

THEATRE NOTES

Tercera Muestra Paraguaya de Teatro

Del 5 al 13 de julio de 1975, Asunción fue sede del tercer encuentro nacional de grupos de teatro, convocado por la Muestra Paraguaya de Teatro, contando nuevamente con el patrocinio de la Universidad Católica "Nuestra Señora de la Asunción."

En sus dos ediciones anteriores, años 73 y 74, la Muestra—evento no competitivo—congregó acerca de 30 grupos, provenientes de diversos puntos del país, facilitando el conocimiento y el intercambio, entre los mismos, de puntos de vista acerca de métodos, repertorio y técnicas de trabajo.

La Muestra Paraguaya de Teatro es una entidad creada y dirigida exclusivamente por los grupos independientes y experimentales del país, con los objetivos de, entre otros: preservar, enriquecer y fomentar el patrimonio cultural de nuestro país; posibilitar el encuentro y la confrontación anual de trabajos y métodos de todos los grupos activantes; buscar y consolidar la organización y la unidad de todos los grupos teatrales del país; brindar asistencia en las áreas de formación técnica a los integrantes de grupos; difundir la labor del autor nacional; promover el contacto con nuevos tipos de público; invitar a grupos y artistas latinoamericanos para establecer el necesario intercambio con otros países hermanos; promover investigaciones y estudios acerca del proceso de desarrollo de las vertientes teatrales en nuestro país.



3ª Muestra Paraguaya de Teatro 1975: *Allá lejos, muy lejos . . .* Grupo: Teatro Popular de Vanguardia. Director: Antonio Pecci.

En dos años se han realizado 6 cursos técnicos, dictados respectivamente por Enrique Buenaventura, María Escudero (2), Norma Basso, Hugo Herrera y Omar Grasso acompañado de los monitores Pedro Pablo Naranjo y Marcelino Duffeau.

Los diversos equipos de trabajo de la Muestra—formado por actores—se hallan activando en lo referente a: consecución de alojamiento y alimentación para los grupos; viajes a comunidades del interior; edición del boletín informativo; confección de 2 programas de radio; organización de un remate de Artes Plásticas, etc.

Los grupos teatrales del Paraguay tuvieron pues, junto a sus invitados latinoamericanos, la oportunidad de apreciar las características de la acción teatral en el país.

Las piezas representadas en la Tercera Muestra Paraguaya de Teatro se encuentran a continuación:

<i>Yvy reñoi</i>	J. Correa y A. González Delvalle
<i>Tío Tigre Comelotodo</i>	Ali Triana
<i>Nemimbyasy</i>	
<i>La orgía</i>	Enrique Buenaventura
<i>Milagro en el mercado viejo</i>	Oswaldo Dragún
<i>Historia de un número</i>	Josefina Plá
<i>Pohanohara mbaretepe</i>	Gardés Gardés
(Adaptación de <i>El médico a palos</i> de Molière)	
<i>¿Qué opino . . . ?</i>	Elena Diarte
<i>Allá lejos, muy lejos, lejísimo,</i> <i>detrás de la enramada . . . no se ve nada</i>	Erenia López
<i>Asunción, Paraguay</i>	

Une Saison a Lima

Lima's winter season 1975 (June, July, August, September) was pretty mediocre. As always, however, there was again one show, and a very ambitious one, that was definitely worth seeing: Alonso Alegría's production of *Hamlet*. All the rest would really merit silence, although there were some good plays (texts) offered; unfortunately, they suffered from ineptness in their production and direction.

In order to get the lesser offerings over with, a general observation must be made: Perú's theaters (really Lima's, for there is very little theatrical activity outside the country's capital) suffer primarily from two ubiquitous defects: (1) the belief that shouting and athletic feats on stage convey drama; (2) the inability, where comedy is concerned, to achieve timing—not even in *criolla* comedies!

More profound defects could be mentioned, of course, defects not at all limited to Perú only, but rampant in a good deal of Latin American theater in general; however, their mention would require excursions into anthropology, sociology, ideology, and other weighty fields, trips that would explode the present context.

Limiting myself to Lima, then, the fare offered to that city's extremely, truly astoundingly, inconsiderate public were dispensable plays like *La tercera palabra* by Casona in a production *kitsched* up beyond belief (though this may seem

impossible, considering the play itself); the helter-skelter plot of *Dos viejas van por la calle* written by Sebastián Salazar Bondy, in which two older actresses were employed whose idea of comicality consisted of giggling endlessly for no apparent reason (after the first laugh in the audience, anyway); the old Limeñan stand-by, *An Inspector Comes* by Priestley (I remember having seen, over the years, three Limeñan productions of it, none of which was impressive), this time produced by Reynaldo d'Amore's "Club de Teatro"; Beckett's *Fin de juego*, by Amelia Cooper with amateur actors but showing a definite awareness of style, something generally lacking in Peruvian productions; a *Woyzeck* by Büchner, offered by a visiting Argentine group that must have gotten its communications-codes mixed up: the production was unbearable in its presumptuous "experimentalism"; and, finally, *El amor de los unos . . . y de los otros*, a homosexual farce by an apparently North American author whose name I do not remember, directed by Edward Guillén who also acted the principal part and managed to get the closest that I have ever seen in Lima to comedy-timing (I should mention the "Histrión"-group here, made up of the Velásquez-brothers, who are easily the only ones in Lima who generally know how to put on comedy. Their *Marat/Sade* of a few years ago, while no comedy in the strict sense, impressed me more than the London or the New York production). There was, when I was about to leave Lima, one more Shakespeare, *The Comedy of Errors*, put on by the mostly quite efficient *elenco* of the *Asociación de Artistas Aficionados* under the direction of Ricardo Roca Rey, a director who knows how to stage a play, but I was unable to see it. The reports on it that I heard were contradictory.

Which leaves us, finally, with Alonso Alegría's *Hamlet*. More Pappish than even Papp himself—"one of the most important Shakespearean directors of the United States" (A. Alegría, interviewed by *La Prensa*, Lima, 8/23/75)¹—and never one to be afraid of rushing in where angels tread to fear, Alonso Alegría's production used *his own translation!* Having worked as Papp's assistant, he said, "during a little more than one year (. . .) I feel perfectly qualified to translate Shakespeare's English." Did he have any help? "Not for the English." And what is the translation like? ". . . it's a prose translation. Of [Spanish] verse translations there are only three. To get into the problem of verses was too hairy and would have been counterproductive for the public. What we have done is a clean translation, one that respects Shakespearean images, in an accessible, if you wish normal language. (. . .) at this moment, pretending to use a Spanish contemporary of Shakespeare would turn out to be absurd. And would be senseless."

