended up in at l'Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM), where he taught while also completing a Masters degree in history. He completed his doctoral studies in 1986 at Université de Montreal, and became a full-time member of the history faculty at UQAM in 1987. However, he declared that over half of the Chilean professors he knew never found teaching jobs because they could not speak French or they disqualified themselves because of self-consciousness about their accent. Del Pozo had the advantage of already speaking French before arriving, but for others, the importance attached to the quality of language used in the classroom led to a "self-exclusion" that left many professionals in Québec underemployed for the duration of their time in Canada.

In the end, José Del Pozo feels that there was no real rejection of the Chileans by Québecois, but that the work question was a gray area. If there was discrimination, he believes it was probably not systematic, as there was no rejection when Chileans tried to rent an apartment, for example. The work situation in Québec was more challenging than in English Canada for everyone in the province, not only the Chileans. On the other hand, the level of social integration was higher.[21]

While most participants successfully re-established previous careers or embarked on new work experiences, there were still problems to face in the labour market that related to rejection of the foreign other by some Canadians. The language issue that affected professionals in Québec also appeared in English Canada, where an accent could be a professional handicap. Patricia Godoy told me about another Chilean woman who had experienced this:

> I remember the friend who I lived with for a while, she had a hard time...She had an accent –my accent was very strong, but hers was even stronger –so she was up for a position in [an insurance company], but they told her she couldn't be a manager because she had a strong accent. Back then, you couldn't do that now. She even took a pronunciation course at the University of Toronto, but it didn't work.

At work, Juan Nuñez encountered condescension at times because of the way he spoke, but used his sense of humour to deal with such situations:

> There are some people who don't like immigrants. I have a really bad accent when I speak English, very strong, and in my work I'm always on the phone. And one day, there was a person...putting me down, because I was an immigrant, I had an accent. Someone says something to you in a joking way, but it's not joking, it's

[21] José D. interview. For more detail on the question of problems of professional insertion, see José Del Pozo, *Les Chiliens au Québec. Immigrants et réfugiés, de 1955 à nos jours.* Montréal: Boréal, 2009, p. 145-176.

> very sarcastic, "Oh, you have a funny accent." I say, "You too!" "Where are you from?" "From Etobicoke!" And then they figure out that they're doing something wrong. Not all, but some realize it, and say "Thank you very much, bye bye." But there are still some who don't care for immigrants.[22]

While language issues affected professional integration and could be a source of friction, workplace tensions also arose around the accusation that exiles were job-stealers. Jaime Llambías-Wolff relates instances of this in Québec, where during the 1970s unemployment was high and job creation slow, and there are examples of such statements in newspapers in 1973 and 1974, when the Canadian economy in general was in the doldrums as a result of the oil shock.[23] S.V.P. also found that some Canadians around her felt threatened, and said that Chileans were in Canada to take jobs away from the native-born. When confronted with such attitudes, she would challenge the Canadians to spend as much time and energy as the exiles did in making themselves employable: "Why don't you specialize? Why don't you get a Master degree? Why? Because that's what I did."[24]

Restarting interrupted careers or finding a suitable place in the Canadian labour market were not simple tasks. Chilean exiles faced problems of discrimination based on their language ability, their sex, and sometimes the lack of recognition of their professional training and qualifications. On the whole, however, the twenty-one exiles I interviewed had made use of the work and training opportunities available in Canada as a

---

[22] Juan interview.

[23] Jaime Llambías-Wolff, *Notre exile pour parler: les Chiliens au Québec.* Montréal: Fides, 1988, p. 94. For an example of arguing against Chilean admission on labour competition grounds, take the following: "The Chilean refugees who were brought to Canada are staying in two Toronto hotels, given warm clothing, a government grant and will be guaranteed jobs by Manpower. What about Canadians who have no warm clothing, no food, no jobs? Haven't we enough immigrants already taking jobs from Canadians? Why doesn't Canada look after its own first?" Dora Burton, "Immigrants get the care owed to Canadians, she says". *Toronto Star*, January 18, 1974. p. B5.

[24] S.V.P. interview.

means of achieving economic stability and a sense of personal fulfilment. As exile became a longer-term experience, establishing or re-establishing careers helped the exiles materially and psychologically, while also deepening their roots in Canada. In the question of professional achievement, the first Chilean exile wave has been remarkably successful in English Canada, though less so in Québec.

At the same time, doing well in the world of work is not the only factor that makes a person's life easier or better. In the cases of Chilean women entering the labour market and acquiring a degree of economic independence that some of them had not known in Chile, success in the market place could even be a source of conflict with their partners. While integration into the economic life of Canada by the people I interviewed was a major accomplishment, it did not solve other problems caused or exacerbated by the forced separation from Chilean society. Exile had long and deep impacts on families and between the sexes. Gender roles and parent-child relationships that were considered normal in Chile were questioned and altered in Canada. As we shall see in the next section, the necessity to re-evaluate interpersonal relationships and roles was a consequence of exile that touched the core of one's day-to-day existence.

Family roles and relationships

The people I interviewed often spoke of how exile had challenged and changed their families. From the beginning, family difficulties within the Chilean community had concerned solidarity groups and others engaged in assisting the politically displaced.[25]

[25] In Chile, the Vicaría de la Solidaridad for the Catholic Church and Fundación de Ayuda Social de las Iglesias Cristianas for other Christian denominations were very concerned about family reunification and

This topic has also drawn much attention since the 1980s from exiled scholars, such as Ana Vásquez and Ana María Araujo, and non-Chilean researchers like Diana Kay. From these earlier studies up to Oñate and Wright's more recent examination of the Chilean diaspora, there are two main points of consensus regarding the effects of exile on family roles and relationships: that exile had an extremely destructive influence on family life in general, and on the role of men in the family unit in particular; and that exiled women had to assume responsibilities beyond those they would have had in Chile, which was simultaneously empowering and exhausting. Testimony from the study participants serves to somewhat complicate these generalizations. While women did take on new roles, and the incidence of marriage breakdown among my group was high, these developments are not solely the results of exile, but also of the changes taking place in the society around them at the time. In addition, the kind of catastrophic family breakdowns discussed by scholars and feared by solidarity groups must certainly have taken place, but it is more notable by its absence in the testimony of my participants, a few of whom even asserted that exile may have brought their families closer together. With this consideration in mind, I will provide an overview of this large issue, based on the accounts of the people I interviewed. Their stories speak of the pain of separation from family members in Chile, the different ways in which men and women dealt with exile, changing relationships between parents and children, and the rethinking of accepted gender roles and responsibilities within couples. These changes often provoked

ran counselling programmes. Internationally, the UNHCR and the International Organization for Migration, among others, had cooperative programmes with these groups to help Chileans already in the exterior with family problems.

crises and new stresses, and were part of the reimagining of individual and group identities caused by life in exile.

In June of 1980, the *Comité Pro-Retorno de Exiliados* [the Committee for the Return of Exiles], a branch of the non-governmental Chilean Human Rights Commission, held a conference in Santiago that examined the impact of exile on people inside and outside the country. The written report from the conference listed the ways in which exile acted as a factor in individual crisis and family disintegration. The contributors summarized the effects on families as: the abrupt separation of family members and their dispersal around the world; the heightening of pre-existing family tensions due to adverse conditions; the exacerbation of problems between couples due to changing roles, emotional problems caused by direct persecution, and the intensity of these problems under conditions of instability; the disruption of life projects and the inability or unwillingness to undertake new ones; and the continual exodus from one country to another in search of stability. These effects could lead to deep feelings of pain and anguish, uprootedness, solitude, isolation, and increased cases of suicide.[26] Not all of participants in this study experienced these effects or feelings to the degree described by the the Committee for the Return of Exiles, which highlighted the most severe problem cases as a way of denouncing regime policy at a moment when the military was still very much in control. However, studies written since the restoration of civilian rule, such as Oñate and Wright's global overview of the Chilean exiles, corroborate many of the Committee's claims. Oñate and Wright

[26] Comisión Chilena de Derechos Humanos, Comité Pro-Retorno de Exiliados, "Primeras Jornadas por el derecho de vivir en la patria." The conference was held on June 20-22, 1980. The factors listed above appear on page 13 of the report.CDVS, Exilio, box 30.

noted that in the communities where they conducted their research, regardless of the country in question, incidence of criminality, drug and alcohol addiction and family breakdown were markedly higher among exiles than in comparable groups in Chile and the host country, and that the percentage of failed marriages in unspecified countries ranged from anywhere between 40 and 80.[27] Anecdotally, Patricia Godoy stated in our interview that "And that's when couples started breaking up [after the first year of exile], tons of couples, fifty percent separated here. So along came another crisis."[28] In the case of the 21 Chileans who participated in this study, all but four were married when they arrived, and one of these had been married but divorced prior to exile. Of the 17 who arrived as part of a married couple, seven divorced while in Canada, and another two after returning to Chile. Seven are still married to the same partner they arrived with, and one is widowed. An examination of Canadian divorce statistics from the 1970s and 1980s reveals that rates of marriage breakdown were rising throughout this period, particularly after changes to the Divorce Act in 1968 and 1985 that made the process less complicated, so in a real sense the exiles were experiencing the same phenomenon as the broader married population.[29] On the other hand, the view of marriage of breakdown as being a

---

[27] Oñate and Wright, *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar*, p. 165, 171, 176.

[28] Patricia interview.

[29] Jane F. Gentleman and Evelyn Park, "Divorce in the 1990s." *Health Reports*, Vol. 9, No. 2, Autumn 1997, p. 3. The rate of divorce per 100 000 population increased from 134.8 in 1971 to a high of 362.3 in 1987. From 1981, when the number of divorces per 100 000 legally married couples began to be measured, the rate increases from 1 180.4 that year to 1 585.8 in 1987. Rates were higher among couples between 15 and 29 years of age than those between 30 and 64, but the latter was the age range in which eight of the nine divorced participants experienced the end of their marriages. This leads me to conclude that the changes around them involving roles and identities were more of a factor in marriage breakdown than the immediate strains of exile, but the question of whether they would have faced similar challenges had they remained in Chile is one that cannot be answered. Article retrieved August 30, 2012 from Statistics Canada, http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/82-003-x/1997002/article/3242-eng.pdf.

particularly acute problem among the exile group was undoubtedly influenced by the very low rates of divorce in Chile, a country which did not pass a divorce law until 2004.[30] Based on the testimony of the participants, the problem of family dissolution was perceived as a large issue related directly to exile, as were intergenerational conflicts and the challenges of adjustment to changing roles within families and between the sexes.

In the literature about Chilean exiles, the effect of exile on gender roles and the relationship dynamics between women and men is portrayed as profound and often destructive. In her capacity as psychiatrist and counsellor, Marlinda Freire lived and witnessed many of the issues that affected Chilean families in exile. During our conversation, she spoke at length about the different ways men and women dealt with exile, and her statements touch on many of the issues that caused tension between couples and eventually contributed to familial disintegration:

> [The] biggest challenges at the personal and family levels are that the roles begin to get switched around. That is, the men get involved in political matters, and some of them keep working, but it was all based on needing to go out, needing to talk, needing to denounce, you need to help the people who were suffering the dictatorship in Chile, while you're worrying about all the practical stuff, and often bringing the money into the house. The women had an easier time accommodating themselves here, better than in Chile. In Chile, many of these women never went out to work...Here women gained a certain degree of economic power, often they were in charge of maintaining the house. The women learned to drive, they often bought their first car... And they began to insist more on their rights. This caused a lot of conflict with the husbands in general...Men were losing ground, they were losing power within the family, the couple, and this brought an increase in domestic violence...There were cases of torture, cases of attempted murder, suicides, all

[30] Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the rate of annulments and divorces combined in Chile remained below 0.5 for 1 000 of the population. Loreto Cox, "Divorcio en Chile: Un análisis preliminar tras la nueva Ley de Matrimonio Civil." Centro de Estudios Públicos seminar, May 10, 2011. Statistics from page 11 of PDF of presentation, retrieved August 30, 2012 from http://www.scribd.com/doc/55890217/Divorcio-en-Chile#download.

> thing kind of thing...In the process of adaptation and integration...the experience has been much more positive for the women. The men lost so much, they lost a ton of ground...Just by being a man, for the question of gender, they had a series of benefits...but these things started to be lost in Canada.[31]

Freire's description of the crisis in male gender roles provoked by exile is one that appears frequently in studies of the Chileans: men feeling robbed of their social and political role, their professional status, and becoming infantilized through dependence on their wives or state institutions for financial support.[32] She told me she thought the change in roles caused by exile was evidence of a different approach to crisis management between men and women:

> These are my theories, but based on what I've done for a long time: Men and women respond differently in times of crisis. The man functions very well in normal situations, but when there is a crisis situation, it is the women who respond, they respond much better, it's like the defence mechanisms are oriented towards survival. I think this has something to do with the biological survival of the species. For example, in Chile, during all the persecution, all the powerful oppression that there was in Chile...it was the women who went looking for the disappeared, the imprisoned. They're the ones who launched legal proceedings, brought a basket of food for prisoners.[33]

In contrast to the way women responded, Freire asserted that the Chilean men she observed tended to seek solace and social reinsertion through solidarity and denunciation. There was a price to pay for focusing on political issues, however, in the sense that it diminished the authority they had wielded in Chilean society by virtue of their sex:

---

[31] Marlinda interview.

[32] C.S.C, "El Derecho de Vivir en Su Patria", p. 4. CDVS, Exilio, Box 29. Similar observations can be found in Oñate and Wright, *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar*, p. 168, 173; Arturo Roizblatt and Daniel Pilowsky, "Forced Migration and Resettlement: Its Impact on Families and Individuals". *Contemporary Family Therapy,* Vol. 18, No. 4, December 1996, p. 517; and Ana Vásquez and Ana María Araujo, *La maldición de Ulises: Repercusiones psicológicas del exilio.* Santiago: Sudamericana, 1990, p. 159-161.

[33] Marlinda interview.

> The men arrived and did their political thing, and tons of them didn't work, because of the language, the kind of work, exploitation, they didn't want to associate with capitalism... but at the same time you have to feed the children, so the women took whatever jobs they could, factories, cleaning. We'd go to parties where we knew they'd be giving away a turkey...we'd get a ham or a turkey, or a bag of toys...We had to go to the schools regularly to find out how the kids were doing. It was the women who did all the educational stuff, who took the kids to the doctor when they were sick. All of the tasks fell to the women, and the women did them, because the men were too tied up with their political matters...It got to the extreme that the men could read and discuss politics in English, but they couldn't go and buy a loaf of bread!...The women had a more healthy adjustment process. For example, there were a lot of families that left Canada because of the husbands, because they couldn't learn English, they didn't want to, it was disagreeable, they treat us bad, they act like soldiers, the people were uneducated, consumerism, but basically we were dealing with people who were terrified, who were full of fear, whose women were taking care of everything, and they didn't want to lose their status in the family, so the decision was to leave the country or to integrate. And there were a lot of separations, many marriage breakdowns.[34]

Marlinda Freire is not a lone voice in making such claims. Nidia Rivera affirmed that life in exile had changed her relationship with her former husband: "Yeah, it changed. Because if I had stayed in Chile, I don't think I would have worked, that I would go out and work. To me it was a big, big change. And I wanted that change to be positive, so I wanted to work, I wanted to help, I wanted to do something."[35] In the Canadian exile communities, like in many others throughout the world, the new realities of life included more opportunities for women to integrate into the workforce and achieve a level of economic self-sufficiency that likely would not have been available to them in Chile, and constituted a challenge to the Chilean male's role as breadwinner.[36]

---

[34] Marlinda interview.
[35] Nidia interview.
[36] Diana Kay devotes a chapter of her work to the question of changing roles and economic power that discusses the importance to male self-image of the breadwinner role; see Diana Kay, *Chileans in Exile: Private Struggles, Public Lives.* Wolfeboro, New Hampshire: Longwood Academic, 1987, p. 175-193. Thomas Klubock traces the origin of the male gender role of family breadwinner to the corporate welfare

Raquel Borgoño also commented on this issue, stating that "I know there were a lot of women who found independence here that they didn't have in Chile" while underlining that this had not been an issue for her, because she had always worked and José was a very supportive partner.[37] It does appear that the question of class and education was a factor in this issue. For women in the academic world like Marcela Duran, exile in Canada did not substantially alter her economic position or complicate her relationships with her husband: "I don't think [conflict over roles] applies to Chilean intellectuals so much...In Chile, at least in our experience, women were professionals...We came from that part of history."[38] But for others who had not worked, such as Nidia or María Teresa, exile in a society where women were increasingly prominent in the labour force meant both new responsibilities and new opportunities.

The issue of economic autonomy was not the only source of friction between exile men and women. In some cases, seemingly mundane considerations like shared household responsibilities and duties became the source of marital conflict. For many

---

policies of foreign-owned copper mines in Chile after the First World War. The policies were aimed at "domesticating" what had theretofore been an itinerant labour pool into a permanent industrial workforce, which necessitated redefining both male and female gender roles in the context of stable nuclear families. Thomas Miller Klubock, *Contested Communities: Class, Gender, and Politics in Chile's El Teniente Copper Mine, 1904-1951.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1998, p. 283-286. As Heidi Tinsman has observed, the same transition in women's roles took place in the Chilean countryside during the period of the Agrarian Reform, under both the Christian Democrats and the Unidad Popular. The ideal image of the family promoted was of "male citizen-producers [who] would responsibly provide for domesticated, if better educated and more civic-minded, wives and children." Heidi Tinsman, *Partners in Conflict: the Politics of Gender, Sexuality, and Labor in the Chilean Agrarian Reform, 1950-1973.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2002, p. 3.

[37] Raquel interview.
[38] Marcela interview.

Chilean men, like José Del Pozo, life in Canada meant taking a more active role in the running of the house:

> Men also did things they didn't do before, like some learned to cook. Not me, but in Chile I had never washed a dish, and at my house I wash the dishes. But it shows something important, which is that no one has a housekeeper. In Chile, almost everyone, including the lower middle class, has a housekeeper. In Chile, the housekeeper is an institution!...So to be left without a housekeeper was an enormous change. So men needed to learn to look after the kids a bit, sometimes to cook, in the end to do things they had never done. Yeah, there was a change.[39]

As a general rule, in Chile working women who could afford it hired housekeepers, while women who could not relied on the female members of their family –mothers, aunts, sisters or in-laws –to help out with domestic chores and child-rearing responsibilities. Because the custom of hiring help was not nearly as common in Canada, and the extended family network did not exist, Chilean husbands and fathers were pressed into service, at times unwillingly.[40]

In his book on Chileans in Québec, Jaime Llambías-Wolff mentions the paradox that exile men were often politically progressive but socially conservative, and that the ingrained customs of both sexes were challenged by the different rules of the new environment.[41] In some cases, this made people reflect on their concepts of gender roles, what was normal or abnormal, and what were good and bad customs. Years after the fact, Alfredo Lavergne told me how his ex-wife's "rapid development" in Canada had made

---

[39] José D. interview.

[40] In extreme cases, putting discourses about equality into practise by assuming new roles was impossible for exile men, and caused them to cut ties with their families: Vásquez and Araujo, *La maldición de Ulises: Repercusiones psicológicas del exilio,* p. 157-158. A discussion of exile women having to perform double duty as wives/mothers and workers, and the unaccustomed level of poverty many middle class Chileans experienced in exile, can be found in Oñate and Wright, *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar*, p. 179-180.

