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Introduction

By the late 1960s as the United States war in Vietnam was raging and protests against it were growing larger, more citizens began to openly criticize the power and influence that the U.S. wielded in world affairs. A vocal part of the antiwar movement was comprised of protestors who viewed the U.S. as an imperialist power; they used the antiwar movement to protest the war and the pattern of U.S. influence in other nations’ affairs. During this time many of these anti-imperialists were also growing concerned with U.S. policies in Latin America and the Caribbean. The U.S. government has had policies justifying intervention and the exertion of political and economic influence in this region since the early 1800s. During the Cold War political scientists dubbed this phenomenon of U.S. exertion of its own interests in other nations’ affairs as part of the U.S. sphere of influence.¹ This was especially evident as the U.S. attempted to stop South America and Southeast Asia from falling under Communism and Soviet influence during the Cold War.

While the war in Vietnam occupied the agenda of most anti-imperialists during the mid to late 1960s, the early 1970s brought a loss of momentum to the antiwar movement. As its activism began to decline, a group of anti-imperialists shifted their focus to Latin America with the fear that it was destined to become the “next Vietnam.” Beginning in 1970 this fear was heightened by the U.S. government’s hostility towards Salvador Allende, the democratically elected Marxist president in Chile. In 1971, a year after Allende was elected to office, Community Action on Latin America (CALA) an anti-imperialist group based in Madison, Wisconsin was founded. CALA focused its

efforts on educating U.S. citizens, specifically in Wisconsin, about the problems of U.S. policy in Latin America. As the U.S.-Chilean relationship continued to deteriorate, it became clear that more needed to be done to address U.S. actions in Chile. In April 1972 a new national organization, Non-Intervention in Chile (NICH), was founded at a CALA conference in order to focus solely on activism against U.S. interventions in Chile. This is the story of the solidarity movement in the U.S. with Allende’s Chile led by CALA and NICH from 1971 until September 11, 1973.

The emergence of Community Action on Latin America (CALA) can be understood through the framework of earlier leftist anti-imperialist activism in the U.S. and the key ideologies of these activists. One central ideology for many anti-imperialists was dependency theory. This was an economic theory that had its roots in an earlier Latin American economic theory from the late 1940s and became prominent in the 1950s to 70s. It served as an explanation on how developed nations keep underdeveloped nations in a state of perpetual subordination (or dependency). This theory added to activists’ understanding of the harmful nature of U.S. influence and intervention in underdeveloped countries. Dependency theory was popular amongst those who led the revival of radical activism against racial injustices and Cold War militarism in the 1960s. This group was classified as the new left and it laid the foundation for CALA’s activism. In this story, the understanding of new left activism is couched in a discussion of Fair Play for Cuba Committee (FPCC), an organization that stood in solidarity with Castro’s Cuban revolution in the early 1960s. FPCC’s activism set a precedent of solidarity with a leftist government that the U.S. government opposed. The model of FPCC and its successes set the stage for CALA’s emergence as an anti-imperialist group focused on Latin American
causes. Later, leftwing activists of the Vietnam-era antiwar movement, insofar as they judged the war as a manifestation of U.S. imperialism, also directly influenced CALA. These leftist factions believed that the war in Vietnam had been a natural consequence of U.S. policy and imperialism. Growing out of this consciousness, CALA organized to ensure that there would not be another Vietnam in Latin America.

The founders of CALA believed that if more citizens had known about U.S. involvement in Vietnam, that the war could have been prevented. Thereby education was a core component of CALA’s mission as was its focus on community activism. CALA was based on the University of Wisconsin-Madison’s campus, but sought to engage the whole Madison community, not just the academic one. One way to engage the community was to draw connections between Wisconsin citizens to those of Chile and other Latin American nations in order to inspire an urgency to take action against U.S. interventions. CALA aimed to explore the effect that Allende’s nationalization of the Chilean copper industry had on the exploitation of the workers of the Wisconsin copper industry in rural Wisconsin in order to make the issue more relatable for the Madison community. As part of an effort to educate a larger crowd about events in Chile, CALA hosted a Crisis in Chile Conference at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in April 1972 as Allende’s government faced growing opposition apparently fostered by the United States. Nixon and Henry Kissinger, Nixon’s national security advisor, feared that Allende’s victory would lead to an unprecedented spread of Communism in South America. Indeed, Allende and his coalition government, Unidad Popular (UP), soon became the Nixon administration’s main foreign target. In light of United States hostility

---

towards Allende, CALA planned the conference to “promote interest in and knowledge about recent developments in Chile by bringing together Latin and North American scholars and members of the greater Madison and University communities.” The U.S. government and a few corporations’ plans to sabotage the Chilean government had recently been exposed in the U.S. media and CALA wanted to capitalize on this knowledge and continue educating people about the danger of an impending intervention.

Over fifty academics, Latin American activists, politicians, and clergy from around the U.S., Canada and Chile were invited by CALA to join in this weekend of teaching and learning. The most notable part of this conference was the creation of Non-Intervention in Chile (NICH), a group formed under the umbrella of CALA that aimed to rebut and block U.S. threats to Allende’s government. While education was also an essential component of NICH’s activism, most of its work had the character of direct action. NICH held demonstrations, circulated petitions and worked to educate the U.S. public about the merits of Allende’s government and the threat that U.S. corporations and government posed to Chile. Together, CALA and NICH continued educating U.S. citizens and protesting against the U.S. corporations that worked to subvert Allende’s government until the violent military coup occurred on September 11, 1973. Allende was killed and thus began a seventeen-year military dictatorship in Chile. In response, a significant movement of solidarity with Chile arose in the United States as a protest against the U.S. government’s support for the dictatorship and its blatant human rights violations.

---

abuses. NICH was involved in this post-coup movement, but its mission was altered as a reaction to the new circumstances in Chile. Due to its size and prominence within the canon of 1970s activism, the post-coup solidarity movement is better known than the solidarity movement led by CALA-NICH during Allende’s presidency. Yet it was the pre-coup movement led by CALA-NICH, which set the stage for the post-coup movement’s quick mobilization and success.

A discussion of Allende’s path to presidency and his relationship with the U.S. government is necessary for an understanding of the significance of the pre-coup and post-coup solidarity movements. In 1933, a twenty-five year old Allende helped found the Chilean Socialist Party.6 "From 1952 on, Allende became a Socialist presidential candidate inspired by Marxist visions of a transformed world…and whose ultimate goal was a revolutionary one— a democratic road to socialism."7 Despite the historic tensions between the Socialist and Communist parties, Allende believed that the way to obtain this peaceful socialism would be through a coalition of these two working class parties. The Socialist party had split in the early 1950s but in 1956 the Socialist party reunified and began an alliance with the Chilean Communist party (PCCh) to form a new coalition, Frente de Acción Popular (FRAP). Allende was chosen as the unified party’s presidential nominee for the 1958 election. Although he lost, this election was a turning point for Allende as it established his vision of democratic socialism as a legitimate one that had a chance to succeed.8 This political moment corresponded with Fidel Castro’s revolution in Cuba, which came the following year. The Cuban revolution “would transform politics

---

7 Ibid, 136.
throughout the region, upping the leftist ante, polarizing politics along ideological line and involving the United States in covert interventions in the politics of democratic countries like Chile to prevent ‘another Cuba’- or an Allende victory.” 9 The U.S.’s reaction to the Cuban revolution angered many and spurred a solidarity movement in the U.S. with Cuba, which would serve as a precursor for CALA.

The success of the leftwing revolution in Cuba raised Chilean leftists’ hopes that Allende could succeed with a win in the 1964 presidential election. Contemporary Chilean scholar and politician, Heraldo Muñoz said, “the Cuban Revolution symbolized and synthesized the essential tenets of [the Socialist] party… Cuba constituted a nationalist, anti-imperialist, popular, anticapitalist and Latin American experience” that resonated with Allende’s party.10 This coupled with Allende’s strong showing in the 1958 election scared the right wing parties who abandoned their candidates in favor of the more moderate candidate, Eduardo Frei, of the Christian Democrat party.11 Frei’s moderate reformist agenda was seen as the “lesser of two evils” and with the support of the right wing parties he was able to win the election.12 Once in power, Frei’s reforms were limited, which angered many leftists within the Christian Democrat party and caused many to leave the party to form a new one called Popular Action Unity Movement (MAPU). In attempts to keep the rest of the Christian Democrats together, left-leaning Radomiro Tomic, was chosen as the party’s candidate. Still, Tomic was too radical for the right wing parties to endorse, so they elected former Chilean president, Jorge

9 Winn, 138.
10 Harmer, 21.
12 Ibid.
Alessandri, as their candidate.\(^\text{13}\) Allende’s advisors predicted that a split between the right and the Christian democrats would be an essential component for the possibility of victory for Allende. But in order to succeed, a broad coalition between left and center-left groups was necessary.\(^\text{14}\) This coalition, called the Unidad Popular (UP), was created in 1969 and was comprised of Socialists, Communists and four non-Marxist parties, including MAPU, that were to the left and right of Allende’s political views. Allende would finally win the presidential election on September 4, 1970 under this coalition and become the first democratically elected Marxist president in Latin America.

However, Allende’s victory was not an easy one. He won only 36.3 percent of the vote while the right wing National Party candidate, Alessandri, won 34.9 percent and Tomic won 27.8 percent.\(^\text{15}\) Since Allende did not win the majority of votes and Alessandri refused to concede the election, his victory needed approval by Congress. The U.S. government’s initial plan to ensure that Allende did not get the congressional votes was to bribe Christian Democratic congressmen to vote for Alessandri in exchange for political power and money from U.S. corporations in Chile. Once it was clear that the Christian Democrats would vote for Allende the U.S. devised a new plan at a meeting attended by Nixon and Kissinger. The idea was to kidnap the head of the military, General René Schneider, but make it appear as though it had been done by radical leftists in hopes that it would inspire a military coup against Allende. Yet the plan went awry and Schneider was killed during the kidnapping. Initially, the far-left group, Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria (MIR), was blamed but within days a retired general uncovered

\(^{13}\) Winn, 141.
\(^{14}\) Ibid.
\(^{15}\) Haslam, 56.
the truth. The nation was shocked by the right wing violence, which created the necessary political pressure to secure Allende’s victory in the Congress.¹⁶

This U.S. backed operation to try to stop Allende from coming to power was not the first instance of U.S. intervention in Chilean or Latin American politics. U.S. intervention in Chile was a product of Cold War ideology and of U.S. economic interests that dated back to before the Nixon administration. As Thomas G. Paterson wrote, President John Kennedy, “preached democracy, but in Latin America he sent military aid to the forces of oppression.”¹⁷ When it came to Latin America, protecting U.S. financial and ideological interests trumphed the protection of democracy. Between 1962-64, in preparation for Allende’s election against Frei, the CIA funneled money into various media outlets, political groups and activist groups to stop Allende’s party from winning the election. The Kennedy and later Johnson administrations’ fear that Allende would nationalize the profitable copper industry was one factor that drove the decision to fund these groups.¹⁸

While protecting economic interests was always on the forefront of the U.S. government’s mind, it was Cold War inspired ideological concerns about Allende and the UP that drove the U.S. government’s interest in intervention in Chile. Allende’s socialist government served as a major ideological threat to the U.S. war against Communism and the Soviet Union. The Nixon administration feared that Allende’s victory coupled with Castro’s rule in Cuba would lead to Communist victories throughout the South American

¹⁶ Haslam 67-71; Winn, 142-143.
continent. This could also inspire and strengthen left-wing parties in Europe, creating a regional and global Communist crisis.\(^{19}\) Yet the democratic nature of Chile’s election made it difficult for the U.S. to oppose Allende openly because of the U.S. emphasis on global democracy. There was fear within the government that an overreaction to Allende’s election would strengthen him and the Chilean left while embarrassing the U.S.\(^{20}\) This led to the Nixon administration’s initial decision to covertly put pressure on the Allende government. A National Security Decision Memorandum issued on November 9, 1970 addressing the Chile situation ordered the U.S. to ‘prevent its [the Chilean government] consolidation and limit its ability to implement policies contrary to the United States and hemispheric interests.’\(^{21}\) In July 1971, the UP began nationalizing the Chilean copper industry as part of Allende’s plan to free Chile from its economic dependency on the U.S. This was seen as “direct attack on U.S. economic interests” and Nixon retaliated by blocking Chile’s applications for bank loans.\(^{22}\)

The U.S. policy of Chilean “containment” also included an invisible credit blockade. This blockade decreased Chile’s capacity to import consumer and factory goods, which reduced Chilean industrial outputs and fueled inflation.\(^{23}\) The economic turmoil caused by the containment policy and the expenses of the nationalization process led to increased middle class support of the right wing parties and an overall exacerbation of social tensions.\(^{24}\) Historian Stephen Rabe argued that this middle class support was born out of the fear that a lower class revolution would result in even greater loss to

\(^{19}\) Harmer, 60-61.  
\(^{20}\) Ibid, 68.  
\(^{21}\) Ibid, 69-70.  
\(^{22}\) Ibid, 110-111.  
\(^{24}\) Ibid.
“their own privileges.”\textsuperscript{25} The U.S. aided the process of polarization both economically and socially, which helped fuel the conditions for enough domestic unrest that would justify a military intervention.\textsuperscript{26} As Kissinger said days after the coup, the U.S.’s covert policies towards Chile during Allende’s presidency did as much as possible to create the conditions for the military coup on September 11, 1973.\textsuperscript{27}

The U.S. solidarity movement against the junta government led by Augusto Pinochet grew rapidly after the fall of Allende’s democratic socialist government and his death during the coup. During the height of the movement there were about one hundred groups with varying ideologies and strategies across the U.S. fighting for an end to U.S. support of Pinochet’s regime.\textsuperscript{28} Despite comprehensive scholarship on these groups and on the U.S.-Chilean relationship during Allende’s presidency, there has been almost no scholarship exploring the U.S. solidarity movement with Allende’s presidency.

