

AN INTERVIEW WITH JEAN FRANCO

Steve Mathews

Jean Franco teaches at Columbia University and is the author of numerous books about Latin American literature, culture and politics, including *The Modern Culture of Latin America: Society and the Artist*, *Cesar Vallejo: The Dialectics of Poetry and Silence*, and most recently, *Plotting Women: Gender and Representation in Mexico*. This interview with Professor Franco was conducted on the University of Iowa campus in April 1991.

My first question is about theory and critical practice. In a 1986 article in Hispanoamérica you talk about a strategic alliance for critical theory between deconstruction, feminism and Marxism. Could you elaborate?

Well, I would say that my main basis is probably some form of Marxism. I say some form of Marxism because there are so many different forms of Marxism, but I would say principally what I'm interested in are questions of ideology. I still find the Althusserian idea of ideology to some extent useful; I don't want to throw out the idea of ideology. The second aspect of my work that I get from Marxism is I'm very much interested in the specific conditions in which particular books and culture and literature and art appeared. I really believe that one has to read literatures very much back into the contexts in which they're produced. I think the whole ideology of the institution here has been to release or give freedom to these works and circulate them in rather abstract conditions which take away a lot of their original political facts. So that is what the debate has been. I don't think feminism is in contradiction naturally to Marxism. And

the third, deconstruction. I think deconstruction can be extraordinarily valuable, but limited. Derrida's original or early work and in particular his work on Husserl and his *On Grammatology* are extraordinarily important. And I think they are important in really making people aware of the way Western thought in a general sense has been constructed. So I think that's absolutely crucial. What I don't like is the way that it has been fed into the arguments about undecidability, rhetoric and so on. I think a lot of it finally turns literary criticism into a kind of game which has very little impact on political or social realities.

Unfortunately. [laughter] That sort of plugs into my second question which is about cultural studies. Some commentators, including Richard Brantlinger in his recent book on cultural studies in Britain and America, contend that cultural studies is potentially a utopian intervention into the Humanities that can somehow negotiate between the limitless polysemy of post-structural textual analysis and the conservative fixture of liberal humanism. How do you evaluate the potential of cultural studies as oppositional critique in the U.S. academy? Can it transform the humanities?

I think it's difficult to say. Can it transform the humanities? I think the short term answer would be no because the short term answer is that the humanities are so firmly grounded in national ideology in this country and they're being very stoutly defended by very vocal and very articulate conservatives who have every interest in marginalizing people who either challenge the western canon or express interests in cultural studies. But I think that what's happening at other levels is very interesting. As far as a pragmatic level of cultural studies, it's working. Let me explain. In two year colleges, and undergraduate colleges generally I think it's becoming less and less viable to try and separate out the study of high culture because of the people who go to those colleges and of what they'll be doing afterwards; they have to be prepared for a different sort of reality. And so I mean on a practical basis, I think cultural studies is taking hold, particularly at that particular level of college teaching. But within the elite institutions, I definitely think that those of us who do it have an oppositional role and I think it's very important. I mean pedagogical intervention assumes importance. I think one of the important things that cultural studies can do there is to actually make students think of literature as a product of an institution, as a part of an institution which has upheld western colonialism, a part of an institution that creates the ideology of the humanities and what that means. I would say that, in that respect, this process of *conscientización* has a purpose.

Related to this kind of intervention in a problematic way, I think, is something you mentioned in your talk last night as well, this discourse on multiculturalism in the U.S. academy which to me appears to be internally conflicted. On the one hand it seems to be a neopluralism that erases difference as it incorporates marginal texts into Barthes' "Family of Man." It reestablishes the cultural hegemony of the metropolitan center in a way that is perhaps similar to the old Comparative Literature of the 1950s. On the other, it seems desirable and hopefully possible to preserve a multiculturalism based on conflict and contention for meaning that doesn't erase power differences. What are your thoughts about multiculturalism in the academy as it's currently deployed? Does it have possibilities?

