

**A Challenge to the Borderline from A Daughter of Aztlán:  
An Interview with Cherríe Moraga**

Interview by İnci Bilgin

The following interview with Cherríe Moraga was done at Stanford University in Palo Alto California, (09.06.2005). She is an Artist-in-Residence and serves as Director of the University Theatre Group at Stanford in the Department of Theatre Arts.

Cherríe Moraga is one of the most striking female figures in contemporary American writing owing not only to her choice of interesting subject matter but also to her authentic form of writing encompassing different genres. Being a Chicana lesbian herself, Moraga has written several essays concerning Chicana identity and/or queer identity. Most of her essays may be considered autobiographical works since her standpoint is usually her own individual experience.

Moraga's voice in her essays is strong and revolutionary and thus she is considered a political activist. She has written and published many poems and plays representing the cultural crisis which Chicanas have been experiencing. Moraga is making a great contribution to American theater since she challenges the stereotypical representation of Chicanas in all areas. She alternates the depiction of submissive women in the kitchen with rebellious female figures and strong women warriors. The new woman presented in many of Moraga's works is fighting for her spiritual land, Aztlán, and has a strong motivation to liberate her nation and her gender as well as her sexuality. Moraga's new female figures are inspired by early Mesoamerican Indian myths. While Moraga successfully incorporates these myths in her plays, she writes in a non-linear time space where past, present, and future all merge. Moraga's writings is a call to reevaluate the Chicana experience while at the same time wishing to disintegrate the geographical borderline as she reinscribes the Chicana on the spiritual land of Aztlán.

\*The following interview was inspired by the premiere of a very impressive Stanford University Production of Moraga's play *Hungry Woman: A Mexican Medea*, directed by Moraga herself.

**I.B:** Your plays betray your own location between the two cultures you experience as a Chicana. How would you describe your in-between journey or in Gloria Anzaldúa's terms, your `bordercrossing`?

**C.M:** Bordercrossing is not a metaphor I use, though I'm sure it can be used. The notion of border, theoretically speaking, came from the work *La Frontera*. In that book Anzaldúa describes being Chicana and she puts the mestiza and also the queer on the borderside where all identities sort of coexist. It is very useful how she conceptualized those entities. That is not how I conceptualize my work--but that's fine to apply the notion of borderlands in that manner. It was in the

Bilgin

plays I wrote that I felt like all of these identities. Because the plays were character based, I did not feel the necessity to explain them--as opposed to my essays where you sort of separate the various aspects of identity and try to make sense out of them. When you work with characters, they embody all those things at once. So there is a certain pleasure in being able to resolve or explore questions through the contradictions that are embodied in a character. Because all of us as human beings are just contradictions. All I do is to create characters based on what I know to be true. I mean on my own living experience and involving people who are completely not represented in American theatre. So I don't consider it bordercrossing-- especially in theatre because it is all of one entity. Each character resides in the world of these imposed, loose contradictions of race, ethnicity, sexuality and so on.

**I.B:** Yes. The question indeed revolves around how you respond to that tradition in terms of structure as well. For instance the shifting of time and place is very explicit in your plays. How does it deal with the whole experience?

**C.M:** The shifting of space and time is another issue. That is simply my effort in theatre to write with a sensibility that is not necessarily driven by Eurocentrism or Euro-Americanism. It is really hard to think outside their structures. But I find that if I let my work dictate to me what it needs, the structure begins to be non-linear with a nonprogressive plot line. It is only with *Hungry Woman* that it became clear to me that I could say that myth is the same as story and history is part of the story and that they, the characters, were living time simultaneously. Physics suggests that but it is not a western notion. So it is in my play, *Hungry Woman* that I consciously started to stage multiple times.

**I.B:** Since the concept of border has been used as a theoretical model for describing and understanding the Chicano experience I would like to ask you about Cherríe Moraga as a Chicana and her own experience with the border. Having an Anglo father and a Mexican mother, on what side of the border do you consider yourself? Where does Cherríe Moraga belong? How do you deal with `border` as a concept?

**C.M:** I would start with questioning the idea of border anyway. There are some Chicanos who have been writing about border identity and there are many theoretical works on that subject. There is another contradictory theoretical and ideological perspective which is not to recognize the geopolitical border, the nation state.

**I.B:** Do you think that is what Aztlán stands for? The spirituality of border rather than the physicality of it? Is it through Aztlán that you reconstruct the understanding of border?

**C.M:** Yes, indeed, it is through Aztlán. But there is also a contemporary discourse of a pan-indigenous movement of Chicanos and Chicanas responding to the emergence of empire building in the U.S. and what the nation state is now

## An Interview with Cherrie Moraga

doing. Depending on what your perspective is, your view may change. But most Chicanos and Chicanas in response to this [empire building] do not identify with this nation state and therefore would not talk about their identity as a border identity. I identify more with this side instead of saying I am more of an American or a Mexican.