[41] Llambías-Wolff, *Notre exile pour parler: les Chiliens au Québec,* p. 103.

them grow apart. He recognized that his own unwillingness to adapt to the new situation was detrimental: "I have machismo in my blood…She grew, and we divorced because of my lack of adjustment to this new reality."[42] His ex-wife wanted independence, her adjustment to life in Canada was faster, and he was unable to cope with the new dynamic in their relationship. Ana María Barrenechea also lived through the breakdown of her relationship, though in her case the essential source of tension with her partner lay in the psychological scarring he suffered as a result of having witnessed atrocities while incarcerated. He tried to deny his painful past rather than deal with it:

> My partner was very traumatized, and I wasn't. And I still think his magnification of his own trauma caused his own breakdown. You know the difference between a willow tree and an oak tree in the middle of a storm? The oak will stand, but in some instances the oak will break because the storm is just so much. At the end of the storm, if the oak broke, it's forever, but the willow tree will return to its natural form.[43]

In other cases, such as Ana's, the strain of exile served to exacerbate problems between couple that already existed before the coup d'état:

> At that time [the aftermath of the coup] I wasn't sure about our relationship. He put me in danger in Chile. I was very upset about the situation, he didn't seem to be so upset, although he claimed to be very supportive of Allende's government…He was a physicist and he just continued to do his heavy research and stuff, but he did stupid things that could have endangered him, and sometimes when I was with him, so I was quite upset that he wasn't helping people but he was endangering himself.[44]

Ana and her daughter went into exile in Canada, leaving her husband behind in Chile. She eventually went to Venezuela to try to reconcile with him after he took refuge there,

---

[42] Alfredo interview.
[43] Ana María 2 interview.
[44] Ana interview.

and they managed to stay together for a few more years, but in the end she left him and returned to Canada. Exile may not have been the root of their failed marriage, but it certainly was a factor.

A final consideration with regard to relationship failures has to do with the reputed problem of infidelity. Many of the exiles were young and had married early. When they arrived in countries like Canada and Sweden, often their first time to be out of Chile, both men and women discovered that they were the object of sexual interest from natives of the country, considered exotic and attractive because of their different appearance and manners.[45] It appears that exiles, and especially exile men, also had a certain romantic cachet to them by virtue of their relationship to the UP project and the drama of the coup d'état. While this problem was not discussed by any of the exiles I interviewed, outside observer Jeff House brought it up as a cause of relationship failure in exile:

> One of the things that was a real problem, though it wouldn't have hit the public press, but the Chilean women thought the Canadian women were whores, basically. And the Chilean men thought that Canadian women were whores, basically. And the sort of women that were in solidarity work, some of them at least had a Che Guevara complex. In other words, "This revolutionary guy, he's in exile, oh poor *pobrecito*", you know. And of course the Chilean women didn't like that one bit, because first of all, they had a more realistic idea of who their husbands were, and maybe they weren't Che Guevara, maybe they were just some poor schmo who got whipped up in this. And then, because of the sixties, I would say, until AIDS came around, there was a tendency to, you know, have some fun. So I think the impression was "Oh, these Canadian women, they're just horrible. They're willing to do anything, all I have to do is snap my revolutionary fingers."[46]

The degree to which infidelity caused relationships to end is unclear, both in the specific case of Canada and the broader Chilean diaspora, as it is a delicate topic that few

---

[45] Vásquez and Araujo, *La maldición de Ulises: Repercusiones psicológicas del exilio,* p. 49.
[46] Jeff interview.

of the people involved would probably wish to talk about openly. There is evidence from other studies that some Chilean exile women viewed the women in different countries of refuge as overly liberal in their attitudes toward sex, and in Canada the legalization of the birth control pill in 1967 and the atmosphere of sexual experimentation of the 1960s in general had changed the way many people viewed sexual relations.[47] However, we should be careful not to mistake an opinion for proof of widespread infidelity. In addition, as Vásquez and Araujo have observed, there was a tendency among exile women to define themselves as better and "truer" women than their native counterparts. This belief served as a defense mechanism for a fragile sense of identity, but also reflected a rejection among left-wing Latin American women of what was seen as the American imperialist doctrine of feminism.[48] It seems likely that testimony such as Jeff House's is more reflective of an accepted belief of widespread infidelity than its actual existence.

Life in exile did not only affect couples, but also had an impact on the extended family. Politically active families often ended up with members scattered all over the globe, like the Durans, or like most of the people I spoke to, with the majority of their relatives still in Chile.[49] While forming new bonds with fellow exiles and others in Canada helped fill

[47] Doug Owram describes the decade from 1965 to 1975 as bringing "a dramatic reorientation of the sexual values that had been in place for at least forty years…The images and assumptions of domesticity would be replaced by a confusing clash of values concerning the rights of men and women in a new world." Doug Owram, *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby-Boom Generation.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996, p. 249 For the Chilean exile women's opinion about European women, see Vásquez and Araujo, *La maldición de Ulises: Repercusiones psicológicas del exilio,* p. 149-155.

[48] Vásquez and Araujo, *La maldición de Ulises: Repercusiones psicológicas del exilio,* p. 149.

[49] Marcela interview. According to Marcela, almost all of her husband's family ended up in exile, mostly in Europe. She and her husband sponsored her husband's mother and younger sister to immigrate to Canada.

the void of losing the extended family, it was not a panacea. Some people, like Manuel Jofré, found the separation from their parents one of the most difficult aspects of exile:

> The conditions of exile are that you aren't in your own country, that you don't speak your own language, and you don't have contact with your parents, like in my case. I didn't see my father for nine years. My mother, four or five years, then she came to Toronto for three weeks or so. But it was a long time before I saw my father. So exile is linked to a kind of brutal familial separation.[50]

For others, forced absence from Chile meant never being able to say goodbye to loved ones who died. Raquel Borgoño's experience of this sad reality is representative of what many others around the world suffered: "My grandmother died there, it was terrible for me because I was raised by my grandmother. It was a terrible blow to not be able to be there. Later another aunt died, my father's sister, she was very dear to me...and that was also a very hard loss."[51] Juan Nuñez, who lost three of his sisters while he was in Canada, referred to this as his "wound of exile."[52]

The lack of an extended biological family also meant that the children of exiles missed out on having the warmth and love of grandparents, uncles, aunts and cousins. Though other members of the Chilean community often played these roles, for children born or raised in Canada, it meant distance from their ancestry. S.V.P. reflected on her feelings on this subject: "My children can't talk about their grandparents, and that's very sad. They don't know what it's like to have a relationship with your grandma, be treated with affection, the gentleness of the elderly, the wisdom that they impart."[53] Even with visits

[50] Manuel interview.
[51] Raquel interview.
[52] Juan interview.
[53] S.V.P. interview.

from relatives or the occasional trip back to Chile during the years of the dictatorship, relationships with the extended family were distant and fleeting.

The matter of how the children of exiles and their parents related to each other is another issue that bears examination. Exile is reported by academics and solidarity group representatives to have caused changes in parent-child roles, values, customs and behaviours. As the psychiatrists Roizblatt and Pilowsky stated it, "The children of the exiled Chilean adapted to the new country with greater ease than their parents did… In other families the parents were unable to accept their children's newly acquired values, thus leading to an intergenerational conflict."[54] Some parents found the embracing of new values a threat to their culture or parental authority, and when conflicts arose, feared going to counselling because they believed therapists from the new culture would side with their children against their parenting styles. In my interview group, however, no one spoke to intergenerational conflict from their own experience. Both Nidia Rivera and María Teresa admitted being more strict and protective than they might have been in Chile: "Here it's different. You get very protective. I was very hard with my children."[55] María Teresa did not go so far as to say that there was a clash of cultures between Chilean parents and Canadian-raised children, but admitted the fear of it had been there. She characterized herself as strict and protective, not giving her children the freedom to get into trouble: "The things that you hear outside of North America, that there's a lot of

---

[54] Roizblatt and Pilowsky, "Forced Migration and Resettlement: Its Impact on Families and Individuals", p. 517-518.
[55] Nidia interview.

drugs, that there are kids that run away from home…I had all of this in my head. So I was very protective, very strict."[56]

In our discussion about generational conflict, Marlinda Freire asserted that it is not just an issue related to forced migration, but a general immigrant problem. She advised that parents needed the flexibility to deal with the different behaviours and attitudes of Canadian-raised children, and identified the issue of children knowing their parents' language as key to mitigating frictions. Marlinda made the effort to ensure that her children could and would speak Spanish at home, as did many other exile parents. She cautioned against forced "Chileanization", however; her experience had shown that "Parents who wanted monocultural [i.e., Chilean] kids ended up with monocultural Canadian kids."

The biggest source of generational conflict that Marlinda observed came when parents preached one way of life while practising another. When children were old enough to recognize the discontinuity between their parents' discourse and actions it would cause them to doubt their parents' honesty:

> The parents talk one way and behave another. So they'd go on about capitalism to their kids, and say "We're in the cradle of capitalism, the poor, poverty…social and economic inequality", but if you take down the boxes [in their closets], you find them packed full of clothes, and thirty different kinds of shampoo in the bathroom. The parents were always buying things because they attained acquisitive power, but telling the kids that capitalism is terrible. How is a child supposed to respond to this?[57]

---

[56] María Teresa interview.
[57] Marlinda interview.

On the other hand, contrary to the generalized portrait of family crisis presented in much of the literature on Chilean exile, several of the people I put the question to declared that the challenges of exile had brought them closer to their partners and children, as Ana stated:

> Maybe we became much closer and very supportive of each other. We have a wonderful relationship and it was from my point of view very positive ...it surprises me a lot as a teacher hearing my students who were born here talk about their families, hearing so many complaints...so many problems between the generations, and we didn't experience that.[58]

Though Ana's marriage failed, in her estimation her relationship with her children was made stronger through facing the trials of exile together. For Eduardo Boza, his bond with his wife was strengthened, while their relationship to their son, born in Canada, was not complicated by exile: "It brought us together. Well, our son is 'Canadian' so he has a different mentality, he didn't participate in any of that [the exile community life]."[59] Examples like these show that while interpersonal problems were often exacerbated by the difficulties of being forced to live outside Chile, not all couples and families ended up divided by the experience. Exile was inordinately hard on many families, and forced all to come to terms with new roles and relationship dynamics, but did not always constitute the death knell for family life or marriage.

As life in exile extended from months to years, with no end in sight, the Chileans of this study at one point or another all had to choose how to cope with their situation. Political activism had helped exiles deal with expatriation and the existential crises it

[58] Ana interview.
[59] Eduardo interview. In Spanish, he said that his son was "*canadiense, entre comillas*" –like saying "he's quote-unquote Canadian". In translating the passage I decided to simply put Canadian in quotations.

caused, while also forging a community where emotional needs could be met and networks could be formed. As long as Chilean exiles were convinced they would soon go home, a recovered sense of identity, purpose and belonging was sufficient to help them through their problems in the short-term. However, the recognition that exile was not transitory led this study's participants to re-evaluate their connection to Canada, and more often than not to begin sinking roots in the country of refuge. These roots took different forms, such as buying a house, restarting a career interrupted by exile, or training for new work activities. In the work sphere, the majority of the twenty-one interviewees achieved high levels of professional integration and success, thus in a sense validating the policy of Canadian immigration authorities of favouring immigrants and refugees who would be of economic utility to the country.

The decision to commit more to life in Canada brought its own set of problems, however. In Canada, as in other parts of the world, exile couples and families faced challenges that forced them to rethink interpersonal relationships and gender roles. In many cases, the strains to relationships caused by life in a new setting with different norms and values combined with other material and psychological issues. The amalgamation of problems led to high levels of divorce that would not have been seen in Chile, given the low rate due to the absence of a divorce law until relatively recently. Even in families that stayed together, the extension of life in exile obliged parents and children to renegotiate how they related to one another, and for women and men to learn new practices and internalize different ideas and expectations about gender roles. More

than economic integration, the question of family stability and human relations proved to be a difficult problem for Chilean exiles, and one that affected their lives on a daily basis.

A more permanent connection to Canada happened at different paces for different individuals and families, but in general Marlinda Friere's three- to five-year timeline quoted earlier in the chapter held true for many of the twenty-one interviewees. To a great degree, economic integration and professional resurrection were successful, providing a level of comfort and satisfaction in an important area of endeavour. At the same time, some Chileans continued to experience instability in their personal lives that resulted from being in exile, facing situations that they likely would not have encountered had they never left Chile. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the people I interviewed had to deal with all the challenges and changes that life in exile entailed.

Even with deeper links to Canada, the idea of returning to Chile still had great resonance for the vast majority of exiles. They continued to denounce the military dictatorship and its human rights abuses, and followed events in Chile with interest and anticipation. Throughout the 1970s and into the following decade, the Pinochet regime seemed to have a firm and brutal grip on power, making the prospect of return remote. However, from 1982 on, the situation in Chile began to change quite suddenly, and the strength of the military regime began to gradually wane. The use of exile as a tool of repression and exclusion began to lose its efficacy, and the regime started to alter its policy under pressure from domestic and foreign sources.[60] After a decade and more of exclusion, the possibility of returning Chile began to grow; but just as establishing roots

[60] Vicaria de la Solidaridad, "Documento de trabajo," 1992, p. 240. CDVS, Exilio, box 30.

in Canada had been a difficult choice, so too would be the decision to go back, or to stay put. The changes to group and individual identity born out of the challenges and changes of exile would complicate what had once been the easiest question to answer: do you want to go home?

Chapter Five

Staying Put or Going Back

The military regime that had excluded hundreds of thousands of Chileans from their homeland came to an end on 11 March 1990, when Christian Democrat Patricio Aylwin was sworn in as the first president to be freely elected since Salvador Allende. How the military came to relinquish power is briefly described in the first section of this chapter; but of greater significance for this study is how the loosening of authoritarian control from the early 1980s on opened up the possibility of a return from exile, and as a result called into question the exile identity that had become part of the participants' sense of self. The dream of going back to Chile had sustained people throughout the years in Canada, and had even served as the justification for acquiring material goods and greater levels of professional qualification, as discussed in the previous chapter. However, when the possibility of return became a reality, nearly two-thirds of those I interviewed – thirteen of twenty-one individuals –made the decision to remain permanently in Canada. Seven attempted to resettle in Chile, of whom four ended up returning to Canada, and one former exile splits his life between the two countries. In this chapter, I examine both sides of the question: why some people attempted to go back to Chile, but also why so many more never did, and what this says about transformations in personal identity related to the changes discussed in the previous chapter. I also discuss the problems returnees faced at different moments in time, as well as their place in contemporary Chilean society. For

some, exile ended the moment they chose to remain in Canada. Paradoxically, some of those who went back discovered in their homecoming a new kind of exile.

To understand the circumstances under which return became possible, it is necessary to look at the decline of military control in Chile. A gradual weakening of the regime's hold on power, spurred by external and domestic developments, opened the door to return from exile for those who had been deemed as unfit for membership in the nation.

The end of exile

In the decade following the coup d'état, the military dictatorship in Chile used state terror to eliminate opponents and quell dissent. However, the regime's near-monolithic political and social control was not immune to forces that reduced its ability to dominate and coerce. The worldwide recession of the early 1980s was felt acutely in Latin America, and Chile was no exception. The unemployment rate increased as the regime's hand-picked economists resigned from their posts, one after another, when their monetarist strategies failed to curb the crisis.[1] In 1982, the deteriorating economic situation provoked the first large-scale public demonstrations since the military takeover, giving rise to a series of National Days of Protest from 1983 to 1986, which regime opponents used to voice opposition to the dictatorship. Instability allowed social advocacy groups such as the Chilean Human Rights Commission and the *Comité Nacional Pro-Retorno de Exiliados* [the National Committee for the Return of Exiles] to emerge and wring

[1] The crisis within the military government caused by the economic issue is nicely summarized in Mary Helen Spooner, *Soldiers in a narrow land: the Pinochet regime in Chile.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994, p. 175-182.

concessions from the regime on the question of exile. Also in 1982, domestic pressure led to the publication of lists of exiles who would be allowed back into the country to ostensibly demonstrate the goodwill of the government.[2] While regime officials sometimes applied this measure arbitrarily and suspended it at their own whim, the publication of the lists marked an important moment in the decline of exile as a form of punishment.[3] It also brought the question into the forum of public discussion, after nearly a decade when many exiles did not know for certain whether they could have returned or not.

For several of the participants, such as Carlos Torres, Alfonso Álvarez and Luis Cortés, this development took place at around the five-year mark of resettlement in Canada, described by Marlinda Freire in the previous chapter as a typical moment of transition among immigrants who begin to view their move as permanent. For all the participants, who had based a large part of their identity around being exiles, the changes in Chile that would allow them to go home again brought them face-to-face with the realization that life in Canada had substantially altered who they were, where they belonged, and how they viewed the world. This constituted a new kind of personal crisis for many participants. Were they still exiles, if exile as a form of punishment no longer had currency? Were they now just another group of immigrants? Were they now more

---

[2] Jaime Llambías-Wolff, "The Voluntary Repatriation Process of Chilean Exiles." *International Migration Review*, Vol. 31, No. 4, 1993, p. 582.

[3] Rody Oñate and Thomas Wright, *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar.* Second edition. Mexico City: Urdimbre, 2002, p. 265-266.

Canadian than Chilean? Or were their identities something else, more complex than an either/or equation?

The definitive end of exile as a juridical method of prohibition came on 27August 1988, with Decrees 1197 and 1198, which stated that all but a small number of those officially exiled would be allowed back into Chile without impediment.[4] This was a strategy of the military regime to appear welcoming and conciliatory immediately before a plebiscite on whether General Pinochet would receive a mandate to continue as president for eight more years, but it proved ineffectual, and the opposition won a surprising victory.[5] The triumph of the No side paved the way for the restoration of democratic rule, albeit with some important concessions to the military to ensure cooperation.[6] In December 1989, the first presidential elections since 1970 were held, with the *Concertación de Partidos por la Democracia* (commonly referred to as la Concertación), a centre-left coalition, winning both a congressional majority and the presidency. In March, 1990, Patricio Aylwin assumed office promising justice for those damaged by military rule, including the exiles: "The State will develop an active policy

[4] Carmen Norambuena Carrasco, "Exilio y retorno: Chile 1973-1994" in Mario Garcés *et al. Memoria para un nuevo siglo: Chile, miradas a la segunda mitad del sigloXX.* Santiago: LOM, 2000, p. 184.
[5] For the ways in which the military regime unsuccessfully attempted to manipulate the campaign, see Mary Helen Spooner, *Soldiers in a Narrow Land: the Pinochet regime in Chile.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994, chapter 9, p. 223-245. The final vote was approximately 56% No, 44% Yes to the proposition that Pinochet's presidential mandate be renewed.
[6] Alexandra Barahona de Brito, "Truth and justice in the consolidation of democracy in Chile and Uruguay." *Parliamentary Affairs,* Vol. 46, No. 4, October 1993. p. 585.

to promote the return of all Chileans to their homeland, creating possibilities for their full integration."[7]

In concrete terms, the new government took measures to facilitate return, such as the establishment of a commission to validate degrees and professional certificates obtained abroad and exempting up to twenty-five thousand dollars worth of belongings acquired in exile from customs duties.[8] The Aylwin administration also established the *Oficina Nacional de Retorno* (National Bureau of Return, henceforth referred to by its Spanish acronym ONR) in August 1990, with a mandate lasting until August 1994.[9] The ONR functioned as a coordinating and referral body, collaborating with "specialized public and international organizations and non-governmental organizations [in] the execution of specific plans, programmes and projects."[10] The ONR directed returning exiles – *retornados* –to bodies such as the *Fundación de Ayuda Social de las Iglesias Cristianas* (Social Assistance Foundation of the Christian Churches, FASIC) for resettlement services for which the ONR provided funding. The ONR was meant to put *retornados* on an equal footing with those who had stayed, in areas such as work and necessities such as housing and health care. Along with Chilean NGOs, the ONR worked with foreign governments such as those of Belgium, Germany, Norway and Sweden, which sponsored

[7] Comité chileno-alemán de solidaridad y por el retorno, "Uno retorno digno y con sobriedad." Federal Republic of Germany, March 1990. CD-FASIC. The quote above is part of the Concertación programme, cited in this document.
[8] Oñate and Wright, *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar*, p. 266.
[9] The ONR was not supplied with operating funds for the 1990 fiscal year because the military government had drafted that year's budget, so it did not begin functioning until 1991. "Informe del Comité ecuménico internacional consultativo sobre refugiados", 20 and 21September 1990, p. 5. CD-FASIC, Collection 4.31.
[10] "Convenio de colaboración entre la Oficina Nacional de retorno y la Fundación de ayuda social de las igelsias cristianas", 16 November 1990, p. 1. CD-FASIC, Collection 4.31.

programmes to assist the reinsertion of exiles who had resided in those countries.[11] The ONR provided referral services for seven main areas: health, education, housing, customs duties, legal advice, work, and welfare.[12] By the time its mandate expired, it had provided assistance to over 56 000 *retornados*.[13] In May, 1994, the UNHCR discontinued the use of the designation "Chilean Exile", given that the situation in the country had normalized and the title was no longer necessary in the international arena.[14]

In short, by the early part of the 1990s, circumstances in Chile allowed for the return of almost all exiles, and the civilian administration took steps to assist in their successful resettlement.[15] For many, the restoration of democratic rule meant the long-cherished goal of return was now a possibility; the long years of exile could finally come to an end.