In Margaret Power’s article “The U.S. Movement in Solidarity with Chile in the 1970s,” she writes off the pre-coup movement as “small and primarily consisted of individuals and groups who supported the [UP] government and identified with the left. They were attracted by the UP’s commitment to democratic socialism, popular participation, and substantial improvements in the people’s standard of living.”\textsuperscript{29} While most of the individuals involved in the pre-coup solidarity were leftists, her characterization fails to provide a complete account of their movement. Although the pre-coup movement was smaller and less diverse than the post-coup movement but it played

\textsuperscript{25} Rabe, 112.
\textsuperscript{26} Feinberg, 35.
\textsuperscript{27} Harmer, 220.
\textsuperscript{28} Heidi Tinsman, \textit{Buying into the Regime: Grapes and Consumption in Cold War Chile and the United States}, (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014), 179.
a significant role in enabling the quick mobilization of the latter movement and in influencing 1970s activism as a whole. CALA-NICH was the largest group dedicated to Chilean solidarity before the coup and had access to resources and infrastructure that was instrumental for the immediate response to the coup. NICH would remain a strong presence in the post-coup movement, as the movement continued to mobilize people against U.S. support for the Pinochet regime in the following years. CALA-NICH’s influence was not limited to the Chilean solidarity movement; the 1970s was marked by a form of activism that was distinctly focused on corporate power and responsibility in the global world. CALA-NICH’s anti-imperialist activism was intrinsically anti-corporate and its campaigns against corporate injustices in Chile were on the forefront of this trend of activism that would carry on throughout the decade and into the 1980s. While CALA-NICH never reached the scope of the post-coup movement its role as a Latin American-focused anti-imperialist group was profound and deserves a spot in the canon of radical activism in the 1970s.
Chapter One: Anti-Imperialism and the New Left

The renewal of vocal anti-imperialist activism in the 1960s set the stage for CALA’s founding in 1971. With the death toll rising in the Vietnam war, protestors took the streets calling for an end to the war. Anti-imperialists groups were a significant part of that antiwar movement protesting not just the war but also the U.S. policies that created the situation in Vietnam. These were the same interventionist policies that had led to a failed military invasion of Cuba shortly after Fidel Castro took power in 1961. Led by the Fair Play for Cuba Committee (FPCC), the solidarity movement in the U.S. with Cuba was influential in opening up the path for Cold War era protests against U.S. foreign policy and for the antiwar in Vietnam protests that would occur a few years later. Inspired by new left ideology, those who protested against U.S. policies towards Cuba and Vietnam understood that these incidents were not anomalies but rather the result of U.S. imperialism. Many of the founders of CALA had been directly involved in the antiwar in Vietnam movement. As that movement began to decline in the early 1970s these anti-imperialists shifted their focus to Latin America in an attempt to prevent “another Vietnam.” It was the political and social developments of the anti-imperialism movements in the 1960s that helped usher in CALA’s form of Latin America focused anti-imperialism in the summer of 1971.

CALA’s founding was the direct result of a proposal passed at an advisory conference on Latin America at Cornell University in March 1971. The conference brought professors, campus ministers and other university-affiliated individuals who were concerned with U.S. policies in Latin America together to brainstorm a remedy to the
deteriorating U.S.-Latin American relationship.\textsuperscript{30} The proposal came from the United Presbyterian Church’s committee on Inter-American Concerns and a national organization of several denominations of campus ministries, the United Ministries of Higher Education’s (UMHE) Internationalization Committee. These were mostly campus affiliated religious groups that were concerned about U.S. policies surrounding Latin America. They proposed to create centers of Latin American Policy Study at the University of Wisconsin, University of Texas, Stanford and Cornell, for the academic year of 1971-72 in order to educate U.S. citizens about the U.S.-Latin American relationship.\textsuperscript{31} CALA was set up as this center of policy study with grant money from Protestant and Catholic agencies, was able to immediately hire two staff members, University of Wisconsin graduate, Al Gedicks and history graduate student, Bruce Vandervort.\textsuperscript{32}

The members of CALA envisioned that their new organization would educate the Madison community about the problematic aspect of U.S. economic involvement in Latin America and garner support for movements in Latin America that were fighting against U.S. imperialism.\textsuperscript{33} This new organization was made up of “students, clergy, Latinos, and members of the Madison community.” Many of the Latino members were Chilean graduate students who planned to return to Chile and support the Unidad Popular (UP)


\textsuperscript{32} “Community Action on Latin America,” \textit{Ibero-American Newsletter} 2,1 (Fall 1971), 6.

government after their education. The Chileans who joined CALA “understood [the] major threat from [the] U.S. [and] wanted to…acquire skills to be of direct assistance,” to stop the “mechanism in the U.S. for American imperial aggression.” CALA was not solely interested in liberating Latin Americans from “the patterns of U.S. domination” it was also worried about the influence that corporate interests played in U.S. foreign policy matters.

**Dependency Theory and Anti-Imperialism**

CALA’s focus on the negative effects of U.S. economic involvement in Latin American stemmed from a prominent Latin American economic theory. Dependency theory was developed in the 1950s to explain the persistent poverty and underdevelopment of Latin American countries. It partially emerged in response to the insufficient explanation of underdevelopment put forth by the dominant modernization theory. Modernization theory related economic development to the stages of industrialization. It asserted that the poverty of underdeveloped countries was connected to technological underdevelopment. Further industrialization and the involvement of developed nations would end underdevelopment and alleviate poverty in these nations.

Dependency theorists argued that the modernization theory failed to address research that showed how “economic activity in the richer countries often led to serious economic problems in poorer countries.” One of the basic premises of dependency theory was the idea that capitalism perpetuates inequality, which can be understood

---

34 *Ibid*; Al Gedicks, Interview with Al Gedicks. Phone. Fairfax, VA, 6/19/15.
35 *Ibid*.
38 *Ibid*. 
through an exploration of the exporting and importing system. The resources of poor Latin American countries were extracted and then exported to developed nations where they were manufactured into various products and then sold back to the Latin American countries at a higher price. Under this model, Latin American countries were always behind because the cost of importing was higher than the money made from exporting the resources originally. Dependency theorists were indicting the system of capitalism; they saw it as the problem, not the solution for underdevelopment in Latin America countries.  

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s dependency theory continued to develop and became prominent among leftists intellectuals. *Monthly Review*, a socialist magazine founded in 1949, published several pieces on dependency theory and the problems that it created in Latin America. In September 1966 Andre Gunder Frank, an economics professor, published an article in *Monthly Review* entitled “The Development of Underdevelopment.” In this article he discussed the euro-centricity of the current “theoretical categories and guides to development policy” and how they were not suitable for understanding Latin American development.  

Gunder Frank pointed to the colonial history of Latin America as the foundation for this perpetual underdevelopment. He argues that the city “was founded by the Conqueror [the Spanish and Portuguese] to serve the same ends that it still serves today; to incorporate the indigenous population into the economy brought and developed by that Conqueror and his descendants. The regional city was an instrument of conquest and is

---

39 Ibid.
still today an instrument of domination.”\textsuperscript{41}

During the colonial period Latin America cities housed the more integrated mestizo population, where as the more discriminated against indigenous communities lived in the rural outskirts. Citing the National Indian Institute of Mexico, Gunder Frank argued that this created a “metropolis-satellite” relationship that involves an “economic and social interdependence…and that the provincial metropolis ‘by being centers of intercourse are also centers of exploitation.’”\textsuperscript{42}

These cities in Latin America then became “satellites” to the Spanish and Portuguese “metropolises” leading the Latin America nations to be the exploited, disadvantaged nations on the world economic stage.\textsuperscript{43} While modernization theory pointed to isolation from developed nations as an explanation for underdevelopment, Gunder Frank and dependency theorists argued the contrary. It was precisely the interactions with the capitalistic world economic system and the exploitation that followed which perpetuated the underdevelopment of these nations.\textsuperscript{44}

Imbedded in Gunder Frank’s analysis that the historic systems of colonialism and contemporary capitalism created underdevelopment in Latin America was the critique of imperialism as the system that continued to perpetuate it. For most dependency theorists the story of underdevelopment cannot be told without also implicating the system of imperialism. In 1970, Uruguayan writer Eduardo Galeano’s \textit{Monthly Review} piece “Latin America and the Theory of Imperialism” said, “Latin American countries have never controlled their own internal markets nor the destination of the economic surplus generated by their productive forces. The control of their basic resources has always been

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid, 19.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid, 20.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid, 23.
in foreign hands.”45 He argues that even after Latin American countries gained their independence, and in some cases industrialized, they remained dependent on Western nations through investments and the market presence of foreign corporations.46 Contrary to the modernization assertion that interaction with developed nations was the most beneficial way to end underdevelopment, Gunder Frank, Galeano and many other dependency theorists believed that economic independence from imperial powers was the solution.

Gunder Frank argued that Chile epitomized this notion of imperialist “satellite underdevelopment.” A report written by Al Gedicks, one of the founders of CALA, expanded upon this point. Gedicks had just graduated from the University of Wisconsin when CALA was founded where he had been a member of SDS. Gedicks’ urgency to prevent another Vietnam in Latin America coupled with his education “during the 1960s about the role of U.S. corporations and the military in the maintenance of an American empire” led him to the position of research coordinator of CALA in 1971.47 Much of his research focused on the connection between the expropriation of Chilean copper and its effect on the Wisconsin copper industry.48 This report was published after the coup in the leftist Review for Radical Political Economics but it was the result of the research Gedicks’ conducted during his employment at CALA. He found that the U.S.-owned Anaconda Copper Mining Company and Kennecott Copper Corporation made $2,011 million in profits from Chilean copper mines from 1915-1968. Of those $2,011 million made from extracting Chilean resources, only $738 million was reinvested into the

---

46 Ibid.
48 Ibid.
Chilean economy. When Allende nationalized the copper industry in the summer of 1971, he “declared the event Chile’s ‘second independence,’ referring to the achievement of economic independence that has been denied [to] Chile since its political break from Spain in 1818.” The story of the Chilean copper industry showed the limitations of economic theories that ignored the adverse effects that capitalism and imperialism had on formerly colonized nations in Latin America.

Although dependency theory was developed directly in relation to Latin America, it gradually expanded to other parts of the developing world, especially Africa. While dependency theory was not usually applied towards Vietnam or other parts of Southeast Asia, the theory’s anti-imperialist ideology was directly related to the contemporary war in Vietnam. The antiwar movement was comprised of a broad coalition of individuals and groups who had varying political ideologies, yet an influential faction of this movement was motivated by anti-imperialism. Yet before the Vietnam War, this connection between dependency theory and anti-imperialism manifested itself in the solidarity movement in the U.S. with the Castro’s Cuban Revolution.

**Fair Play for Cuba Committee and the New Left**

The Cuban revolution was a turning point for anti-imperialist activism in the U.S. It set the precedence for opposing U.S. imperial policies during the Cold War era and it was an important component for the rise of new left activism. Both of these elements would set the stage for CALA’s form of activism that would emerge a decade later. Dubbed the new left in the 1960s, this movement had began to emerge in the 1950s as more intellectually based “left wing insurgency” that would be rooted in participatory

---


democracy and non-violence.\textsuperscript{51} It focused on racial injustice and U.S. militarism as its core issues and sympathized with countries that were “emerging from colonialism to independence.”\textsuperscript{52} Unlike earlier movements, the new left identified students and African-Americans as the demographics most likely to create this radical social change.\textsuperscript{53} While the civil rights group, Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), and antiwar movement group, SDS, are more notably associated with the new left, the Cuban solidarity movement played an important role in the emergence of the new left.

By January 1, 1959, Fidel Castro’s movement had overthrown the Cuban dictator Fulgencio Batista and had officially begun governing in Cuba but the revolution was far from over. According to Aviva Chomsky, “‘the revolution’ refers to a 50-year process of consciously creating a new society with many different phases” in Cuba.\textsuperscript{54} Castro’s revolution relied on the need for populist social policies to bring about political change. He “declared that a government’s authority rested on the consent of the governed.”\textsuperscript{55} Despite the end of McCarthyism, the stronger association between the Cuban revolution and socialism had made it politically “suicidal” to openly support Castro’s revolution.\textsuperscript{56} The negative ramifications of supporting Castro’s revolution deterred some leftist support for the movement, as did the Marxist-Leninist conception of “adventurism.” Adventurism was the idea of violent action or revolution that was not linked to deep-rooted thought or ideology. Many older Marxist-Leninist leftists feared that Castro’s movement fit the mold

\textsuperscript{52} Brick and Phelps, 86.
\textsuperscript{53} Rossinow, 2.
\textsuperscript{54} \textit{Ibid}, 43.
of adventurism. Despite their alignment with many of the Cuban revolution’s ideals, including anti-imperialism, those leftists chose not to join in solidarity with Cuba.

Castro’s movement also isolated that particular group of leftists because it did not identify itself within the already existing Marxist-Lenin revolutionary mold. “This older left model of programmatic, party-based revolution was anathema to the Cuban with their populist, youthful origins and their frank assertion of political eclecticism.” In contrast, it was exactly these youthful and populist aspects that attracted many new leftists to stand in solidarity with Castro. The commitment to anti-imperialism and efforts to end underdevelopment through the lens of dependency theory was imbedded in the emergence of the new left’s ideology and in the Castro’s revolutionary struggle. Despite the Cold War paradigm that support for a socialist government meant inherent support of the Soviet Union and anti-U.S. sentiments; these new left activists were skeptical of both the United States and the Soviet Union, two of the world’s superpowers. Instead, new leftists aligned themselves with the “Third World.” They viewed socialism and socialist revolutions as movements rooted in self-determination and as tools of “rapid economic development” for underdeveloped nations.

While the solidarity with Cuba movement in the U.S. was mostly composed of new left activists, members from various parts of the political spectrum were involved. The initial aim of the movement was to offset hostility towards Castro’s government and to oppose the U.S. government’s support for counter-revolutionary groups in Cuba. Those in solidarity with Cuba became an influential component of new left activism.

57 Ibid, 127, 129.
58 Ibid, 129.
59 Rossinow, 221.
60 Gosse, 129-131.
whereas some of the other leftists began straying into the liberal tent that supported intervention and perpetuation of dependency in Latin America.

Fair Play for Cuba Committee (FPCC) was the primary group associated with the solidarity movement and it was comprised of a diverse group of individuals from across the country. Many of the student activists from FPCC, “would in the next decade play leading roles in the antiwar movement and the revival of the intellectual left.”\(^{61}\) FPCC’s role as a new left activist group helped spark involvement in the antiwar movement and subsequently the Chilean solidarity movement. These movements were centered on the ideals of anti-imperialism and in terms of FPCC, on the economic concerns of underdeveloped nations. As Doug Rossinow explained, “in sum, virtually every current of the later sixties upsurge briefly cohered around the defense of Cuba.”\(^{62}\)

FPCC was founded by a small group of anti-imperialists who were reacting to the quickly deteriorating relations between Cuba and the U.S. in 1960. These individuals were angered by the U.S. diplomatic approach to Cuba and wanted to stop the negative manipulation of Cuba’s image in the media. As stated in FPCC’s original mission from April 1960, its goal was “to disseminate truth, to combat untruth, to publish the factual information which the U.S. mass media suppress, which the American public has the right to know.”\(^{63}\) FPCC saw the U.S. government and media’s distortion of the Cuban revolution as an “not merely a grave injustice to the Cuban people…but a serious threat, as well, to the free traditions of our own people, our nation, our Hemisphere.”\(^{64}\) FPCC
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envisioned that their efforts to disseminate the truth about the Cuban revolution would help restore positive diplomatic relations between the U.S. and Castro’s Cuba.\textsuperscript{65}

Prompted by a trade deal made in February 1960 by June 1960 the Eisenhower administration had become openly hostile to the Cuban government. Cuba had agreed to provide sugar to the Soviet Union in exchange for oil and manufactured goods and in response, U.S. oil companies in Cuba refused to process the Soviet oil. In June, Cuba expropriated the oil industry and by October of that year the U.S. had declared an economic embargo on Cuba.\textsuperscript{66} This series of events led to the U.S. decision to end all diplomatic relations with Cuba in January 1961. This break in relations in turn radicalized FPCC. Chapters began popping up on college campuses and all over the country as the ideology shifted to become more centrally aligned with new left ideals.\textsuperscript{67} This shift was caused by the increased radicalization of the Cuban revolution and by “the dynamic of [FPCC] being that strange new thing, an independent radical membership organization.”\textsuperscript{68} FPCC was unlike earlier solidarity organizations that took the form of coalitions or large organizations associated with a specific party. It was not associated with any political party and therefore attracted a diverse array of individuals committed to new left ideals and solidarity with the Cuban revolution.\textsuperscript{69}

One of the main leaders of FPCC, Saul Landau, was the head of the new left’s main intellectual journal, \textit{Studies on the Left}, and a student at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Landau and the other students who published \textit{Studies} were socialist club leaders who had formerly been in the youth wing of the Communist Party. From the
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Communist Party, they brought an anti-imperialist viewpoint with them to their work in the new left and in FPCC.\textsuperscript{70} Through FPCC, Landau organized a Christmas tour of Cuba for North American students in December of 1960. Over 326 students made the trip to Cuba that December one month before the U.S. government banned all travel to the island. Despite warnings and attempts from the U.S. State Department and other governmental officials to shut it down, the trip was a success. Those students returned to school in the January 1961 with first hand knowledge of the revolution. This sparked an upsurge in the formation of chapters, rallies, newspaper articles and other forms of student activism across the U.S. Cuba had become a hot-button topic on college campuses across the country.\textsuperscript{71}

In the late 1950s, before the big student trip to Cuba, Studies published an issue dedicated to the Cuban revolution that emphasized the importance of solidarity movements in the U.S. Similar to the original mission of FPCC, the issue directly linked support of Castro’s revolution with support of a truly democratic U.S. society.\textsuperscript{72} New left activists viewed the socialism of the Cuban revolution as an inspiration for social change within the U.S. It was not Castro’s specific plan that appealed to these activists it was his concepts such as universal healthcare that these activists felt were necessary and inspiring for U.S. society.\textsuperscript{73}

Other influential new leftists such as C. Wright Mills, a radical Columbia University professor and FPCC member, published writings in support of solidarity with Cuba. He argued that if U.S. students did not view the lessons from Cuban revolution as
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an opportunity to make real political change within the U.S. then they would “pale in comparison to their contemporaries.” In November 1960, Mills published, *Listen, Yankee!,* a book about his firsthand experience with the revolution based on interviews with rebels, intellectuals, journalists, government officials and with Castro himself. The book was written in first person from the point of view of a Cuban rebel addressing a “Yankee.” Mills wrote, “Our country, our Cuba, it *was* simply an economic colony of the U.S. corporations until our revolution…Our revolution is not about your fight with Russia, or about Communism, or Hemispheric Defense, or any of all that: all those words came later, partly forced down our throat by your government and your monopolies.”