Of course I am more American. I was born and raised in the US, my education is here. My dominant language is English. I had to relearn my Spanish. In terms of my autobiographical experience, there is no question that I am of mixed blood. Our biography, however, does not prescribe the way we think. But what one needs to do is to decolonize the brain. So I try not to frame my own work within that border conversation. I am more interested in how it is that the Chicanos as a *pueblo* historically have crossed back and forth along that border. I am more devoted to the notion of Aztlán.

**I.B:** I also wonder whether these strong ties to the Mexican tradition, to Mexican roots, differ from one generation to another. While reading your autobiographical work *Waiting In The Wings: Towards A Queer Motherhood*, I was curious about your son Rafael . How close is he to his mother's Mexican roots? You mentioned that you tried to work on your Spanish. Does he speak Spanish for instance? Is he familiar with Mexican culture?

**C.M:** My partner is also a Chicana and was raised by the same generation of women that raised me. We share not only cultural ties but also a political perspective. So my son has been raised differently in that sense but he still has been raised as a Chicano. As you know, his father is a Chicano, so he has more Mexican Indian blood than I do. He will never have a relationship like I had with my mother as my mother is the generation she is. She was born in 1914 so her access to her *Mexicanismo* [Mexicanness] is very different than mine. But also there is certain access to Mexican culture that I had and Rafael did not. For instance, I spent a lot of time in Mexico and I know about Mexican history, philosophy and mythology. It is a whole wealth of information that can give one pride to be a Chicano. I have access to all that cultural heritage and pass it on to my son. He has already spent time in Mexico. His Spanish is like every Chicano kid which means great before going to school where English is dominant. But he understands Spanish and I am convinced that he can develop it. Indeed it is really difficult for the child when the parents are bilingual.

Another difference is that he is a middle class kid while I was a working class kid. So another factor is how class affects culture in this culture. They are very much connected. He will never have a working class Mexican experience. I made a conscious choice to create a family in which culture is not static but continues to evolve and it is also being retained. That is exactly what we are trying to do in our lives. And he is being raised by two lesbian women as you know. This is what some people may not consider traditional. But from our perspective, being raised in an extended family mostly with aunts is really traditional. So I just feel like our experience is different when you compare

Bilgin

mine to my son's. In many ways he has more access than I ever had except for the generational experience I had. My mother is ninety now but he has a deep relationship with her. Rafael has his father's family as well. This is not an easy experience but if you consider US, every culture of color goes through that. As for religion also, if you are not a white Christian, that's what you go through.

**I.B:** I'm also curious about the depiction of your characters. How do male and female stereotypes function in your plays and how do you depict them? While reading your plays, I thought that the Chicanos in your plays are the weak ones. They are the losers as opposed to the strong, decisive Chicanas. Is it really that way and is it a realistic depiction of Chicano men?

**C.M:** I do not think that my plays represent a full race. That is the biggest burden for a writer. When you decide you are going to represent a race, you are in trouble. Because then you end up writing stereotypes rather than developing complex characters. There is plenty of Chicano literature that privileges men and all the complexity of male characters. So that job is being done. I feel like I have written complex male characters. That they betray and disappoint their female counterparts is also true. I feel that it is very much institutional and my cultural critique is as much a critique of the dominant culture. The Chicano personality is set up systematically to betray their female counterparts--be it their sisters, their daughters or their wives. Because masculinity in this country is defined by patriarchy and Mexico has its own version of it like many other countries. So I betray what I see. For instance Mario in *Heroes and Saints* is a lovely character full of passion and has to leave his house for his desire for another man.

My critique is about patriarchy. Even with Manuel, what I wanted to portray is the homosociality of Mexican culture. But also because I am a lesbian writer, people are looking for me to hate men. When they ask me why I don't write a positive male character, I answer: `well, maybe when I see one`. My job is to write a compassionate portrait but everybody betrays everybody. Medea for instance is weak indeed compared to Luna. Nobody says `You are writing weak female characters` despite Medea who betrays Luna and is certainly weak. I am doing critique since my genre is not comedy. I really believe that working class men in this country are in complete crisis. And I feel that my male counterparts are not doing enough to really examine that crisis. So the ones who suffer are the women. Our sons betray us. This is the condition of racism in the country. That is why they ask you whether you write stereotypes while you are making a critique. Nobody asks a white writer that. He doesn't carry the burden of representing. I don't want to carry the burden of representing, either. I always ask myself about how close my writing is to women of color outside U.S. Do they have similar female relationships for instance? I am very much interested in relating or comparing international experiences as well. But in this country we are considered minority writers and there is so much criticism that keeps looking at things in these boxes. You know that the white male privileged man is always at the center in this country and there is an effort going on to make him still the center. What I'm doing is to decenter him.