I, for one, found the translation quite acceptable, though occasionally perhaps too contemporary and often too casual: to hear, for instance, I do not remember which characters say things like "*No me deajo manipular*" (I will not be manipulated) provokes giggles rather than reflection. And to make the public reflect, primarily in terms of politics, was one of Alegría's highly publicized intentions: "[We wanted] a non-personal vision of what happens to Hamlet." Luis Freire Sarria, the interviewer, objected that Hamlet's was an "ethical, not a political point of view." Alegría: ". . . salvaging a little the political implications which that To kill or Not to kill has, we try to get the public to distance itself from the character and to question him. We try to guide the interpretations which the public might wish to make, toward the political implications." And, "ours is an

illumination of one side of the work, not a projection (. . .) Everything is in the work." And, ". . . we have imposed upon ourselves the task of illuminating the play, but without changing one single line." True; but quite a number of lines were dropped. Still, a just evaluation of Alegría's translation would require comparing Shakespeare's text with Alegría's, side by side, something I am and was unable to do.

What does the production mean for Perú? "Seeing that more than 300 years have passed since its première, it seems to me that it was high time for someone to put the play on in Perú (. . .) it appears to me absolutely important to 'nationalize'—I'll repeat my controversial term—foreign works, for they are ours, or we can make them ours by means of productions pertinent to our reality and our moment." And this "moment" required Alegría to see *Hamlet* thus: "The To be or Not to be of Hamlet is a To do or Not to do. It is evident that when one examines with too much minuteness and profundity each consequence of the acts one is planning, that which one is doing will turn out to be bad by all means."

While Alegría's intentions may indeed have been to emphasize the political implications of the play, the show—and I use this word consciously, for the production was, overall, a splendid *show*—did not at all strike me as political. Perhaps this is due to the fact that the political story (Denmark, Fortinbras, as Alegría says he saw it) is, especially for Peruvians, simply too far removed from the "reality" and "moment" Alegría invokes. Worse, Fortinbras and his warriors, quite *verfremdet*, were forced into ridiculous costumes that were more than grotesque: they looked like bit-players who had erroneously walked in from *Ivan the Terrible*. It was difficult to relate them even to Hamlet's "moment" and "reality." Also, when Fortinbras finally triumphs, Alegría has that enemy's men drag Hamlet off-stage in a more than undignified manner: like a bag of potatoes. Perhaps this was to correlate to the total absence of fanfares in the production, something at least one Limeñian critic found deplorable.

The production was what Alegría called "absolutely *teatral*." The ghost? It did *not* appear but expressed itself from loudspeakers on the first balcony, something acceptable I think though not very "*teatral*." The greatest advantage I found in the production was the lucidity and clarity with which Alegría had profiled the plot, something not always the case in more sophisticated *mises-en-scène* and, in the process of "naturalization," definitely necessary for a Lima public. At times, the comic elements were perhaps overemphasized (although I quite enjoyed them). Thus, the entrance of the Players became a regular circus-clown routine. Alegría has a special flair for such almost Fellinian dimensions. No wonder, therefore, that Polonius was hammed up thickly, too.

And Hamlet himself? He was played by Edgar Saba whose earlier fame rested on the lead in *Mockingpott*, a play in which he was indeed superb. As Hamlet, he was the most un-Nordic Dane imaginable: black hair and an impressive black beard. Ophelia, too, was Latin, of course. And why not? Saba has a very good voice, abused frequently by frenzied shouting, extraordinary energy, was exuberant, and—for the sake of politics?—at no moment subtle or melancholy. Alegría, in one scene, even had him make faces at Polonius. Saba's physical "fitness" came him in good stead, for Alegría occasionally had him jump dashingly from high places like one of the Musketeers. The final massacre and

its component part, Laertes and Hamlet hacking away at each other, a scene normally among the most "*teatrales*," was badly staged. Worse yet was the endless dying of Hamlet. I was reminded of la Dame aux Camélias's endless agony. Luckily, Saba did not have to cough. I gained the impression, as the play progressed, that in Saba's characterization there was visible a certain conflict between his own interpretation and the business Alegría imposed on him. A revealing moment of this was the inevitable "To be or not to be" sequence, in which Saba had to come rushing in from upstage right, jump down over what I took to be fortress-like stones, keep on scooting toward the edge of a miniature-apron, and stick out his arms breathlessly over the ramp before exploding into the first line. He looked as though, on a hot day, he were anxious to jump into a swimming-pool. *La pausa que refresca*.

All in all—and not considering now the irremediable defects inherent in much of Lima's theatrical work: no acting styles, little ensemble play, often incomprehensible pronunciation, physical clumsiness, lack of stage-discipline, etc.—Alegría's *Hamlet* was an enjoyable experiment that, within the Lima context, came off very well. The production was agile, colorful, bumptious at times, at times very captivating, loudly expressive, spectacular, full of ideas, generously unorthodox, in one word: alive. Just what a Lima public needs if it is to be lured into something that jerks no tears or, *horribile dictu*, celebrates homosexual love. Alonso Alegría undoubtedly has lots of talent, even though from time to time he brashly takes on too much, as he did for instance with Lope de Vega's jazzed-up *Fuenteovejuna* in the previous season, a production that was a disaster.

Concluding, I would like to report that, according to the newspapers, there is imminent the first production of César Vallejo's *Entre dos orillas corre el río*, to be directed by the Chilean Sergio Arrau, who, some years ago, lived in Perú and has quite a good reputation there as a director. *Entre . . .* is also known, intriguingly, as "Moscú contra Moscú."