Mills was and is seen as one of the most influential thinkers of the new left. Yet *Listen Yankee!* was the respected radical intellectual’s most controversial work and many of his contemporary ivy-league scholars were furious about his support of the revolution. Regardless, his effective writing in the non-academic style “did what it set out to do: it caused people to listen. Mills put the intellectuals’ formerly private dissent over Cuba into the mainstream and made it acceptable perhaps even fashionable to consider the Cuban point of view.” Mills also alienated many liberals who had shifted towards support for the counter-revolution, a view that was aligned with President Kennedy’s vision of continued intervention in Latin America.

The Christmas trip to Cuba and the support of Mills and various other prominent intellectuals all helped the growth of FPCC during its first year. By early 1961 FPCC
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reported 7,000 members, forty student chapters and twenty-seven non-campus based chapters. From late 1960 to early 1961 these chapters engaged in typical activist tactics such as film screenings, speaker, fundraisers, protests and various other events to educate people about the revolution in Cuba.\(^79\)

During the height of FPCC’s momentum, the failed U.S. attempt to overthrow Castro at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961 would mark the beginning of FPCC’s decline and would set the stage for future anti-imperialists and new left activism. Beginning in March 1960, the CIA and the U.S. government created, funded and trained a counter-revolutionary army comprised of Cuban exiles living in the U.S. in preparation for the Bay of Pigs invasion. The army trained in Florida, Panama and Guatemala and on April 17, 1961 they landed on Playa Girón in Cuba. Yet with little help on the ground, the rebel group was defeated by Castro’s military in just three days. This failed attempt to overthrow Castro’s government strengthened support for the Cuban revolution in both Cuba and in the U.S. amongst those who had previously been sympathetic but not vocally supportive of the movement.\(^80\) The overt operation, and worse its failure, generated significant attention in the U.S. and brought people out to the front lines with FPCC. The solidarity that FPCC had generated in earlier years was an important precursor for the mobilization of the protests that occurred in response to the Bay of Pigs. FPCC protests sprang up in cities all across the country from April 17 until the end of the invasion. Although these protests brought out individuals of all ages, it was the students who were at the forefront of these demonstrations.\(^81\)
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While the FPCC membership and protests never generated as much support as the later movement against the Vietnam war did, FPCC “altered the domestic political landscape, producing the first publicly visible dissent over imperial politics since the beginning of the Cold War.” These protests created the space for antiwar activists to speak out against U.S. policies of imperialism and economic intervention in later years. The Bay of Pigs protests were the largest protests against the U.S. government since the Cold War had begun. These protests allowed people to openly criticize the actions the U.S. government without the accusations of being anti-American, which set the stage for further demonstrations against the government.

Although Mills and a handful of other academics were already associated with the new left, the majority of academics did not support the Cuban revolution. Despite this, the overt actions of the U.S. government at the Bay of Pigs had created an overwhelming sense among intellectuals that U.S. intervention in Cuba was wrong. This response was part of the academic community’s slow shift towards the left in the 1960s, which would play a large role in the later antiwar in Vietnam movement. FPCC continued to exist after the Bay of Pigs but once the protests died down and momentum was lost the organization began to fade away. Van Gosse argues that by late 1961 FPCC “began to enter the half-life, neither defunct nor active in any consequential sense.” After the embarrassment of the Bay of Pigs the urgency around Cuba died because it was clear that the U.S. would not try another overt intervention. It also became more difficult to publically support Castro’s as he grew closer to the Soviet Union and declared himself a Marxist-Leninist.
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Additionally, the activism around race relations in the South became a priority for many leftist activists.  

Although the Cuban solidarity movement ended in the early 1960s it laid the groundwork for future radical politics in the U.S. including the anti-imperialist groups of the anti-Vietnam war movement. FPCC paved the way for dissent against U.S. imperialism during the Cold War and showed the government that there were U.S. citizens who would not tolerate U.S. imperialism or economic intervention. These young activists would continue to bring their new left ideals into later organizing and solidarity. It was FPCC and the Cuban solidarity movement that paved the way for antiwar activists and eventually for the activists in Madison, WI who decided that they could no longer stay silent on the U.S.’s policies towards Salvador Allende and the Chilean revolution.

The Antiwar Movement

Overt U.S. interventions in foreign countries, such as the Bay of Pigs and the Vietnam War, made it easier to mobilize U.S. citizens to demonstrate against the government’s actions. Yet there were groups and individuals calling for an end to U.S. interventions in Cuba and Vietnam before these disasters occurred. The FPCC existed before the Bay of Pigs and critiques of U.S. actions in Southeast Asia existed before the war. In June 1954, about a decade before the escalation of U.S. military involvement in Vietnam and six years before the creation of FPCC, the Monthly Review published an article warning about an impending crisis in Vietnam. The article “What Every American Should Know About Indo-China” written by Leo Huberman and Paul Sweezy, the magazine’s founders and editors, exposed the hypocrisy of the Cold War mentality as it stood in relation to the French rule in Vietnam. They argued that the U.S. government
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could dislike Communism but since the Vietnamese people wanted a Communist
government it should be their choice to elect one. “Are we going to take the position that
anti-Communism justifies anything, including colonialism, interference in the affairs of
other countries and aggression?” Huberman and Sweezy viewed the U.S. government’s
fighting Communism against the wishes of the Vietnamese people as a direct violation of
the founding principles of the U.S. This idea that U.S. imperialism was a force that
inherently hindered developing nations as well as U.S. democracy became a trope for
new left activism.

Radical leftists were among the earliest critics of U.S. intervention in Vietnam. The ideas espoused in Huberman and Sweezy’s article became more visible in U.S. society first through the FPCC and the new left’s growth in the early 1960s then more notably with certain groups in the antiwar movement. It was within the ideological vein of anti-imperialism as activism geared towards the liberation of developing nations as a means of also liberating the U.S. that CALA was founded. This critique of U.S. imperialism was well founded because of “a readiness to use military force, especially where communism or socialism of any kind was concerned, was in fact a hallmark of mainstream liberalism in the 1950s and 1960s.” Similar to the distrust of the liberal vision of Latin American that drove many FPCC activists to action, the anti-imperialists of the antiwar movement saw liberals as committed to imperialism and suppression of
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Communism by any means necessary in Vietnam. This view grew stronger as the liberal president, Johnson, escalated the war.  

In August 1964, a U.S. ship USS Maddox was reportedly attacked on two different occasions by North Vietnamese ships in the Gulf of Tonkin. Although it is now known that these attacks did not occur, the Gulf of Tonkin incidents led to the passing of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in Congress. This bill gave Johnson the power to “take all necessary measures to repel any armed attacks against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.” In early 1965 the U.S. began Operation Rolling Thunder, an airstrike campaign and by April it had begun an escalation of U.S. military presence in Vietnam. After April the number of troops being sent over increased rapidly for the next few years.

As seen by the Sweezy and Huberman’s article from 1954, there was opposition to U.S. intervention long before the escalation of the war in 1965 but the Gulf of Tonkin incident was a catalyst for the growth of the antiwar movement. Historian Tom Wells argues that it was in December 1964, four months after the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution that the idea for the first national action against the war in Vietnam would come into fruition. The event was planned for April 17, 1965 and 20,000 people would gather in Washington D.C. to take part in the largest peace demonstration in U.S. history to date. It was Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), an influential new left activist group that organized this demonstration.
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While FPCC facilitated the creation of the new left, SDS one of the main activist groups associated with that movement. SDS was born out of a socialist student organization and was started in 1960 at the University of Michigan. It was in 1962 when that the group officially adopted its manifesto, the *Port Huron Statement*, at a national SDS conference that the organization began growing on campuses across the nation.\(^{96}\) This statement excited leftist students across the country as it declared that radical social change would be rooted in participatory democracy and could only be accomplished by working both inside and outside of mainstream institutions. Just as Castro had inspired FPCC activists in his declaration that government only works if the citizens of the nation consent to their government, SDS called for citizens to share “in the social decisions determining the quality and direction of his [their] life.”\(^{97}\) SDS was heavily inspired by Mills’s work and called for the creation a true democracy in the U.S. based on domestic racial equality that was inherently linked to support for the developing nations.\(^{98}\) At the demonstration in April 1965, the SDS president Paul Potter argued that the system that was perpetuating both the war in Vietnam and the oppression and disenfranchisement of African Americans in the South must be brought down. While Potter refused to use name the system as capitalism and imperialism because he saw them as antiquated, later radical antiwar activists embraced those terms when referring to the perpetuation of inequality.\(^{99}\)

SDS’s demonstration in April 1965 was just one of the many actions that were organized by students or on campuses across the country that year. On March 24 the first teach-in about the Vietnam War took place at the University of Michigan. Over three
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thousand people showed up to this all night event that was organized by thirty professors at the University. SDS member Carl Oglesby wrote, “the stroke of genius out there in Michigan…put the debate on the map for the whole academic community.” Ann Arbor’s teach-in had a widespread effect and within the next few months over a hundred other teach-ins had been organized on campuses across the country. Over thirty thousand people attended the teach-in at the University of California in Berkeley.100

By the end of 1965, SDS had shifted their tactics away from education and teach-ins towards civil disobedience through large protests and demonstrations.101 As the war continued to escalate there was a change in military draft policy in February 1966. Before students had been exempt from the draft, now based on class rankings the university determined student eligibility. Through SDS protests against the ranking system, students became more aware of the university system’s complicity in the war and all that the war stood for.102 The momentum generated by all these events on campuses translated into increased support for SDS. SDS grew five times its size between 1965 and 1966, from 3,000 members to 15,000. And by 1967 they had doubled their number from the year before, reporting 30,000 members.103

As the war in Vietnam continued to escalate in the mid to late 1960s and affect the lives of many U.S. citizens, the antiwar movement became much more diverse. Until 1967, SDS and other leftists who had been calling for the downfall of imperialism and capitalism as the way to end the war had been a prominent presence in the anti-war movement. Many of the newer liberal activists saw Vietnam as an exceptional situation in
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U.S. history and were calling for an end to what they deemed a mistake. For new leftists, viewing Vietnam as a mistake was a mischaracterization of the war. They saw Vietnam as the most recent example, albeit an extreme one, of the pre-existing pattern of U.S. foreign policy. For SDS, what happened in Vietnam was part of a larger story about Cuba and the many other countries in the developing world where the U.S. had acted against its own values in favor of corporate interests and Cold War ideology. Oglesby explained “these interventions were made in order to quell the rising tide of anticolonialism around the world and thus maintain an ‘empire’ from which U.S. elites derived concrete benefits.” Vietnam was not a mistake and SDS wanted to show the U.S. government and people that the whole system needed to come down or else another Vietnam was inevitable.

SDS began to decline and lose its influence in the movement in the late 1960s, which was followed by the whole antiwar movement’s decline in the early 1970s. By 1970 Nixon had begun withdrawing troops and engaged in attempts to end the war through his policy of “Vietnamization.” These developments made the antiwar movement less urgent for many who opposed the war but were not avowed anti-imperialists. Between Nixon’s de-escalation of the war and his engagement of détente with the Soviet Union and China it appeared that the U.S. was heading towards a new era devoid of Cold War attitudes and into one of global cooperation. For those who subscribed to the liberal notion that Vietnam was just a mistake these developments made demonstrations and protests seem unnecessary. Yet the anti-imperialists were not impressed and while the antiwar movement as a whole declined greatly in 1970 many
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radical activists remained active until the last troops had been withdrawn from Vietnam. Even then they joined other movements to address the continued global and domestic injustices that the system, which helped create Vietnam, continued to perpetrate. It was in this moment of Vietnamization and the loss of motivation around the antiwar movement that CALA emerged as a response to the liberal notion that Vietnam as just a mistake. Al Gedicks, a founder of CALA, said that CALA was an “outgrowth of consciousness of the anti-imperialist games in Vietnam” and there was an understanding that once Vietnam was over the heat would shift to other developing countries.  

CALA identified Latin America as the next victim of U.S. imperialism and started organizing to prevent another Vietnam in that region.

Growing out of the still existing antiwar movement, CALA set out to educate and inform U.S. citizens about the U.S. government and corporations’ problematic actions in Latin America. On a flyer for a Latin American Speakers Bureau sponsored by CALA they wrote, “it was once said that war in Vietnam would not have been possible if the structure, function and motion of the U.S. foreign policy establishment had been a matter of public knowledge.”  