Well, it does have possibilities. I entirely agree with your description of certain limitations and possibilities. But, I was very alarmed recently, for instance, to hear from a colleague about a conference that was going to be held this summer in Budapest on multiculturalism. One of her colleagues who has never taught anything other than Trollope or something like that has applied to go to this conference because he wants to go to Budapest, right. Okay, you see, at the lowest possible level, multiculturalism is a very easy bandwagon for people to jump on. It can be completely meaningless. I was also at a conference last week in which people were just brought together from different cultures. It was supposed to promote interculturalism. As if merely being present in a room with Chinese, Japanese, or whatever, you were going to produce this interculturalism. And I think this is the worst, you know, the most, what I call Benetton Internationalism [laughter], right. And that's the name I've given it, but I think the other side of the coin is that multiculturalism has come about because of real demands, particularly demands from ethnic minorities in the U.S., and that responds to some very serious issues related to understanding other cultures and the notorious inability of the empire to understand those other cultures. So again, you know, it can give rise to serious pedagogical activity. But, I think as in most fashions, as in deconstruction, as in any other practice, in Marxism, what the U.S. academy tends to encourage is the trendy version, right. And the serious work has to be done on a rather different basis.

I wonder if we could shift the terrain a bit to a consideration of the primary basis of your work, which is Latin American cultural politics and cultural production. My first question is about utopia, something I see hints of in your work constantly.

Yes.

In many of your articles, I think, there are suggestions of it. An important element of Latin American culture that you try to draw out in your writing is something that we might call the symbolic repertoire of utopian imagination, a discourse you associate with the feminine and the indigenous. However, what you point out is that certain male writers, in tapping into this symbolic reservoir, have colonized it, have translated it for the metropolitan center and thereby attenuated its political potential. So my question: Have recent women writers managed to make more politically progressive use of this material? Can women plot utopias?

Well, I think we can and are doing that. And I mean to cite two examples: one would certainly be Rigoberta Menchú as far as both an indigenous person and a woman who is concerned, who is actually working for a future society and establishing these rather extraordinary networks across cultures. Another example I would cite would be something like Elena Poniatowska's essay on the women of Cuchután which is clearly a utopian text about women who have power and have sexual power and who, she says, are the real government of this particular region. So I think women can and do plot utopias. But, I'd like to introduce another question which is different from utopia and which I've been using more and more, and that is Latin America as a heterotopia. Foucault describes these "other spaces" within the space of society. He mentions cemeteries, brothels, and I don't know, multiple other examples of heterotopias. And he also says in one place that colonies can become compensatory heterotopias. I talked to my students about this and they accused me of overextending this Foucauldian idea. But I still think it's very interesting for Latin America, if you think about the whole history of Latin America in terms of Tupac Amaru, the Jesuits, the Tolstoian colonism of the 19th century, the *gauchos judios* in Argentina, Cuba, liberated territories right now. I mean these liberated territories do seem to correspond, to me—more than to utopias, which are "no place" obviously—to heterotopias where people really intend to establish within the dominant system, another system. I mean the Jesuit colonies were set up as a critique of European secularization, which is very interesting. And the liberated territory, like the Makandarian in Columbia, and the early days of the Cuban revolution. That was when Che Guevara talked about "non-material incentives"; it was very consciously setting up something that was in opposition to capitalist society. So it's a heterotopia within this system, this world system in which this seems impractical or oppositional or difficult or whatever. But, I'm very interested in the idea of a heterotopia. Basically I see it in many novels. I see that in Macondo, in Lucia's settlement in *La casa verde*. I mean I see these as literary examples of heterotopias.

My sense of the current political conjuncture is that something like either heterotopian or utopian imagination is crucial. To be able to imagine an alternative is becoming increasingly difficult. This is why we have to do it.

I agree, and the only reason that I guess I would take the term heterotopia instead of utopia is because if you take something like Louis Marin's definition of a utopia, it seems to be an imagined space outside of the logic of a particular system, but it's still a "no place." It doesn't exist in real space. Whereas, the interesting thing about the heterotopias is these are actual places, founded with this conscious idea of being surrounded by society.

Okay. About resistance. You identify in some of your essays several discursive strategies of resistance available to women: performance, parody, the temporary reclaiming of public space with newly politicized traditional subjectivities, the insistence on radical heterogeneity. But there is the sense that all of these are ultimately recuperable by hostile regimes of truth. Is all performance ultimately sado-masochistic? Are there other forms of resistance that interest you?