* * *

PS: I went back to Lima for three weeks over Christmas. The *cartelera*, while varied, offered nothing particularly attractive. The only play I was interested in seeing was *La heredera* (*The Heiress*), the Goetz's adaptation of Henry James' *Washington Square*. Since, however, the adaptors were blithely given as the authors and Henry James not even mentioned, I got so angry that I did not go and see the play. Alonso Alegría was at it again, this time talking about the success of his *Hamlet*: "The result obtained speaks for itself. Between 100 and 200 pupils (*escolares*) in each performance, full houses, the public watching and enjoying the work as though it had been written yesterday, loudly commenting, at some moments even discussing things with Hamlet and criticizing him (*cuestionándolo*), all this is remarkable if we consider that it is the most famous work of all literature (. . .) The fact of having succeeded in making the play communicate its important message in a vital and immediate form to an audience from here and now is for us the full justification of this staging" (*Comercio, Dominical*, 10/26/75). While talking to Alonso Alegría, I also learned that, in order to be published in Eastern Germany in book-form, my translation of his *Cruce sobre el Niágara* had to be "adapted" to Eastern German, whatever that may be. To come back to the *cartelera* around Christmas time, I noticed a

proliferation of *café-teatros*, *teatro-bars*, and similar enterprises (mostly located in more or less Limeñanly plush Miraflores, where, according to the Government, the reactionaries live). The fare offered is of exceedingly select vulgarity and seeks recognition mainly by way of scatology. Among the plays on legitimate stages, there were worth noting: Brecht's *Los fusiles de la madre Carrar* staged by the generally good Teatro de la Universidad Católica; the terribly didactic *Analfabéticas* by the rather crude Peruvian playwright Víctor Zavala, directed by the capable Chilean director Domingo Piga; Pinter's *El amante*, de Filippo's *Filomena Marturano* with Lola Vilar in her first serious role in Lima; the new group "Alforja" combined Brecht's *Dansen* and Weiss's *La indagación* for an evening's delectation; the Histrión group offered another de Filippo, *Los fantasmas*. And there was *Cactus Flower*. The rest is shudder.

Wolfgang A. Luchting
Washington State University

Notes

1. All quotations are from this interview and were translated by me.

La Segunda Muestra de Teatro Peruano

A fin de poder ofrecer más una evaluación que un comentario sobre el trabajo realizado, hemos querido remitirles nuestro informe cuando ya la Muestra está casi concluida. En base a la pregunta "¿Existe un teatro peruano?" se inició la Primera Muestra en la que participaron seis grupos y uno colaboró con el material fotográfico.

Esta Segunda Muestra tuvo en principio una brillante acogida, en la Segunda Reunión Preparatoria en ambiente entusiasta se elaboró el cronograma de presentaciones con 16 grupos inscritos y cuatro locales teatrales. Posteriormente un grupo se brindó como volante para reemplazar a quienes por cualquier razón tuvieran alguna dificultad para presentarse, y la eventualidad se concretó indudablemente.

La Segunda Muestra se inició el viernes 5 de setiembre y continuó todos los jueves-viernes-sábados y domingos. A continuación damos los nombres de los grupos y una breve referencia de las presentaciones:

Jorge Acuña	buena cantidad de público, ninguna dificultad, diálogo eficaz.
Pequeño Teatro	no se presentó, un actor no pudo asistir.
Yego	poco público, no aceptó el diálogo al terminar la presentación.
CET Mariátegui	regular público, ninguna dificultad, diálogo eficaz.
Ricchariy	grupo que se iniciaba con la 2da Muestra, tres éxitos de público, ninguna dificultad, diálogo eficaz.
Yuyachkani	regular público, no dieron una función, diálogo eficaz.
Cuatro Tablas	regular público, no hubo ninguna dificultad, diálogo muy interesante.
Raysut	poquísimo público, una sola función, llegaron tarde, diálogo discutible.

T. P. Campesino de Collique	no hubo público, no asisitó a la primera función.
El Martillo	no hubo público, tuvieron dificultades con sus componentes, no les interesaba el diálogo.
Tul	no se pusieron de acuerdo acerca de la obra, no se presentaron.
Teatro Ensamble	poco público, grupo que se iniciaba con la 2da Muestra.
Los Piqueras	avisaron que no se presentarían por otros compromisos.

Este informe corresponde a las presentaciones en el local de Los Grillos.

Respecto a los otros locales—Centro Comunitario del Carmen de la Legua 1° de Mayo cdra 9; Centro Comunal Sta. Cruz, Mariano Melgar 293 Miraflores; Teatro El Ayllu, Sector 3 Grupo 7 Mza D, Villa El Salvador—aun no hemos recibido el informe completo pero la situación ha sido similar.

En general se puede determinar que sería de desear que hubiera menos grupos y se pudiera conseguir una mayor calidad con los elementos más trabajadores de cada uno. En la mayoría de los casos hay un pequeño porcentaje de entusiastas que arrastran un lastre de personas que parece que se han decidido a hacer teatro como una obligación más.

La Prensa no sabe o no quiere darle la publicidad necesaria. Ayudan pero no son objetivos ni parecen entender lo que un evento de esta naturaleza puede aportar si cumple a cabalidad lo que se ha propuesto, es decir: 1) Atraer al público; 2) Incentivar y dar a conocer autores nacionales; 3) Enfrentar y sopesar a los distintos grupos.

Capítulo aparte merecería comentar lo que se ha dado en llamar Creación Colectiva, por lo menos en nuestro medio, aunque sabemos por referencias (*Revista Primer Acto*, algunos amigos de teatro que han asistido) que en Nancy, Manizales por citar algunos se da también esto. En muchos casos este trabajo sin autor, sin director, deviene simplemente en una improvisación desmañada con un pretendido contenido político que las más de las veces desanima y aun confunde al público dándole al recién llegado una triste opinión de lo que cree poder llamar Teatro. Y en el caso de las llevadas y traídas “mayorías expoliadas” vale la reflexión de si este es otro nuevo de tipo de expiación que tienen que sobrellevar.

A no dudarlo y con sus deficiencias inevitables y superables el cotejo es provechoso. El domingo 14 de diciembre y a las 10.00 a.m. en el local de Los Grillos, Pedro Peralta 221, Urbanización San Joaquín, Bellavista, Callao-2 Perú, tuvo lugar la reunión final en la que se decidió sobre la Muestra Cerrada o sea una presentación de cada grupo para los otros grupos con debates a continuación de la misma, y se determinó también la suerte de las Muestras. Cualquier grupo de otros países que desee el libro de obras peruanas de la Primera Muestra o mayor información puede escribir a Los Grillos en la dirección que señalamos anteriormente. El grupo volante que cubrió las vacantes habidas por la no asistencia es Blanco y desarrolló una tarea muy eficaz.

El Teatro Libre: An Interview between Teresinka Pereira and Ray Leal

TP—Could you tell us something about your background as “theatre folk” prior to forming the new Chicano group “Teatro Libre”?