The activists who founded CALA in 1971 were reacting to and acting upon the same new left ideals that had been espoused by leftists in the antiwar movement and FPCC. Unlike the liberals who viewed Vietnam as a “mistake,” CALA-NICH activists understood it as a symptom of the larger problem, the system of capitalism and imperialism. New left activists throughout the 1960s had indicted these U.S.-perpetuated systems as the inhibitors of freedom in developing nations and as hindering true U.S. democracy. The formation of a solidarity group in support of the
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Cuban revolution within the U.S. was an influential aspect of the new left’s emergence. FPCC also created the space to openly critique U.S. policy without the political ramifications that U.S. citizens would have faced in the earlier years of the Cold War. The FPCC helped set the stage for the anti-imperialists groups in the early years of the antiwar movement. SDS was a significant force in the antiwar movement and for the continued development of the new left. It helped generate momentum on campuses across the country to end the war in Vietnam. SDS also worked to end the systems of imperialism and capitalism that were part of a pattern in U.S. foreign policy that had led to the war. It is within the framework of the new left activism that centered around bringing down these systems that we can gain a better understanding of CALA’s emergence in 1971.
Chapter Two: The First Year of CALA

Madison, Wisconsin’s deep roots in the traditions of progressive and radical politics dating back to the 1920s played a large role in shaping CALA. During the late 1950s and 1960s the University and subsequently the city became a center of New Left activism. Studies on the Left, Saul Landau and various other students active in FPCC were products of the University of Wisconsin. As new left ideals continued to proliferate in Madison, the 1960s and early 1970s was marked by several student protests and activism against the war in Vietnam. In an article of CALA’s first monthly newsletter, published in November 1971, CALA’s language links their new movement to the goals and the aims of the radical antiwar activists before them. This new movement was not about Vietnam, but it was about exposing U.S. imperialism and ending the U.S. foreign empire. As SDS and other radical antiwar activists had espoused earlier the Vietnam war was not a mistake and CALA activists understood that an end to capitalism and imperialism was the only way to ensure that the devastation of the war would not be repeated.

CALA’s emergence from the antiwar movement to create a solidarity group focused on the Latin American struggle was not innovative. The existence of that small national network of organizations focused on Latin American solidarity work helped influence CALA’s mission. The most notable of these organizations was a North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA), which began in 1967 as a forum of varying groups and individuals who were “drawn together by 1) our common sense of dismay as we perceive the obstructionist role of the United States in Latin America; 2)

our common commitment to the necessity of far-reaching social revolution in Latin America.”
While the members of NACLA recognized that the numbers of people focused on Latin America were relatively small, the ideals that they were espousing were in line with the larger new left movement and the anti-imperialists from the antiwar movement.

NACLA and other groups had set the precedence for a natural coalition between anti-imperialists in the antiwar movement and Latin American solidarity work. This allowed CALA to step in and carry with it the ideals of the antiwar movement and the new left while shifting the conversation to Latin America. CALA’s first newsletter, published in November 1971, exemplifies how CALA fused these two elements. The article, “The Game of Dominoes in South America,” compared the United States government’s reactions to its fears about the spread of communism in Southeast Asia to its fears in South America. In the 1950s, the U.S. worried that if Vietnam fell to the communist “Ho Chi Minh, other non-Communist governments in the area would soon topple as well—like so many dominoes.” When the article was published in 1971 the fear was that leftist governments would soon surround the right-wing military dictatorship in Brazil, the U.S. South American ally, with communism. Army officials viewed this threat of communism in South America as the “theory of the circle.” These officials argued that Castro’s revolution had been the first threat with Peru, Bolivia and Chile following suit soon after. Unless Brazil fought back it would soon be
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surrounded by hostile communist governments. In 1971 after Allende’s election, Brazil began searching for neighboring allies against the Chilean threat but found that Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia had grown closer to Chile and only Paraguay was interested in an alliance. Just as the invasion into Vietnam in 1965 had been to stop the “dominoes” from falling and CALA argued that if nothing was done to stop U.S. influence in Latin America there was a potential for a U.S. supported war between Brazil and its leftist neighbors.\(^\text{114}\) CALA urged U.S. citizens to stand up and “inform our representatives that we do not intend to support Brazil’s interference with the right of sovereign peoples to decide their own political future.”\(^\text{115}\) CALA believed that educating the community about these U.S. actions could prevent another war in Latin America. Yet CALA was not simply focused on preventing another war, it also wanted to end the injustices that imperialism created within the U.S. Another article from that same newsletter explained that “most of the important foreign and domestic policy decisions made in their [the American people’s] name are, in fact, made for the benefit of a few rich and powerful individuals…We want to help to give American back to the American people. And in so doing, we think we will have helped other peoples to regain their freedom and sovereignty.”\(^\text{116}\) Interventions and wars in foreign nations corroded the moral fabric of U.S. society and had serious economic consequences for U.S. citizens who lived in poverty. CALA initial concentration on the broader issue of imperialism in Latin America was meant to address global injustices as well as those that occurred on U.S. soil. By February 1972, CALA would start to narrow in on it worries about imperialism
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in relation to Chile. This growing focus would set the stage for CALA’s second year and for the creation of the Non-Intervention in Chile (NICH) in April 1972.

Why Madison?

In order to understand how a small Midwestern city became a center of solidarity with Chile, it is necessary to contextualize CALA’s existence within the progressive history of Madison, Wisconsin. As universities across the country succumbed to Wisconsin Senator Joe McCarthy’s fear mongering in the 1950s, University of Wisconsin remained mostly free of McCarthy’s influence. Saul Landau recalled how Madison became the center of anti-McCarthy politics with leftist activists leading the campaign to recall him. The firing of professors and the censorship of students and academics at other campuses acted as a unifying force between Madison’s Communist and liberal communities. These two groups were not natural allies but they saw it as their duty to protect the University from an attack on their freedom and free speech. While reminiscing about his activity in the Communist Party Landau said, “the liberals saw in McCarthyism an infinitely greater threat to their heritage and freedom than could ever be constituted by what they must have felt was our naïve, perhaps even reprehensible, faith in Stalin and the Soviet Union.” While the coalition between liberals and communists did not completely stop the McCarthy style attacks on the leftists on campus, Madison was “in many ways a haven in a hostile world” and allowed for a safer space for

radicalism to grow.\textsuperscript{120} Although the radical community was not huge in Madison during the 1950s, it was given the room to grow during a time where leftist activity was predominantly stifled. During this period the leftist students in Madison, who had been predominantly raised as communists, were searching for alternatives in activism in light of the “exhaustion of the Communist Party USA.”\textsuperscript{121} These students were more interested in topics such as race, which would become the central focus of the new left as opposed to the labor issues of the older generations.\textsuperscript{122} The combination of shifting interests and the rare space of leftist growth during the McCarthy era allowed the circumstances for a generation of leftist to lead the “transition between the Old and the New Left” in Madison.\textsuperscript{123}

The appointment of Professor William Appleman Williams in 1957 contributed to the shift from the Old to New Left in Madison. In a field that had been dominated by the Cold War and anti-Stalinist sentiments, Williams brought a fresh approach to the study of U.S. society that did not focus on those paradigms.\textsuperscript{124} Landau, a former communist himself, stated that both C. Wright Mills and Williams “had an important influence on both the New Left and those who moved from Old to New.”\textsuperscript{125} Williams along with several other scholars at the University forged a new path for academia in the 1960s and 70s that was focused on a more critical view of U.S. foreign policy, the study of state repression and a “bottom up” history that explored under recognized groups such as African Americans and the U.S. working class.\textsuperscript{126} Part of Williams’s criticism of U.S.
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foreign policy stemmed from his theory of “Corporate Liberalism.” He published an article about this theory in *Studies on the Left*, which he was the faculty advisor of; this theory was later incorporated into SDS and some radical antiwar activism to explain the system that had created Vietnam. Ogelsby, an SDS president in the mid-1960s, later expanded on Williams’s idea by arguing that corporate liberals sought to ‘safeguard…American interests around the world against revolution or revolutionary change, which they always called Communism.” This critique of the corporate state and liberals was couched in a general moral criticism of U.S. elites that was part of Williams’s and other Wisconsin academics’ radical and new approach to U.S. history. Williams’s also argued that while the U.S. appeared to benefit from imperialism, “it was a false gain derived from a false view of the self in society” perpetuated by the system of liberal capitalism. This false view of self was the historical praising of individual accomplishment as the marker of the path to a successful society. In fact, Williams saw liberalism as a corrosive force on U.S. society and embraced a need to return to the socialist vision of “common responsibility.” Corporate Liberalism corroded the fabric of U.S. values because its blind support for market interests lead to the overthrowing of elected governments and the support of racist regimes and human-rights violating dictatorships worldwide. For Williams, Ogelsby and many new left activists, corporate liberalism was antithetical to the value of democracy. It was a form of elite domination that rested on the maintenance of the U.S. empire and exploitation of developing nations.
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Therefore, criticizing imperialist policies was inherent in the new left’s aims to end the elite domination that resulted from corporate liberalism through participatory democracy.

Under the influence of scholars like Williams and graduate students like Landau, the University of Wisconsin became a campus that cultivated radical activism throughout the 1960s and early 1970s. University of Wisconsin was one of the few schools in the country that had been able to nurture a leftist culture during the McCarthy era and in turn had developed a concentration of “red diaper” babies, children of 1930s leftists. As these children grew up and began going to college in the 1960s and 1970s they developed an “international consciousness.” This meant that leftists on Madison’s campus had a heightened sensitivity to the interconnectedness between global and domestic struggles. This new left presence and international consciousness was an important factor for CALA’s formation and it had created the circumstances for leftist antiwar activism to blossom in Madison.

Due to the radical intellectual culture that had cultivated at the University of Wisconsin from the 1950s throughout the 1960s, antiwar activism found a natural home in Madison. Yet in August of 1970, four radical Madison antiwar activists set off a bomb in the University of Wisconsin’s Sterling Hall. This building was the site of the Army Mathematics Research Center (AMRC) and was bombed as a protest of the University’s connections with the government and the war in Vietnam. The attack fatally injured a young researcher and wounded seven more individuals who had no connection to AMRC. This event shocked the students, administrators and residents of Madison and has often been associated with the loss of antiwar activism momentum at the University
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of Wisconsin. Paul Ginsberg, the dean of students at the university in 1970, stated in an interview “that when you look in retrospect, to the beginning of the end of the antiwar movement on this campus, Sterling Hall is certainly that, I think, time.”

There is no consensus that the bombing caused the decline of Madison’s antiwar movement there is a strong argument for a correlation between the two. Sarah O’Brien, a law student at the time who later worked on the defense team of Karl Armstrong, the ringleader of the bombing, cited the Kent State shooting earlier in 1970 and various other violent protests and firebombings in Madison as other likely contributors to the decline. Yet she does note the “strong reaction to that bombing and I think people were very taken aback by the fact that somebody was killed and people were injured.”

The bombing and the decline of the antiwar movement in Madison were crucial to the development of this new anti-imperialist organization. In report written in 1976 by Gedicks, a founder of CALA, he remembered that the bombing and its aftermath created “a critical juncture in the Madison antiwar movement.” This juncture led to “an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of a university-based anti-imperialist movement” to ensure that CALA would not face the same fate as the antiwar movement in Madison had. The early organizers of CALA identified access to university resources as a strength because it created the means for pinpointing university generated research that benefited military technological advancements and the perpetration of the war in Vietnam. These known and exposed connections between the military and the
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university made it easier to for antiwar activists to mobilize students. Yet for the founders of CALA the downside of a university-based anti-imperialist organization was that it failed to create a broad coalition of U.S. citizens.\textsuperscript{137}

Many of these CALA founders had been involved in the anti-war movement but their radicalization had been spurred by their experiences in the Peace Corps or other time spent in Latin American countries dominated by U.S. imperialism. These experiences working with people in those countries made CALA members realize the most effective way for them to create change was to do work in the U.S. and not Latin America. Educating the U.S. citizens in about the negative ramifications of U.S. corporate greed was the number one priority in their campaign to avert another Vietnam.\textsuperscript{138} These conversations about the problems regarding corporate interests and U.S. imperialism were already commonplace among the radical students who were mobilizing on campus. CALA wanted to correct what they saw as a big failure of the antiwar movement in Madison by focusing on the Madison community and bringing a political consciousness about imperialism to places where it was mostly absent. In order to effect change the message needed to spread broadly throughout Madison and the U.S. and not just to the students and academics at the University.

**NACLA**

The activist discourse in the U.S. during the 1960s was dominated by the antiwar in Vietnam movement and the African-American fight for equality. Movements of solidarity with Latin America within the U.S. were neither large nor at the forefront of U.S. activism but they did exist in smaller numbers. However, Latin American solidarity
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did not occur in a vacuum; individuals interested in this cause were often involved in the Civil Rights Movement and the antiwar movement. An article in NACLA’s first published newsletter vaguely outlined the group’s mission. It was explicitly stated that, “many people can be identified with several groups, or with no particular group” and that members of both SDS and the prominent civil rights organization, Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), were interested in NACLA and its commitment to ending U.S. imperialism in Latin America. The loose formation of the organization gave people the space to be committed to the ideals that NACLA espoused rather than to the politics of any specific group. The article continues by stating that NACLA “affords a good opportunity for study, action and dialogue among those of us who are committed to the liberation of Latin America from North American imperialism.” While this mission explicitly refers to Latin America the involvement of various leftist activist groups points to its commitment to the general goal of ending imperialism and liberating people from oppression around the world.

While the presence of SDS, SNCC and other leftist activists linked NACLA to anti-imperialist activism of the late 1960s, the material in NACLA’s newsletters provide a stronger connection between those movements and the solidarity with Latin American anti-imperialists. In a report on NACLA’s February 1967 meeting in New York it outlined that NACLA “should work to create a broad-based coalition of groups and individuals building a radical foreign policy public, which would pressure for reforms in US Latin American policy.” This broad-based coalition included Andre Gunder Frank,
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the professor in Montreal who wrote “The Development of Underdevelopment” and many other articles in the socialist magazine *Monthly Review*. NACLA’s newsletter was also used to advertise the latest research publication about global underdevelopment co-written by former SDS chapter president and new left intellectual, Carl Oglesby.

Due to their shared goal to end imperialism, NACLA often published articles concerning antiwar activism. In the January 1968 newsletter the first article explored the role that universities and research institutions within the U.S. played in aiding imperialism, specifically in Vietnam. While NACLA remained dedicated to the Latin American struggle, the importance of alliances with other leftist causes was essential to NACLA’s activism.

At the afternoon session of the NACLA’s February 1967 meeting, a member shared his reflections on his recent trip to North Vietnam where he had run into groups of Latin Americans who were there to learn guerilla-fighting techniques. He believed that one difficulty of building an effective solidarity movement in the U.S. was the inability for U.S. citizens to truly grasp the importance of nationalism and independence for people who live under foreign imperialism. He was told that as a U.S. citizen, the most effective way to support the struggle of individuals on the ground fighting imperialism was to “work for change in your own country.” This idea of a global two-tracked movement was present in a lot of radical leftist activism at this time. Revolutionaries in
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developing countries were fighting for their own liberation from imperialism and corrupt
governments that were propped up by the U.S. government. The revolutionaries on the
ground repeatedly told U.S. radicals that they must be part of the internal fight to educate
the masses within the U.S. and in turn change U.S. foreign policy. This internal fight was
manifested through the activism of various anti-imperialist groups within the U.S.

Similar to CALA, NACLA was founded as a general Latin American solidarity
group that published educational material to expose U.S. citizens to a variety of Latin
American issues. These materials ranged from theoretical articles on dependency,
imperialism and Latin American underdevelopment to articles on specific relevant
struggles and events about the Puerto Rican independence movements and the
dictatorship in Brazil, which lasted from 1964-1985. Shortly after Allende’s election in
September 1970, Chile became a large focus of NACLA and other activists interested in
Latin America. In 1971, NACLA unprecedentedly published two newsletters that solely
discussed the situation in Chile and several other issues that contained at least one article
about Chile.\textsuperscript{147} Yet because NACLA was founded as a coalition “formed by a diverse
group of individuals and groups,” the articles were meant to be more informative and
shed light on a variety of opinions regarding ending U.S. imperialism rather than promote
one definitive form of activism around this issue.\textsuperscript{148} The structure of NACLA as a
coalition created space for the hope that “groups with specific interests will ‘spin-off’ and
form their own groups. Perhaps such groups can and will stay in NACLA also.”\textsuperscript{149} This is
exactly what the members of CALA did in 1971; they joined together as a solidarity
group with their own specific vision of how to end to U.S. imperialism.