I think people talk about resistance too generally. So you get people, Barbara Harlow for instance—in her book it seems to me almost anything becomes resistance. Writing from prison is resistance. Fighting in a guerilla war is resistance. And I resist that generalized notion of resistance. I do think one certainly has to make differences between, say, writing a parody, which I think is important to do, and going off to fight in the hills or whatever. I just think everything depends on the particular conjuncture, and I think there are certain conjunctures where parody may be the only intervention that's realistic. You see in Skip Gates' book where signifying becomes one of the tools to use in situations where blacks are locked in a very rigid situation, dangerous relationships. Again, it's part of this system of a black man or woman being very specific about how they respond, where they have an opportunity for resistance for practical reasons.

Sort of a notion of a politics of location that's very grounded.

Yes, very grounded. Just let me give you an example of what I mean by resistance. This is parodic resistance. I've been doing a course on parody this semester which has been very interesting. I began with Machado de Assis. He does this brilliant parody of 19th century positivism which was the dominant, you know, it was the underlying logic for the whole production of progress, European hegemony and

so on. So what he really does is to provide a deconstruction of those notions. Now, one of the problems of parody is that when you don't know the context, it's no longer parody. So, Machado de Assis, read in the 20th century and in translation and with an introduction by Susan Sontag, the narrator becomes somebody who's standing up for freedom of the artist; and I mean this is why the task of a literary critic in the present time is not so much discriminating between and evaluating and saying this is good, this is bad. I think it's much more to be constantly insisting on, as you put it, grounding these works so that their force is not diminished, attenuated by these, what you might call liberal reading frames.

*I have a somewhat related question about ethnography. This is a question about the responsibility of theory, the problems of ethnography and perhaps a kind of paranoia. You critique Elena Poniatowska for her relationship to the subaltern woman she uses as a subject in her testimonial novel *Hasta no verte más, Jesús mío*. Is this relationship in any way analogous to the one between the first world theorist or cultural critic and the marginalized subject of our investigation? I'm thinking of your discussion of the inquisition trial of Ana Rodríguez de Castro y Arambarra Montezuma. What are the problems related to "giving voice" to the subaltern? What are the problems with seeing theory as a collector of subjectivities, be they resistant or not?*

I take quite seriously Gayatri Spivak's article "Can the Subaltern Speak?" because I think what she objects to in that article is the left intellectual like Foucault or Deleuze not representing themselves or allowing the subaltern to speak without themselves having any apparent participation in the project. She says that in doing that they really restore the West as subject, right, while denying it. And you see, to my mind it is this question of framing that is of crucial importance, and I feel that Trinh Minh-ha is someone who insists on this a great deal. I think that we as intellectuals, whether you're male, whether you're female, whether you're in the metropolis or in Latin America, you still have to be very scrupulous in trying to frame whatever you're saying and giving due recognition and due acknowledgment and stating your own position in this particular debate. It's not as if the intellectual is outside politics. This is what happens in academia; the sociologists and the anthropologists are outside the politics of the place which they're studying nine times out of ten. And that, to me, is the impossible position, right [laughter], that gives you this pretense that you're outside the politics of the place.

It's a pretense that erases ...

Yes, it erases the observer or the critical whatever as a political subject and I think that has to be put back. That's something that Gayatri Spivak has taught me personally which I think is quite important.

Earlier you put the term postmodernism in scare quotes, which I think is an important thing to do when you talk about Latin America. However, some theorists of postmodernism don't seem to do that, and I see that as problematic. I'm thinking of Linda Hutcheon, for example, and what I see as the colonizing move of this "carnavalesque pluralism" in the readings that she does of Puig and Roa Bastos. I personally see that as theoretical neocolonialism, and that may be reductive, but that's my position. Since you mentioned Spivak, it's interesting to note that she writes about her concern that there is a new Orientalism afoot. And I think the general problems that you just talked about could be related to international postmodernism and its theorization in the metropolis. So, how do we talk about Latin American postmodernism? Is it possible? Is there a Latin American postmodernism, or do we just chuck out the term?

Well, this is sort of what's going on. It's a debate that's been going on for some time. Many critics talk about incomplete modernization and so on, or incomplete modernity, unfinished modernity, but I think it's highly problematic to use the term in Latin America. To begin with, I think in this country it's subject to so many different meanings, because if you take a Lyotardian notion of postmodernism it's different from a Baudrillardian notion of postmodernism; it's not the same thing. The way postmodern is vulgarly used around here is basically for what is happening in contemporary culture in cities like New York and Los Angeles. I think that's the lowest common denominator.