And yet, the majority of exiles and economic migrants forced from Chile chose not to go back.[16] Given how central the goal of return had been, the question of why people did not to go back must be addressed. What factors affected the decision to remain in Canada, and thus in essence choose to change from a "situation of exile to a situation of

[11] Oficina Nacional de Retorno, "Memoria anual", 1992. Section 11, p. 1-2. CDVS, Exilio, Box 30.
[12] Ibid, Anexo 4, p 1-4.
[13] This number is according to the Oficina Nacional de Retorno, "Informe Final", 1995. Cited in Thomas C. Wright and Rody Oñate, "Chilean Diaspora", in Melvin Ember, Carol R. Ember and Ian Skoggard, eds. *Encyclopedia of Diasporas: Immigrant and Refugee Cultures Around the World.* Vol. 2. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 2004, p. 63. The number only accounts for r*etornados* who made use of the ONR, and does not represent the total number of people who returned from abroad.
[14] *Derechos Chile,* Cronologia 1990-1998. Retrieved August 30, 2012 from http://www.derechoschile.com/espanol/crono4.html.
[15] Initially between 300 and 1 000 exiles were forbidden to return because of past charges of armed resistance. Oñate and Wright, *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar,* p. 260.
[16] Ibid, p. 267. The authors suggest that less than half of the political exiles returned. Even fewer economic migrants seem to have opted to go back. In 1994 "The ONR reported that 700,000 Chileans remained outside the country, while 45,000 had returned since the inauguration of the first transitional democratic government." *Derechos Chile,* Cronologia 1990-1998. Retrieved August 30, 2012 from http://www.derechoschile.com/espanol/crono4.html.

immigration"?[17] The historiography of the Chilean diaspora written since the end of military rule invariably includes an examination of the *retornados,* but little attention is given to why so many Chileans chose to stay where they were. Oñate and Wright, for example, following the argument of Edward Said that exile is a scar that never heals, stress in their study the high incidence of failed *retornados* as evidence of alienation from Chile caused by the restructuring implemented by the military regime, but give little attention to those who remained where they had resettled. The testimony in this chapter of those who remained in Canada helps to fill in this blank space, and shows that the participants had reasons for remaining in Canada that were more complex than simply a sense of alienation from Chile. Practical reasons of economic status and professional activity, along with family considerations, combined with less tangible reasons, such as a sense of no longer belonging in/to Chile or its corollary, belonging more in/to Canada. Participants made the decision to stay in Canada based on a complex set of criteria that involved personal questions of lifestyle and identity, with their relationship to a changed Chile only one of the considerations.

That being said, it is true that many of those who did return found life in their former homeland disappointing and demoralizing, and the process of reinsertion into Chilean society either very difficult or impossible. The Spanish phrase "*El desexilio es un nuevo exilio*" –the return from exile is a new exile –is often used in reference to the realities of

[17] Exile Iván Jaksik, quoted in Oñate and Wright, *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar*, p. 161.

going back.[18] I examine the return issue from a number of angles: whether the attempt was made during military rule or after; the testimonies of those who went back and succeeded in rebuilding their lives in Chile; and the testimonies of those who tried to re-establish themselves in Chile but failed, and ended up back in Canada once again. There are many questions that emerge from both successful and unsuccessful attempts to return. Most fundamentally, why did some people succeed and others fail? When was the decision to return made, and what inspired it? How had Chile changed in the years of their absence? How had the exiles themselves changed? Does exile ever really end?

Desexilio during dictatorship: returning from exile, 1982 to 1990

If exile has a definite start point –11 September 1973 –it is impossible to speak of its end, as the return of the expatriated continues to this day. However, it is possible to examine when the return process began, and how issues surrounding it have changed over time, reflecting political, economic and social circumstances in Chile. For this purpose, the publication of the first regime-approved list of those permitted to return to Chile in 1982 is a key moment in the gradual abandonment of exile as a policy whose efficacy had run its course.

At the same time, the slow reopening of Chile to those who had been forced out often served as a catalyst for choosing to stay put. For people who tested the waters to see if

[18] This phrase is the title of a chapter in Eugenia Meyer and Eva Salgado, *Un refugio en la memoria*. Mexico City: Oceano, 2002, p. 263. The same sentiment is often found expressed in English and French works as well. It was originally enunciated by the Uruguayan writer Mario Benedetti.

return was feasible in the early 1980s, the situation was daunting on several levels. The economic environment was uninviting: an official unemployment rate of 15% greatly complicated reinsertion into the job market.[19] In addition, continuing military rule meant that early *retornados* had to live under a regime that had violated their human rights, forced them from their country and then only allowed them back in on the dictatorship's own terms, "pardoning" exiles for their supposed crimes against the nation.[20] These first trips back for many exiles often erased any illusion of a permanent return.[21] S.V.P. discovered this for herself in 1982, when she found herself effectively blacklisted:

> When I went, I knocked on a lot of doors –I went to the University of Chile, the Catholic University –because I wanted to stay then. I wanted to stay, I had my Master's, and everywhere they shut the door. First question: "Where do you live?" "Canada." "Why did you leave?" "Political asylum." "Are there torture victims in your family? Are there disappeared in your family?" This stuff. All the universities were governed by soldiers. In interviews I had to say 'No, no one tortured", I had to say it. But "We'll contact you", and they never did. The fact of coming from abroad with a Master's degree, it was threatening, and they didn't give me any opportunity.[22]

Early tentative explorations of return often were new moments of crisis, driving home for exiles the realization that the Chile they had left a decade ago no longer existed, and the underpinnings of middle and working class life they remembered had been eliminated

---

[19] Mario Garcés and Nancy Nicholls, *Para una Historia de los Derechos Humanos en Chile: Historia Institucional de la Fundación de Ayuda Social de las Iglesias Cristianas FASIC 1975-1991.* Santiago: LOM, 2005, p. 183.

[20] The psychological ramifications of essentially submitting to the rules of the regime is discussed in Juana Kovalskys, "Exilio y desexilio: una experiencia más de violencia" in Adrianne Aron, ed. *Fuga, exilio y retorno: La salud mental y el refugiado.* San Francisco: The Committee for Health Rights in Central America, 1988, p. 84: "Pardon became the consecration of a crime that was not committed." The inalienable right to live in your country of nationality was replaced by the necessity of obeying the rules of the regime.

[21] The testimony of several Chileans living in Quebec on this issue can be found in José Del Pozo, *Les Chiliens au Québec. Immigrants et réfugiés, de 1955 à nos jours.* Montréal: Boréal, 2009, p. 310-311.

[22] S.V.P. interview. I do not include her as one of the seven who attempted return despite this visit, because she only went for a short time to test the waters and never cut her material ties to Canada.

by the regime's social and economic restructuring projects.[23] The Chile of the pre-coup era was gone: "That which made me feel very Chilean—the values and basic principles of life—had vanished. That society no longer existed."[24]

Testimony from other exiles who resettled in Chile during the 1980s echoes S.V.P.'s experience and extends it to the social level, where rejection from friends and family who had remained behind occurred.[25] Despite these obstacles and disincentives, some did go back: 244 families started the process in 1982-83, with the number of returnees reaching approximately 10 000 by the time civilian rule was restored in 1990.[26] Those who chose to return did not have much structural support to do so, either within Chile or from the governments of the host societies where they had lived. The support that did exist came mostly from non-governmental organizations. There were scholarships from FASIC or the World University Service, resettlement assistance from the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration or the UNHCR, and in some cases health care through the Chilean NGO PIDEE (*la Fundación de Protección a la Infancia Dañada por los Estados de Emergencia*, Foundation for the Protection of Children Damaged by the

[23] Marita Eastmond, *The Dilemmas of Exile: Chilean Refugees in the USA.* Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1997, p. 141-145.
[24] Toronto exile Dr. Raul Berdichevsky, quoted in Joan Simalchik, "The Material Culture of Chilean Exile: A Transnational Dialogue." *Refuge,* Vol. 23, No. 2, June 2006, p. 103.
[25] The most comprehensive examination I encountered regarding the challenges for 1980s *retornados* is María Angélica Celedón and Luz María Opazo, *Volver a empezar.* Santiago: Pehuén, 1987. For example, Maria's testimony on p 58-59 describes how she encountered hostility from former friends and neighbours who believed in the image of golden exile, *exilio dorado,* promulgated by the regime and its supporters. There are many mentions of feeling alienated, excluded and the need for self-censorship to avoid political and social problems throughout the book.
[26] Garcés and Nicholls, *Para una Historia de los Derechos Humanos en Chile: Historia Institucional de la Fundación de Ayuda Social de las Iglesias Cristianas FASIC 1975-1991*, p. 182. The second number is according to the Comité Pro-Retorno de Exiliados, cited in "Informe del Comité ecuménico internacional consultativo sobre refugiados," 20 and 21September 1990, p. 5. CD-FASIC, Collection 4.31. There is no breakdown of where the returnees were coming from.

States of Emergency).[27] By and large, however, early *retornados* were on their own and in hostile terrain.

Manuel Jofré was the first of the interviewees to return on a permanent basis, while the military was still very much in charge. He was working at the University of Toronto and received a postgraduate fellowship in 1982 from the Canadian government to study the question of life under dictatorship in Chile. He had no legal impediments to returning to Chile, and could move about the country without much fear of detention. His fellowship was renewed for a second year, and during that period he decided to stay. His experience of the process illustrates the problem of professional reinsertion during a time when jobs were scarce and the universities were controlled by the military. The lack of stable work in Santiago led him to take part-time work in private universities outside the capital that paid little. Eventually he was hired by a state university in the northern city of La Serena, only achieving his goal of returning to work at the University of Chile after a decade of effort:

> [When] the Concertación won in 1990, we started living in Santiago, and I worked in three or four universities in Santiago, and with some work I recovered my post in the University of Chile. Only six hours at first, and later twelve, until now, now I'm here full-time. So I had an interesting stage of six or seven years in La Serena when I didn't have any professional prospects here in Santiago.

Manuel also discussed the professional stigma of being a *retornado*, and the climate of control that existed in the universities:

---

[27] Garcés and Nicholls, *Para una Historia de los Derechos Humanos en Chile: Historia Institucional de la Fundación de Ayuda Social de las Iglesias Cristianas FASIC 1975-1991*, p. 183; Sociala Missionen-Diakonia, "La problemática del retorno de los refugiados latinoamericanos," p. 27. CD-FASIC, Collection 4.31.; Celedón and Opazo, *Volver a empezar*, p. 39, 54-56, 85. The WUS scholarships were funded by the government of Sweden.

> [I experienced] institutional rejection, more than personal rejection. An institutional rejection of those who received their degrees and training outside of Chile, who couldn't return to the universities they had been in before in Chile...There were many very authoritarian people in the state universities who wouldn't allow people with something in their past to be reintegrated... In the universities, there were subjects and people who you couldn't study. You couldn't study Neruda, Garcia Marquez, Julio Cortazar, the most contemporary literature...So there were certainly thematic restrictions, just as there were restrictions through self-censorship. You couldn't fully express yourself or your thoughts during the last years of the dictatorship, for entire years, because of the orders of the military men who weren't there democratically, they were appointed.

In his case, recovery of his professional standing was a slow but ultimately successful process, but for many of his colleagues, returning to Chile simply was not realistic:

> The unemployment rate is nine or ten percent, so the people who come from abroad –they come very well educated, I know of fifty people with doctorates in my field who have come back from Holland, France, the United States, Canada –and they've had to go back to those countries. There are also people who lived in exile in Canada and managed to save some money, but came here and couldn't find work, and they're better off being in Canada than here.[28]

Word of mouth from early retornados like Manuel Jofré and news reports about political unrest and the unwelcoming attitude toward potential returnees further dampened enthusiasm for going back. Jorge Etcheverry made no attempt at return; friends who had gone back told him about the lack of respect for exiles, the prevalence of the perception that they were living an *exilio dorado* –a golden exile –and the difficulty in finding work.[29] An investigative report in the Chilean weekly *Hoy* in 1987 explored the reasons why so few Chileans were returning home. Between 1983 and 1986, only 708 of 7034 returnees ended up staying in the country due to political, economic and professional obstacles. These were described as: political insecurity; discrimination in the

---

[28] Manuel interview.
[29] Jorge interview.

job market and in education; the lack of health coverage; the lack of housing, thus necessitating living with relatives; the lack of recognition for professional titles and university studies completed abroad; and high customs duties for bringing back possessions from overseas.[30] While many of these concerns would be addressed by the ONR, until that happened, the prospect of abandoning a life of relative comfort and stability in Canada for uncertainty in Chile served as a powerful incentive to staying put.

Why then go back at all, if the circumstances and environment were so hostile to successful reintegration? No doubt there were a wide variety of personal reasons for deciding to go back in the 1980s, but they largely involve three interrelated factors: the desire to be part of the fight against the military regime, nostalgic reasons relating to people and places, and the goal among *retornados* of rediscovering a disrupted national identity.[31] For exiles in some countries, there were also material issues relating to a lack of work opportunities that led them to return to Chile, a problem that became increasingly acute for those in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union as the Communist bloc declined throughout the 1980s.[32] Because exiles had not willingly chosen to leave, many felt a strong urge to reclaim their homeland and to reassert their vision of what the country should be through meaningful political activity. What they more often found was another punishment like that of the original expatriation: a radically changed country where they were neither welcomed nor supported. A decade of authoritarian rule had restructured

[30] Maria Irene Soto, "De vuelta a casa." *Hoy*, No. 524, 3-9August, 1987, p. 21.
[31] Norambuena Carrasco, "Exilio y retorno: Chile 1973-1994", p. 181-182.
[32] Mili Rodríguez Villouta, *Ya nunca me veras como me vieras.* Santiago: Ornitorrinco, 1990, p. 14. Rodríguez describes those coming back from Argentina as poor as when they left; those from Eastern Europe, well-educated but without any money; while the 30 000 in Sweden would not be coming back, due to their wealth and the generosity of their host country.

Chile in such fundamental ways that the country was almost unrecognizable. Pragmatic, technocratic education had replaced the humanist curriculum exiles had known as students and teachers, materialistic individualism had trumped collective projects, and ambivalence to political and social issues had replaced the radical activism of pre-coup Chile.[33] The depoliticizing of Chile meant the absence of the party structures they were used to, so returning activists no longer knew how to channel their opposition and had to learn the "codes of behaviour" for operating in a police state that had become second nature to those who had stayed behind.[34] One returnee commented on how reconnecting with family and friends was complicated by this code, rendering many conversations frivolous and superficial and reflecting a change in the values and interests of Chileans who had endured life under the dictatorship.[35] Finally, in terms of reasserting their particular kind of Chilean identity, some early returnees instead found themselves silenced by the disinterest in their experience of exile of those around them, or they engaged in a form of self-censorship to avoid making observations that could cause problems or hurt feelings, especially when they involved criticism of Chile.[36]

Early-stage *retornada* Luisa also testified that her family could not or would not see the changes exile had caused in her, and simply assumed she had done well while living in a wealthy European country.[37] Her account is evidence of the effectiveness of the

[33] These observations about the changes in Chilean society after 1973 come from a 1987 survey summarized in Pamela Constable and Arturo Valenzuela's *A Nation of Enemies: Chile under Pinochet*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1991, p. 267-269.
[34] Kovalskys, "Exilio y desexilio: una experiencia más de violencia", p. 85.
[35] This was an observation made by Antonia in Celedón and Opazo, *Volver a empezar*, p. 125-127.
[36] The habit of self-censorship is mentioned by both Luisa and Fabiola in ibid, p. 33, 167.
[37] Ibid, p. 35.

regime's depiction of exiles as living the good life while abroad in one of its milder forms; certainly other *retornados* encountered more outright expressions of disdain or hostility from fellow Chileans who accepted the government-backed, media-diffused myth of *exilio dorado*, golden exile. Consciously conceived as a strategy to counter the denunciation campaigns of exiles throughout the world, the depiction of exile as voluntarily accepted by its victims undermined the returnees' legitimacy in the eyes of people who had stayed behind.[38] Exiles were depicted as little more than frustrated terrorists, and they generated very little interest or sympathy among those who believed the regime's propaganda.[39] The manifold ways in which exiles had suffered were not recognized, often even by their own family members. Their difficult experiences did not garner them any medals in what one high-profile exile referred to as the "Olympics of suffering" Chileans engaged in to prove who endured more at the hands of the regime.[40] *Exilio dorado* was even sometimes believed by people on the political left, who resented *retornados* speaking new languages, with new degrees or training from prestigious foreign institutions, and in some cases a greater level of material wealth than those who had remained in Chile and carried on the fight against the dictatorship.[41] Even those who did not find *retornados* objectionable still exhibited little to no interest in the experiences of the exiles; rather, there was more curiosity about what material goods they brought

[38] Vicaria de la Solidaridad, "Documento de trabajo," 1992, p. 236-237. CDVS, Exilio, box 30.
[39] Ibid, p. 285.
[40] This phrase was used by Carlos Jorquera, Allende's press secretary. Mili Rodríguez Villouta, *Ya nunca me verás como me vieras: Doce testimonios vivos del exilio.* Santiago: Ediciones del Ornitorrinco, 1990, p. 261.
[41] Katherine Roberts Hite, "Chile: A Rough Road Home." *NACLA Report on the Americas*, Vol. XXIV, No. 5, February 1991, p. 6-7.

back.[42] Those who attempted return while the dictatorship was still in control faced a society that was largely hostile or indifferent to them and a material situation that was unpromising at best.