RL—I have personally been involved in theatre for some time. During the years 1964-1968 I studied drama at the University of Texas at Austin. I received a B.S. in drama from that school in 1968. During my undergraduate years I studied acting, playwriting, and directing. During my high school years at Laredo, Texas, I appeared in several plays at Martin High School. Throughout my high school years I was very active in speech and drama meets all over south Texas.

TP—Could you tell us briefly about the group that makes up “Teatro Libre” and how you got together?

RL—During the 1975 spring semester at the University of Indiana at Bloomington, I was the facilitator (instructor) of X215—Chicano Theatre and Social Consciousness. This course was taught in conjunction with the curriculum of the Office of Chicano-Riqueño Studies. The course sought to make its participants (students) aware of: a) the Chicano and Riqueño situation in the United States; b) Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and the process of *conscientização*; and c) basic theatre skills. The major goal of the course was to have the participants create *actos* which they feel depict the Chicano situation in the U.S., and to present these *actos* before the Bloomington community. The participants and facilitator chose the name of “Teatro Libre” for this theatre group because we seek to liberate people from their prejudices and stereotypes of Chicanos and Riqueños. We also seek to liberate all people from the social, political and economic contradictions in which they exist. This concept of liberation is in keeping with Freire’s process of *conscientização*: the process of becoming conscious of the economic, social and political contradictions in the world and thereby taking action to transform the world.

TP—Why did you decide on the “teatro colectivo” method for presenting Chicano works?

RL—We used the method of collective theatre because it is creatively more fruitful. It is also in keeping with Freire’s concept of dialogue—a situation in which everyone has an equal voice. As a result, the *actos* have been developed by all members of the group. It is my feeling as a director that an *acto* which has been created by those acting in it has more spontaneity and creativity than a script handed to an actor to be memorized. Also important is that the Teatro Libre is half Chicano and half Anglo. This has helped tremendously in helping all members dispel their stereotypes of each other. It has also helped make Anglos aware of the Chicano situation so that they might help educate other Anglos. It is my estimation that ethnic plays, works, or programs which exclude the larger population as an audience are making a strategic error. Freire states that the oppressed must not only liberate themselves but their oppressors as well.

TP—Paulo Freire, the Brazilian, is mentioned in your presentation of the Chicano piece, but he is not a playwright. Could you explain the relationship you find between his theories and “Teatro Chicano”?

RL—Freire is an international educator whose theories have much relevance for the Third World, minorities, and the oppressed. An important point is that many people are oppressed, not just minorities. Examples of oppressed peoples would be prison inmates who have no legal rights as humans. We use Freire's theory in that we see the theatre as a vehicle by which we might take action against all contradictions and prejudices facing Chicanos and Riqueños. However, for a complete understanding of Freire's theory, one must read his *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.

TP—Every group using "teatro colectivo" has its particular method of working. Could you explain the method of the "Teatro Libre"? That is to say, could you describe the steps you follow in your method?

RL—Our method is similar to Freire's concept of praxis. Praxis is the act of first reflecting upon the world, and then taking action to transform it. During the first part of the course we reflected upon the Chicano and Riqueño situation in the United States. Our reflection involved the use of films, dialogue, guest speakers and group exercises. Then, based upon our collective images gathered during reflection, we took action by creating three *actos* which we would perform before an audience. The most intense form of action involved the performance of *tres actos* which we would perform before the members of Hermandad Panamericana at the penitentiary at Terre Haute, and also before members of the Bloomington community. Most of the *actos* are improvisational; the only permanent part of an *acto* is its special message. We use improvisation because it builds greater self-confidence and it puts an actor in a more creative frame of reference. Improvisation is mentally and creatively liberating. We also encourage dialogue with our audience by means of audience participation. We like for our audiences to relate to our social messages and become involved in them personally.

TP—Does your method compare to that of Brechtian theatre?

RL—We are similar to Brecht in that his theatre is one of social criticism. Ours is very similar in purpose, but we call it a theatre of social consciousness. Our purpose, as I would suppose Brecht's would be, is to arouse the audience's consciousness so that they might take action upon the problems presented by the theatre.

TP—What are the plans of the group for the future?

RL—This course will be taught again at I.U. in Bloomington in the fall semester of 1975. Teatro Libre will perform *actos* again in Bloomington. If funding were available, the group would like to perform before migrants and other audiences.

The following are brief descriptions of some of our *actos*, with their social messages. Since our *actos* are improvisational, there are no fixed scripts. The exception to this is "Good to the Last Chicano." A copy of this *acto* is available from Professor Luis Davila, University of Indiana at Bloomington, Ballantine Hall 865, Bloomington, Indiana.

Will the Real Conqueror Please Stand Up—1521?

This *acto* seeks to dilute the Spanish conquistador omnipotence theory. Many historians have written how the Spaniards completely dominated the Aztecs. This *acto* seeks to give us a new perspective on Mexican history. In it, the Spaniards

arrive and are immediately frightened by the Aztecs. The Spaniards state that they come in peace and are looking for gold. After a lengthy translation, the Aztecs bring out their Mexican gold, marijuana. The Spaniards are dismayed and say, "That's not gold. It's oregano." After the Spaniards and the Aztecs have had a few puffs, the Spaniards pass out, while Moctezuma, the real conqueror, stands up and leaves the unconscious Spaniards. However, Moctezuma decides to play a joke that will later backfire on him. Before he leaves the stage, he looks at his companion and tells him to burn the Spaniards' boats.

The social message of this *acto* is that it was the act of a great Aztec ruler which caused the Spaniards to stay in the New World, and not the supposed heroic tradition of Cortes.

Un Acto de Importancia

This *acto* deals with the prejudice encountered by Chicanos in Midwestern schools. The *acto* opens with the school principal admonishing the school's basketball star, Jocko Magruder. It appears that Jocko is in for his seventh offense of pinching female teachers. However, since an important game against the East Chicago Chicanos is coming up, the principal does not suspend Jocko but instead asks him for betting odds.

While all this has been going on, Javier Garza Gongora de Lozano and his teacher, Fanny Smith, have been waiting outside the principal's office. They enter. Smith tells the principal that she doesn't know what to do with Javier because he can't even speak English. It becomes very apparent that the principal is more interested in Miss Smith than in Javier's problems. He asks her to go out with him after work for a little beer and bowling. Finally, they decide to call in their token Mexican-American. The Harvard educated Spanish teacher enters—Mr. Ramirez. In his efforts to communicate with Javier, it becomes clear that Harvard has made Mr. Ramirez forget his native tongue. However, Ramirez is confident that he can handle Javier. So the principal grudgingly escorts Javier to Ramirez's homeroom.