\textsuperscript{147} NACLA Newsletter, 4,9-10; 5,1-8 (January 1971-December 1971).
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CALA’s First Year

In reaction to the advisory conference that was held Cornell University at the beginning of the 1971, CALA officially formed that summer in Madison. While NACLA had established itself as a coalition that allowed room for a variety of anti-imperialists with different visions of solidarity, CALA formed as an organization with a more direct vision of how to end imperialism. And just as NACLA had hoped, CALA remained connected to the NACLA network. Part of this more directed vision was the decision to make CALA an organization that while based on campus, was meant for the community as a whole. This decision came from the interrogation about the successes and failure of university based organizing from the antiwar movement in Madison. While CALA published newsletters that were disseminated throughout the nation, it was still a distinctly Madison-based movement that was meant to inspire anti-imperialism within the Wisconsin community by finding connections between local issues and Latin America. In a short blurb published by the University of Wisconsin’s Ibero-American Studies Program’s newsletter in Fall 1971 CALA wrote, “established on the Madison campus for the purpose of helping to educate both University and community people about the impact of U.S. policies and involvements on Latin America.” CALA differed from NACLA because it was not a national forum that linked leftists interested in Latin America together. CALA was founding a community-based initiative that would facilitate change in both Latin American and Wisconsin. The members of CALA viewed strategic education about current events, U.S. influence and more specifically local
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Wisconsin corporate influence in Latin America as the most effective way to create this change.\footnote{Ibid.}

In 1971 CALA’s educational efforts were focused on a film series and the production of a monthly research newsletter.\footnote{Ibid; Al Gedicks, “The Idea of Guerilla Research,” \textit{CALA Newsletter}, November 1971, Folder 10, Box 2, M94-371, Community Action on Latin America Part 5: Additions, 1971-1999, Wisconsin Historical Society, 5.} In the first newsletter, which was published in November 1971, there are two articles that highlight the importance of film and research in CALA’s work. The first article “Cinema for Liberation,” the author describes Latin American and other Third World film as a “revolutionary tool.” He argued that films created by the victims of U.S. imperialism broke the societal lens of colonialism in which people viewed developing world while simultaneously presenting the viewer with the reality of imperialism. These films were brought to Madison by CALA in the hopes of awakening the conscience of the community to act upon the anti-imperialist struggle. During November 1971, CALA brought three different films to campus; one delved into dependency in Argentina, one discussed urban poverty and Chile and the last film discussed how U.S. citizens were taught to view Cuban culture.\footnote{S. Sequenzia, “Cinema for Liberation,” \textit{CALA Newsletter}, (November 1971), Folder 10, Box 2, M94-371, Community Action on Latin America Part 5: Additions, 1971-1999, Wisconsin Historical Society, 3.} Although each of these films depicted different struggles in different Latin American cultures, each one was meant to highlight the economic and cultural impact of U.S. imperialism. Dependency and urban poverty were directly related to prioritization of U.S. corporate interest within U.S. foreign policy and the skewed views of Cubans were a direct result of the consequences of Cold War era stigma against communists and Castro’s revolution. All three of these films made an accessible connection between the
abstracted theories of dependency and imperialism and the lives of real people living in Latin America for the individuals living in Madison.

The second article, “The Idea of Guerilla Research,” was written by Gedicks and discussed research as another revolutionary tool in the fight for liberation. Gedicks named this tool “guerilla research,” which is used “to investigate the causes of this situation [underdevelopment] and to raise critical questions about how the various power relationships can be changed so that the process of underdevelopment will not continue.”

Unequal power relationships, while amplified in the developing world, occurred in the U.S. as well. Gedicks drew a parallel between the economic situation of people in poverty in Latin America and in the rural and mining areas of Northern Wisconsin.

The founding of CALA had coincided with Allende’s nationalization of Chile’s copper industry; a process that had created conflict with the U.S. based Kennecott Copper Corporation. In response to the nationalization, Kennecott proposed the opening of mines in the economically deprived areas of Northern Wisconsin. Gedicks explained that while “each area experienced tremendous growth due to its rich natural resources (copper, iron ore, lumber) but that wealth has not created thriving industrial communities; rather, it has resulted in widespread poverty and depression.” In 1973 Gedicks published a report about Kennecott’s effect in Chile and Rusk County, WI that was a culmination of his two years of research as the CALA research coordinator. The report, “Kennecott Copper Corporation and Mining Development,” found that characteristics of Rusk County’s economy closely resembled economies of developing nations. These
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economies were typically agricultural, poorly industrialized, had low income and employment rates and high rates of outward migration.\textsuperscript{158} By comparing the exploitation of the poor in Latin America to the poor in rural Wisconsin CALA was interested in making issues of dependency urgent for the Madison community. CALA was trying to show people that exploitation did not just happen across the world, it was happening in their own backyard. This was part of the international consciousness, the understanding that global liberation is linked; my freedom is your freedom.

While CALA’s main focus was on organizing the Madison community, its also attempted to engaged and educate Wisconsin’s rural working class about its findings on the copper industry in Rusk County. Gedicks argued that for people to understand and take action against imperialism it must relate to their immediate economic situations.\textsuperscript{159} Yet the only evidence of CALA’s work in Northern Wisconsin was Gedicks’ mention of five activists in Green Bay who were working with CALA to disseminate information about Kennecott and a few interactions with farmers in the affected regions.\textsuperscript{160} The connection between Madison and the individuals in the mining regions remained mostly academic. CALA used the research to organized against Kennecott, but it had little overlap or interaction with the individuals who were affected firsthand by the exploitation.

Even within the Madison community it is unclear how much interaction CALA had with individuals who were not affiliated with the University. The advisory board of

\textsuperscript{159} Gedicks, “The Idea of Guerilla Research,” 5.
CALA was made up of University of Wisconsin faculty members, students from both the U.S. and Latin America, and religious campus leaders. In a CALA advertisement through the Ibero-American Studies department, inquiries about CALA were directed to the campus Episcopal chaplain, Reverend Arthur Lloyd and Professors David Chaplin and Alex Wilde. In fact, Professor David Chaplin was also on the executive committee for the University of Wisconsin’s Ibero-American Studies program. A later addition to the CALA team, the film series coordinator, Tom Sinks had received a M.A. in Public Policy from University of Wisconsin. In the CALA archive at the Wisconsin Historical Institute, the majority of the correspondences outside of Madison are between CALA staffers such as Sinks, Gedicks and Bruce Vandervort, the program coordinator and other CALA staff member, and academics at other universities. These letters show that CALA was well connected not just to the University of Wisconsin, but also to the larger academic world.

Yet CALA was not solely influential at the University. By the beginning of 1972 the organization had become better known in the Madison area. Citing more recognition in Madison as well as invitations to speak on campus and for other groups around the city, CALA announced a formation of a speakers bureau in its March 1972 newsletter. Although CALA was expanding and gaining recognition in Madison it is difficult to gauge the scope of its engagement with the non-University community. Yet it is clear that outside of the academic world, CALA most effectively engaged the church community.
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In an update about CALA’s second semester, Vandervort wrote that its newsletters were sent to about 1,200 churches throughout the state of Wisconsin including 43 local ones.\textsuperscript{164} CALA’s interaction with the Church community had existed from its inception when the United Ministries of Higher Education (UMHE) and the United Presbyterian Church proposed the idea of regional centers of Latin American research. Yet CALA continued to grow outside of the campus-affiliated church community and the Presbyterian Church. Letters from Catholic, Lutheran, Baptist and Congregational Churches from across the nation were sent to CALA. These clergymen were looking for resources and educational materials on Latin America, which they could share with their congregants.\textsuperscript{165}

CALA’s engagement with the Church community highlights a trend of radical Christian activism in the U.S that was sympathetic to the goals of CALA and other anti-imperialist organizations that had emerged in the 1960s. “The inequities of American society exposed by the civil rights movement prompted the religious community to reevaluate its cold war attitudes.”\textsuperscript{166} The legal discrimination against blacks in the U.S. coupled with the violence that was used to enforce the discrimination forced members of the religious community to be vocal and oppose the immorality that they witnessed. The multi-denominational religious activism from the civil rights movement served as a catalyst for clergy to join the antiwar movement and work together as a religious community opposed to injustices.\textsuperscript{167} Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam (CALCAV), was the prominent group that organized one of the largest constituencies of
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antiwar movement, the religious community. Many members of CALCAV were concerned not just with the war but also with other injustices including U.S. foreign policies, racism and disproportional corporate influence.\textsuperscript{168} This trend of ecumenical activism against injustices perpetuated by the U.S. from the 1960s continued into the 1970s and provides an explanation about the large church and campus ministry involvement in CALA.

As CALA continued to grow during its first year, the focus of the organization began to shift. CALA’s initial focus as a general Latin American solidarity organization provided room to explore multiple significant topics in the region. Among these topics were the military dictatorship in Brazil, the nationalization of Chilean copper, and critiques of U.S. corporate involvement in Latin America and Nixon’s foreign policy. The first four CALA newsletters were titled: The Game of Dominos in Latin America, Indochina in Latin America, Latin America: Nixon’s Game Plan, and Missionaries for the Empire in Latin America.\textsuperscript{169} These newsletters were published from November 1971 to March 1972 and both the titles and the content reflected CALA’s holistic approach to Latin American issues. Compared to the CALA newsletters that were published after April 1972, these earlier editions did not focus strictly on Chile. Yet by the February 1972 edition, Chile had begun to receive considerably more attention in CALA’s publications. In the November 1971 newsletter there was an article on the responses of Kennecott and Anaconda, two U.S. copper corporations to their nationalization in Chile, one on Uruguayan and Bolivian elections and the articles on guerilla research and
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revolutionary cinema. And the December 1971 newsletters contained an article on U.S. support for the dictatorship in Brazil, on Chilean Poet Pablo Neruda’s Noble prize and a poem he wrote comparing Anaconda in Chile, to a serpent. As there was no January 1972 newsletter, the February issue featured on article the media’s depiction of Allende’s government and on Nixon’s support for Brazil and his undermining of Chile. There was also an article that reinforced CALA’s appeal to ending U.S. imperialism and an advertisement for a recent NACLA publication, “New Chile.” The growing focus on Chile was due in part to the upcoming CALA conference on Chile but it was also due to a growing concern within the anti-imperialist community about the Nixon Administrations actions towards the Allende government.

The content of NACLA’s newsletters in the early 1970s shows a similar shift in focus towards Chile. From 1967-1971, the Brazilian dictatorship and Puerto Rican independence movements were the most common topics in NACLA articles. Yet in 1971, NACLA published two different newsletters, dedicated solely to articles about Chile and Allende’s government. These were the first two issues that NACLA had dedicated to one specific country. The March “Special Issue: Chile,” focused on Allende’s election, the UP’s platform, U.S. investments in Chile, and the response of a more left wing party, Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria’s (MIR), to the UP’s platform. The end of the newsletter includes an interview with Allende conducted by Landau. The September
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issue, “In Chile…There Will Be Work For All,” was an in-depth investigation of the nationalization of Chilean copper and U.S. copper corporation’s activities in Chile.\textsuperscript{175} By 1972, Chile was featured in almost every NACLA newsletter published that year. In the February issue an article explained that Brazil and Chile are the two countries “which concern U.S. imperialist strategists today…Chile presents a different situation for imperialism as its leftist coalition government under Salvador Allende struggles to halt U.S. penetration of the economy.”\textsuperscript{176} The Nixon administration’s animosity towards the Allende government coupled with the nationalization of Chilean copper in the summer of 1971 contributed to the increasing focus on Chile amongst Latin American-focused U.S. anti-imperialists in 1972. Although Nixon was not a liberal, Williams’s theory of corporate liberalism provides a framework to understand the collusion between corporate and government interests against Allende’s leftist government in Chile. As Chile was becoming the target of Nixon’s foreign policy it was also becoming the focus of Latin American anti-imperialists within the U.S.

Madison’s history as a haven for leftists during the 1950s and as a key new left center provided a space for antiwar and subsequently anti-imperialist activism to thrive. With the decline of the antiwar movement in the 1970s coupled with the influential work of NACLA, CALA was able to create an anti-imperialist organization that had a direct vision of how to end U.S. domination in Latin America. Through film series, newsletters, research on local underdevelopment and a speakers bureau CALA set out to educate U.S. citizens, specifically the Madison community, about the dangers of imperialism. As 1972


went on, CALA began concentrating on Chile and its conference on Chile held in April 1972 served as a turning point for the organization. While the first year of CALA was focused on educating the greater Madison and Wisconsin community about anti-imperialism, the next year and a half of CALA would focus on the dangers of a U.S. government and corporate intervention in Chile.
Chapter Three: The Imminent Danger of Intervention

The sweeping reforms of Allende’s government were a source of inspiration to liberation movements in nations across the developing world. Allende’s political project, “la vía chilena al socialismo” (the Chilean way to Socialism), involved agrarian reforms and nationalization of the copper industry as a means of returning power and wealth to the working and rural classes in Chile. This revolution provided other liberation movements the hope that governments, which represented the people and not the interests of the elite classes and global superpowers, could exist. Yet while Allende’s popularity was growing amongst people in developing nations who wanted an end to U.S. intervention and a fundamental change in U.S.-dominated global economics, the Nixon administration’s efforts towards dismantling the Chilean government grew stronger.\(^{177}\)

The Nixon administration’s policy of détente that had been employed in the early 1970s toward Russia and China did not extend to the U.S.-Chilean relationship during Allende’s regime. Historian Tanya Harmer argued, “it was in 1972—the very year that Nixon visited Moscow and Beijing—that the Chileans came to...acknowledge that détente actually closed doors instead of opening them.”\(^{178}\)

Economic struggles in the Soviet Union informed its decision embrace détente with the U.S. even when the U.S. made it clear that these policies would not extend to Cuba and Chile. The primary concern of the Soviet Union was to ensure the stability of its economy, which would be most fruitful by embracing détente, rather than supporting the Chilean and Cuban governments. The UP’s economic situation was deteriorating and without support of the Soviet Union there was
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little hope for an economic recovery in Chile. While many viewed détente as a notable step towards ending the Cold War, the U.S. decision to only engaged in détente with two superpowers and not Chile and Cuba showed that Nixon was more focused on expanding economic opportunities than attempting to end the ideological tensions of the war.179

As relations between the U.S., the Soviet Union and China were beginning to warm; the U.S. government was continuing covert actions in Chile to undermine the Allende government. This led CALA and NACLA to become increasingly focused on Chile and more specifically, the dangers of U.S. interventions in Chile in 1972. The shift of focus after CALA’s first year was responsive to the larger trend within the U.S. government of more frequent U.S. attempts to help overthrow Allende in 1972-1973.