I was very disappointed in Frederic Jameson's book on the cultural logic of late capitalism. I think he fails to make a specific case; he fails to link a culture of postmodernism with a particular economic situation, it seems to me, though he's trying to do that. And I don't think cognitive mapping, to my mind, is enough. He uses these rather blanket notions; I have problems with that. Pastiche, nostalgia, etc. Then he sort of invents this something which will apply to the cultural sphere, the economic sphere, and the political sphere. But I personally don't find that convincing. I think certainly the reason that you can't altogether throw out postmodernism is because, quite clearly, there are elements in contemporary culture which are very different from modernist culture. I mean, there's just no doubt that *postmodernist* is true—something has changed, and it's changed everywhere. But what I would object to is this rather mechanical linking of that change to a postindustrial society and the failure to nuance

what those changes are in particular cultures. It's something which I think Andreas Huyssen tries to do in that article in which he nationalizes different postmodernisms.

Perhaps there's now a need to consider something that Marxist geographers are forcing us to think about: the uneven geographical development in Latin America and, as you point out, this incomplete modernization. The boom writers are really modernists in many ways and not postmodernists.

Yes, they are modernists. And one can point out postmodernists—one would say certain performance artists, maybe like Gomez-Peña or something like that—exist. But these are a new kind of migrant intelligentsia, I think very largely. You go to Arequipa and you know as somebody said, you go to Arequipa and what's postmodern about Arequipa? [laughter]. . . . I went to give a talk and after the talk a number of people came up to me and said we'd like to have a draught with you later on. So I said well, okay, if you come to my hotel around nine this evening, I'd be glad to. So eventually one of the male students came round. And I said, "Where are the women?" He said, "With their families. They can't come out this time of night." And then he said, "Would you like to have a coffee? We'll go to the main square if you'd like." So we went to the main square, three students and myself, sat down at a table on the main square and after a few minutes the manager came 'round and asked us to go inside to a back room because respectable women don't sit out in public having coffee at nine o'clock at night with males. It was incredible. [laughter] Mind you, this was 1972, but that's not so long ago.

In an article on feminist criticism in Hispanoamérica you make the point that the marginalization of women works very differently from the marginalization of indigenous peoples, that the struggle is definitely not the same. How does this work for your notion of deterritorialization? Does the invading militarized state create an affinity that might be the basis for a common struggle? How are these positions different?

I wrote that article some years ago, at a time when the idea of military governments was very important. Some kind of women's position in the military government was very crucial to illuminate. I think one would have to modify it. Women are marginalized because they're women and at the same time many women, a large section of women, are privileged because of their position in the middle class which is very different from being indigenous, obviously. So I mean, I think here I'm very much reintroducing at this stage now, this concept of

class stratification. Partly because I think this class stratification has hardly been eliminated with time. In other words, I think whereas in the 1930s and 1940s there were subjects of upward social mobility, for instance of the cholos in Peru who went massively into San Marcos University in the 1940s and 1950s. You see, that sort of movement is virtually at a standstill now. In fact, the opposite is happening: formerly middle class people are sinking into a kind of survival category. And this is what makes very problematic to me certain very privileged forms of writing, the aesthetic in the traditional sense to which there has been a sort of return by certain newer writers. And I think for women it's becoming a real crucial matter of choice because there isn't any easy way to cross that class barrier. And the question then arises: Are they going to embrace a middle class feminism which often separates them from the subaltern classes? Or are they going to abandon feminist aims because they don't want to separate themselves? Some women find solutions to that, for example, Maífo Olandaiz in Mexico, who is doing work with prostitute women. So there are different ways of coming up with solutions or solving these problems. You see, at this time, I don't think the problems are quite the same. I mean now it's becoming very much more difficult in this political situation.

Nevertheless, there are strategies to deal with this double bind.

Yes, there are strategies, but I don't think they're easy. I think Nicaragua might give us some very interesting lessons on this.

Yes. I spent some time working in Nicaragua in 1986. I was working with Salvadorans. The critiques that women were making about the old Left are still apropos today in Nicaragua, unfortunately. And that is a serious problem.

I was down there for the elections in Nicaragua and I asked them; I'm pretty sure that the women's vote swung against the Sandinistas. Nobody would acknowledge this.

Well, probably because of the clear appropriation of feminism by Chamorro, or at least the people who handled her who were able to create a sort of Cory Aquino phenomenon.

Not only that. It was also the opposite of that: the machismo of Daniel Ortega who went out to the pueblos riding a white horse and looking like Sandino and who did not address any issues that women were wanting addressed.