In his absence it becomes clear that Fanny Smith and Ramirez are lovers. Fanny tells Ramirez that she hates playing up to the principal, but that she needs the raise. Ramirez says that he knows just how she feels. Curtain closes.

The social message of this *acto* is that many school administrators and teachers, both Anglo and Chicano, become too involved with their own desires and as a result forget the problems of their students.

Festival Nacional del Nuevo Teatro (Colombia)

A theatre of commitment and political radicalism characterized the Festival Nacional del Nuevo Teatro held in Bogotá from October 6-17, 1975. Sixteen groups from different regions of Colombia presented plays in various parts of the capital, ranging from the traditional theatres to the poorest *barrios*. The two week festival was the climax of a broader activity which began a month earlier. In September, 96 groups participated in the Muestras Regionales del Nuevo Teatro from which the final sixteen were chosen.

Within this social-political framework of the festival, the two outstanding constants were the national (or at least Latin American) emphasis in thematics through either collective creations or adaptations from Colombian or Latin American writers, and a tendency toward a rewriting of history. Thus, seven of the works were collective creations, only two were European, and the remaining were either written by Colombians or adapted from Latin American novels. In terms of history, the festival seen as a whole presented a complete spectrum of key moments in the history of Colombia and Latin America: the Independence (*Tupamaros 1780* and *Santa Juana de America*); the loss of the Canal Zone in Panama (*I Took Panama*); the banana strike massacre of 1928 popularized in García Márquez's *Cien años de soledad* and Cepeda Samudio's *La casa grande* (*Soldados, 1928*); the violence of the decade of the fifties in Colombia (*Guadalupe, años sin cuenta*) and present day conflicts between land owners and peasants (*Los inquilinos de la ira*).

The three well established professional groups clearly made the superior presentations of the festival. These were the Teatro Experimental de Cali directed by Enrique Buenaventura in *A la diestra del Dios Padre*, the Teatro Popular de Bogota directed by Jorge Alí Triana in *I Took Panama* and La Candelaria directed by Santiago García in *Guadalupe, años sin cuenta*. Each of these superb productions played to an enthusiastic sellout crowd nightly.

The *A la diestra del Dios Padre* seen in the festival was the fourth version of Enrique Buenaventura's classic. This version differs from the original in three ways: 1) it shows a strong influence of the *mojiganga*, a hybrid of Medieval Spanish theatre and Indian culture which features the use of masks, the clothing of the seventeenth and eighteenth century, and representative characters such as "Death," "Justice," and the "Devil"; 2) the integration of folklore, which is experienced primarily through the use of traditional music and dancing; and 3) the central myth of the work is developed beyond that of the original version



A la Diestra de Dios Padre, Teatro Experimental de Cali

and to its ultimate consequences. As this version is presented, Peralta's story is told in a lineal fashion, divided into two parts. The first part consists of twenty-two rapidly changing scenes that maintain unity both from the story line and the songs that often serve as a thematic background as the scenes shift. At the end of the first part Peralta has become the hero of the downtrodden by having cleverly controlled "Death." The second half begins with a farcical "Entremés de la vida y la muerte" and through a lineal development of eight scenes carries the myth to its ultimate consequences: Peralta must return "Death" to the rich and the poor must return to the status quo. Peralta subsequently questions "Pero los pobres, ¿de dónde van a sacar la paciencia?," which lingers as the central question the play offers.

I Took Panama takes its title from the words of Theodore Roosevelt and is thus indicative of the meticulous historical study this collective creation represents: 70% of the words spoken in the play are direct quotes from historical documents, such as speeches from the U.S. or Colombian Congress, researched from over fifty different volumes of history. Although such an objective approach might sound dry, the TPB made the play one of the most entertaining and humorous denunciations of all the festival entries. It tells the story of Colombia's loss of Panama in a chronological fashion in three structural divisions. The first part shifts scenes between the three parties involved, the United States, Colombia, and the French company. The U.S. doctrine of Manifest Destiny, the unstable internal situation in Colombia and the French interest in obtaining as much money as possible are the three factors that lead to the formulation of a treaty. The second part shows the Colombian Congress debating the treaty, which is eventually rejected. In the third part a reporter recounts the events that follow this rejection of the treaty in 1903. The work shows the United States operating in conjunction with local



T.P.B., TEATRO POPULAR DE BOGOTA

Carlos Barbosa, Luis Alberto García, Gustavo Angarita y Antonio Corrales en una escena de la obra "I TOOK PANAMA" (El Caso Panamá) de Luis Alberto García, bajo la dirección de Jorge Alí Triana.

leaders in Panama to incite a revolt and thus negotiating a treaty with the Republic of Panama rather than Colombia. All parties involved are so effectively ridiculed that it would be difficult to choose one specific villain. The brute physicality of Roosevelt's mentality is exemplified through the red, white, and blue gym uniforms he and his cabinet wear, usually exercising methodically while outlining their plans to make "America for Americans." Both President Marroquín and the Colombian Congress are completely anachronistic. The petty bickering and empty rhetoric of the Congress attain most humorous proportions. Given the historical detail involved, the work could become quite complicated, but this is avoided through the use of physical movement that provides a visual explanation of the matters being discussed: Roosevelt explains his master-plan to his cabinet by showing them the difference between attempting to jump over two chairs, and simply splitting them apart and walking between them (his Cabinet, amazed at the subtlety of this maneuver, exclaims in English "Fine, Teddy!"); the original negotiations between the Americans and the French are shown through a boxing match; the internal strife in Colombia is demonstrated through a five-part parade viewed by Marroquín and the American Ambassador to Colombia. Although there is no doubt that *I Took Panama* is a masterpiece in both conception and execution, some viewers might question the validity of its structure because of its ending. Whereas the central focus of the work is the period of the American takeover of the Canal Zone, a weak attempt is made at the end to bring the story up to the present by showing the massacre of students in 1964 and thus ending with a song that proclaims "la bandera de los gringos no tendrá ni una [estrella] más."