Choosing between Canada and Chile after 1990

After 1990, some of the important justifications for staying in Canada rather than attempting to return were no longer applicable, and yet the majority of people involved in this study decided to stay. In examining why exiles chose to remain in Canada, a number of reasons stand out: the economic feasibility of return; the effect return would have on family cohesion; the pursuit of a life project based on professional or artistic activity; and an increasing sense of attachment to life in Canada. Short-term visits to Chile aimed at testing the feasibility of return, like that of S.V.P. described earlier, often ended up spurring greater integration into Canadian society. After the return process began in the early 1980s, word of mouth and advice from family, friends and colleagues in Chile also influenced the decision to remain in Canada. For a significant number of this study's participants, the reasons for continuing to live in Canada outweighed the desire to reclaim a place in Chile. In the case of Canada and several other sheltering nations, *retornados* – successful or not –are the minority.[43] What were the reasons nearly two-thirds of the exiles I spoke with decided to stay? In this choice, they acted much like other immigrant groups that chose a permanent presence in Canada over a sojourner experience, but how

---

[42] Oñate and Wright, *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar*, p. 279.
[43] The rate of return has also been low for Sweden, the United Kingdom and Australia, according to a 2003-2004 study of Chilean exile communities throughout the world. José Del Pozo, ed. *Exiliados, emigrados y retornados: chilenos en América y Europa, 1973-2004*. Santiago: RIL Editores, 2006, p. 195-200.

do we account for it when, as María Teresa told me, the Chilean exiles were always singing "*Y volver, volver, volver*"?[44]

Even with the return of democratic rule and ONR resettlement measures, the amelioration in these conditions was not enough to convince most people to return, as there was still no guarantee of financial security. In studies of Chilean exiles throughout the world, such as those in Sweden, the matter of economic stability looms large in explaining why people stayed in their countries of refuge.[45] The inability to make a living and provide for a family was a large disincentive for returning to Chile, and made the relative economic stability of life in Canada more attractive. Several participants cited economic reasons as one justification for staying, sometimes combined with other factors, such as family considerations and continuing work activities. Eduardo Boza was blunt in his explanation of why he remained in Canada: "I'm very pragmatic, I said there was no way I could go back, there was nothing for me to do…What am I going to do there? We have our little house, the family, grandchildren, so we're good."[46] For his part, Alfredo Lavergne eventually did go back to Chile, but not for many years after the restoration of civilian rule. When I asked him why he had stayed after 1990, he mentioned both financial and personal motivations: "Because everything was really good. I felt good, I

[44] María Teresa interview. *Volver* means to go back or return. With regard to other immigrant groups facing similar choices, Gilberto Fernandes, Director of the Portuguese Canadian History Project, explained to me that questions of economic uncertainty and political instability in Portugal in the 1970s and 1980s, combined with a sense of rootedness in Canada, kept Portuguese migrants who had seen themselves as sojourners from returning to Portugal in substantial numbers after the end of the Salazar regime in 1974. Gilberto Fernandes to Francis Peddie, personal communication, May 17, 2012.
[45] Martin Klinthäll, "Refugee Return Migration: Return Migration from Sweden to Chile, Iran and Poland, 1973-1996." *Journal of Refugee Studies,* Vol. 20, No. 4, 2007, p. 583. Klinthäll also identifies the ability to make a decent standard of living as an incentive for Chileans to remain in Sweden, along with the civil rights and state structures of the country.
[46] Eduardo interview.

had my job, I was writing literature, I had my world. And I knew immigrating, returning to Chile, wasn't just going back to your own culture, like you're just some guy on the street. It was another immigration, something very tough, and I knew it would be tough."[47]

With the end of the military regime, some exiles hoped to return so that they could help rebuild democracy in Chile, but they balanced this dream against a realistic assessment of what opportunities were available to them.[48] Those who did not have a clear idea of how they would play a useful role in Chilean society tended to stay in Canada, as Jaime Llambías-Wolff observed: "Statistically speaking, you will only go back if you have political involvement. But for working, who would leave a university in Canada, or Sweden, or being an engineer, or being a doctor, just to be the same thing there? Unless you know that your contribution socially –not in terms of your profession, socially –makes a difference."[49]

The conjunction between economic or professional considerations and a sense of purpose can be seen in Carlos Torres' decision to remain in Canada. His testimony also shows that the dependence on word of mouth accounts from friends and colleagues both in Canada and Chile played an important part in the choice between going or staying. After the military government ended, he visited Chile several times in a professional capacity, working with unions and speaking at cultural events and conferences, but was dissuaded from resettling: "A friend said, 'Did you study? Did you finish anything?' And

[47] Alfredo interview.
[48] Del Pozo, *Les Chiliens au Québec. Immigrants et réfugiés, de 1955 à nos jours*, p. 308.
[49] Jaime interview.

I said no. 'Do you have a lot of money?' 'No, I don't have either'. So she said, 'You can come, you can try to come back, but then you're going to end up going back to Canada.'" He decided he would remain in Canada until there was a real possibility of successfully returning to Chile, both from a financial perspective and in terms of having something to accomplish: "So my sense was that I had to get something, so I went back to school...I studied Political Science, I did a Master's, and now I'm going back in about two weeks [from the date of our first interview in Toronto]...Now I have the conditions both financially and academically...Because I was a political prisoner I have a scholarship and a pension for life that will allow me to do my thing.[50]" When I interviewed Carlos a second time in Santiago approximately a year and a half after our first session, he partially attributed the success of his resettlement up to that point to financial stability and the personal satisfaction of having a useful project to work on.[51]

While the lack of a meaningful reason for returning to Chile may have influenced some people, the existence of a fulfilling professional life in Canada was also a factor. Marlinda Freire cited her sense of professional and personal satisfaction in Canada as a strong reason to stay:

> I think I'm a lucky person in the sense of finding a life project that's allowed me to feel like I'm contributing to the Chilean population in particular, the Latin American community in general, and the rest of the refugees of the world, because I work a lot with refugees, it's my day-to-day work. So I wasn't left without a project. A lot of very political people, highly educated, didn't know how to give what they could in a country like Canada. But this wasn't my case...I worked with

[50] Carlos 1 interview.
[51] Interview number two by author with Carlos Torres, Santiago, April 11, 2010 (henceforth Carlos 2 interview). Interview in Spanish.

> the poor in Chile…but arriving here I continued to work with the poor, with people with big needs, so I could not only repeat that but show my ability to work. So I never had that conflict…that extreme frustration that I could have done this or that…I never saw the necessity of going back.[52]

In some cases, it was not so much a specific project, as the sense of having a better life in exile : "I didn't want to lose what I'd worked hard to build," stated one commentator, "I had a job I liked, I'd furnished our home, I had friends and my children were in a good school. Why return to Chile when things were so bad politically and economically?"[53] Beyond these kinds of practical considerations, José Del Pozo observed that there was the recognition that some Canadian values were superior to those in Chile, such as less authoritarianism in raising children, greater freedom for personal development, and more opportunities for people who would likely struggle in Chile, such as single mothers.[54] Life in Canada had many positive aspects that became part of participants' identities, especially pertaining to questions of tolerance and inclusion, as S.V.P. observed:

> [Canada is] a country of opportunities. In fact, when we arrived, we all worked in marginal jobs…like maids, factories, cleaning…You didn't do this in Chile. You passed the factory, you didn't go in it! Here I was a worker, a line worker, and I had to live with people from all over, for how Canada is, very multicultural, live with people from many ethnicities. This enriches you as a person. Being more multicultural, we're more tolerant, we're more respectful of beliefs, religions. We're more respectful of the sexuality of other people…So we've learned how to grow as people. We've matured, and of course we appreciate that Chile isn't better than everywhere else in the world.[55]

---

[52] Marlinda interview.
[53] Quoted in Loreto Rebolledo, "Mujeres exiliados con Chile en la memoria". Centro de Estudios Miguel Enríquez-Archivo Chile, p. 6. The speaker of the quote is not identified. This article was downloaded from www.archivochile.com/Mov_socialesmov_mujeresMSmovmujeres0018.pdf.

[54] José Del Pozo, "Exilio e identidad: El caso de los chilenos de Montreal, Canadá. Observaciones preliminares." *Revista Universum,* No. 17, 2002, p. 79.
[55] S.V.P. interview.

Marlinda Freire also discussed her attachment to the way of life in Canada as a factor in remaining while critiquing the levels of inequality she sees in Chile:

> It's very peculiar, because I feel much safer here in Canada. Because life is different in Chile. There are all the new [social] models, there is a lot of social and economic inequality. Like if I go into a store, and men come in after me, they get served first. And women with lighter skin than me, who don't have the indigenous features that I have, they will be served first. And these things haven't been dealt with, so there is quite a bit of racism, quite a bit of division, quite a bit of discrimination. And it bothers them if I say so, but it's true...So you go, and do the stuff you need to do, but I personally won't ever go back to live in Chile.[56]

Prolonged exile life in Canada meant people became used to different ways of living, and integrated new attitudes and behaviours into their identities that complicated their relationship to their country of birth. The reunion with Chile that had been so eagerly anticipated during exile sometimes proved to be a profound disappointment that influenced the choice of staying: as one exile pointed out, "After fifteen years, Chilean society had changed and so had we."[57] Jaime Llambías-Wolff described his personal experiences of this phenomenon during our interview and his dislike for certain aspects of Chilean life, especially the lack of trust between people, cheating in business, and the lack of respect for civil rights. He observed that "I'm much more Canadian now" in his personal behaviours, such as respecting queues, paying debts, telling the truth, speaking frankly, and honouring his commitments:

> And the more you stay in those countries, like Canada or Sweden, the more you become adapted to Canadian or Swedish life, and you expect things that you will never get there [in Chile]...I don't even want to work there, because, you know, it just creates more problems because I don't feel comfortable in working

---

[56] Marlinda interview.

[57] Maria Eugenia Saul, quoted in Del Pozo, *Les Chiliens au Québec. Immigrants et réfugiés, de 1955 à nos jours*, p. 309.

> relations…I'm always fighting about the nature of working relationships, professional relationships. And also in terms of social life. You know, most of the people…[exiles coming back] from Canada or Sweden or Europe, they also have the same reading, you know, it's a society that doesn't respect civil rights, it's a society that has very little civic education, respect for the environment. Freedom of speech, in the sense of a complete freedom of speech. It's not just repressing people, it's being able to understand the necessity of pluralism and diversity, tolerance, all those so-called Canadian values that we have learned, and we don't necessarily have them [in Chile].[58]

Another important consideration for exiles was what return would mean to the family unit. A Swedish study concluded that exiles with children born or mostly raised in the country of refuge were less likely to return, and that the citizenship of spouses was also an important variable.[59] Other reports showed that it could be a divisive issue both between couples and also for parents and children.[60] Native-born spouses and many children of exiles felt loyal to the country of refuge, and had little or no connection to Chile.[61] A number of participants cited family unity as the main reason they did not go back. For Alfonso Álvarez, health questions and financial worries played their part, but so too did considerations of his partner, whose family is in Canada.[62] Marcela Duran recognized the effect return would have on her children, and this combined with professional reasons to keep her family in Canada:

> It was very clear that we couldn't break our kids' hearts…I knew very well that you cannot uproot a fourteen-year-old, and so we decided if we were going to return and re-establish ourselves our kids had to be in university at least, and they're six years apart, so that makes it difficult….On the other hand it was economically

---

[58] Jaime interview. Despite his lack of desire to work in Chile, Jaime does spend half the year there running a hotel with his partner, and the rest of the year in Canada.
[59] Klinthäll, "Refugee Return Migration: Return Migration from Sweden to Chile, Iran and Poland, 1973-1996", p. 590-591.
[60] Arturo Roizblatt and Daniel Pilowsky, "Forced Migration and Resettlement: Its Impact on Families and Individuals". *Contemporary Family Therapy,* Vol. 18, No. 4, December 1996, p. 518.
[61] Ibid, p. 519.
[62] Alfonso interview.

unwise. And to even imagine to re-establish ourselves while it was still Pinochet, the universities would not have hired us.[63]

In one case, the decision to split the family between Chile and Canada contributed to the permanent rupture between the couple. Nidia Rivera's brief return encapsulates all the reasons why some chose to stay in Canada. She went back for three months in 1993, joining her husband, who had already gone, but leaving behind three of her four children. She had no success in finding a job, and felt alienated from both her husband and her country of birth, so she chose to return to Canada to be with her children.[64]

In the final analysis, for many of the participants forced relocation to Canada ended up being a journey from being an exile to effectively becoming an immigrant. As time passed, many of the interviewees recreated stable, satisfying professional lives like the ones they had started in Chile, and experienced changes to identity and their sense of belonging that inexorably tied them to their new home. Their pasts were in Chile, but their present and future lay more in Canada. While their story is often peripheral in examinations of the Chilean diaspora, it forms an important part of the broader exile experience, and illustrates that people do not have to return to the land that expelled them to cease being exiles.

Going back to a new Chile

While some participants ceased to be exiles the moment they chose to remain in Canada, it can also be argued that in some ways exile continued for those who went back

[63] Marcela interview.
[64] Nidia interview.

to Chile. Reunion with the homeland was not the remedy to the need to reconnect with their past that afflicted so many exiles. In this section, the return stories of the study participants show the many complications surrounding going back to Chile and "ending" exile after 1990. Like return migrants of other nationalities, they had to come to terms with a society that had changed in their absence; but for returning exiles, there were additional problems involving their relationship to a country where they had been declared unfit for membership in the national family, and continued to be viewed with a degree of mistrust and misunderstanding. These experiences illustrate the fact that those who were forced out by the military regime have since been engaged in a constant struggle to prove their right to be part of the nation, which has not ended with the restoration of democratic rule. The changes imposed on Chilean society by the military government have often meant that *retornados* are still in a very real sense exiles: while physically restored to their country, they are still marginalized from its past and present. The exiles have become the ignored and forgotten casualties of the battle for Chile.

In the case of three of the study participants, the changes they encountered in Chile on their return and the lack of recognition or sympathy for the traumas of exile they had experienced led them to once again leave the land of their birth and return to Canada. Belonging is still denied them, but now through marginalization and rejection that is the legacy of military rule, rather than a conscious policy of exclusion. Instead of healing the wounds caused by exile, the re-encounter with Chile provoked new traumas and suffering.

On the other hand, two of the people I interviewed in Santiago had successfully re-established themselves in Chile in the 2000s and told me a great deal about what made for a successful return process. They also reflected on the issues associated with being a former exile in a society where their presence is a constant reminder of a difficult, unresolved past. While their experiences share some common features with the unsuccessful attempts at resettling in Chile, they also serve to illustrate the ways in which life in exile has contributed to the growth of new and different identities that have helped people deal with the "new exile" of return.

The end of military rule did little to change the social and economic stigma that was attached to being a returnee. The sensitivity of the Aylwin administration to the needs of returnees was not matched by the business and professional communities. These two groups continued to view former exiles as either a threat to order or as unwanted competition in a difficult labour market.[65] Far from being a joyous re-encounter with Chile, the attempt to go home often ended in failure, disappointment, and another moment of crisis similar to that of the original exile. Jaime Llambías-Wolff offered his view on what stood in the way of successful return, underlining the economic and social problems *retornados* still had to deal with in the 1990s: "Money was the first problem. Working opportunities...Second, the typical nostalgic problem, I mean, once you have it, then you forget about it. So actually after two months, or six months, you know, it's not that great. You get used to it." To explain the rejection of *retornados* on a social level, he

[65] Oficina Nacional de Retorno, "Memoria anual", 1992. Section II, p. 3. CDVS, Exilio, Box 30.; Norambuena Carrasco, "Exilio y retorno: Chile 1973-1994", p. 183.

explained to me the Chilean idiom *chacateo*, meaning to pull someone down by the bottom of their jacket. By standing out, *retornados* became the target of those who were jealous of their success and achievements, who attempted to "pull them down" by attributing the success of the returnee to luck or connections rather than ability. He told me an anecdote about one of his friends who encountered a typical Catch-22 situation that affected many *retornados*: if they came back richer and better qualified than when they left, they were the objects of jealousy and vulnerable to accusations of having lived an exilio dorado.[66] Yet if they came back largely empty-handed, literally and figuratively, they were criticized by people who declared that they could have done better with their opportunities.[67] The rediscovery of a sense of belonging in the Chilean nation was much more difficult than exiles had anticipated. Those who came back and those who had stayed behind were essentially speaking two different languages, leading to misunderstanding and miscommunication that has been described by psychiatrist Juana Kovalskys as a "monologue in two voices".[68]

With the closure of the ONR in 1994, government assistance for *retornados* came to an end, but the movement of exiles back to Chile did not. However, as we shall see with the cases of Carlos Torres and Alfredo Lavergne, the reasons for returning that had prompted earlier attempts –such as participating in the restoration of democracy, or restoring a lost sense of identity –became less important, and expectations of what the *retornados* would find became more informed by the realities of post-dictatorship Chile.

[66] Jaime interview.
[67] This phenomenon is described by Canadian exile Francisco Ruiz in Oñate and Wright, *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar*, p. 275.
[68] Kovalskys, "Exilio y desexilio: una experiencia más de violencia", p. 87.

Nevertheless, many returnees continued to find themselves on the margins of Chilean society over a decade after the end of military rule.[69] Even though *retornados* are recognized by the post-dictatorship political system as having been subjects of persecution eligible for certain benefits –such as scholarships for political prisoners, pensions for *exonerados*, and reparation payments for torture victims –official recognition has not amounted to acceptance or an easy reinsertion into the Chilean society and workforce.[70]

Of the people I interviewed for this project, Manuel Jofré, Alfredo Lavergne and Carlos Torres now live in Santiago and can be considered successful retornados, while three others –Luis Cortés, Willy Behrens and Patricia Godoy –made efforts to resettle in Chile that ended with their return to Canada. Examining their testimonies gives us an idea of how the issues surrounding return affected *desexiliados* in concrete ways.

After Manuel Jofré, Luis Cortés was the next of the participants to try resettling, and the first to do so after the return of civilian rule. He returned in 1990 with the help of the International Red Cross and the ONR, optimistic about building a better Chile:

> There was the possibility for us to go back. The government was conscious of opening the doors so all of us who were in different countries, in different conditions, could go back. So I went as part of a programme… When I went in

[69] Comité de Retornados del exilio-Chile, "Seminario Encuentro Metropolitano de Retornados del Exilio." Santiago, 2003, p. 5. CDVS, Exilio, box 32.
[70] Brian Loveman and Elizabeth Lira, "Truth, Justice, Reconciliation and Impunity as Historical Themes: Chile, 1814-2006." *Radical History Review*, No. 97, Winter 2007. The authors place the National Truth and Reconciliation Commission (1990 – 91) and the National Commission on Political Prisoners and Torture (2003 – 5) in the context of reconciliation and reparation policies from the earliest years of independence up to the present day. Reparation efforts in the post-coup era have included pensions, free health care, scholarships and reincorporation for some into professional and political possessions lost due arbitrary military decisions. See p. 47-48, 52, 63-64, 66-67.

> 1990, I thought the government recognized the condition of the returnees...I was very enthusiastic for the process. I participated in the commission, the Rettig Commission, where you talked about your situation, what had happened to you.[71]

Luis talked about the advantages some returnees had because of their professions or the countries they were returning from, and mentioned some of the shortcomings of the resettlement assistance programme:

> The people who reintegrated the fastest were the ones who came with their professions, because they worked in the same field, but for those who didn't...So they made a commission to help these people [the ONR]... For example, they gave me a document for medical care in hospitals...this was called PRAIS [*Programa de Reparación y Atención Integral de Salud*, the Integrated Health Care and Reparations Programme, available to torture victims and former political prisoners]. This was for me and my children...It was a help, but it was very discriminatory, you see, and the majority of Chileans wanted more concrete assistance, something more complete like a full-time job, or an apartment when they arrived, assurances. Many people were there for a year, two years, three years, and went back to the country that gave them asylum. Many.

Luis received a certain amount of structural support, but he also had projects in mind. He soon joined a worker's group and embarked on a five-year project dealing with criminality. He found that he was treated well by his family, even by some siblings who had supported the coup. However, he encountered other barriers. For one, Luis found himself in a new setting: "My experience was that I had never lived in the capital, so I felt a lot of solitude." He also found getting recognized by the Chilean government as a true *desexiliado* a long and frustrating process. He experienced problems sorting out the paperwork for getting official identification documents and even a driver's license. It took five years before he was recognized as a returnee. In his new union, he also had to

[71] The National Commission for Truth and Reconciliation, established by the Aylwin administration to report on human rights abuses committed during the military dictatorship, often called the Rettig Comission after its chairperson, Raúl Rettig. The report of the commission was published in February, 1991.

deal with jealousy over money issues and combat the idea of *exilio dorado*. He recounted to me how he would deal with this accusation:

> "You believe this, but it isn't so. There it's a country like any other. You have to work. You see me like this because I took care of myself....I worked hard." I saw that it went right over the heads of some of my friends...I would go around asking people "What do you need? How can I help?" because I always offered my hand in solidarity, socially. It wasn't to say, "Look, I've got money", but some people thought so.

The lack of understanding of his past as an exile was not what drove him back to Canada, however. During the course of the project he was engaged in, which involved reforming criminals, he was assaulted in a Santiago *población*, leaving him physically and psychologically unable to continue his work. The lack of a meaningful project and a situation of economic instability ultimately led him and his partner to return to Canada in 2002. They experienced difficulties surviving on the pensions they had due to the high cost of living in Santiago, and found being back in Chile tough on their health. In Canada, Luis can get more help for the depression he suffers as a result of his experiences of torture and exile, feels safer and healthier, has a job, and a sense of mission in his work for Casa Salvador Allende in Toronto.[72] For Luis Cortés, the identity of the exile, connected to the dreams and goals of the Unidad Popular nearly forty years since the coup d'état, continues to give his life meaning that he could not rediscover in Chile.[73]

---

[72] Luis interview.