How can we think about and articulate the relationship between deterritorialization and privatization? That's a hard question.

Yes, that's a hard question. I think the two are so closely interconnected. I was using deterritorialization in a rather different sense from Deleuze and Guattari to begin with. I mean it's much like it's used by the Border Workshop and Gomez-Peña for referring to the fact that there's a kind of new class of people coming into being. And it's funny that just before I came here I was reading an article by Cornel West which makes the same kind of observation that there is a new class of people coming into being and these are people who really don't have a home or homeland or territory. So you can no longer fall back easily on nation or national identity, ethnic identity, or female identity. I mean it's not easy to just fall back and say this is my identity, this is my position; you're always constructing a position. So I think this is one of the reasons for this deterritorialization—in a sense, the upsets, the unsettlements that are occurring with this kind of global rearrangement. Which has to do with the economy, which has to do with privatization and so on, the transnational crossing of boundaries. So the two are intimately connected, but they're not the same thing.

You were talking about the conflicted space inhabited by feminist intellectuals. Is that similar to the conflicted space inhabited by Marxist intellectuals, because of course there still are Marxist intellectuals in Latin America. For many, Marxism remains a compelling paradigm.

It's difficult to say because "feminist intellectual" covers a lot of ground. There are some feminist intellectuals who are really bourgeois individualist intellectuals. But on the question of commitment I would say yes in the sense that the Marxist intellectual is very conscious of the fact that there are political movements which are not simply voluntaristically inaugurated by themselves and that they have some responsibility toward those. And I think that is also true of the feminists, that they can't ignore the fact that there are women's movements that they have not generated themselves and yet to which they have to pay attention.

*A related question, still on the topic of intellectuals. In many ways Angel Rama's book, *La ciudad letrada* asks us to rethink the periodization of cultural history. Of course, unfortunately, he was unable to finish his study of the intellectual sector in Latin America. The book ends prior to the contemporary period. How would you conclude the work if you were asked to finish writing it? What is the*

current organization of la ciudad letrada, the Latin American intellectual community, in relation to privatization and the state?

One of the crucial things that Angel Rama never truly lived to see or rather never truly understood . . . one of the things that truly upset him at the end of his life was the way he was handled by the U.S. He was totally devastated by it. He felt a threat to his own dignity as a human being. But what I think that also indicates—you see he was a very serious social democrat actually—I think he underestimated the power, strength and viciousness of conservatism. And also the underhandedness. Right. Therefore, that's why I think the end of *La ciudad letrada* is less satisfying to me than the beginning, and I think he's better on the emancipatory possibilities, the setting up of "la ciudad letrada," and then the development of the institution at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries. He's better on that than when he gets closer to the present and I think one thing he doesn't really take into account in that latter part of *La ciudad letrada* is the continuing tradition of conservative intellectuals in Latin America and their resurgence. You see, they were very much out of fashion in the 1950s and 1960s. They were thrust into the background. But nevertheless, there was a very strong underhanded campaign through the Congress for Liberty and Culture to bring Latin American intellectuals into line with American (U.S.) policy. That was followed by Mundo Nuevo in 1967. And then what's happened since has been really conservative intellectuals receiving an enormous amount of validation and publicity. So that people like Paz and Vargas Llosa, as far as the international community is concerned, are setting the tone. So I think if I were going to complete *La ciudad letrada*, I would want to complete it with a study of conservative intellectuals and that would include not only writers but also government officials and bureaucrats.

I have a couple of questions that have to do with the possibilities of politics in what you're calling an "alternative public sphere," something that has something to do with emancipation.

Well, Lula was interesting to me. Lula did not lose by that much in Brazil and Lula's election campaign was brilliant in many ways. We shouldn't always anticipate defeat. I do think there is a place for politics. I don't think politics have disappeared altogether. What I feel though, what these media politicians like Collor and Fujimori and Menem suggest to me is that the Left has to be very, very sensitive to the media. It was one of Lula's strengths, in fact, that his media campaign was quite brilliant, his videos were brilliant. I think they have to use the media as a tool. I don't see any possibility of not using it. At least on the national level.