Elements of both *A la diestra del Dios Padre* and *I Took Panama* are evidenced in *Guadalupe, años sin cuenta*. Like the former, it combines a series of rapidly changing scenes through the development of a basic story line, and does so effectively by using music as the scenes shift to clarify the events. And like the latter, it is a collective creation that represents an exhaustive study of the period it covers: its formulation involved over 40,000 man-hours of researching books, the press, and to a large extent listening to accounts from the people who lived the period. It deals with the 1950-53 years of *la violencia* in the countryside, showing the conflict between the military and the Liberal guerrillas led by Guadalupe Salcedo. Its two levels make it circular in structure. The first level, on which the play opens and closes, is the "present" during which Guadalupe Salcedo is assassinated. In this opening scene several witnesses of his death are questioned, but the "official" version of the events is fabricated only by ignoring the witnesses who contradict the military version. After this opening, the second level is introduced by a song which explains that the story of Guadalupe Salcedo will be related. This level focuses primarily on the training of the peasants under the Liberals, the military and its indoctrination of soldiers, and the dilemmas of the leaders of the Liberal party. The peasants are trained to fight for a cause they do not understand, and once they begin to gain control in the rural areas even the Liberal leaders demand that a peace accord be made. The indoctrination of the soldiers is done not only by emphasizing the normal military ideals of order and organization, but also by instilling machine-like reactions toward the enemy in order to maintain the necessary distance between the soldiers and the liberals.

They are taught to chant methodically, for example, "Los soldados/son los hijos/de la virgen/los liberales/son los hijos/de la puta." When this level of the action is completed it is evident the peasants have been betrayed. In a phrase that recalls the problematics of *A la diestra del Dios Padre*, at the end the landowner asks the peasants for "un poco de paciencia." The final scene returns to the original present in which Guadalupe Salcedo is guaranteed safety if he surrenders, then is promptly assassinated.

The three plays offer many similarities in theme and technique. All three were either collective creations or re-elaborations by the group. They incorporate music effectively as an expression of national culture and use humor as one of the principal tools for the conveyance of theme. In these works, and in the festival in general, the constant focal points of social comment were the Church and the military. Language is significant in each of the three works not only in the sense that the authentic language of the masses is incorporated in the dialogues and music, but also to the extent that the anachronistic rhetoric of the past is consistently ridiculed.

Of the less established groups, two presentations that were favorably received during the festival, and rightfully so, were the Teatro Libre de Bogotá in *Los inquilinos de la ira* and Grutela in *Tupamaros 1780*. *Los inquilinos de la ira* presents the most recent rewriting of history, dealing with a massacre of peasants in 1974. Although less documentary than the other historical works discussed, it does share with them a similar use of language and musical effects. Its chronological development tells of the peasants from their illegal—but just—takeover of some land, until their death. The opening scenes establish the justices of their cause by emphasizing the respectability of the impoverished workers and showing the uselessness of attempting to solve their problems through legal means. Once these matters are clarified, the basic tension of the work is created through the contrast between the rising expectations of the peasants and the inevitability of their defeat. Besides the dreams they express through dialogue, their hopes are communicated by means of obvious symbols: the naming of their camp "La Esperanza," and their decision to paint the door of one of the shacks the yellow color of an egg yolk, suggesting fertility. Physical defeat does come, but it does not affect their spirit. At the end they are still determined to continue their cause, valiantly pulling the cart that contains the corpses of their assassinated comrades. One of the survivors asks "¿Manuel, éste es el final?" The answer: "No. Este es el principio."

Tupamaros 1780 concerns the rebel Tupac Amaru and is developed on two levels, one of which shows his imprisonment and torture, the second dealing with the events that lead to his encarcelation. Done with only three characters that play many roles and an absolute minimum of stage materials, in this work physical movement and facial expression are equally as significant as dialogue, if not more so.

Productions that can be mentioned in pairs are two by Brecht, *La madre* and *Cuanto cuesta el hierro*, and two childrens' plays, *Globito Manuel* and *Los caballitos rebeldes*. The Brecht plays were presented on the supposition that the thematics apply to the present day situation in Colombia, even though they are foreign works. *Globito Manuel* (presented with *El hombre que se escondió en*

la luna) is a puppet theatre created with the idea of sharpening the perception of the child viewer, enhancing his ability to establish cause and effect relationships between products and producers.

The festival was sponsored by the Corporación Colombiana de Teatro and the Instituto Colombiano de Cultura and was a successful event not only according to its official goals, but also because of the enthusiasm in theatre and the interchange of ideas it promoted. It was the first theatre festival in Colombia's history to be entirely organized and carried out by the groups themselves. Patricia Ariza, its principal organizer, defined the goals of the festival as follows: 1) to raise the artistic level of the groups; 2) to take theatre to the masses; 3) to set the precedent that the workers of the groups organize theatre festivals in Colombia.

Several secondary attractions contributed to the festival's atmosphere. Each day at noon special presentations were done at La Candelaria exclusively for the evaluation of the members of the other groups. These provided a platform for dialogue between groups and written evaluations were exchanged. Seminars on special topics were held. Special presentations were given of works that did not officially constitute part of the festival. For example, the TEC directed by Enrique Buenaventura did *La orgía*, the *Ballet Cordillera* directed by Jacinto Jaramillo did one special presentation for the members of the groups, as did the Teatro Taller de Colombia with a play called *Genesis*. In accordance with the political nature of the productions, it only seems appropriate that there was some political debate associated with all this: before each presentation members of the group La Mama read accusations against the government for allegedly arresting their director for political reasons, and some polemics were ignited when an editorial in *El Tiempo* questioned the festival's strongly leftist ideological orientation.

A resume of the participants in the festival follows.

<i>Title</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Director</i>	<i>Group</i>
<i>I Took Panama</i>	Collective	J. Alí Triana	Teatro Popular de Bogotá
<i>Guadalupe, años sin cuenta</i>	Collective	S. García	La Candelaria (Bogotá)
<i>Los inquilinos de la ira</i>	J. Aníbal Niño	R. Camacho	Teatro Libre de Bogotá
<i>Globito Manuel</i>	C. José Reyes	C. José Reyes	El Alacrán (Bogotá)
<i>Los caballitos rebeldes</i>	M. Rosenkof Collective	M. Torres	El Local (Bogotá)
<i>A la diestra del Dios Padre</i>	E. Buenaventura Collective	E. Buenaventura	Teatro Experimental de Cali
<i>Tupamaros 1780</i>	Collective	D. Tenorio	Grutela (Cali)
<i>Cuanto cuesta el hierro</i>	B. Brecht	C. Bernal A. Bonilla L. Bolaños	La Máscara (Cali)
<i>Mi vida en la escuela</i>	Collective	H. Fernández	Instituto Popular de Cultura (Cali)