[73] As of June 2012, Luis Cortés continues to be involved with Casa Salvador Allende as Culture and Social Director. The mission statement of the organization reveals that some of the original political goals of Chilean community organizations continue to have influence among current members, who are often from the first exile wave: "Casa Salvador Allende-Toronto is an organization whose objectives are to: Develop a sense of belonging for the Toronto Chilean community and to facilitate integration into Canadian society; Provide a space for participation by members of the Chilean-Canadian community and Latin America to

Manuel Jofré's earlier observations regarding the slim professional prospects for most *retornados* are reflected in the experience of Willy Behrens, who decided to leave Ottawa with his wife and one of his two daughters in early 1993. He did not mince words when it came to assessing his attempt at resettlement: "It was a disaster, an emotional and economic disaster, very frustrating. Things have changed in Chile, economic considerations rule. Everyone wants a car." A biochemist with an extensive resume, his work experience made him overqualified for many of the jobs he applied for in Chile, and he encountered hostility and jealousy from other scientists and academics who thought he was trying to replace them: "I felt bad when people found out that I'd come to apply for work, and they'd look at me in a tremendously hostile way because I was trying to take away the position that they had. So instead of being friendly towards me they became very aggressive, and it wasn't nice at all." Willy encountered the suspicion of returnees in the workplace, as well: "At a private university I went to, the first thing they asked me was 'When did you leave Chile?', because that would determine which side I was on." At one private university, the rector told him they didn't want any *retornados* because they were communists.

In his experience, the hostility toward *desexiliados* meant that less qualified candidates were given jobs before him: "I was beaten out by two people, recent graduates in Chile, who had no experience on their resumes or anything. And you can't complain to

---

identify commonalities that allow us to work in building the Canada we want; Organize briefings on matters of civil rights of Chileans abroad; Promote respect and understanding of traditional values of our country of origin in the new generation of Chilean-Canadian [sic]; Work and promote solidarity activities for respect of human rights, social justice and democracy in Chile and the world." Statement retrieved August 30, 2012 from Casa Salvador Allende website, http://casasalvadorallende.com/?page_id=2.

anybody or anything, you just hit a wall, it's all done in secret." While the politically discharged *exonerados* had the right to reclaim the positions from which they had been summarily dismissed, Willy had been in Canada at the time of the coup, so he had no former post. He also found working conditions and the professional practices of Chileans shocking: a lack of laboratory space and equipment, no investment from the government in education, and bureaucratic inefficiency and rudeness in the institutions to which he applied. After a year and a half of fruitless searching, he gave up and went back to Canada; his partner and daughter had gone back a half-year earlier, also frustrated by their experiences at work and in school, respectively. For Willy, the deciding factor was professional, and hence economic, marginalization: "If I'd found work I would have stayed, because as bad as it was, I still loved Chile." In the end, the changes that had occurred in his former homeland left him permanently excluded: "There was no place for me in Chile, so I came back to Canada."[74]

Patricia Godoy decided to go back in 1996, when the legal aid clinic where she worked was shut down. She saw this as the moment to resettle in Chile, so she went back with her partner. Like other failed *retornados*, she had problems with the rules surrounding reparations for exiles. Because her father had been in the navy, she had his pension from the Armed Forces and the right to health care in navy hospitals, but was not eligible for the benefits promised to *exonerados* because she had not worked for ten years before leaving, as the law regarding reappointment stipulated. She also had to confront the lack of understanding from those who had stayed behind, even among her own family.

[74] Willy interview.

She would eventually leave Chile, demoralized by the attempt to reconnect with her homeland:

> I didn't feel right in Chile…I was involved in the neighbourhood association, I worked a lot on that. I tried to change the way of thinking there in Chile, but the people looked at me like I was crazy…In the area [where she resettled] most people were on the right. I made friends there with a woman who had been in exile in Italy, she was the only friend I had in that area. And my family, well, I'd always been the black sheep, so I'd always been different in every way…So in the end we went to Guatemala.

In her case, it was less a question of the resentment felt toward *retornados* than the sense of profound disappointment in what Chile had become that drove Patricia away: "Chile's a very hypocritical country…It's all smiles, but you don't know. They look down on you. It's all about money…There were lots of people who supported Pinochet, tons, you can't even believe it." In addition, she suffered both physical and mental health issues while there: depression, a thyroid condition, and chronic fatigue syndrome. When she returned to Canada after a few years living in Guatemala, Patricia had to depend on the solidarity of others to get back on her feet, just as she had in 1973: "Everything I have here, with the exception of my bed and a few things, was given to me by my friends when I came back." More than thirty years later, Patricia was still dealing with the upheaval of being an exile.[75]

Alfredo Lavergne had been back in Chile for five years at the time of our interview in April 2010, and had to that point been a successful *retornado* with a fulfilling artistic project, working in the Chilean Writers' Society. He had waited until long after the restoration of democracy to go back, but eventually the longing to live in an environment

[75] Patricia interview.

where he could speak his own language led this man of letters to go home, a decision that was galvanized by an unpleasant encounter in Montreal in December 2004. He had been told to "Go home, you fucking immigrant" after bumping into a person on the street, and then and there decided he did not want to live anymore as outsider and target of underlying racism. His readjustment to Chile has not been entirely smooth, however, as his words reveal:

> I've been here five years, and only after three years did I really begin to reintegrate. In Canada it only took me two years to learn the language and land a so-so job, here it took me three! My integration into Chile was longer than in Canada, because I came back to a very different Chile, a very changed Chile, a Chile with a project very different from that before the coup d'état, and different from that of the dictatorship.

Attempting to escape the problems of being an immigrant in Canada, Alfredo discovered that his status as a *desexiliado* rendered him an alien in his own country of birth:

> It was a bit difficult at first, because when I left, I went to Québec as an immigrant, but I came back here as a *retornado.* It's not easy being a *retornado*. You could have published eleven or twelve books abroad, and have a lot of literary contacts, but to be a *retornado* is to be marked as an immigrant. You're not recognized because you didn't do it here, because of the defensiveness and denial that's part of the literary world here. It was really difficult. I remember the first year being very difficult. I was continually suffering the culture [shock] of the *retornado.*

He talked about how *retornados* had played a big role in the Aylwin government but less since, and how it had become common to blame problems in government on returnees and look at them as immigrants. I asked him if the rejection of the *retornado* extended to artists, including writers like him:

> Yes. It's not a personal thing. We have a lot to offer, those of us who were exiled, which you see clearly when we're talking about intellectuals, the literary world. We have people who were in Ottawa like Manuel Jofré… He's working as an academic,

> which is fine, but he doesn't have the recognition that he deserves because of being a *retornado*. Or Naín Nomez, who left at the beginning, who worked in Ottawa with Jorge Etcheverry. Here she's been published in some anthologies, but she isn't as widely recognized as she deserves to be. I think the country has been very slow in recognizing them.

Alfredo feels that his years abroad had given him a different view of what is logical and sensible. He holds opinions which others have trouble understanding because they have not lived what he has. During our interview, he was open about what he found disconcerting about the Chile to which he had returned: a parochial attitude that put Chile at the centre of the world and denigrated the people around them, especially Peruvians and Bolivians; the almost total lack of government involvement in the economy and even the vital infrastructure of the country; and a culture of impunity at the highest levels, in which supposedly open, democratic administrations continue to act as though they were not answerable to their own citizens.[76] These criticisms of Chile did not mean that he regretted his decision to return, but they did show that he was looking at the world around him through eyes influenced by values and ideas learned in Canada, rather than through the rosy lens of nostalgia. He had come to terms with the fact that "the fantasized future in exile is now the present, contradictory and conflictive" and learned to deal with the sometimes confusing and problematic relationship with friends and family who had stayed behind without taking their lack of understanding too personally.[77]

Carlos Torres presented himself as a successful *retornado*, a year and a half after returning to Chile. He based his confident self-assessment in these advantages: having a project to work on, a level of financial security, a realistic view of where he fits in to the

[76] Alfredo interview.
[77] Kovalskys, "Exilio y desexilio: una experiencia más de violencia", p. 90-91.

society around him, and an understanding of what the identity of the *desexiliado* means in contemporary Chile. His testimony from both the interviews we conducted also displays a kind of post-national identity that developed over his years in exile. He no longer depends on having a place in the Chilean national family to act as a cornerstone of his sense of self, but sees his homeland as the place where he should be at this point in his life in order to reach the goals he has set.

When we first spoke in Toronto in October 2008, Carlos told me that the conditions for him to go back were finally right. When we met again in Santiago in April 2010, he told me why he had eventually opted to leave Canada for Chile:

> So I'm back, and it's a serious attempt to live in Chile…built on three bases. First, I have specific permission to be in a university program. Second, based on the economic conditions I've made for myself in the last ten years, twelve years, in Canada, it's allowed me to come back here without suffering on arrival, I didn't need to beg for a job or anything. And third, I've been able to do it without uprooting myself from Canada, but rather, I've stopped living in Canada to live in Chile. Tomorrow I could decide to go back to Canada, or go somewhere else…So my return is completely independent, it doesn't depend on any organization, or any necessity other than my own. And it's not romantic, it doesn't have any sentimental reasoning behind it, it's not nostalgia. I came here to try to live in Chile, not relive what I'd known. Also, because I had been coming back to Chile regularly for the last ten years, I knew it was no longer the same country, that because of the neo-liberal model the country had been transformed socially, culturally, politically…It was clear to me that Chile had changed, and so had I. Chile had gone in one direction, and me in another. Chile grew materially and economically, from the point of view of consumption and debt, and I grew in the sense of changing my paradigm of thought.

For Carlos, one of the most important changes he underwent in exile was becoming involved in social advocacy relating to Canadian and Latin American affairs. This has made him think of issues that go beyond Chile and to look at his country of birth with a cooler eye:

> These lessons, having these experiences, has allowed me to return to Chile without feelings of being tricked, without nostalgia, without expecting that someone will take me in or resolve my problems...There's nothing in Chile that I need in order to live. Just like there's nothing in Canada that I need in order to live. I could live there, or live here, or live in Brazil...If I decide tomorrow, or in four or five more years, that I don't feel right in Chile, I'll go, I'll go to where I can feel good. So this is what has changed. I don't need a homeland, specifically. And the causes and the struggles for social justice that are the driving force of my life, till the end of my days, can be done here, or in Canada, or Brazil. I have no problem with that.

Carlos' reintegration into Chilean life has been gradual, starting many years before he took the decision to move back. Like Alfredo Lavergne, he has discovered that his status as a *retornado* influences how other Chileans see him and regard his opinions and points of view:

> [It's] obvious that if there isn't a rejection, there's a type of...they don't take you seriously, because you didn't live here. So when I suggest something, it's "Yeah, that's good, but...", "That's fine, but...", "You weren't here", and then, when things turn out as I suggested, of course no one says "You were right". That's very Chilean. So I've noticed that my opinion might be heard, but not taken very seriously. They ask me to write or talk about what happens in Latin America, not what happens in Chile...This happens a lot here. And I knew this, so it wasn't a shock. I didn't feel disparaged or ignored, though at times I wish people would listen to me without prejudice.

Ultimately, Carlos returned to Chile because he felt there was a good reason for him to be there, and he wanted to implement what he had studied in Canada about organizing and planning projects in a Latin American country. He has found what psychologists who focus on exiles like Kovalskys have identified as the key factor in successfully returning after years of forced absence: integrating the past experience of exile with present circumstances, and projecting yourself in a new plan for the future.[78] The validation of his sense of identity now depends very little on where he is from, and much more on what he

[78] Ibid, p. 90.

is doing and what he hopes to do in the future. Chile is not some kind of paradise lost, but a place where he once lived, and now does again.

In the end, the success or failure of return depended largely on opportunities and expectations. Manuel Jofré, Alfredo Lavergne and Carlos Torres did not expect much in the way of assistance nor a warm welcome from anyone other than family and close friends. All three have strong criticisms to offer about present-day Chile, but have managed to come to terms with the fact that their homeland is not a utopia, but a place like any other, with both flaws and attractions. They also have found spaces in Chilean society where they feel useful and fulfilled. For Willy Behrens, Luis Cortés and Patricia Godoy, the changes in Chile were too much to deal with, and they felt excluded, unwanted, and in Luis' case even in danger. Willy and Luis expected more of the society they had longed to rejoin, and were embittered by the failure of their return attempts. Patricia, meanwhile, did not find that the end of exile from Chile meant the end of the problems she had faced in Canada. Returning to live in her homeland was not a cure for the psychological and physical obstacles that complicate her life.

All of these return stories contain a common element, that of the problematic position of the *retornado* in Chilean society. The failure of *retornados* and those who stayed on to understand one another –so well encapsulated by the Spanish word *desencuentro* –is in itself a metaphor for a society that remains deeply divided about the collective national memory and meaning of the recent, troubled past. *Retornados*, by virtue of living through exile, have gone through a process of transculturation which has affected their identity,

values and attitudes, so that a distance exists between them and those who never left. This transformation is true of the participants in this study, whether they attempted to return or not, and it has made their relationship to Chileans "back home" problematic. The people I interviewed still feel their Chilean roots, but they have also sprouted new ones in different soil that have influenced how they see themselves and the world around them, and how they are seen by others. The threat to their sense of national identity, the suffering they experienced because of dislocation, and the changes life in exile obligated them to face were all real and important challenges to them, as individuals, as families, and as members of a broader community. The development of a culture and an identity of exile had helped them cope with life in Canada, and given them a way to express and assert their *chilenidad* without having to be in Chile. At the same time, living life in another country and having to cope with all the practical necessities that entailed meant that the participants, whether they wished to or not, became increasingly entrenched in Canada as the years passed. In some cases consciously, at other times without even realizing it, they began to internalize values and attitudes present in the host society that set them apart from Chileans who did not live what they lived. By the time exile as a form of exclusion had run its course, the people I spoke to had changed so much inside, and become so materially and emotionally connected to Canada, that the long-awaited dream of return to Chile was put off or abandoned by many. In part, this was because they did not want to put themselves or their families through a "second exile"; but beyond this important consideration, an altered sense of belonging played a large role. Chile had changed, and so had they; and most of them no longer needed to be in Chile to

affirm who they were. They were now people who crossed national boundaries and concepts of national identity; no longer simply Chilean leftist exiles waiting to go home, but men and women from different classes and professions, of diverse political and social commitments, born and raised in one country, now at home somewhere else.

Conclusion

11 September 1973 is a moment of rupture in the lives of the Chileans whose experiences of exile have been the basis of this study. They became casualties in a war in pitted one vision of society against another, wherein their plan relied on an appeal to the masses and that of their opponent on coercion. The Chilean experience of autocratic rule between 1973 and 1990 was part of a historic phase in most Latin American nations when democratic pluralism was sacrificed in the name of both state security –defined as defending the nation against the threat of revolution –and to accelerate the process of economic development without having to accommodate "defiant" social sectors that represented marginalized middle- and lower-class interests.[1] As part of the losing side in the conflict, exiles saw their version of what it meant to be Chilean devalued and essentially outlawed. The "strong, predatory" state established by the Chilean military and its backers sought to "destroy basic social institutions and then rebuild them in its own image", and implemented a systematic terror campaign to eliminate virtually all opposition to its project.[2] One of the tools of this campaign was exclusion from the nation, either through formal expulsion or by making conditions within the country such that a substantial portion of the population felt the need to leave. The new order in Chile judged the people who contributed their histories to this project to be part of a "cancerous tumour" infecting the body politic that had to be cut out so that the nation could survive.

[1] Fernando Henrique Cardoso, "The Characterization of Authoritarian Regimes", in David Collier, ed. *The New Authoritarianism in Latin America.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979, p. 48. By 1976, only Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Costa Rica were not under military rule.

[2] Darren G. Hawkins, *International Human Rights and Authoritarian Rule in Chile.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002, p. 51.

Their rights as citizens were abrogated in the name of maintaining order and stability and ensuring that Hispanic, Christian, Western Chile did not become a second Communist bastion in the Americas. In the context of the Cold War, democratic rights and principles were expendable when security was deemed to be at stake. The use of exile to eliminate opposition and intimidate those remaining behind was not a novelty in Chile, or in the broader region. What was different after the 1973 coup was how exile, through direct or indirect repression, affected such a broad swath of the society, including relatively low-level opposition members and supporters who had never dreamed that they could become targets of political violence. The regime saw any citizen who did not share their vision for Chile as a "bad" Chilean, unworthy of membership in the national family.[3]

While the process of eliminating the unwanted "Marxists" from the nation was happening in Chile, at the other extreme of the Americas Canadian society was going through one of its frequent reassessments of who was suitable for citizenship and who was not. Restrictions based on racial or ethnic considerations had gradually diminished following the Second World War, and by the 1970s the question of ideology had become more prevalent. The Canadian government was reluctant to accept Chileans who might pose a threat to national security and complicate relations with the country's Cold War allies, especially the United States. The position of the government was contested by domestic bodies which pressured the Trudeau administration to act based on humanitarian principles and in accordance with the recent precedents of assistance for

[3] Rody Oñate and Thomas Wright, *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar.* Second edition. Mexico City: Urdimbre, 2002, p. 51. Luis Cortés also described how repression spread beyond the ranks of party members and active supporters: "It affected everyone who didn't want anything to do with the coup d'état . There were a lot of military people imprisoned with me. Police taken prisoner, too." Luis interview.

fugitives from Communist regimes. As a result, Canada did become a country of asylum for Chileans escaping persecution, accepting six thousand exiles and their dependents by 1978. While this number compares favourably with many other nations that house parts of the Chilean diaspora, it must be remembered that a fairly rigorous selection process was still employed to make sure those admitted would not be either dangers or burdens to the Canadian state or society. Canada became a reluctant host to Chilean exiles, tolerating their presence in the nation as long as they worked hard and stayed out of trouble, like good immigrants should. Many could ultimately successfully reconstruct their lives in Canada, and benefit from the wealth, stability and opportunities the land of exile had to offer, but they still had to deal with changes to their sense of self, their collective identity, and their human relations that were amplified by the condition of exile.

These are the events and the historic context that forms the backdrop to what is at its heart a human story of identity and belonging. The people who participated in this study were actors in this story, and their experiences give us an intimate look at what it means to be forced out of your home and into an unknown world, cut off from your past, bewildered in your present and completely unsure of your future. Their testimonies have illustrated how they faced the crises of exile: the need to rebuild a sense of normalcy and stability on the individual and group level; heal physical and psychological wounds caused by the forced separation from the life and the world they had known; learn how to live, work, and relate in a different, and often indifferent, society; how to respond to challenges and changes on the individual, family and community level that surfaced over the years of exile; and finally, deal with the wrenching decision whether to return to Chile

and one again rebuild, or stay in Canada and accept a separation from their homeland that had not been a choice, but a necessity.

The road ahead for the Chilean community in Canada: the waning of the "culture of exile"

As one of the many groups that form the population of Canada, Chileans are not numerically that significant: in 2006, those reporting Chilean ethnicity ranked fourth among Spanish-speaking groups, after Mexicans, Salvadorans and Colombians.[4] However, the impact of the Chilean presence in Canada has not depended as much on numbers but what the community accomplished, both by chance and design. The controversy surrounding the admission of Chilean exiles forced the Canadian state to recognize and modify biases in its attitude and actions toward people seeking shelter in Canada for reasons of political persecution, and the codified refugee legislation that resulted by 1978 owes a debt to the challenge posed to the system by the "Marxists" from the southern end of the Americas. Once in Canada, members of the Chilean exile community put to work their prodigious organizational skills to help develop an ethnic infrastructure for Spanish-speaking newcomers where very little had existed before. Such activity may have been initially for self-interested reasons of ethnic preservation and protection, but over time the structures Chileans put in place –Spanish-language schools, media outlets, sport and cultural organizations among them –have become open to a wider Hispanic community and helped provide the kind of inclusive spaces for

[4] Statistics Canada, "Hispanic Spanish speaking population in Canada: a special report prepared for the Canadian Hispanic Congress." 2006, p. 4,6.

newcomers that the Chileans themselves initially lacked. While the Chileans were not the first Latin Americans to come to Canada, both the manner in which they came to the country and their actions once established have left the impression of the Chileans as a "highly politicized group" composed mainly of political refugees, even though this has not been the case for some time.[5] This image defines the Chilean community in Canada and relates directly to the exile identity that has been a dominant feature of the group up to the present day.