The “Madison Conference on Chile” that CALA hosted in April 1972 marked this major shift in CALA’s concentration and approach to its solidarity work. During the first nine months of CALA’s existence it had increasingly published articles about Chile. By the time of the conference there was a feeling that CALA needed to do more to prevent the growing possibility of a U.S. intervention in Chile. It was these sentiments that spurred the creation of Non-Intervention in Chile (NICH), a group that operated as a “sub-project” of CALA, at the April Conference.180 Whereas CALA was created as a general Latin America-focused anti-imperialist collective that worked within the Madison community, NICH was a national anti-imperialist organization dedicated to building a solidarity movement to stop a U.S. intervention in Chile. Similar to CALA, NICH aimed to achieve its goals by educating U.S. citizens about the situation in Chile but it also focused on taking direct action against corporations involved in subverting Allende’s
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power. This conference can be identified as the moment that CALA began organizing against intervention in Chile in addition to its goal of addressing anti-imperialist concerns in all of Latin America.

From April 1972 until the military coup on September 11, 1973, CALA-NICH’s activism was direct action and research based. During this time CALA remained centered in Madison and devoted time to educating the community and researching U.S. corporate ties between Chile and the United States. Yet the specificity and urgency of NICH’s mission created the conditions for it to become a national movement with reach outside of Wisconsin. The Bay Area became another center of NICH activism outside of Madison and NACLA staff members led it. The coalition between the U.S. government, corporations and the right wing parties in Chile led to attempted coups, political polarization, and an increased premonition that danger lay ahead for Chile. This increased sense of urgency helped create more momentum for NICH’s cause. While CALA-NICH could not have anticipated the fatal end of Allende, it sensed that more needed to be done to support him and end U.S. involvement in Chile. This feeling of imminent danger and fear occupied CALA-NICH from the conference in April 1972 until September 1973.

Madison Conference on Chile

In partnership with the University of Wisconsin’s Ibero-American Studies Program, CALA sponsored the Madison Conference on Chile on April 13-15, 1972 at the University Catholic Center. This was the first national conference CALA hosted and according to promotional material sent out a week before the conference its aim was “to
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promote interest in and knowledge about recent developments in Chile by bringing together Latin and North American scholars and members of the greater Madison and University communities."\(^{182}\) The goal that CALA articulated for its conference fits within the framework of its first-year activism as it was meant to be an educational event for the community yet was mostly centered within the academic community. Most correspondences about the conference were between CALA members and professors from across North America. CALA kept a list of people it contacted to speak at the conference that included about twenty-seven professors from History, Political Science, Latin American Studies and Sociology departments from various universities.\(^{183}\) Many of the contacted professors were radicals such as Miles Wolpin, a Political Science Professor at St. Francis Xavier University in Nova Scotia. Wolpin wrote that he was interested in the conference but requested funds because of his “extremely tenuous status here (my chairman has not spoken to me for the past ten months),” due to his radical political views.\(^{184}\) He added that he could not ask for money from his department because his “contract is up for renewal or termination next month,” and the situation was extremely delicate, as he had “already been denied jobs at two and probably three other institutions solely because of my radical perspective.”\(^{185}\) Several other professors requested funds from CALA in order to participate in the conference and the University of Wisconsin footed the $1,270 bill to help bring these professors out to Madison.
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These professors, along with many others, all participated the panels that dominated the structure of the three-day conference. On the first day, Thursday, April 13, Orlando Letelier, the Chilean Ambassador to the U.S. gave the keynote address. The second day consisted of a panels on the Chilean Political Economy, Chile in the International Context and a reading of Chilean poet Pablo Neruda’s work by the Chilean Cultural Attaché to the U.S., Fernando Alegria, and a screening of two films, “Chile Puts on Long Pants” and “How and Why the General Was Murdered.” The latter film was about General René Schneider’s murder in 1970 and the role it played in Allende’s election. The final day of the conference featured panels on Mass Political Participation and the Problems Facing Chile in the Immediate Future. The conference concluded with a concert by Argentinean folk singer Suni Paz, a visiting professor at Rutgers University and part of nueva canción, a Latin American folk music movement that was committed to revolutionary ideology and political activism. In her correspondence with CALA she wrote that her “songs reflect the goals of Unidad Popular.” Through her music she hoped “to give an accurate picture of 1) Chile’s need for socialism 2) their present road towards socialism, and 3) Unidad Popular’s goals.” Her participation in other conferences on third world and Latin American anti-imperialist movements also informed her decision to join CALA’s conference.

The idea of presenting an in-depth conference on Chile had been on CALA’s agenda since the end of 1971 and it was organized to address “problems and prospects of
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the Allende regime.” More broadly, Chile was chosen to exemplify the trend of U.S. propagated misinformation on Latin American revolutions. CALA’s February 1972 newsletter, “Latin America: Nixon’s Game Plan,” reiterated why CALA cared about educating U.S. citizens. “The media tells us that Latin America is poor and beset by dictators, but never explains why. T.V. documentarian show that Spanish-speaking Americans are up in arms, but the reasons are not spelled out. It seems clear that we must have more and better sources of information on these questions if we are ever to go forward.”

There was little transparency in the U.S. media about the government’s actions in Latin America, which had propped up dictatorships in pre-Castro Cuba and in contemporary Brazil while branding revolutions that stood up to U.S. imperialism, such as Chile, as backward and dangerous. The growth of economic nationalism throughout the developing world was a threat to the U.S. empire because more nations were seeking domestic control over their own economies and not blindly prioritizing U.S. interests. CALA organized the conference in order to present a picture of the Allende government that could not be found in the mainstream media.

In the February newsletter there was an article that compared New York Times coverage of a Chilean protest to the French newspaper Le Monde’s coverage of a women’s hunger march in Santiago. These two publications were chosen because they were both influential, liberal and had staff members working in Santiago. The CALA article highlighted the difference between the U.S. media and the foreign media’s reporting of the march. The women planned this event to protest Allende’s order of martial law in Santiago in preparation for Castro’s visit to the city. While the New York Times

---

Times was quick to blame Allende for overreacting, *Le Monde* told a different story. It reported that the protest was led by upper class women who used the issue of hunger as a façade for their true aim of creating a political opportunity to embarrass Allende during Castro’s visit. “It seems to be an attempt to heighten political tension in Chile and to provoke the kind of violent confrontation that Allende-knowing the U.S. tendency for equating Left-wing government (even when legally established, as in the Chilean case) with mob rule- has been scrupulously avoiding.”¹⁹¹ The oversimplification and in some cases the blatantly negative coverage of Allende’s government worried CALA members who saw the conference as a needed opportunity for fully informed dialogue on Chile’s present and future situation.¹⁹²

In order to counter the misinformation and oversimplification surrounding Chile, CALA structured the panels to discuss an array of topics. In the Mass Political Participation panel, Elsa Chaney, a professor at Fordham University, discussed the political role of women in Chile while California State College Professor, Donald Bray, discussed mass mobilization of individuals in the Chilean political system.¹⁹³ Most of the panelists were presenting their own published papers or dissertations and other topics included past Chilean elections, historical perspectives on the UP government and the effects of foreign investments on Chilean politics.¹⁹⁴ The panelists all reinforced CALA’s mission of providing in-depth understanding of Allende’s presidency in the context of Chilean history and U.S. foreign relations. Only two panel speakers were not professors
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or graduate students, they were Berkeley based NACLA staff members, Elizabeth Farnsworth and Susanne Bodenheimer. Both of whom had contributed to NACLA’s one-hundred and sixty page reader on Unidad Popular’s first year in power.\(^\text{195}\)

Not only were all the panelists experts on the present situation in Chile and the country’s history, many of them were products of the same ideological environment that spawned CALA. Of the twelve professors who spoke, four of them had direct connections to the University of Wisconsin. Donald Bray and Harvard graduate student, Andrew Zimbalist, both attended the University as undergraduates, and Bray cited his interactions with Professor William Appleman Williams as influential for his intellectual growth.\(^\text{196}\) Charney received her PhD from the University of Wisconsin and Claudio Barriga, who spoke on “The End of Latifundium and the Role of the Peasantry,” was in the last year of his PhD at the University.

In a conference advertisement that CALA placed in the University of Wisconsin’s Ibero-American newsletter it stated, “we want the conference to be a public event, bringing together knowledgeable academics and community and campus people who want to know more about the first Latin American nation to elect a Marxist president. This, we think, is in keeping with the purposes of CALA.”\(^\text{197}\) As there is no available list of attendees at the conference there is no way to gauge if this event attracted any non-University affiliated community members. But outside of academics, NACLA staff and Chilean embassy staff, news of the conference appeared to reach various local and national church groups. John Sinclair, the regional secretary for Latin America at United
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Presbyterian Church in the United States’ Commission on Ecumenical Mission and Relations, responded to CALA about his excitement for the conference. He published an announcement about the conference in *Monday Morning*, a journal that went out to Presbyterian pastors nationwide. Sinclair followed up after the conference and requested 100 copies of pamphlets from the conference to distribute to his constituents. Word of the conference reached campus chaplains and pulpit clergy from different denominations and parts of the country.

This conference exemplified CALA’s model of education as political activism; it used the current situation in Chile and people’s confusion about it to push forward its anti-imperialist agenda. While there was an attempt to bring in speakers who were not leftists, most of speakers, like Paz, espoused messages of anti-imperialism and implicit and explicit support for Allende. When Fredrick Pike, a history professor at University of Notre Dame who had written extensively on Chilean politics, was invited to the conference he declined because he felt that he would be ideologically out of place. Pike’s fears were not unfounded, as an in-depth look at the panels shows a general critique of U.S. government and corporate interactions with the Allende government. The Chilean Political Economy Panel featured professors who had written and were presenting on “Foreign Investments and Chilean Politics,” “Counter Revolutionary Forces” and how they impacted the Allende government and Chilean economic climate. Paul Sigmund, a Professor of Politics at Princeton, wrote that while it would
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be interesting to try to get some right-wing and Christian Democrats to come to the event he noted the tension in creating a more diverse space because many of them identify as political refugees who had escaped the Allende government and therefore would not speak to anyone from the embassy.\textsuperscript{202} Fernando Alegria, the Chilean Cultural Attaché to the U.S., and Letelier’s participation in the conference indicates an acceptance and celebration of the validity of the Chilean government. This conference was not intended to create an educational space with a diversity of ideas about the situation in Chile; it was meant to lift up the Allende government and inform people about the situation in Chile in a way that the media and the government were not.

Non-Intervention in Chile (NICH) emerged as an unexpected consequence of the April Conference on Chile. As the imminent threat of a U.S. intervention in Chile became more visible, the majority of the conference participants decided that there needed to be a more urgent and organized approach to ensuring that the Allende government was not overthrown. CALA was elected to “serve as the national coordinating agency” for NICH. Although NICH was a national committee it was predominantly based and coordinated in Madison.\textsuperscript{203} At the conference NICH gathered a list of about eighty-six people who identified themselves as part of this new Chile solidarity committee. This list was not limited to Latin America-focused anti-imperialists and included Dianne Roland, a member of the Vietnam Solidarity Committee.\textsuperscript{204} Additionally, both NACLA staff members, Bodenheimer and Farnsworth, became two of the leaders of the NICH-
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Berkeley chapter, which would soon become the strongest chapter. A few days after the conference ended, Farnsworth sent a note to CALA expressing her excitement about NICH and how it will pave the road for future Chile support groups to “proliferate throughout the country.”\textsuperscript{205} By the end of June 1972, NICH-Berkeley under Farnsworth’s leadership had held its first meeting, which attracted ten individuals, five of whom were Chilean.\textsuperscript{206}

The birth of NICH was a turning point for CALA, both in its approach to activism and in its ability to mobilize anti-imperialists in the U.S. While CALA remained committed to its original mission of guerilla research and community engagement in relation to Latin America as a whole; the next year and a half of the organization cannot be separated from NICH and its new focus on Chile. I will refer to the post-April 1972 organization as CALA-NICH, except in cases where I am able to distinguish between the two, in which case I will refer to CALA or NICH separately. With its explicit focus on Chile, CALA-NICH made direct action a central element of its program. It was this mixture of corporate research and direct action that marked the post-conference period of CALA-NICH’s existence.

The Tactical Shift in Activism

One of the first direct actions that CALA-NICH organized was a boycott campaign against the telephone corporation, International Telephone and Telegraph Company (ITT), which began in July 1972. In conjunction with the U.S. government and other corporations, ITT had played a role in raising over one million dollars to defeat

\footnote{Letter from Elizabeth Farnsworth to CALA, 4/18/72, Folder 19, Box 1, M94-371, Community Action on Latin America Part 5: Additions, 1971-1999, Wisconsin Historical Society.}
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Allende in the 1964 presidential campaign. Then in 1970, ITT attempted to give one million more dollars to ensure that Congress would not confirm Allende as president.\(^{207}\) CALA members had known this information when journalist Jack Anderson leaked secret memos from the corporation in March 1972, which further “reveal[ed] ITT’s crucial role in creating economic chaos and undermining Allende’s democratically elected government.”\(^{208}\) ITT’s motivation to overthrow Allende came from its investments in the Chitelco, the national Chilean phone system and some manufacturing plants, which were worth more than $200 million dollars. After ITT, the CIA, the Nixon Administration and the right wing Chilean parties’ attempted coup failed in October 1970 and after the Chilean government expropriated the phone system in late 1971, ITT’s vice president sent Nixon’s Advisor for Economic Affairs a proposal for a new strategy to address the Chile problem.\(^{209}\) He presented “a 18-point program for bringing about an economic crisis which would destroy Allende’s government. The plan included creation of a special White House task force which would be assisted by the CIA in extensive economic warfare, subversion of the Chilean armed forces and diplomatic sabotage.”\(^{210}\)

In the aftermath of the ITT discovery, CALA-NICH focused its April, May and October 1972 newsletters on the scandal. The April newsletter, “Subversion in Chile: U.S. Style,” was written directly after Anderson’s exposition of the ITT memos. It largely focused on ITT’s role in the attempted 1970 coup and its collusion with the U.S. government to create economic chaos in Chile. With nearly two months to synthesize the information, the May issue, “Chile After ITT and the CIA,” focused on the implications
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of ITT’s actions. Gedicks argued that the most significant implication was “that many of the measures ITT had been proposing were already part of U.S. policy towards Chile and continue to be carried out at various levels of U.S. policy-making.” The newsletter expanded on the Nixon administration’s policy of overt and covert economic intervention and its continued monetary and social relationship with the Chilean military. In the article, “A Call for Opposition To U.S. Intervention in Chile,” CALA-NICH directly link anti-imperialist activism in Vietnam to the situation in Chile by explaining that these are just two of the many examples where their “right to self-determination is regarded in Washington as jeopardizing the interests of the United States.” As intervention attempts by the U.S. against Chile were becoming better known, the connection between the Vietnam and Chile became stronger. While there was no war in Chile, the public nature of the ITT scandal made the role the U.S. played in subverting its self-determination harder to ignore. At the end of the article NICH directly called upon “those who have already demonstrated their opposition to the Southeast Asia War to join in declaration of support,” for NICH’s efforts against intervention in Chile. This call to action was the first stage of CALA-NICH’s mobilization efforts around the ITT scandal. The next stage came in June at the North American Anti-Imperialist Coalition Conference (NAAIC) in July 1972.