<i>Title</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Director</i>	<i>Group</i>
<i>Santa Juana de América</i>	A. Lizárraga	A. Cadavid	Teatro Antorcha (Medellín)
1789	Collective	P. Balvet	Grupo Tal (Medellín)
<i>Nos han dado la tierra</i>	J. Rulfo Collective	E. Cárdenas	Pequeño Teatro (Medellín)
<i>Contracerca</i>	Collective	G. Maldonado	Universidad de Pamplona (Bucaramanga)
<i>Soldados, 1928</i>	C. José Reyes E. Buenaventura	C. Badillo	Butaregua (Bucaramanga)
<i>La madre</i>	B. Brecht	H. de Avila	Grupo Bellas Artes (Cartagena)
<i>Los pescadores</i>	J. Aníbal Niño	T. Guillén	Teatro Alianza Francesa (Barranquilla)

Raymond L. Williams
Bogotá, Colombia

El Mito del Midwest

La Escena: Mosaic of empty, burned out blocks. Skeletons of junked cars and shutdown factories. Detroit, Michigan during the Recession of 1975—smoldering on a smoggy Memorial Day Weekend. Los Actores: Over fifty members of MITO (Midwest Teatro Organization) which is a branch of the tree of TENAZ (Teatros Nacionales de Aztlan) are celebrating their arte in the palid face of the Midwest.

Friday, May 23: I could not attend the opening. I was still in Noo Jork trying to arrange for Miguel Pinero (Nuyorican playwright who has created a new form of Street Teatro on The Lower East Side of Manhattan) to attend MITO Festival. Logistics screwed up linking of Rican Theatre with Chicano Teatro to form a warm abrazo across the embittered heart of America.

But I was told that after registration the hosts of the festival (Teatro La Palomilla of Detroit) put on una presentacion muy chingona (Palomilla is managed by ex-Teatro Campesino Jose Rendon) of *Bernabe*, escrita by none other than Luis Valdez—El Papasote del Teatro Chicano. Teatro de los Estudiantes was there (Ann Arbor), as were the smiling teeth of minstrel Chuy Negrete with El Grupo Midztlan (South Chicago) who warmed up the audience with song.

El segundo festival de los Midwest Teatros was held in different locations throughout the community—free of charge. There were critiques in the morning, workshops in the afternoon, and performances at night. It was one of the few festivals I have ever attended in which there was little or no bitching. Those who

were promised money for gas y otras cosas—got it. (Michigan Council for the Arts supplied the bread y la comunidad; Holy Trinity Parish, Los Guadalupanos, American G.I. Forum, etc. supplied the elbow grease and material.) The weary actors actually got to sleep on *cots*, y la comida (menudo, gallina con mole, pan dulce, etc.) estaba a toda madre.

The only argument or clash (with one exception which I'll explain later) occurred with the theatrical styles. Each Teatro Proletario had a different way of presenting their pitch to El Pueblo: They ranged from Meaty Marxism like Bread and Roses (a "right on" mostly white group from the North Side of Chicago) to Airy Abstractism like Teatro Despertar (Chicano y Boriqua students from Circle Campus in Chicago).

Saturday, May 24: Compañía Trucha (Vatos Locos de la Diez y Ocho de Chicago), for example, favored the hard sell. Their quick improvisationally inspired reality actos seemed to club the audience over la cabezota. During the morning critiques it was said that they were "too tied down in their own rhetoric" and that they were "taking themselves too seriously."

Trucha, which has arisen from timid, almost humble beginnings over one year ago has ballooned into one of the most creative and hilarious of the Chicago area groups. Once they gained confidence and once they played to the limits of their improvisational zanyness—they began to educate and entertain at the same time. Their dedication and the vitality of their rise reminded me of the original Teatro Campesino, circa 1967. But the critiques spelled out that Trucha should stick to their time tested locuras instead of burrowing into the hole of dull dogmatism. (Regla Número Uno: "Con comedia hay risa, pero con retórica hay pedo.")

El Teatro Desengaño del Pueblo (Gary, Indiana), a mestizaje of Boricua and Chicano, on the other hand, was critiqued for *not* being political enough. It was said of Desengaño that they "seemed more bent on entertaining than politicizing." Regla Número Dos: "Entretiene a los chanchos burgeses, pero trata de educar al pueblo, compadre.")

Desengaño, in existence for over three years, has thirty skits in their repertoire which they have performed at demonstrations, marches, picket lines, elementary schools, and even at the ordination of a radical priest. Yet, it was said that they need to create newer and heavier skits. In my opinion, however, Desengaño is one of the most innovative of the Midwest Teatros. They were the first to mix Ricans and Mexican-Americans (in the entire country) and they were also one of the first to use a large group of young people ranging in ages from seven to seventeen as part of their standard company.

In one of their skits in Detroit they utilized a small child and his mother shopping at the grocery store to demonstrate how the recession is squeezing people to the bone. Somehow, this skit backfired. The mother could not pay for the groceries and was finally forced into giving up her son to the clerk at the checkout counter as payment. The question here is: Would a Latina give up her son like that, or wouldn't she give herself up first? (It should also be pointed out that the mother in this skit had the option of giving the clerk her *watch*—but decided to keep *it* instead of her son!) Critics notwithstanding, Teatro Desengaño (along with Bread and Roses) received the most applause of the festival.

That same night (May 24) another conjunto from Chicago, El Grupo Latino,

got up and started singing, all bunched together and very unprofessional. Admitting, quite frankly, that "they knew little about harmony" and other such tricks of the trade, they sang for the pure joy of it and invited anyone to join in. It worked. The audience appreciated their rasquachiness and it was evident later on, after most of the crowd had gone home, and they and Chuy Negrete were jamming—that Grupo Latino is better appreciated in informal and more intimate surroundings. It was difficult for them to project on a raised stage and in the large hall where the performances were held. Their act could best be utilized at warmups at small mitins prior to the main speakers.

Although many groups had representatives attending the festival, not everyone was able to stage a spectacle. Alive and Trucking (a radical white group from Minnesota) broke down with car trouble; Trumbull Park (otros vatos locos de Chicago) are still studying the basics of theory and politics, and Teatro del Barrio (South Chicago) is having psychological problems. (Teatro del Barrio, once the best of the Chicago-area groups, have grown overly timid about presenting untested new material at festivals.)

Everyone, however, participated in the critiques (admirably panelled by Dr. Jorge Huerta, an expert on Chicano Drama, who was flown in from Califas) which often lasted two or more hours and was guided by Dr. Huerta into the best ambience for constructive criticism—as opposed to destrutive or "petty bourgeoisie" critique.