In part, the perpetuation of the image of Chileans in Canada as an activist, exile community has to do with the early impression the community left on the Canadian public, but it also has to do with the role exiles play in the community itself. Members of the first wave tend to dominate leadership positions in Chilean organizations, which has meant that the narrative of the Chilean presence in Canada revolves around the story of expulsion, homogenizing the origins and nature of the community and excluding other histories.[6] This was one of the caveats of José Del Pozo during our interview: "For many, *chilenidad* means being on the left. But you have to be careful, because in this type of study you inevitably gather the information from exiles, and not much point of view of those who weren't exiles." His own work on the Chileans in Québec encompasses a much broader range of the group, from those who arrived many years before the coup to

[5] Harry Diaz, "Chileans", in Paul R., Magocsi, ed. *Encyclopedia of Canada's Peoples*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999, p. 349. In 1999, refugees accounted for 36% of the Chilean population in Canada.
[6] This has also been noted in Chilean exile groups in the United States and Europe. In some cases acceptance in the community depended on establishing your personal credibility as a legitimate victim of persecution. *Cf* Marita Eastmond, *The Dilemmas of Exile: Chilean Refugees in the USA*. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1997p. 72; Ana Vásquez and Ana María Araujo, *La maldición de Ulises: Repercusiones psicológicas del exilio.* Santiago: Sudamericana, 1990, p. 62-68.

those who continue to come to Canada to this day, for reasons that have little or nothing to do with politics. He admitted, however, that it was much harder to find participants from these sectors of the community, and that other perspectives tend to be muted.[7]

The image of the exile may still dominate the perception of Chileans in Canada, but it seems unlikely to remain intact in the future. The exiles are getting older, some have returned to Chile, and their demographic presence in the community has been diluted by subsequent Chilean immigrants. The data from 2006 reveals that 39.7% of the Chilean-born arrived between 1971-1980, 28.3% from 1981-1990, and 17.5% between 1991 and 2000.[8] The collective memory of exile may continue for the time being to be a source of group identity, but shared by an increasingly smaller pool of people and not internalized by members of the community who came under different circumstances and with divergent goals and values. This does not just apply to more recent Chilean arrives, but to the children of exiles as well, as Eduardo Boza pointed out:

> There's another thing, that the old folks like me and the youth, the second generation, there's no connection either, we don't know how to talk to each other, we don't know how to communicate....They're more Canadian than us. So that's another thing you notice, the big gap between us.[9]

While many may share their parents' values and socio-political commitments, they are not doing it as exiles attempting to validate and assert a threatened sense of identity: "There is no similar memory of wounds, no phantom pain, over a homeland that was

[7] José D. interview.
[8] Statistics Canada, "Hispanic Spanish speaking population in Canada: a special report prepared for the Canadian Hispanic Congress," 2006, p. 38.
[9] Eduardo interview.

never lost in the first place."[10] Their sense of *chilenidad* as part of their overall identity may be influenced by the narrative of exile, but it is not dominated by it.

Further factors working against the continued dominance of the exile identity are the lack of a unifying national organization, the absence of permanent community spaces in the cities with high numbers of Chileans, and the increasingly depoliticized nature of Chilean-Canadian associations throughout the country. The scattered nature of Chilean settlement since the first wave phase and the vast distances separating groups in different regions established a culture of local organization among exile communities from Québec City to Vancouver, whose focus in the early stage of exile was on Chile, not with their position in Canadian society.[11] With the exception of Montreal, where the *Asociación de chilenos de Québec* has a permanent headquarters, Chilean organizations in the rest of Canada are administered from people's homes and have to rent space for events.[12] The lack of a social space in which a Chilean identity in Canada can be fostered continuously has contributed to the heterogeneity of the broader community identity despite the strong presence of exiles within organizations. For S.V.P., the lack of a shared space for

[10] Rubén D. Rumbaut and Rubén G. Rumbaut, "Self and Circumstance: Journeys and Visions of Exile", in Peter I. Rose, ed. *The Dispossessed: An Anatomy of Exile.* Amherst & Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005, p. 352.

[11] There is evidence of unsuccessful attempts to establish closer ties among regional associations. Willy mentioned that a meeting was held in Ottawa for Ontario and Quebec solidarity groups to try to foster more cooperation, but that it was only successful for making contacts and nothing else. Willy interview. A 1976 RCMP report into the activity of suspicious Chileans also mentioned an unnamed exile in Edmonton trying to start a pan-Canadian organization at the urging of and with assistance from Cuban intelligence agents stationed in Canada. "Chilean Activity in Canada", June 4, 1976. LAC RG 76 Vol. 986 File 5781-3-6 Refugees- Chilean Movement. Processing of Applications - Oppressed Minority Prisoners, Vol. 1.

[12] José Del Pozo, "Las organizaciones communitarios de chilenos en la provincia de Québec, Canadá" in José Del Pozo, ed. *Exiliados, emigrados y retornados: chilenos en América y Europa, 1973-2004.* Santiago: RIL Editores, 2006, p. 143-144.

Chileans in Toronto was a shortcoming compared to other groups. Her comments regarding community life in Toronto also revealed how the importance of political action, which is strongly tied to the exile identity, has been eclipsed by other, more broadly accepted concerns: "The Toronto Chilean Society collapsed, and now we have the Casa Salvador Allende, which only has one *peña* a year, for 18 September, not with the goal of sending money to Chile, but to fund scholarships for students without resources to keep studying, economic help for other things."[13] Eduardo Boza, who is an active member of the Casa Salvador Allende, also noted that though 11 September continues to be commemorated, projects to promote and preserve Chilean culture have taken precedence in the activities of the Toronto Chilean community: "That's what we did, Casa Salvador Allende, promote culture and traditions…Before it was called the Canadian Salvador Allende Association, but there was a split, so we had to change the name."[14]

Eduardo's comment revealed another reason why the prevalence of the exile identity is gradually declining: within the exile community itself, divisions dating back to the UP years stand in the way of a unified collective memory for the community, one that would reinforce a shared sense of identity based on the exilic origins of the Chilean presence in Canada. Exile identity has not become the touchstone for the broader Chilean community simply because there is no one exile identity, but many. I asked Ana María Barrenenchea if she thought an accepted collective memory of the history of Chileans in Canada was being formed that reflected the importance of the exile presence within the community:

---

[13] S.V.P. interview.
[14] Eduardo interview.

> No. This will always be tinted by the glasses of the different political parties. "If it wasn't [for] you!" We're going to celebrate Allende, we're going to celebrate the past history in a very common way, we're going to admit all the suffering, we're going to be very solidarity [sic] up to a point... There are different narratives first, and different historical interpretations of what were the dynamics of the time. The Chileans present a common group to the outside. And the only difference is the different [party] background.

She continued that the differences within the exile group can still be seen when an election is on in Chile, like in early 2010, when our second interview took place. The Chilean exiles may show a unified face to Canadian society, but within the group partisan divisions continue:

> [When] there's an election is the best example of how the Chilean exile is exactly where they were forty years ago when they came. "The Communists have become fascists." "How can they vote for Frei when his father did this and that and the other thing?"...How does the Chilean political reality interest the exiles? A lot, a lot. And how they make interpretations based on incomplete information..because they get their information from their party.[15]

In the broader scheme of things, the perception and reality of the Chilean community in Canada as being a leftist, socially activist ethnic group whose presence is due to exile are both beginning to diminish over time. The decline of the "culture of the left" and the political identity of the Chileans in Montreal that has been documented by Del Pozo holds true for the rest of Canada as well.[16] It seems inevitable that Chilean-Canadians in the future will identify less with the idea of being members of a community formed through exile, as this narrative becomes less widespread and further from the reality of why most group members came.

---

[15] Ana María 2 interview.

[16] José Del Pozo, *Les Chiliens au Québec. Immigrants et réfugiés, de 1955 à nos jours.* Montréal: Boréal, 2009, p. 332-333.

And yet, the exiles' vision of what *chilenidad* is has not disappeared. The forced absence from Chile they experienced constituted an identity crisis that has forever marked their personal histories and changed their relationship with their country of origin. However, even nearly four decades after leaving Chile, those who have remained in Canada have not ceased to be Chilean, at least in terms of how they define what being Chilean means. Time and circumstances have changed the way many of the exiles I interviewed look at themselves and the world around them, but many of the core values they had as young Unidad Popular sympathizers remain, and continue to have resonance with other Chilean-Canadians.

Carlos Torres is a case in point, someone who is aware of how his beliefs and values have changed in important but positive ways, augmenting the dedication to egalitarianism he has held since his youth. His words describe how his sense of social commitment –an integral part of his Chilean identity –has been affected by his time in Canada, and how he intended to incorporate those things that were part of his new identity into his work:

> My political approach to issues in Chile is much different now because of what I learned and developed in Canada with Canadians both in Québec and in English Canada...It has to do with diversity, that I'm coming from an extremely homogeneous country, a dominant culture and oppression of natives and women, gay people, and here I've been in touch with the progressive community, which is extremely aware of these issues, and I've learned to integrate that in my thinking, in my practices as well. So that has created a change, I'm also not extremely ideologically singular anymore, and I believe that transformation will take place involving a diversity of political and ideological approaches... I have been "enriched" by this involvement, by this connection with Canadians in that regard.[17]

[17] Carlos 1 interview.

At the same time, the emergence of a complex identity has not eliminated the part of themselves that exiles view as the positive parts of *chilenidad*:

> What I've seen is that Chileans, and I'm talking about the group that arrived first, the first wave, the parents put a great deal of importance on the children not forgetting that they're Chilean, that even their grandchildren don't forget their roots. That they retain the language, and that the children have a social conscience, which you could say is part of the left. This has been very important, and on a personal level it's been important for my mental health. It hasn't always worked, but we've always tried. If you get together one hundred people from my group, this is what they'll say. Because again, according to our set of values, to be a good Chilean you have to act as a good citizen of the world.[18]

The image of what being Chilean should mean, rather than its present reality, is shaped by the values exiles retain from their past and have transmitted to their children and others close to them. José Del Pozo, despite what he has written on the decline of the culture of exile, still admitted that the exiles' vision of proper *chilenidad* continued to have influence:

> [O]ne of my nieces is around 40 now. She lived in Argentina first, but when she was eleven my sister went to Montreal. So she grew up there. She'd gone to Chile from time to time, and I interviewed her for my book. I asked her about this and she said "Look, uncle, I feel I'm a Chilean from Montreal, because I don't like the Chileans from Chile, because they're classists, they're racists, and they're *machistas* [male chauvinists]. My identity is of a foreign Chilean, because all the good ones are here. The Chileans who have learned to be tolerant, the Chileans on the left, but who aren't machistas."...So there's an identity among the younger people, especially those who grew up there [Canada], that they like going to Chile

[18] Marlinda interview. Evidently Marlinda's hope that her children would absorb some of the values of the exiles has come true: as I wrote this conclusion, her daughter Tatiana, a specialist in maternal-fetal medicine, was quoted in a Toronto Star article on physicians protesting changes to the health care provisions for refugee claimants, in which she drew parallels to her own family's experience as refugees in the early 1970s. Nicholas Keung, "Refugee health cuts: Nationwide physicians' protest draws 500 in Toronto." *Toronto Star*, 18 June 2012. Retrieved June 19, 2012 from http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/article/1213420--refugee-health-cuts-nationwide-physicians-protest-draws-500-in-toronto.

> but the way of thinking that exists here bothers them… So it's a very interesting identity, that they like being Chilean, but a different kind of Chilean.[19]

Finally, there are those exiles whose life outside of Chile has caused them to distance themselves from a narrow national identity and recognize a sense of belonging to a global society. This point of view was expressed by Jaime Llambías-Wolff when we discussed the question of identity and exile:

> Look, I think it's a very personal issue. I may be in a minority position here, and probably what I'm going to say to you, it will eventually shock other people who are thinking differently: I don't feel very patriotic, and I've never felt very patriotic. I'm not the one carrying a flag. I'm much more a world citizen. I'm a Chilean, I have been fighting for this, I lost everything, I lost my country…I took the risks, but it doesn't mean for me that I feel the need… to go every Saturday to listen to Chilean music to feel myself that I'm Chilean. I enjoy being with Chilean people because they speak the same language, we share the same culture, we can talk about the same jokes, but if it doesn't happen, I'm not going to dramatize this, I'm not going to feel depressed about this.[20]

Dismissing the feeling of being a "world citizen" as an example of the exiles' leftist political ideology would be to forget that the Unidad Popular movement was self-consciously Chilean, promoting a "revolution with red wine and empanadas." The people who shared their exile histories with me were part of a movement that sought to alleviate national problems of poverty, dependence and marginalization; their focus was on making a better home for all members of the Chilean family. The attack on their identity as Chileans was one way in which the military regime crippled their opponents, and for those who were obliged to take asylum elsewhere the damage to their sense of *chilenidad* provoked a re-imagination of what their national identity meant to them. Distance in time and space from the country that helped shape their self-image has combined with the

---

[19] José D interview.
[20] Jaime interview.

influences of daily life in a different setting to give rise to a new identity, the metaphorical scar tissue for the wound of exile, the *chilenó/a*-and-something else: Canadian, Québécois(e), Latin American, exile, immigrant, *desexiliado, retornado*, doctor, teacher, baker, man, woman, parent, grandparent. Nearly forty years after becoming exiles, the participants in this study are past that label. They are not circumscribed by membership in one national group or another, one simple identity marker or another, but are complex people who transcend boundaries and belong to both Chile and Canada, to their past, present and future.

> Two countries reside on the planes of my horizon.
>
> I am all the people who died. I am all the people who left.
>
> I am…
>
> I was a small seed. Now I am two hearts, two shorelines, two maps.
>
> I am complete.
>
> Demarcation and boundaries led me to this. A border within myself has been erased. Replaced by so much sound, beauty and life.
>
> *Gracias a la vida…*[21]

[21] Mariló Nuñez, "North Meets South". Used with permission of the author. Originally published in *Canadian Woman Studies,* Vol. 19, No. 3, p. 95.

Postscript: Utility and suitability, forty years on

This study has examined the lives of twenty-one people who resettled in Canada as a result of a dangerous and unpredictable situation in their country of origin. I have been able to relate a part of their stories here because they were admitted into Canada, despite having come at a time when affiliation with the left of the political spectrum was potentially grounds for exclusion. Historians can now look at this movement of human beings from one end of the Americas to the other and examine it in relation to the time and circumstances in which it took place. We know how many Chilean exiles came, what they did, where they settled, and how many did or did not return to Chile. These stories can be heard, if one is interested in listening.

But what of the stories of those who did not get in? The statistics from chapter two that covered the period from September 1973 to February 1976 mention 7 390 applicants who had been refused or withdrawn their requests, with reasons given for 590 of the rejections (security reasons, 470; civil or settlement issues, 100; and health reasons, 20).[22] We can safely assume more applications were refused or withdrawn before the Special Movement Chile ended, and that the visa requirements in place after 1979 reduced the number of Chileans claiming refugee status at Canadian ports of entry. The SMC represented a brief moment when the Cold War security concerns about immigrants and refugees were given reduced priority in the face of a humanitarian crisis, but that did not mean the concerns disappeared. A perceived need to protect Canada from subversive

[22] "Chilean Refugees Accepted for Permanent or Temporary Resettlement." No date, most likely late 1976. LAC RG 76 Vol. 986 File 5781-1 Refugees-Chilean Movement General.

leftists still informed whom Manpower and Immigration agents considered a safe newcomer, and who was a danger. We do not know the stories of those who were turned away, or who gave up trying to get into Canada, and likely never will.

Those Chileans who did secure admission were not considered threats to national security, and in fact represented in many ways the kind of useful entrant favoured by Canadian immigration policy. The "young, well-educated and adaptable" people of the first exile wave had the kind of professional and technical skills that made them employable and capable of integrating into the social and cultural life of the cities where they resettled. Through their contributions to Canadian economy as taxpayers and consumers, and especially through their work in establishing a social and cultural infrastructure for Spanish-speakers in the country, the Chilean exiles of the 1970s have played the kinds of positive roles expected of those who receive the privilege of Canadian residence. The Trudeau administration in 1973 took a chance that the benefits Chileans could bring to Canada would outweigh the potential dangers of their association with the wrong side in the Cold War. Looking at the results of that decision, in the form of the lives of the twenty-one participants, I would argue that the government at the time made the correct prediction.

The Cold War is now long over, and Canadian immigration policy has not remained static, but in two key ways the present resembles the past when it comes to judging eligibility for settlement in Canada. Questions of assimilability into the Canadian labour market and suitability from the standpoint of national security are still two of the

cornerstones of admission policy, just as they were in 1973. The former should come as no surprise, as the economic utility of immigration has always been a central consideration of policy and public perception. What is notable in the context of June 2012, as I write this conclusion, is that the changes to immigration policy introduced earlier this year make no attempt at putting any kind of humanitarian or nation-building veneer on the question. Prime Minister Stephen Harper was explicit about the connection: "We will ensure that, while we respect our humanitarian obligations and family-reunification objectives, we make our economic and labour force needs the central goal of our immigration efforts in the future." This position was further underlined by the minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Jason Kenney, who in March of this year stated that "We'll be reforming our immigration programs to do more in ensuring that our historic openness to newcomers works to fuel prosperity in Canada."[23] The doors of the country are still open, but open wider to those who can contribute to Canada's prosperity right away.

Security concerns, meanwhile, have shifted insofar as who is seen as a threat. In 2012, it is no longer Marxists who constitute a danger to the liberal, capitalist, democratic society, but Islamic extremists who aim to spread terror and destabilize the west, as they successfully did on the "other 11 September".[24] The fear of infiltration by jihadists who would use Canada as a base to attack its southern neighbor, or encourage home-grown terrorists like the Toronto 18, has led to calls for increased vigilance on the borders of the

[23] Tristan Hopper, "New immigrants must be employable, have language proficiency: Jason Kenney". National Post, 19 March 2012.
[24] Ariel Dorfman, "The Other 9/11". *Granta* online, 2 September 2011. Retrieved August 30, 2012 from http://www.granta.com/New-Writing/dorfman.

country and a more rigorous security screening process for those who wish to enter. Former diplomats and members of the Department of External Affairs, along with academics and critics of Canada's admissions policy, have drawn clear links between the "security threats associated with immigration and refugee processing, and the threat that may arise from migrants, new citizens, or the next generation who do not integrate or identify with the values of their new homelands."[25] Stating that "terrorists are able to manipulate the immigration and refugee policies of Western democracies", the editors of *Immigration Policy and the Terrorist Threat in Canada and the United States* sound an alarm that would not have been out of place in 1973: "While immigrants can make significant contributions to their new countries, the possibility that they may use the host country as a place for recruitment, fund-raising, and a staging ground for terrorist attacks, abroad or in the host country, poses a clear and present danger."[26] Now it is not the leftist, but the Muslim who must be kept out for fear of what he or she might do the stability and security of the Canadian state. Whitaker and Marcuse's "national insecurity state" has not disappeared.[27] Forty years from now, will another aspiring historian examine the current era and see this moment as one when the pendulum swung in the direction of greater vigilance, to swing back again when the perceived threat diminished? Or will that person see it as a moment when Canada's open doors began to close? Time will tell.

[25] Alexander Moens and Martin Collacott, eds. *Immigration Policy and the Terrorist Threat in Canada and the United States.* Vancouver: Simon Fraser Institute, 2008, p. ix.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Reg Whitaker and Gary.Marcuse, *Cold War Canada: The Making of a National Insecurity State, 1945-1957.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.

Appendix A: Interview template

1. Name:

2. Age: 20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60-69 70-79 80-89

3. Year arrived in Canada:

4. Activity/profession in Chile:

5. Were you directly involved in any way with the Unidad Popular government? Yes/No

If yes, please describe in what capacity:

6. How long after the coup d'etat did you decide to, or were forced to, leave Chile?

7. Was Canada your first choice as a country of asylum? If yes, please explain why. If no, please explain where you wished to go, and how it was that you ended up in Canada instead.