NAAIC was a national coalition of about twenty-two anti-imperialist groups in the U.S. that were all focused on different global liberation struggles. CALA-NICH was a
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member group of NAAIC along with another Madison based anti-imperialist group, Madison Area Committee on Southern Africa (MACSA). NAAIC identified anti-imperialism as a class struggle and one of its main tenants was a dedication to campaigns against corporations, governments and military groups that oppressed the working and lower classes. At the 1972 NAAIC conference in Allenspark, CO, CALA proposed a boycott of ITT to be adopted by all the NAAIC member groups. In the proposal, CALA-NCIH explained that the widespread exposure of this scandal made ITT an important national target. Yet the most important message was that groups focused on Southeast Asia, Africa and the Middle East were all impacted by ITT’s intervention in Chile. Not only was ITT’s enterprise present in all of those regions but also because anti-corporate activism was anti-imperialist activism. If this happened in Chile, it could happen anywhere therefore, in light of the scandal’s exposure there needed to be a strong reaction against ITT.

The proposal was voted on and passed, which committed all NAAIC groups to join the already existing boycott against the ITT subsidiary, Wonder Bread. This boycott had been organized by antiwar groups including Vietnam Peace Parade Committee and Women’s Strike for Peace in 1972 as a reaction to ITT’s role as one of the top defense contractors for the U.S. in Vietnam. The proposal of consumer boycott against Wonder Bread was an accessible way to call on U.S. citizens to speak up against the war effort since consumers did not have the power to boycott military weaponry sales. Consumer

boycotts and anti-corporate activism would become a trademark of 1970s activism as a way for U.S. citizens to attempt to put pressure on corporations that perpetrated economic and imperialist injustices across the world. Usually these boycott did not significantly impact the corporations’ financial situation but in many instances they were able to put public pressure on these corporations to correct their immoral actions.

Through coalition building CALA-NICH called the other anti-imperialist groups to join against ITT’s actions in Vietnam and in Chile. It also called for member groups to disseminate information about ITT in their publications and geographical areas, to investigate church and universities investments in ITT and to provide input to antiwar groups about “the connection between ITT as a war contractor as well as a multinational conglomeration in service of the interests of empire.”

While a large part of this boycott campaign was education-based, this was CALA-NICH’s first direct action campaign. CALA-NICH capitalized on the urgency to spread the word about ITT’s activities in Chile by engaging other groups with the anti-corporate activism as anti-imperialism activism framework.

CALA-NICH’s own anti-imperialist activism was spurred by an attempt to prevent another Vietnam in Latin America and for this campaign it employed the same logic. ITT’s unchecked actions had been a threat in Vietnam and now in Chile and until anti-imperialist groups worked together to end corporate oppression of the working and lower classes around the world more “ITT interventions were inevitable.” Until the systems of oppression ended the need for solidarity groups would be relentless. Therefore, anti-imperialist groups needed to work together to ensure an end to corporate and governmental economic oppression. This task would be accomplished by the masses
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and not by the elite that benefited from these systems. In this vein consumer boycotts and grassroots campaigns were effective means to pressure corporations and government’s actions.

Solidarity and coalition building with other activist movements was necessary in order to increase the visibility and effectiveness of any CALA-NICH direct action. The ITT boycott campaign demonstrated how CALA-NICH made an issue that was central to Chile important to all anti-imperialist groups. This campaign also exposed the inherent connection between anti-corporate and anti-imperialist activity. Intersectionality between activism was key to building solidarity and in turn strengthening movements. In letter to the editor of the New York Times, CALA-NICH did not simply critique the coverage of the Allende government but they also call out the reporter’s racism and sexism.\footnote{Letter to New York Times Editor, 6/12/72, Folder 5, Box 1, M80-048, Community Action on Latin America Part 3: Additions, 1971-1979, Wisconsin Historical Society.} CALA-NICH and other leftist activists were in tune with the role that racism and sexism played in liberation movements throughout the world as well as in the U.S. By being aware of this connection, coalition building was opened not just to other anti-imperialist groups but also to feminist, racial equality and workers rights movements. While it is unclear if CALA-NICH was successful in building coalitions with these movements, it is clear that it was attuned to the concerns of these movements.

A NICH organized demonstration in support of Allende was an instance in which a diversity of supporters outside of CALA-NICH came to protest. When Allende came to speak at the United Nations headquarters in New York on December 4, 1972, NICH organized a demonstration outside the Kennecott Copper headquarters against U.S. policy in Chile. The Communist party, the Young Workers Liberation League, Youth Against
War and Fascism, NAAIC, and other local groups joined NICH in this demonstration, which brought 250 people to the streets of New York in support of Allende. Half of the crowd was made up of Latino and black activists and everyone was carrying signs calling for “U.S. Imperialism Hands Off Chile,” and chanting for an “end to the invisible blockade.” While there is mention of NICH activity in New York in the archive, it was not a strong center for the committee. The ability of NICH to bring out 250 activists from various organizations to this demonstration shows some power of CALA-NICH’s coalition building skills.

CALA-NICH continued to expand its activism outside of Madison by organizing direct actions through its newsletter that reached audiences across the nation. In the November 1972 newsletter, “Kennecott vs. Chilean Self-Determination,” there was an in-depth report on Kennecott’s efforts to block the sales of Chilean copper as a response to the Allende government’s expropriation of copper. Kennecott had sent letters to Chilean copper consumers warning of its power to embargo up to 49% of copper purchases. In October, a Kennecott subsidiary in Paris had won an initial court verdict to deny payments to the Chilean government for any copper it receives. In response to the verdict, French dockworkers refused to unload any Chilean copper in solidarity with the Chilean government. The ship was then rerouted to the Netherlands where the Dutch dockworkers also refused to unload it in solidarity with the Chilean government’s right to self-determination and the Chilean workers whose wages would be suspend without payment for the shipment. In the back of the newsletter was a letter “to the French and Dutch dockworkers who refused to unload copper in solidarity with Chile” and a petition to Mr.
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Frank Milliken, the president of Kennecott Copper Corporation for people to gather signatures on and send back to Madison.

While Kennecott was filing lawsuits in Europe other U.S. corporations were refusing to supply Chile with technological items that Chile was dependent on causing shortages in the Chilean economy.221 “The timing of these actions…suggest a well orchestrated strategy on the part of U.S. governmental-corporate decision makers to provoke a major economic crisis in Chile,” which would weaken Allende and strengthen his opposition.222 The petition to the Kennecott Copper Corporation president that expressed outrage at its actions and to condemn its actions as “an act of international piracy.”223 Recipients of the newsletter were encouraged to tear our and then circulate the petition and then send it back to NICH. The NICH archive documents twenty-two pages of the petition that total to about two hundred and sixteen signatures that NICH then sent to the Kennecott president.224 Despite CALA-NICH’s continued efforts to force Kennecott’s hand through research on the politics of the copper industry and through petitions such as this one, the efforts had little impact on Kennecott’s operations. While CALA-NICH may not have changed much in terms of Kennecott’s actions, Gedicks reported that the major players in the corporation were aware of CALA-NICH and the work that they were doing in regards to anti-corporate, anti-imperialist activism.225

Although the creation of NICH and the newfound sense of urgency around the situation in Chile created more opportunities for a direct action strategy, education-based
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activism remained essential to the organization’s mission. The national reach and specificity in topic of NICH allowed for the circumstances to pass around petitions, organize demonstrations and stage boycotts, but there was still a need to educate U.S. citizens about Chile and other Latin American causes. The CALA model of education was used to facilitate the direct actions that NICH organized. The petitions were sent out in the CALA newsletters and the research that Gedicks and other members were conducting was used to highlight the connections between anti-imperialism and ITT and Kennecott’s roles in threatening stability in Chile and other parts of the developing world. Without CALA’s emphasis on education and radical research, it would have been more difficult to mobilize individuals in support of NICH’s direct actions.

CALA used education to facilitate direct action in support of Allende’s Chile but it also continued with its education on various countries in Latin America, anti-imperialism and the interconnectedness between Latin American workers and Wisconsin workers after the conference. In the fall of 1972, CALA added a Latin American Speaker’s Bureau in addition to its semester film series. The suggested topics for the bureau were based on the availability of speakers and included many topics ranging from U.S. foreign policy in Latin America, Latin American literature, women and social change and alternative models of economic development with a focus on Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Mexico and Peru.226 Despite the event’s focus on Latin American and not Chile, the reasoning behind its inception was “an attempt to meet the new interest in U.S.-Latin American relations generated by the election in Chile of the world’s first Marxist president.”227 While this was already the second year of the Allende government and not
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quite a “new interest,” it was only a few months after the pivotal CALA conference. In the time following the conference it was impossible to discuss Latin America without focusing on Chile. This event is indicative of the shift towards focusing on Chile when referring to Latin America affairs, which was present throughout the U.S. due to the heightened fear of intervention.

Of the CALA newsletters published between the conference in April 1972 and the coup in September 1973, only two issues did not have a story on Chile. The other nine issues either focused exclusively on Chile or primarily discussed Chile but had an article or two on a different Latin American country or on an ideology that applied to multiple Latin American nations. The topics of CALA’s other initiatives were more widespread; the fall 1972 film series featured films on Brazil, Chile and Argentina and Bolivia. The following semester’s film series was rebranded as the Third World Cinema series and featured films on Cuba, Bolivia, Algeria, Mexico, South Africa and Chile.

CALA’s annual conference on April 7, 1973 was titled, “Development for Liberation: Alternative Models for Latin America, Southern Africa and Wisconsin.” Chile was discussed at the conference, but it was more focused “economic, political, social involvement of the U.S. in the affairs of Latin American countries,” and the relationship between these policies and other parts of the world. While Chile was present in most of the educational material, CALA did stick to its mission to educate U.S. citizens about other Latin American affairs as well.
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“Is the Revolution Reversible?”

Through direct action, education and the growing sense of peril surrounding the situation in Chile, NICH’s presence expanded throughout the country. There is evidence of chapters forming in Santa Barbara, Boston, Chicago and New York City, but the chapter in Berkeley was by far the most active outside of Madison. Bodenheimer, Farnsworth and Professor Donald Bray were a few of the leaders of the Berkeley chapter and had all been panelists at the April 1972 Chile conference. In fact, it was the NICH-Berkeley chapter that suggested writing the letter of solidarity with French workers that a CALA-NICH member later penned in Madison. Some of NICH-Berkeley’s strength came from the large Chilean population in the area, which translated to greater numbers of people at large events. In April 1973, the Berkeley chapter organized a multi-media Chile festival at a community theater in San Francisco. The festival included music, dancing, films, book and record sales, a photography and poster art display and eight different workshops. Farnsworth reported that during the two-day festival four hundred people came out on the first day and two hundred came on the second day. The chapter also taught a local class for adults at a leftist San Francisco school about Chile and Latin America in May and June of 1973. The class helped attract some new people to the chapter’s already consistent membership of ten and an additional ten “who come and go.” Although the Berkeley chapter did not have a large membership, it was still able to mobilize mass events such as the Chile festival and a demonstration outside of an ITT

subsidiary in downtown San Francisco in late June. This demonstration was in response to the attempted military coup in Chile on June 29, 1973. NICH-Berkeley was able to quickly gather eighty people from many different groups in the area to join the march, which was covered by the local news and by five newspapers in Chile.²³⁷

As NICH continued to expand in Berkeley and across the nation, the situation in Chile became even more precarious. CALA-NICH members knew of the serious threats to Allende’s government but remained optimistic of the power of his revolution and what it stood for. The June 1973 edition of CALA’s newsletter was printed before the attempted coup and it was not until September 1973 that the next newsletter came out. That newsletter, “Chile, Is the Revolution Reversible?” featured an article with the same name that was written on August 28, 1973 by Ian Roxborough, a PhD candidate at the University of Wisconsin. He discussed the possibility of many coups or “even if this [coup] does not occur--since the strength and vigilance of the working class may prevent such an attempt to thwart the movement to liberate Chile from the shackles of dependent capitalism-- there exists the likelihood that the Socialist-Communist coalition will face a united owning class in the presidential election of 1976.”²³⁸ Roxborough identified the inflation caused by the U.S. credit blockade, which created a basis of opposition within the middle class as the reasoning behind a possible coup or electoral challenge. This opposition translated into mass demonstrations that created a climate of political instability and chaos, which in turn caused national polarization. “The more the capitalist class sees its interests threatened, the more radical are the measures it takes to oppose the government. The more overtly counterrevolutionary the capitalist opposition becomes,

²³⁷ _Ibid._
the more the workers and peasants…respond with revolutionary countermeasures. And
the more the reformists try to rely on the supposedly neutral military, the more the
military itself become politicized.”

Roxborough explained that the conditions that created the political situation in
Chile and attempted to show that the situation would not be easily resolved. The
economic situation in Chile had politicized the middle class to side with the right-wing
“owning class.” Yet it was not just the middle class that had become polarized. The
working class and peasantry had also become increasingly radical and were often upset
with Allende’s more reformist position. This created strength in Allende’s leftist
opposition and added to the chaos of the political environment. After acknowledging
Allende’s many challenges, the article ends on an optimistic note. Not only had the UP’s
share of the vote risen 6% in the 1973 congressional elections but “people had seen that a
just society is possible…In this sense, the revolution is clearly irreversible.” Despite
predicting more coup attempts or a strong electoral opposition in the 1976 presidential
election, CALA-NICH and Roxborough had faith in the power of justice, equality and
anti-imperialism. The end of the article stated that only “the most draconian measures”
could overturn this revolution. Such draconian measures came on September 11, 1973,
fourteen days after this article was written. Allende was killed in a military coup that
resulted in a seventeen-year military dictatorship led by Augusto Pinochet.
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Conclusion

The coup on September 11, 1973 was the result of months of political and economic tension and polarization within Chile. The Nixon Administration’s credit blockade of Chile contributed to the destabilization of the economic situation in Chile, which exacerbated tensions between the middle class and the working class. While Allende had the broad support of the rural and working classes, the economic struggles led the middle class and to support rightwing and elite groups. Additionally, far-left militant groups who were opposed to Allende’s plan of a peaceful revolution served as further provocation for right-wing militant players and split Allende’s support amongst the rural and working classes as more radical factions joined the militant groups. The economic hardships and the fractioning of Allende’s left wing support helped set the stage for the volatile situation in Chile that preceded the coup. In the few months before the coup, Allende and his cabinet were aware of the possibility of a military coup, but believed that if the military were to split in that situation, enough people would stay loyal to the government and protect him.