As for the afternoon workshops, they seemed to be appreciated by everyone. Hardly anybody played hookey, as has often been the case in other festivals. The workshops were: "Inner group problems of Teatro; progressive direction and organization," by Lalo Cervantes formerly of Los Mascarones de Mexico, "Collective Creations," by Dr. Jorge Huerta, formerly of El Teatro de La Esperanza de Santa Barbara, California; "Body Movements and theater games," by Richard Garibay and Rosa Negrete del Teatro del Barrio de Chicago, Illinois; "Música y Canciones," by Chuy Negrete del Grupo Midztlan and by El Grupo Latino—both from Chicago; "Voice and Diction, Movement and Voice," by Carlos Contreras del Teatro Triángulo de Venezuela; "Politics and Teatro," by Antonio Zavala del Compañía Trucha de Chicago and Jorge Huerta de California.

Several hours were also put aside throughout the festival so that La Gente had the opportunity to interact with each other on a more personal level. They sat on the grass and rapped about El Movimiento. The entire festival had an air of dedication. That is, las borracheras and sexist movidas were kept to a minimum. (Regla Número Tres: "No mesclan los mocos con el guacamole.")

Sunday, May 25: This was the last day of the weekend spectacle and a special performance was held in a park donde va mucha Raza. This was done over the objections of Tlaloc the Raingod who blessed La Gente with intermittent rain showers. The spirit of Teatro carried the day, however, because el público climbed up to the shelter of the portable stage and the show went on regardless.

At night, two more performances were held in a hall, and here the extremes to which popular theatre can go were strikingly exhibited. The first group to stage their work was Teatro Despertar, a fledgling university teatro directed by Carlos Contreras from Venezuela. Contreras is a professional actor who has toured the Western Hemisphere with El Teatro Triángulo. He speaks only Spanish and is

university bred. The piece seemed more of an extension of Contreras himself than a truly organic production of the half dozen actors. The play was done entirely in Spanish (the actors even sounded Latin American although most were native Chicagoans) and the meat of the matter was so abstract, intellectual, and devoid of Chicano or Rican reality that few got the bite of it.

The play was a comment on repression, it was concluded afterwards in the critiques. It was staged in a series of scenes (albeit too loosely—like chains without links) tied together. The actors wore black tights and built collages of movement, which, with the use of lights and sound effects, created a drab, monotonous factory world inhabited by robots. Speech was delivered in self declarations—answered from different parts of the stage in similar harangues—without the actors looking at each other. (“Too much dialogue and not enough drama,” was one comment.)

On the whole, it was argued that the play was “demasiado pesado.” Even students in the audience were aggravated or bored by the abstractism. And here a comment was made that “el pueblo no son tan pendejos como la mayoría de los pinches intelectuales creen!”

“True,” came a respuesta, “but neither should our actos be insane flights of fancy with no roots to the ground.”

“Más canto y menos grito,” dijo otro. (It was said that there was no laughter to offset the oppressive weight of the theme.)

Despite the negativism received from the audience, the actors and directors were praised for their imaginative use of visual effects, body movement, and hard work. In the words of one viewer: “Se pasaron!” Still, there was general agreement that the play deserves more trabajo.

Bread and Roses, made up of Chicago freaks and heavily influenced by the San Francisco Mime Troupe, was the hit of the festival. They premiered a work, “Sit-In,” which dealt with an actual factory takeover by militant workers during the 1930’s in Flint, Michigan. That action precipitated similar sit-ins and strikes all over the country which led to such basic worker demands as minimum pay, right to organize, etc., being recognized. And of course, the striking similarities between the depression of the thirties and the recession of seventies inflamed the largely working class audience’s imagination.

“Sit-In,” a collective creation, began slowly, showing the interplay between worker and boss. It picked up speed as the conflict drew to a head (the workers decided to lock themselves in the plant and weld the doors shut) and ended in a triumphant crescendo as the proletariat forced the bourgeoisie to concede defeat (temporarily, we shall see). It was a classic plot and the set design, costumes, sound effect, technique, and superior acting combined to present an exciting and credible “proletariat drama.”

A brief digression here—selected Anglo groups, those with revolutionary credentials, have traditionally attended Teatro Festivals. (Besides Bread and Roses, Alive and Trucking and the Wisconsin’s People’s History Party were the other Anglo groups invited to the MITO Festival.) But it must be accepted that conflicts are going to occur and this time was no exception. (Ironically enough, the Festival itself was brought to Detroit by La Esperanza, Inc.—a community based group “dedicated to the study of cultural conflict.”)

What happened was this: Throughout the weekend an overzealous Anglo feminist kept asking the older Latinas en la cocina (sort of half-kidding, at first) why there were no machos working in the kitchen! I mentioned earlier that the community had volunteered their labor and it so happened that several middle-aged Latinas along with a couple of "unliberated" gringas contributed some fantastic comida. The feminist, according to "traditionalist" sources, "jodió tanto que finalmente la mandaron a la chingada!" (Regla Número Cuatro: "What are rosas to one person is mierda to another.")

It was to everyone's credit that the incident did not blow up and cause a stink. (I personally thought it would be humorous enough to be a short acto.) I only mention it because we must be prepared for culture conflicts in the future, and we must handle them in a spirit of compromise. Ha, ha, ha. Good Teatro knows no language or color bounds, as was evidenced by the tumultuous applause and warm abrazos received by Bread and Roses' memorable premiere.

Back to the actual play: The bleak realities of present day Detroit led to a theoretical rap regarding the staging of "Sit-In" in auto worker circles. Would the people be moved into taking over their factories? It was pointed out by some auto workers in the crowd that management would like nothing better than to have their mostly Black and Latino working force take over the faltering inner city factories—as an excuse to shut them down completely or move them out to suburbia.

It was also pointed out, by the same astute workers, that the reactionary United Auto Workers Union would love to see a historical play glorifying their so called "triumph" over the bosses. In reality, they contended, the UAW is a pawn of the corporate state and an enemy of the working class. Bread and Roses replied that they would add more acts to the play showing the subsequent corruption of the union.

All in all, the weekend was a colorful display of Teatro—proof que hay un aspecto de bronze in the so called white face of the Midwest. And we all look forward to the next MITO Festival to be held in, believe it or not, Gary, Indiana.

Carlos Morton
Nueva York, N.Y.
(junio el 13, 1975)