8. Did any organization(s) inside or outside Chile help you escape from Chile? Yes/No

If yes, please explain which organization(s) and how it/they helped you:

9. Were you seen by representatives of the Canadian government or the department of Manpower and Immigration while still in Chile? Yes/No

If yes, please describe the content of your discussions, the general attitude of the representatives and any conditions on entry into Canada they told you about:

10. Were you accompanied by family members when you left Chile? Yes/No

If yes, please tell me who accompanied you:

11. Upon arrival in Canada, did representatives of the Canadian government or the government of the province where you entered the country provide you with any form of material assistance or counselling? Yes/No

If yes, please explain what kind of assistance or guidance was provided:

12. Upon arrival in Canada, did representatives of any non-governmental organization (i.e. churches, citizen's groups) provide you with any form of material assistance or counselling? Yes/No

If yes, please explain what kind of assistance or guidance was provided:

13. Were there any organizations, government-run or otherwise, that helped you in the settlement process (i.e. finding housing, employment, providing translators or interpreters, helping to find schools for children)? Yes/No

If yes, please explain which organization(s), and what it/they did to assist in the settlement process:

14. Were there services available to you in your native language? Yes/No

If yes, what services and who provided them?

15. After settling in Canada, were you involved in organizations dedicated to fostering awareness of the situation in Chile at the time? Yes/No

If yes, what organization? Where was it based? What kind of activities did it carry out?

16. After settling in Canada, were you involved in organizations dedicated to promoting Chilean culture? Yes/No

If yes, what organization? Where was it based? What kind of activities did it carry out?

17. Did you begin working soon after your arrival in Canada? Yes/No

If yes, in what kind of work were you engaged? Did your first job(s) in Canada relate to what you had done in Chile?

18. Does the work you currently or most recently did relate to what you had done in Chile?

Yes/No

If yes, please explain how.

19. What impact did resettling in Canada have on relationships between family members (i.e. between spouses, between parents and children)?

20. How did you maintain contact with family and friends in Chile?

21. How would you describe your initial impressions of life in Canada?

22. How would you describe the treatment you received from native-born Canadians?

23. What were the biggest challenges you faced in adjustment to life in Canada?

24. Did you return to Chile after the fall of the Pinochet regime? If yes, when did you first go? If no, please explain why not.

25. Did you ever attempt to resettle in Chile? If yes, what obstacles did you encounter in readjusting to life in that country?

26. Is there anything you would like to add about your experience of life in Canada?

Appendix B: Chilean participants' profiles

Name	Age in 1973	Month/ year of arrival in Canada	Activity or profession in Chile	Party affiliation	First country of asylum	Organizational assistance to leave Chile or enter Canada	Arrived alone/ with family	Current marital status	Current or most recent work	Attempted return to Chile
Alfonso Álvarez	43	March 1977	Journalist	PCCh	Canada	Sponsored under SMC	Alone	Married (second marriage)	Waiter, bartender, part-time journalist (retired)	X
Ana	31	February 1974	Professor	None	Canada	SMC	Daughter	Divorced	Teacher	X
Ana María Barrenechea	31	March 1974	Physician	None	Mexico	SMC	Alone	Divorced	Physician	X
Willy Behrens	34	April 1970	Scientist	None	Not applicable [1]	None	Spouse	Married	Professor (retired)	O (later returned to Canada)
José Borgoño	30	March 1974	Professor	PCCh	Canada	SMC	Spouse, child	Married	Social worker (retired)	X

[1] Willy Behrens was in Canada at the time of the coup

Raquel Borgoño	Early 30's[2]	March 1974	Professor	None, husband connected to PCCh	Canada	SMC	Spouse, child	Married	Not asked	X
Eduardo Boza	31	May 1975	Civil servant	PCCh	Canada	Sponsored under SMC	Spouse	Married	Accountant (retired)	X
Luis Cortés	29	April 1978	Baker	PCCh	Canada	SMC political prisoners program	Alone	Married (second marriage)	Baker	O (later returned to Canada)
José Del Pozo	31	March 1974	Professor	None, husband connected to PS	Canada	SMC	Spouse, child	Married	Professor	X
Marcela Duran	28	October 1973	Professor	None	Canada	Canadian embassy in Santiago	Spouse, two children	Married	Professor	X
Jorge Etcheverry	27	March 1975	Professor	None, former connection to MIR	Canada	Sponsored under SMC	Alone [3]	Divorced	Writer, director of a publishing house	X

[2] I forgot to ask her age during the interview

[3] Spouse arrived two months later

Marlinda Freire	29	March 1974	Physician	None	Panama	Catholic Church, UNHCR	Spouse, three children	Divorced	Physician	X
Patricia Godoy	28	December 1973	Civil servant	PS	Peru	SMC	Alone	Divorced	Unemployed	O (later returned to Canada)
Manuel Jofré	25	December 1973	Professor	None	Canada	Canadian University Committee for Refugee Chilean Professionals and Students (World University Service)	Alone[4]	Divorced	Professor	O
Alfredo Lavergne	22	October 1975	Auto worker	None, union activist, wife connected to PS	Canada	Catholic Church (Vicaría de la Solidaridad)	Spouse	Divorced	Writer, Works for the Writers' Society of Chile	O
Jaime Llambías-Wolff	23	October 1973	Professor	MAPU	Canada	Government of Canada (inland refugee claim)	Alone	Married	Professor	Δ[5]

[4] Spouse arrived three months later
[5] Jaime Llambías-Wolff lives half the year in Chile, half in Canada

María Teresa	Late 20's or early 30's[6]	October 1974	Home maker	None, husband connected to PS	Argentina	UNHCR	Spouse, three children	Widowed	Social worker	X
Juan Nuñez	27	September 1974	Civil servant	MAPU	Canada	SMC	Spouse, child	Married	Social worker	X
Nidia Rivera	24	March 1974	Home maker	None, husband connected to PS	Honduras	UNHCR	Spouse, one of three children	Divorced	Administrative work	O (later returned to Canada)
S.V.P.	26	March 1974	Teacher	None, husband connected to MIR	Canada	SMC	Spouse, two children	Divorced	Teacher	X
Carlos Torres	19	October 1978	Student	None, student activist	Argentina	SMC political prisoners program	Alone	With partner (second marriage)[7]	Graduate student	O

PCC – Partido Comunista de Chile, Communist Party of Chile PS – Partido Socialista, Socialist Party

MAPU – Movimiento de Acción Popular Unitaria, Popular Unitary Action Movement

MIR – Movimiento de la Izquierda Revolucionaria, Movement of the Revolutionary Left

SMC – Special Movement Chile UNHCR – United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

[6] I forgot to ask her age during the interview
[7] I did not ask whether he and his current partner are married; he was married before coming to Canada but got divorced

Archives Consulted

Archives of Ontario, Toronto

Archivo Nacional de Chile, Santiago

Biblioteca Nacional de Chile, Santiago

Centro de Documentación de la Fundación de Ayuda Social de las Iglesias Cristianas, Santiago

Centro de Documentación de la Vicaría de la Solidaridad, Santiago

Multicultural History Society of Ontario Archive, Toronto

Multicultural History Society of Ontario Oral History Archive, Toronto

North American Congress on Latin America Archive of Latin Americana at the New School for Social Research, New York City (microfilm)

National Archives of Canada, Ottawa

United Nations Archives, New York City

William Ready Division of Archives and Research Division, Mc Master University, Hamilton

Bibliography

Monographs and compilations

Abella, Irving, and Harold Troper. *None is Too Many: Canada and the Jews of Europe, 1933-1948.* New York: Random House, 1983.

Adelman, Howard, and C. Michael Lanphier, eds. *Refuge or Asylum: A Choice for Canada.* Toronto: York Lanes Press, 1990.

Ahumada, Eugenio et al, eds. *Chile: la memoria prohibida: las violaciones a los derechos humanos, 1973-1983.* Fourth edition. Santaigo: Pehuén, 1990. Three volumes.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and the Spread of Nationalism.* 2nd edition. New York: Verso, 1991.

Aron, Adrianne, ed. *Fuga, exilio y retorno: La salud mental y el refugiado.* San Francisco: The Committee for Health Rights in Central America, 1988.

Avery, Donald H. *Reluctant Host: Canada's Response to Immigrant Workers, 1896-1994.* Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1995.

Barr-Melej, Patrick. *Reforming Chile: Cultural Politics, Nationalism, and the Rise of the Middle Class.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Behrens, Willy A. *Retornado Go Home.* Gatineau, Canada: Gauvin Press, 2008.

Berins Collier, Ruth and David Collier. *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America.* South Bend, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002.

Birns, Laurence. *The End of Chilean Democracy: An IDOC Dossier on the Coup and its Aftermath.* New York: Seabury Press, 1974.

Borgoño, José M. *Torn Between Two Worlds.* Toronto: Private publication, 2006.

Brands, Hal. *Latin America's Cold War.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Cavell, Richard, ed. *Love, Hate and Fear in Canada's Cold War.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.

Celedón, María Angélica, and Luz María Opazo. *Volver a empezar.* Santiago: Pehuén, 1987.

Cohen, Robin, ed. *The Cambridge Survey of World Migration.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Collier, David, ed. *The New Authoritarianism in Latin America.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Constable, Pamela, and Arturo Valenzuela. *A Nation of Enemies: Chile under Pinochet.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1991.

De la Parra, Marco Antonio. *La Mala Memoria.* Santiago: Planeta, 1997.

Del Pozo, José and André Jacob, eds. *Chili de 1970 á 1990: De l'Unité populaire á l'après-Pinochet.* Montréal: VLB Éditeur, 1994.

Del Pozo, José. *La Hoja de Arce y la Flor de Lis: Un Chileno en el Canadá francés.* Santiago: Ediciones ChileAmérica, 1996.

----------------- *Le Chili Contemporain: Quelle Démocratie?* Québec City: Éditions Nota bene, 2000.

------------------ ed. *Exiliados, emigrados y retornados: chilenos en América y Europa, 1973-2004.* Santiago: RIL Editores, 2006.

------------------ *Les Chiliens au Québec. Immigrants et réfugiés, de 1955 à nos jours.* Montréal: Boréal, 2009.

Department of the Secretary of State, Multiculturalism Department. *The Canadian Family Tree.* Don Mills: Corpus, 1979.

Dirks, Gerald E. *Canada's Refugee Policy: Indifference or Opportunism?* Montreal and London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1977.

------------------- *Controversy and Complexity: Canadian Immigration Policy during the 1980s.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995.

Dobell, Peter C. *Canada's Search for New Roles: Foreign Policy in the Trudeau Era.* London: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Dorfman, Ariel. *Heading South, Looking North.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1998.

Drake, Paul W., and Iván Jaksić, eds. *The Struggle for Democracy in Chile.* Revised edition. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995.

Durán, Claudio. *La infancia y los exilios/Childhood and Exile.* Ottawa: Split Quotation/La Cita Trunca, 2008.

Eastmond, Marita. *The Dilemmas of Exile: Chilean Refugees in the USA.* Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1997.

Ember, Melvin, Carol R. Ember, and Ian Skoggard, eds. *Encyclopedia of Diasporas: Immigrant and Refugee Cultures Around the World.* Vol. 2. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 2004.

Ensalaco, Mark. *Chile under Pinochet: recovering the truth.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2000.

Faúndez, Julio. *Marxism and Democracy in Chile: From 1932 to the fall of Allende.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

Fey, Ingrid E., and Karen Racine, eds. *Strange Pilgrimages: Exile, Travel and National Identity in Latin America, 1800-1990s.* Wilmington: Jaguar Scholarly Books, 2000.

Fontaine, Roger W., and James D. Theberge, eds. *Latin America*'s *New Internationalism: The End of Hemispheric Isolation.* New York: Praeger, 1976.

Garcés, Mario, *et al. Memoria para un nuevo siglo: Chile, miradas a la segunda mitad del sigloXX.* Santiago: LOM, 2000.

Garcés. Mario, and Nancy Nicholls. *Para una Historia de los Derechos Humanos en Chile: Historia Institucional de la Fundación de Ayuda Social de las Iglesias Cristianas FASIC 1975-1991.* Santiago: LOM, 2005.

Ginieniewicz, Jorge and Daniel Schugurensky, eds. *Ruptures, Continuities and Re-learning: The political participation of Latin Americans in Toronto.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 2006.

Gómez-Barris, Macarena. *Where Memory Dwells: Culture and State Violence in Chile.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2009.

Grandin, Greg. *The Last Colonial Massacre: Latin America in the Cold War.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Green, Duncan. *Faces of Latin America.* London: Latin American Bureau, 1991.

Groppo, Bruno, and Patricia Flier, eds. *La imposibilidad del olvido.* La Plata: Ediciones al Margen, 2001.

Grossman, Dave. *On Killing: The Psychological Costs of Learning to Kill in War and Society.* Boston and New York: Back Bay, 1995.

Hawkins, Darren G. *International Human Rights and Authoritarian Rule in Chile.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002.

Hawkins, Freda. *Canada and Immigration: Public policy and public concern.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988.

Henfry, Colin, and Bernardo Sorj. *Chilean Voices.* Hassock, Sussex: The Hravester Press, 1977.

Hillmer, Norman, and Stevenson, Garth, eds. *Foremost Nation: Canadian Foreign Policy and a Changing World.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977.

Hillmer, Norman, Bohdan Kordan, and Lubomyr Luciuk, eds. *On Guard For Thee: War, Ethnicity, and the Canadian State, 1939- 1945.* Ottawa: Canadian Committee for the History of the Second World War, 1988.

Hudson, Rex A., ed. *Chile: A Country Study.* Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1994.

Iacovetta, Franca, Roberto Perin, and Angelo Principe, eds, *Enemies Within: Italian and Other Internees in Canada and Abroad.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

Iacovetta, Franca. *Gatekeepers: Reshaping Immigrant Lives in Cold War Canada.* Toronto: Between the Lines, 2006.

Israel Z., Ricardo. *Politics and Ideology in Allende's Chile.* Tempe, Arizona: Center for Latin American Studies, 1989.

Kay, Diana. *Chileans in Exile: Private Struggles, Public Lives.* Wolfeboro, New Hampshire: Longwood Academic, 1987.

Kelley, Ninette, and M.J. Trebilcock. *The Making of the Mosaic: a history of Canadian immigration policy.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Kinsman, Gary, Dieter K. Buse, and Mercedes Steedman, eds. *Whose National Security? Canadian State Surveillance and the Creation of Enemies.* Toronto: Between the Lines, 2000.

Klubock, Thomas Miller. Contested Communities: Class, Gender, and Politics in Chile's El Teniente Copper Mine, 1904-1951. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.

Knowles, Valerie. *Strangers at Our Gates: Canadian Immigration and Immigration Policy, 1540-2006.* Revised edition. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2007.

Lambert, Jacques. *Latin America: Social structures and political institutions.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Llambías-Wolff, Jaime. *Notre exile pour parler: les Chiliens au Québec.* Montréal: Fides, 1988.

Lovett Barraclough, Solon. *Agrarian Structure in Latin America. A resume of the CIDA land tenure studies of: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala.* Toronto: Lexington Books, 1973.

Lowenthal, Abraham F. *Partners in Conflict: The United States and Latin America in the 1900s.* Revised edition. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Magocsi, Paul R., ed. *Encyclopedia of Canada's Peoples.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.

Mallon, Florencia E. *Courage Tastes of Blood: the Mapuche Community of Nicolás Ailío and the Chilean State, 1906-2001.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2005.

Margolian, Howard. *Unauthorized Entry: the Truth about Nazi War Criminals in Canada, 1946-1956.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

McLuhan, Elizabeth, ed. *Safe Haven: The Refugee Experience of Five Families.* Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1995.

Meyer, Eugenia, and Eva Salgado. *Un refugio en la memoria*. Mexico City: Oceano, 2002.

Mills, Sean. *The Empire Within: Postcolonial Thought and Political Activism in Sixties Montreal.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010.

Moens, Alexander, and Martin Collacott, eds. *Immigration Policy and the Terrorist Threat in Canada and the United States.* Vancouver: Simon Fraser Institute, 2008.

Molineu, Harold. *U.S. policy toward Latin America: from regionalism to globalism.* Second edition.Boulder:WestviewPress,1990.

Naficy, Hamid, ed. *Home, Exile, Homeland: Film, Media and the Politics of Place.* New York and London: Routledge, 1999.

Oñate, Rody, and Thomas Wright. *La diáspora chilena a 30 años del golpe militar.* Second edition. Mexico City: Urdimbre, 2002. Published in English as *Flight From Chile: Voices of Exile*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998.

Oñate, Rody, Thomas Wright, Caroline Espinoza, Andrea Soto and Ximena Galleguillos. *Exilio y retorno.* Santiago: LOM, 2005.

Owram, Doug. *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby-Boom Generation.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996

Perks, Robert, and Alistair Thomson, eds. *The Oral History Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.

Pieper Mooney, Jadwiga E. *The Politics of Motherhood: Maternity and Women's Rights in Twentieth-Century Chile.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009.

Pion-Berlin, David. *The Ideology of State Terror: Economic Doctrine and Political Repression in Argentina and Peru.* Boulder & London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1989.

Rochlin, James A. *Discovering the Americas: Evolution of Canadian Foreign Policy towards Latin America*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1993.

Rodríguez Villouta, Mili. *Ya nunca me verás como me vieras: Doce testimonios vivos del exilio.* Santiago: Ediciones del Ornitorrinco, 1990.

Roniger, Luis, and Mario Sznajder. *The Legacy of Human Rights Violations in the Southern Cone. Argentina, Chile and Uruguay.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Rose, Peter I., ed. *The Dispossessed: An Anatomy of Exile.* Amherst & Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2005.

Rouquié, Alain. *The Military and the State in Latin America.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989. Second edition.

Salazar, Gabriel, and Julio Pinto. *Historia Contemporánea de Chile II: Actores, identidad y movimiento.* Santiago: LOM, 1999.

Saywell, John, ed. *Canadian Annual Review of Politics and Public Affairs.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.

----------- *Canadian Annual Review of Politics and Public Affairs.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Shayne, Julie D. *They Used to Call Us Witches: Chilean exiles, culture, and feminism.* Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2009.

Simpson, John. *The Oxford Book of Exile.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Spooner, Mary Helen. *Soldiers in a narrow land: the Pinochet regime in Chile.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Stern, Steve J. *Remembering Pinochet's Chile: on the eve of London, 1998.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.

---------------- *Battling for Hearts and Minds: Memory Struggles in Pinochet's Chile, 1973-1988*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.

----------------- *Reckoning with Pinochet: the Memory Question in Democratic Chile, 1989-2006.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2010.

Stevenson, J.R. *Canada, Latin America and the New Internationalism: a foreign policy analysis, 1968-1990*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000.

Thompson, Andrew Stuart. *In Defence of Principles: NGOs and human rights in Canada.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2010.

Thordarson, Bruce. *Trudeau and Foreign Policy: a study in decision making.* Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Tinsman, Heidi. *Partners in Conflict: the Politics of Gender, Sexuality, and Labor in the Chilean Agrarian Reform, 1950-1973.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.

Tonkin, Elizabeth. *Narrating our pasts: the social construction of oral history.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Vásquez, Ana, and Ana María Araujo. *La maldición de Ulises: Repercusiones psicológicas del exilio.* Santiago: Sudamericana, 1990.

Villouta, Mili Rodríguez. *Ya nunca me veras como me vieras.* Santiago: Ornitorrinco, 1990.

Whitaker, Reg. *Double Standard: The Secret History of Canadian Immigration.* Toronto: Lester and Orpen Dennys, 1987.

Whitaker, Reg, and Gary Marcuse. *Cold War Canada: The Making of a National Insecurity State, 1945-1957.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.

Winks, Robin W. *The Blacks in Canada: A History.* Montreal and Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997.

Wright, Thomas C. *State Terrorism in Latin America: Chile, Argentina, and International Human Rights.* New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007.

Zucchi, John. *A History of Ethnic Enclaves in Canada.* Ottawa: The Canadian Historical Association, 2007.

Articles

No author cited, "Green Light for the Generals", *NACLA's Latin America and Empire Report,* Vol. VII, No. 8, October 1973.

No author cited, "Chronology of Events Before the Coup", *NACLA's Latin America and Empire Report,* Vol. VIII, No. 8, October 1973.

No author cited, "Under the Cloak and Behind the Dagger" *NACLA's Latin America and Empire Report,* Vol. VIII, No. 6, July-August 1974.

Manuel Agosin, "Export Performance in Chile: Lessons for Africa". *United Nations University Working Papers*, No. 144, October 1997.