Something seems to happen when these newly politicized groups consolidate and actually form their own programs. I'll give you a couple of examples of what I'm talking about. When I was in San Cristobal de las Casas last summer, there was graffiti all over the walls produced by a feminist group that was part of an anti-rape campaign. They were denouncing male rapists on public spaces, writing their names down and writing the time and date and place where the rape took place. I was only there for a couple of weeks, but while I was, they were engaged in a dialogue by the local judiciary and police and what not. And they cleaned up the walls. They talked about instituting tougher laws. Ultimately, as I heard from a Norwegian friend of mine in San Cristobal recently, nothing has come of this. And another perhaps stronger example is what happened to las madres in the mid-eighties in Argentina. In 1986, Alfonsín was refusing to talk to them. But in 1983 when he was elected, he used their symbolic repertoire. The Radical Party clearly appropriated a bunch of their imagery. But as soon as they started talking about actual left-wing programs and formulating policy alternatives and stepped beyond their positions as mothers and started to talk about actually changing society and not just getting their sons and daughters back, suddenly this president who was talking to them stopped talking to them. They were marginalized. That's a danger. What are your thoughts about those dangers?

I think a lot of people have spoken about this and spoken about on one hand how easy it is for new social movements to be co-opted by politicians and used by them. In various countries this has happened to women's movements; the authorities have apparently responded to their causes. In Brazil they set up special police stations, women's police stations, to deal with women's crimes. So I think this is happening. I think it's inevitable that it does happen because obviously the state's first step is to try and co-opt these forces that are held against it. I don't think you can stop that. On the other hand you see, the mothers' issue and the rape issue are two different things. With the mothers' issue, they themselves became split when redemocratization came. There was a real sense in which it was difficult for them to make the transition as a group into redemocratized society because of the way in which they were constituted. I think the rape thing is different. I don't think that is going to go away in Mexico and I think even though that one campaign in that one place was co-opted, I'm quite sure this is an issue that's going to come back. The walls are still there. There are lots of active groups in Mexico organizing around violence against women. So that's not going to stop.

Again on cultural politics. Beatriz Sarlo, the Argentine cultural theorist, spoke about what she called a decline in the political intensity of younger writers in Latin America. Her comment was that politics is no longer the absolute horizon of cultural engagement like it was in Argentina for Cortázar and that generation. Do you agree with this assessment? Is there a regional division, say between Mexico and the Southern Cone? What accounts for this?

I absolutely agree with Beatriz. I think she's right and I think it's general in Latin America and I think what accounts for it is the vastly different political situation. Because when Cortázar was writing, there was the imperative of the guerrilla. The guerrilla stood for the standard of what real political dedication could be. And writers felt bound to respond to that, either by rejection or by creating some alternative. Or by joining the guerrilla in some way or other which many of them did. I don't think that imperative is there now. The imperative from the left is gone in Latin America, largely, except for Peru and *el Sendero*, right. Or in El Salvador and possibly in Columbia. But in most of Latin America it's no longer there. And it's certainly not there in Argentina and so you get a vacuum on the left and there seems to be a kind of askesis, a withdrawal from politics and this move toward privatization too.

Okay, this is the last question. When she was here, Professor Sarlo made several comments about the political future of Latin America that were excruciatingly pessimistic. What she said was that in the short term she sees a great deal of pain and suffering with little to encourage hope. But in the long run, she remains quite optimistic. What is your assessment of the possibilities for political change in Latin America for both the short and long terms?

I don't see how possibly things can't change because I think now the situation we have is so desperate that most people can't last. The Peruvians were talking just now about how even the glass of milk program has been abandoned and soup kitchens abandoned also. I mean there's starvation, there's cholera. It's not a situation that can last in any Latin American country. The speed of downward mobility is quite frightening. So I think something has to happen. What's encouraging to me more than anything is to see what's happening in Brazil and Mexico. Those two places have such rich grassroots political movements. I think that if one looks at the level of national politics, you throw up your hands in horror. But then when you look at the grassroots stuff you see that there is a lot happening. And so that's the whole other side. It's the grassroots movements that are so important right now in Latin America. That's going to be crucial. But

what Sarlo said to me, when we talked, was that she expressed her horror to me about this country and the Persian Gulf War. The other big question when you're talking about the future of Latin America, is what is the impact of the Gulf War going to be in third world countries outside the Middle East? I think it's going to be a *hatred* for this country, a fear of this country. And how that will affect folks, whether it will be in the direction of "well, we better not raise our heads too high or we'll get hit with the big stick," or whether it will translate itself into a more politicized opposition to U.S. policies, I don't know.