In the few weeks before the coup, top officials in the Chilean armed forces were strengthening their plans against Allende. On September 1, despite opposition from the Allende government, Admiral Merino attempted to replaces Admiral Montero as the naval commander in chief. Merino claimed that parties, which supported the government, had infiltrated the navy and he feared that it would become a Marxist institution and therefore the change of command was necessary. On the 5, Merino recalls a heated exchange between himself and Allende in which he said, “we are at war with you. This
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navy is at war because it is not communist and will never be communist...we will defend it to the last, it is our life and the life of our Chile.”246 Merino and Allende met two days later in person but resolved little. By this time it was clear that a coup was on the horizon. Yet Allende was convinced that Augusto Pinochet and Gustavo Leigh, the commanders in chief of the army and air force respectively, would remain loyal to him. Their loyalty would severely limit the size and power of any attempted coup by Merino.247 Yet on September 9 both Pinochet and Leigh signed a note from Merino agreeing to “unite their forces in staging a coup on the eleventh.”248 By the 10, the US embassy had been informed of the coup and the director of the CIA allegedly settled in to watch the coup from a room, which overlooked Allende’s office. According to a later report in an Argentinean newspaper, thirty-two U.S. planes arrived in Argentina on the border of Chile had arrived just a few days earlier. Evidence shows that U.S. agents in Chile were prepared to help out if their assistance was needed but when a “key officer” asked an U.S. official if the U.S. would provide military assistance if the situation became “difficult,” he refused to give a straight forward commitment.249

As the military moved troops all day on the 10, “plotters within Chile’s armed forces successfully deflected government enquires about troop movements.”250 By the evening of the 10 the rumors of troop movements had reached Allende in Santiago but after calling various military officials who ensured him that nothing was wrong Allende dismissed the rumors.251 He said, “We would not have slept for months if we had had to
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Around 1:30am on the 11, a US defense official reported back to Washington that the coup would take place in a matter of hours. Allende did not hear this news until 6:00am and he was still unsure of who in the military had remained loyal to him. Upon hearing the news Allende headed straight to La Moneda, the presidential palace. While this coup was somewhat anticipated, the “ferocity” in which it was carried out was unexpected.

Allende’s final address to the Chilean people occurred as he was barricaded in La Moneda while refusing to surrender Santiago to the Chilean armed forces. “Placed in a historic transition, I will pay the people’s loyalty with my life. And I say to you that I’m certain that the seed we have sown in the dignified conscience of thousands and thousands of Chileans will not be shriveled forever…Long live Chile! Long live the People! Long live the workers!”

Echoing the sentiments of the “Chile: Is the Revolution Reversible,” there was hope that despite the violent forces of the counterrevolution, that the message of Allende’s revolution would not die with him. As Allende refused to surrender Santiago or La Moneda to the military, the palace was surrounded by military troops and air force jets flew overhead and bombed the building. Allende died during this bombardment and it is still unknown if he committed suicide or if his death was the result of the bombing. Within a week Cuba’s representative to the United Nations accused Nixon of being “the intellectual author” of
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the coup and countries around the world followed suit by blaming the U.S. for orchestrating the conditions for the coup.\textsuperscript{256}

As the junta government took over on September 11, Pinochet announced a national reconstruction as he disbanded congress and the constitution on national TV. Leigh and Merino had both envisioned reinstituting a constitutional government after the coup but were cast aside by Pinochet who would serve as the Chilean dictator until 1990.\textsuperscript{257} Starting that evening, thousands of political prisoners were rounded up into the national stadium in Santiago where they were imprisoned, tortured and later sent to execution.\textsuperscript{258} It is difficult to find correct numbers of those who were killed and “disappeared” in Chile, as many of these atrocities were committed unofficially. A 1974 Amnesty International report on Chile estimated that within the first two weeks of the coup about 2,769 corpses were processed at a Santiago morgue. Yet an unofficial U.S. State Department report stated that the number was 10,800 by late December 1973.\textsuperscript{259} Two U.S. citizens, Charles Horman a filmmaker and Frank Teruggi a student at the University of Chile who had been in touch with CALA activists in earlier years, both disappeared in Chile after the coup. Many have claimed that U.S. officials were indifferent if not complicit in their deaths.\textsuperscript{260} As the junta government rounded up and murdered blacklisted leftists, the State Department instructed U.S. officials to “discreetly convey Washington’s ‘desire to cooperate’ and ‘assist’” the new government.\textsuperscript{261} In private Kissinger argued “‘however unpleasant' the new government was [it was] ‘better
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for us than Allende.” As thousands of people were dying in Chile, the U.S. threw its support behind Pinochet and in response a movement against the junta government was growing in the U.S.

The coup marked a shift of the centrality of NICH activism from Madison out to Berkeley. The Berkeley chapter coordinated most of the protests throughout California in the month following the coup. NICH-Berkeley worked in coordination with the other NICH chapters but became disconnected from CALA and the Madison chapter. In the first *Ibero-American Newsletter* published the University of Wisconsin after the coup there was a mention of a new organization “Madison Committee to Help Chile” which had mobilized to raise money to help find employment for Chilean scholars in exile. The published paragraph on CALA events for the upcoming semester did not mention NICH or the coup. It mentioned the schedule for the film festival and for its national conference in November on “Repression and Development in Brazil.” It appears that CALA and NICH divided almost immediately after the coup. Post-coup activism similar to NICH sprouted out throughout the nation, as seen with the Madison Committee to Help Chile, but the Madison NICH chapter appeared to dissolve and NICH and CALA separated their affiliation for one another.

On November 1, NICH published its first *Chile Newsletter* with a statement on NICH’s proposed actions against the junta government. It stated that NICH would continue to expose U.S. involvement in Chile and educate people about the merits of Allende’s government. NICH would also expose the U.S.’s efforts in overthrowing
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Allende and “intensity its efforts to halt further U.S. intervention now necessary to prop up yet another unpopular military dictatorship.”265 The Chile Newsletter was intended to inform people about the developing situation in Chile and was to be used as a coordinating tool between local and national activist groups. This was especially important in the earliest month of the coup as national groups were just starting to organize.266

The first Chile Newsletter also outlined the actions that were taken in response to the coup in September and October, as well as some new campaigns for individuals to partake in. Immediately following the coup “rallies of solidarity” took place in cities across the world, followed by teach-ins and meetings to mobilize people on the issue. An International Week of Solidarity with Chile was sponsored in about thirty-five U.S. cities on October 8-14. NICH reported that thousands of people had attended rallies along the whole West Coast from San Diego to Seattle, including the 1,000 individuals in San Francisco who came out on October 4 for a memorial poetry reading for Allende.267 NICH-Berkeley coordinated many of the teach-ins, meetings and film series throughout Northern California and acted as a resource for any communities or individuals throughout the country that wanted to get involved in Chilean solidarity activism.268 NICH also warned readers that ‘the junta could no more survive without U.S. aid than could the Allende government” so it launched a campaign for individuals to contact the congressional committee on Chilean aid to advocate against the U.S. sending money to
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the junta government. In addition to coordinating national rallies and campaigns NICH used the newsletter to inform U.S. citizens of developments in Chile. In the later years NICH organized a network to help political prisoners by publishing a Political Prisoners Bulletin in addition to the Chile Newsletter. NICH continued to play a role in the prominent solidarity movement against Pinochet’s regime that emerged after the coup.

While the post-coup movement was more successful and widespread than the solidarity movement that CALA-NICH led during Allende’s presidency, the impact of the latter movement has been ignored and mischaracterized by historians. One article describes the pre-coup movement as “a small group of leftists who embraced the Unidad Popular.” While that statement is accurate it belittles the achievements of the movement and does not acknowledge the root of CALA-NICH’s activism. CALA-NICH activists did in fact embrace the Allende government but the movement emerged as a response to the war in Vietnam and continued U.S. imperialism, not an infatuation with Allende’s socialist revolution. Most of the founders of CALA had been activists in the anti-war movement and had been on campus during the height of its activity. As the antiwar movement’s activism began slowing down in the early 1970s, the founders of CALA looked to other global areas that were in danger of becoming the next Vietnam. These individuals were concerned about the long history of U.S. imperialism in Latin America and joined together in Madison, Wisconsin to attempt to stop “another Vietnam.” CALA believed that if the U.S. masses had been exposed to the information about U.S.
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imperialism in Vietnam that the war may have been prevented. In that vein CALA worked to inform the people about Latin America and the role that U.S. imperialism played in oppressing Latin Americans as a preemptive measure to save the U.S. from another disastrous war. As the ITT memos were exposed in the media and more was learned about the Nixon administrations actions in Chile, NICH was founded to inform people about the dangers of intervention in Chile. NICH became a more focused version of CALA and worked to prevent a subversion of democracy and another Vietnam war in Chile. It was the influence of the Vietnam war and the antiwar movement, which planted the seed for CALA and NICH’s anti-imperialist activism in Latin America.

Although CALA-NICH’s activism was sandwiched between two prominent activist movements, the antiwar movement and the post-coup solidarity with Chile movement, it never reached the same momentum as its predecessor or successor movements. Yet the network that CALA-NICH had built during the years of the Allende government were instrumental in facilitating the quick mobilization of solidarity with Chile immediately after the coup. NICH already had resources on U.S. interventions in Chile, connections with other anti-imperialist groups (both Latin America-focused and not) and chapters in several cities. These factors put NICH on the forefront of this new movement that had emerged out of the coup. NICH worked closely with NACLA and groups with similar missions such as Common Front for Latin America (COFFLA) to ensure that Chile became a central issue for activists in the U.S. As a general Latin America-focused group, COFFLA understood the effect that this coup would have on all the whole region. It immediately urged all other Latin America-focused solidarity groups
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to “organize themselves and promote Non-Intervention in Chile (NICH) coalitions for mobilizing short run impact activity,” as well as coordinate other U.S. activists groups to take up the Chilean cause. As NICH was the largest solidarity group focused on Chile before the coup its existing infrastructure, comprehensive understanding of the situation, and access to resources on Chile made NICH essential for the post-coup’s initial response. COFFLA recognized that a strong initial response to the coup would help generate a more sustainable long-term movement and attract a broad coalition of activists from other U.S. solidarity groups, Latin America focused and not. This strategy was effective, as over one hundred diverse activists groups joined the post-coup movement by the end of 1973 including the United Auto Workers and the Black Panther Party. In Heidi Tinsman’s book on the post-coup boycott of Chilean grapes, she lists NICH as one of the few major groups that had “national scope” in this movement. With over fifteen chapters throughout the nation, the Chile newsletter and the political prisoners bulletin, NICH remained an influential presence in coordinating solidarity efforts as the movement continued to expand up into the 1980s.

CALA-NICH’s form of activism was not just influential for the post-coup solidarity with Chile movement; it was an influential force in 1970s activism more broadly. Much of the 1970s activism was marked by consumer boycotts that arose from specific concerns about corporate responsibility and the perpetuation of dependency in developing nations. This included campaigns against the support of Pinochet’s regime, South Africa’s apartheid and marketing techniques in developing countries by Nestlé and
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pesticide, alcohol, and tobacco companies. For CALA-NICH anti-corporate activism was an inherent part of its anti-imperialist activism and it was manifested in Gedicks’s in-depth research on Kennecott’s role in the perpetuation of dependency in Chile and Wisconsin and in its boycott and campaigns against ITT. The idea of consumer boycotts linked new left ideals of participatory democracy with CALA-NICH’s commitment to community initiatives. While boycotts became prolific in the 1970s there had been instances of notable boycott campaigns in earlier years. SDS was engaged in several boycotts including one in 1969 against Standard Oil’s treatment of union workers and the Union of Farm Workers (UFW), led by César Chávez and Dolores Huerta, organized boycotts of California grapes in the 1960s to protest poor working conditions. Yet it was not until the 1970s that targeted corporate boycotts and the focus on global corporate harm in relation to imperialism and dependency became a trademark of activism. Robin Broad and Zahara Heckscher point to the ITT controversy in Chile as the “poster child” for the “increasing concerns over TNCs’ [transnational corporations] economic and political power vis-à-vis Third World governments” that arose in the 1970s. CALA-NICH was on the forefront of this new pattern of activism that would have a lasting impact for future generations.

Boycotts of corporations as well as of the Chilean government played a prominent role in the post-coup movement. A month after the coup NICH met up with NACLA and several other groups to discuss the need for a boycotts against Chilean and U.S.
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businesses that had played a role in overthrowing Allende, such as ITT. By November 1973, the San Francisco area’s International Longshore and Warehouse Union declared that they would not unload any Chilean products.\textsuperscript{279} While this boycott was not especially effective, the “boycott stance became an important rallying point and central theme for the emerging Chile solidarity movement.” In 1979 groups began organizing a consumer boycott of Chilean grapes and wine.\textsuperscript{280} With the renewed economic relationship between the U.S. and Chile after the coup Chilean grape exports to the U.S. increases rapidly. By 1975 Chile had begun exporting about 80 percent of its grapes to the U.S. Similar to the earlier Longshore and Warehouse Union boycott, this consumer boycott had little economic effect on the Pinochet regime but it did tie together an economic critique of Pinochet’s policies to the moral critique. Rather than simply denouncing the overt human rights abuses of the Chilean junta, these activists wanted to focus “on the regime’s economic policies that were wrecking havoc by exposing Chile to extremes of international capitalism.”\textsuperscript{281} This boycott raised awareness about the dramatic levels of poverty and unemployment that Pinochet’s government was producing because of its obsession with the U.S.-Chilean economic relations that breed dependency and economic inequality.\textsuperscript{282} This type of boycott, inspired by economic critiques of imperialist and dependent policies that CALA-NICH had participated in, was prominent in 1970s activism.

While dependency theory was developed in reference to Latin America the theory was soon applied to developing nations across the world. This was reflected in anti-
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corporate campaigns of the 1970s that emerged in nations outside of Latin America. In 1977 a boycott was launched against the Swiss corporation, Nestlé, for its marketing techniques of baby formula in developing countries. According to a *New York Times* article from 1981, “the advertisements usually promised, if only subtly, that formula was the modern method of infant feeding, associated with upward mobility.”\(^{283}\) Formula can be a safe alternative to breast milk under the right conditions but Nestlé targeted women who were often not able to get access to clean water or refrigeration or could not buy enough formula to sustain their infant. Under these conditions the baby formula was dangerous and caused many infants in the developing world to suffer from malnourishment and other illnesses.\(^{284}\) The boycott attracted a diverse group of activists from people concerned about child healthcare, world hunger to the power that corporations wielded in the developing world. This boycott lasted seven years and was instrumental in the development of the World Health Organization’s international code about marketing for baby formulas.\(^{285}\) It also “had a major impact on the interpretation of corporate accountability and the reconciliation of human rights and commercial interests.”\(^{286}\) This boycott of Nestlé was just one of many consumer boycotts organized in the U.S. and Europe during the 1970s to address the issue of corporate interests trumping considerations for the safety and welfare of those living in poverty in developing countries. CALA-NICH’s activism in the early 1970s was on the forefront of this anti-corporate activism as anti-imperialist activism that stemmed from a critique of
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dependency theory. This activism took the form of boycotts against economic policies of abusive regimes, such as the boycott of Chilean grapes and against specific corporations that were benefiting through unlawful intervention and the exploitation of those in poverty in the developing world. The latter campaigns were exemplified by CALA-NICH’s boycott of ITT subsidiaries in Chile and Vietnam and the Nestlé boycott.

Ultimately CALA-NICH did not succeed in its goal of stopping U.S. intervention from subverting democracy in Chile nor did it end U.S. imperialism in Latin America. Yet CALA-NICH was an essential part of the post-coup movement’s initial mobilization efforts and NICH continued to be an influential presence in the movement through the 1980s. This movement also played a significant role in Latin American activism and in the shift towards the anti-corporate activism that would mark the 1970s and 1980s. When evaluating CALA-NICH’s role in broader trends of 1970s activism, CALA-NICH was on the forefront of the growing view of anti-corporate activism as anti-imperialism. This view of targeting and boycotting specific corporations for their role in perpetuating dependency and of exploiting people in the developing world would have a lasting impact on activism in the U.S. The story of CALA-NICH also sheds light on the moral stain that U.S. interventions in Chile and Latin America have left on our society. These political maneuvers have caused immense amounts of trauma to the people of Latin America. Therefore we must join in and support those who speak out against global and domestic injustices.
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