Mario I. Aguilar, "Cardinal Raul Silva Henriquez, the Catholic Church, and the Pinochet regime, 1973-1980: public responses to a national security state." *The Catholic Historical Review,* Vol. 89, No.4, October 2003.

Fernando Allodi and G. Cowgill, "Ethical and Psychiatric Aspects of Torture: A Canadian Study." *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 27, March 1985.

Fernando Allodi and Alejandro Rojas, "The Health and Adaptation of Victims of Political Violence in Latin America (psychiatric effects of torture and disappearance", in Pichot, P., Berner, P., R. Wolf, R., and Thau, K., eds. *Psychiatry. The State of the Art. Vol. 6: Drug Dependence and Alcoholism, Forensic Psychiatry, Military Psychiatry.* New York: Plenum Press, 1985.

--, "The Role of a Housing Cooperative Community in the Mental Health and Social Adaptation of Latin American Refugees in Toronto." *Migration World Magazine,* Vol. 16, No. 3, 1988.

Alan Angell and Susan Carstairs, “The Exile Question in Chilean Politics”. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 9, No. 1, January 1987.

Alexandra Barahona de Brito, “Truth and justice in the consolidation of democracy in Chile and Uruguay.” *Parliamentary Affairs,* Vol. 46, No. 4, October 1993.

Jorge Barudy, “A Programme of Mental Health For Political Refugees: Dealing with the invisible pain of political exile”. *Social Science and Medicine,* Vol. 28, No. 7, 1989.

Louis Bickford, “Human Rights Archives and Research on Historical Memory: Argentina, Chile and Uruguay.” *Latin American Research Review,* Vol. 35, No. 2, 2000.

Laura Briggs, Gladys McCormick and J.T. Way, “Transnationalism: A Category of Analysis.” *American Quarterly,* Vol.60, No. 3, 2008.

John Cleveland, “New Left, not new liberal: 1960s movements in English Canada and Québec.” *Canadian Journal of Sociology and Anthropology* 41, No. 4, 2004.

Comité de los Derechos Humanos del Pueblo, “The Effects of Torture and Political Repression in a Sample of Chilean Families.” *Social Science and Medicine*, Vol. 28, No. 7, 1989.

Declaración de Principios del Gobierno de Chile March 11, 1974. http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Congress/1770/declaracion-de-principios.html

José Del Pozo, “Les chemins vers la gauche: la socialisation politique des supporteurs de l'Unité Populaire chilienne.” *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 29, 1990.

----------------, “Exilio e identidad: El caso de los chilenos de Montreal, Canadá. Observaciones preliminares.” *Revista Universum*, No. 17, 2002.

-----------------, “Los chilenos en el exterior: ¿De la emigración y el exilio a la diáspora? El caso de Montréal.” *Revue européenne des migrations internationales,* Vol. 20, No. 1, 2004.

Cristián Doña-Reveco and Amanda Levinson, “Chile: A Growing Destination Country in Search of a Coherent Approach to Migration.” Migracion Policy Institute Country Profile, June 2012.

Leo Driedger, “Toward a Perspective on Canadian Pluralism: Ethnic Identity in Winnipeg.” *The Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, Vol. 2, No. 1,Winter 1977.

Claudio and Marcela Duran, “Chilean Exile: The Uncertainties of Return”. *Refuge,* Vol. 3, No. 3, March 1984.

Mark Ensalaco, "Truth Commissions for Chile and El Salvador: A Report and Assessment." *Human Rights Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 4, November 1994.

Joaquín Fermandois, "¿Peón o actor? Chile en la Guerra Fría (1962-1973)." *Estudios Públicos*, No. 72, 1998.

Fuente de Informacion Norteamericana, "Collision Course: Chile Before the Coup." *NACLA's Latin America and Empire Report,* Vol. VII, No. 8, October 1973.

Mario Garcés Duran *et al*, "Manifiesto de Historiadores". Archivo Chile, Centro Estudios Miguel Enríquez ,1999.

Jane F. Gentleman and Evelyn Park, "Divorce in the 1990s." Health Reports, Vol. 9, No. 2, Autumn 1997.

Carlos J. Gonsalves, "The Psychological Effects of Political Repression on Chilean Exiles in the U.S." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, Vol. 60, No. 1, 1990.

James N. Green and Luis Roniger, "Exile and the Setting of Future Research Agendas". *Latin American Perspectives*, Vol. 34, No. 4, 2007.

George Hanff, "Decision-Making Under Pressure: A Study of the Admittance of Chilean Refugees by Canada." *North-South, the Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 8, 1979.

John J. Hassett, "Dictatorship, Memory and the Prospects for Democracy: The Fiction of Ariel Dorfman". *Third World Quarterly,* Vol. 13, No. 2, 1992.

Rhoda Howard, "Contemporary Canadian Refugee Policy: A Critical Assessment". *Canadian Public Policy / Analyse de Politiques,* Vol. 6, No. 2, Spring 1980.

Earl E. Huyck and Leon F. Bouvier, "The Demography of Refugees". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 467, May 1983.

Ivan Jaksic, "The Legacies of Military Rule in Chile." *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 1993.

Stuart D. Johnson and Cornelia B. Johnson, "Institutional Origins of the Chilean Refugee Community in Winnipeg." *Prairie Forum*, Vol. 7, No. 2, 1982.

Isabel Kaprielian-Churchill, "Armenian Refugees and Their Entry into Canada, 1919-1930". *Canadian Historical Review*, No. 71, 1990.

Martin Klinthäll, "Refugee Return Migration: Return Migration from Sweden to Chile, Iran and Poland, 1973-1996." *Journal of Refugee Studies,* Vol. 20, No. 4, 2007.

Thomas Klubock, "And Justice, When?" *NACLA Report on the Americas,* Vol. 24, No. 5, February 1991.

Laurier LaPierre, "Québec: October 1970." *The North American Review*, Vol. 256, No. 3, Fall 1971.

Jaime Llambias-Wolff, "Réflexion sur la condition d'exilé/Reflections on the condition of the exile." *Forces,* No. 73, Winter 1986.

----------------------------"The Voluntary Repatriation Process of Chilean Exiles." *International Migration Review*, Vol. 31, No. 4, 1993.

Brian Loveman and Elizabeth Lira, "Truth, Justice, Reconciliation and Impunity as Historical Themes: Chile, 1814-2006." *Radical History Review*, No. 97, Winter 2007.

Pamela Lowden, "The Ecumenical Committee for Peace in Chile 1973-1975: The Foundation of Moral Opposition to Authoritarian Rule in Chile". *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, Vol. 12, No. 2, May, 1993.

Fernando Mata, "Latin American Immigration to Canada: Some Reflections on the Immigration Statistics". *North-South,* Vol. 20, No. 20, 1985.

Teresa Meade, "Holding the Junta Accountable: Chile's 'Sitios de la Memoria' and the History of Torture, Disappearance and Death". *Radical History Review,* No. 79, Winter 2001.

Paola Méndez, "Sitios de memoria: El recuerdo que permite olvidar." *Revista Reflexión*, No. 30, September 2003.

John Mercer, "Canadian Cities and Their Immigrants: New Realities." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 538, March 1995.

Liliana Muñoz, "Exile as bereavement: Socio-psychological manifestations of Chilean exiles in Great Britain." *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, Vol. 53, 1980.

Mariló Nuñez, "North Meets South". *Canadian Woman Studies,* Vol. 19, No. 3.

J. C. M. Ogelsby "A Trudeau Decade: Canadian-Latin American Relations 1968-1978." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, Vol. 21, No. 2, May, 1979.

Carmela Patrias and Ruth A. Frager, "This is Our Country, These Are Our Rights: Minorities and the Origins of Ontario's Human Rights Campaigns." *Canadian Historical Review,* Vol. 82, No. 1, March 2001.

Margarite M. Perez, "Exile: The Chilean Experience." *International Journal Of Social Psychiatry*, vol. 30, no. 1-2, March 1984.

Augusto Pinochet, "Carta a los chilenos", December 1998. http://es.wikisource.org/wiki/Carta_a_los_Chilenos,_de_Augusto_Pinochet.

David Pion-Berlin, "To Prosecute or to Pardon? Human Rights Decisions in the Latin American Southern Cone." *Human Rights Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 1, February 1994.

Peter Read, "The Truth Which Will Set Us All Free: National Reconciliation, Oral History and the Conspiracy of Silence." *Oral History*, Spring 2007.

Loreto Rebolledo, "Mujeres exiliados con Chile en la memoria". Centro de Estudios Miguel Enríquez- Archivo Chile, www.archivochile.com/Mov_socialesmov_mujeresMSmovmujeres0018.pdf.

Katherine Roberts Hite, "Chile: A Rough Road Home." *NACLA Report on the Americas,* Vol. 24, No. 5, February 1991.

Arturo Roizblatt and Daniel Pilowsky, "Forced Migration and Resettlement: Its Impact on Families and Individuals". *Contemporary Family Therapy,* Vol. 18, No. 4, December 1996.

Luis Roniger and James Green, "Exile and the Politics of Exclusion in Latin America", *Latin American Perspectives*, Vol. 34, No. 4, 2007.

William Rowe and Teresa Whitfield, "Thresholds of Identity: Literature and Exile in Latin America." *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 9, No. 1, January 1987.

Edward W. Said, "The Mind of Winter: Reflections on life in exile." *Harper's*, Vol. 269, No. 1612, September 1984.

Jesús de Andrés Sanz, "The Coups d'Etat and the International Context". *CPA Estudios / Working Papers,* No. 10, 2004.

Eduardo Silva, "Capitalist Regime Loyalties and Redemocratization in Chile", *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, Vol. 34, No. 4, Winter 1992-1993.

Joan Simalchik, "The Material Culture of Chilean Exile: A Transnational Dialogue", *Refuge,* Vol. 23, No. 2, June 2006.

Brian H. Smith, "Churches and Human Rights in Latin America: Recent Trends in the Subcontinent." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, Vol. 21, No. 1, February 1979.

Charles D. Smith, "Refugee or Asylum-Does Canada Have a Choice?" *International Migration Review*, Vol. 21, No. 1, Spring 1987.

Mario Sznajder and Luis Roniger, "Political exile in Latin America" *Latin American Perspectives,* Vol. 34, No. 4, 2007.

--, "Exile Communities and their Differential Institutional Dynamics: A Comparative Analysis of the Chilean and Uruguayan Political Diasporas." *Revista de Ciencia Política,* Vol. 27, No. 1, 2007.

Antonio Ugalde and Rodolfo R. Vega, "State Terrorism, Torture, and Health in the Southern Cone." *Social Science and Medicine,* Vol. 28, No. 7, 1989.

Steven Volk, "Chile and History: The Meanings of 1973." *NACLA Report of the Americas,* Vol. XXVII, No. 2, September/October 1993.

Alexander Wilde, "Irruptions of Memory: Expressive Politics in Chile's Transition to Democracy." *Journal of Latin American Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 2, May 1999.

Thomas C. Wright, "Legacy of Dictatorship: Works on the Chilean Diaspora." *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 30, No. 3, 1995.

Thomas C. Wright and Rody Oñate Zúñiga, "Chilean Political Exile", *Latin American Perspectives,* Vol. 34, No. 4, 2007.

Theses

Litzy Baeza Kallens, "Voces del exilio: testimonios orales del exilio chileno en Edmonton, Canadá." Master's thesis in Latin American Studies, Universidad de Chile, 2004.

Maurice Demers, "Pan-Americansim Re-Invented in Uncle Sam's Backyard: Catholic and Latin Identity in Québec and Mexico in the First Half of the Twentieth Century." Doctoral thesis in History, York University, 2010.

Monica Escobar, "Exile Women and National Identity: Chilean Women in Canada." Doctoral thesis in Psychology, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, 2000.

Gabrielle Etcheverry, "Ediciones Cordillera: A Study of Chilean Literary Production in Canada". Master's thesis in Communication and Culture, York University, 2005.

Raul M. Muñoz, "Separation and National Identity: A Narrative Account of Chilean Exiles Living in Saskatchewan." Master's thesis in Sociology, University of Saskatchewan, 2006.

Matthew Scalena, "'I Don't Get Out Without a Fight': Exploring the Life Stories of Chilean Exiles." Master's thesis in History, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, Canada. 2005.

Joan Simalchik, "Part of the Great Awakening: Canadian Churches and the Chilean Refugees, 1970-1979." Master's thesis in History, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, 1993.

Bulletins and reports

A Diplomat's Handbook, "Case Study: Chile."
http://www.diplomatshandbook.org/pdf/Handbook_Chile.pdf

Alberta Manpower Settlement Services, "Latin American Newcomers: Issues Affecting the Adaptation of Immigrants from Chile, Nicaragua, Guatemala and El Salvador." Date unknown, post-1984. Multicultural History Society of Ontario Oral History Archive.

José Borgoño, "A Preliminary Report on the Analysis of the Spanish Speaking Community." Centre for Spanish Speaking Peoples, Toronto, Canada, July 1976.

-----------------, "The Board's Social Service Function in Regard to the Spanish-Speaking Community." The Board of Education for the City of Toronto Social Work Services, Toronto, Canada, February 1977.

-----------------, "School drop-outs: the ethnocultural factor". Text of presentation to the Board of Education for the City of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, October 1987.

-----------------, "Inmigración, bilingüismo e identidad: el caso de los niños y jóvenes hispanohablantes". Text of presentation for the Fourth Annual Day of Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, February 2008.

Andrew Brewin, Louis Duclos and David MacDonald, "One Gigantic Prison: Report of the Fact-Finding Mission to Chile, Argentina and Uruguay." Toronto: Inter-Church Committee on Chile, 1976.

Cathy Carroll, Bob Carty and John Foster, "Chilean Refugees –Canada's reluctant response." United Church of Canada, March 1974.

Chicago Commission of Inquiry into the Status of Human Rights in Chile, "Report of the Chicago Commission of Inquiry into the Status of Human Rights in Chile. Santiago, Chile, February 16-23, 1974." Chicago, 1974.

Comisión Nacional de Verdad y Reconciliación,"Informe de la Comisión Nacional de Verdad y Reconciliación." Santiago: La Nación, 1991.

Loreto Cox, "Divorcio en Chile: Un análisis preliminar tras la nueva Ley de Matrimonio Civil." Centro de Estudios Públicos seminar, May 10, 2011.

Wei Wei Da, "Chileans in Canada: Contexts of Departure and Arrival." Toronto: Latin American Research Group, York University, 2002.

Gallup Report 1974. Ottawa: The Canadian Gallup Poll Limited, 1974.

Gallup Report 1975. Ottawa: The Canadian Gallup Poll Limited, 1975.

Hispanic Development Council, "Latin America and Canada: A community perspective." http://www.hispaniccouncil.net/the-americas-spain.html

Hispanic Social Development Council, "Socio-Economic Profile of the Latin American Community of Metro Toronto." Toronto, 1983. Multicultural History Society of Ontario Archive.

Isabel Jara Hinojosa, "Imagen-País' de la Unidad Popular y de la Dictadura chilena: la disputa de los proyectos editorials." Prácticas del territorio: Arte, Crítica e Historia colloquiam, 23 November 2011, Centro GAM, Santiago, Chile.

Latin American Community Centre, "Latin Americans in North York: An Exploratory Study." North York, Ontario, 1980. Multicultural History Society of Ontario Archive.

Andrew Machalski, "Hispanic Writers in Canada". Ottawa: Department of the Secretary of State, Multiculturalism Department, 1988.

Fernando Mata, "Immigrants From the Hispanic World in Canada- Demographic Profiles and Social Adaptation." Toronto: Centre for Research on Latin America and the Caribbean, York University, 1988.

Organization of American States, "Report on the State of Human Rights in Chile." 1985.

Organización Internacional para las Migraciones, "Las Migraciones Internacionales: Análisis y perspectivas para una Política Migratoria." Santiago, 2003.

Rene E. Rodas, "No More Children of a Postponed Dream." Toronto, 1993. Prepared for the Ontario Historic Society and the Hispanic Council of Metropolitan Toronto. Multicultural History Society of Ontario Archive.

Statistics Canada, "Hispanic Spanish speaking population in Canada: a special report prepared for the Canadian Hispanic Congress." 2006.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees magazine *Refugees*, No. 38, February 1987.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, "La situación de los refugiados en el mundo 2000. Cincuenta años de acción humanitaria." United Nations, 2000.

U.S Congress, Senate Judiciary Subcommittee. Hearing before the subcommittee to investigate problems connected with refugees and escapees of the committee on the Judiciary United States Senate. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

United States Congress and Senate, "Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities". Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1976.

Lionel Vallée, "Report on a trip to Chile, December 1973." Social Science Research Council of Canada, Ottawa, 1974.

Print Media

El Popular (Toronto)

The Guardian (London, England)

Globe and Mail

Hoy (Santiago)

Le Devoir

Montreal Gazette

National Post

Saturday Night

Time Magazine

Toronto Star

Interviews

Interview by author with Alfonso Álvarez, Toronto, November 4, 2008. Interview in Spanish.

Interview by author with Ana, Toronto, November 21, 2008. Interview in English. She requested that her family name not be used.

Interview number one by author with Ana María Barrenechea, Toronto, December 21, 2009. Interview in English. There is no audio recording of this interview.

Interview number two by author with Ana María Barrenechea, Toronto, February 14, 2010. Interview in English and Spanish.

Interview by author with Willy Behrens, Ottawa, February 17, 2010. Interview in Spanish.

Interview by author with José Borgoño, Toronto, October 21, 2008. Interview in Spanish.

Interview by author with Raquel Borgoño, Toronto, October 21, 2008. Interview in Spanish.

Interview by author with Eduardo Boza, Toronto, November 3, 2008. Interview in Spanish.

Interview by author with Luis Cortés, Toronto, November 4, 2008. Interview in Spanish.

Interview by author with José Del Pozo, Santiago, April 19, 2010. Interview in Spanish.

Interview by author with Marcela Duran, Toronto, October 30, 2008. Interview in English.

Interview by author with Jorge Etcheverry, Ottawa, February 16, 2010. Interview in Spanish.

Interview by author with Marlinda Freire, Toronto, October 22, 2008. Interview in Spanish.

Interview by author with Patricia Godoy, Toronto, October 31, 2008. Interview in Spanish.

Interview by author with Jeffry House, Toronto, February 11, 2010. Interview in English.

Interview by author with Manuel Jofré, Santiago, April 16, 2010. Interview in Spanish.

Interview by author with Alfredo Lavergne, Santiago, April 12, 2010. Interview in Spanish.

Interview by author with Jaime Llambías-Wolff, Toronto, November 23, 2009. Interview in English.

Interview by author with María Teresa, Toronto, October 3, 2008. Interview in Spanish. She requested that her family name not be used.

Interview by author with Juan Nuñez, Toronto, November 21, 2009. Interview in Spanish.

Interview by author with Nidia Rivera, Toronto, November 9, 2008. Interview in English.

Interview by author with Joan Simalchik, Toronto, February 15, 2010. Interview in English.

Interview by author with S.V.P., Toronto, October 31, 2008. Interview in Spanish. She requested that only her initials be used.

Interview number one by author with Carlos Torres, Toronto, October 21, 2008. Interview in English.

Interview number two by author with Carlos Torres, Santiago, April 11, 2010. Interview in Spanish.

Web Sites

Archives Canada: http://www.Archivescanada.ca

Archivo Chile, Web del Centro Estudios Miguel Enríquez (CEME): http://www.archivo-chile.com

Casa Salvador Allende: http://casasalvadorallende.com

Citizenship and Immigration Canada: http://www.cic.gc.ca

Derechos Chile: http://www.derechoschile.com

GeoCities: http://www.geocities.com (No longer operational)

Geographic.org: www.geographic.org

Granta: www.granta.com

Informe País: www.informepais.cl

Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, Organization of American States: http://www.cidh.oas.org.

Human Resources and Skills Development Canada: http://www4.hrsdc.gc.ca

Library of Congress Country Studies/Area Handbook Series: http://countrystudies.us

Migration Policy Institute: www.migrationinformation.org

National Security Archive, George Washington University: http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv.

Scribd: www.scribd.com

Statistics Canada: http://www12.statcan.ca

Wikisource: http://es.wikisource.org