## An Interview with Cherrie Moraga

**I.B:** Having also read your autobiographical writing entitled *Towards A Queer Motherhood*, I would like to ask Medea's fears about bringing up a male child and her final murdering of her own child Chac Mool. Do you at times share her worries as a queer mother while raising Rafael? As you may be perceived as an intellectual warrior fighting for Aztlán, how close is Medea to Cherrie?

**C.M:** I would say not at all. When I thought of her desire and how she frames her desire as well as being the object of desire and her vanity in that dynamic my identification is closer to Luna. But Medea's desire for land and her politics is absolutely what I believe in. It's not personal to me but I know middle aged women like this who still have great desire for a nation, for Aztlán. It's not just a myth. It is really people's living practice. She reflects my vision and politics in that way. The sense of values in people I know including my partner is there. On that level, it is not just an autobiography but more a collective biography. As for the relationship with the son, of course it is similar. I wrote the play before I had my son. So I had to relook at things after having him. It is sort of like art imitates life or life imitates art. There are things I knew intuitively. It is ironic that I wrote all this before my son and he is eleven now. I still don't know him as a 13 year old. Rafael has a poetic nature and a deep love and sense of loyalty. He is much more loyal then I am at times. I didn't know that then. I believe if you write well enough as an artist you can conjure from places that may not have even been lived before.

**I.B:** Like some kind of foreshadowing?

**C.M:** Yes. So I feel that about the play. I am pleased that I created this portrait of boyhood that shows their sensitivity and complexity. They are real. I see boys like that. In terms of her act of murder, so as to write something like that, you just have to go to those places of rage. In that sense, it is not real to you but there are some moments that you just want to kill. So in writing you capture those sights of great terror in you. In terms of feeling he is growing up to betray me, which is the theme in the play, I think that's what raising your child in patriarchy is. You worry about your son but you worry about your daughter, too.

**I.B:** How about the function of transition between Spanish to English in your plays? In your introduction to *Watsonville* you point out that this is a realistic depiction of a bilingual community. Is bilingualism used to render a realistic representation? For an English-speaking reader like me, it is not easy to understand some of the conversations and expressions in Spanish. I felt a bit distanced at times. So who is this `broadly defined new audience` you mentioned in *Watsonville*? In your *Waiting In The Wings: Towards A Queer Motherhood* you note that the bilingual Chicano community is `mi familia` to you. In some of your plays I felt I was sharing a family secret and at times quite distanced from the family. Is this also a strategy that you use to speak directly to `mi familia`?

**C.M:** It is never intended to exclude and it could not. When I write, I let the characters talk whatever language they want to talk. Then I look at it and start to make combinations so as not to exclude anyone. The English speaking reader would not lose the story but some of the expressions or jokes. But if I didn't include those, there wouldn't be a real culture in the play. It would then be just a translated language. My commitment is to create an authentic work which in my understanding means an accurate representation of who we are, not a translation. The thing is plays are also written to be seen and most of the things you can't understand while reading may be understood while watching. While writing essays for example, I don't use so much Spanish as it is only to be read not to be seen. On stage however, the use of body will make it clear to you whether it is a joke or irony. I tried to stay committed to the form. Another thing I'm politically interested in doing is giving the audience the privileged of seeing a Chicano play represented in such a way that it is true.

**I.B:** During this conversation, I realize that you are using many literary or cultural terms. I also noticed that in some of your plays your stage directions and introductions involve comments and you explain the reader why you do things that way. Like a self-conscious text... I know that you have both a BA and an MA in English. How does it influence your view as a playwright? Is your intellectual background at times a boundary on your creativity? Do you have a critical stand towards your own work? Or do you have a tendency to theorize your own work before you write it? In what ways do your creative and critical sides support and contradict each other?

**C.M:** I also consider myself a cultural critic and all my writing is motivated by that. I really don't consider myself an academic. I teach at Stanford University. My status is artist-in-residence. So I was hired basically because of my writing. My writing is influenced by the teaching of drama. In my essays, I can do a comparative analysis of how the plays make the same sets of questions manifest in a different genre. It is all critical so what happens then is the play becomes an enactment, a scenario or a narration of a certain set of questions. *Hungry Woman* was the most recent. In that and in essays such as in the new version of *Loving In The War Years*, I look at questions about patriarchal motherhood. How is it that mothers give birth to sons for sons to betray us? Those are theoretical questions I ask and that complexity is embodied in Medea of the *Hungry Woman*. So yes, those two sides or two genres are completely in conversation with each other.

**I.B:** You also contributed a lot to Chicana feminist theory with Gloria Anzaldúa in *This Bridge Called My Back*. If we consider that as a call to transcribe the tradition, who and what works are the responses? And to whom do you respond? I would also like to hear about writings by women of color in that volume. Do you consider the Black and Asian Americans within the same circle?

## An Interview with Cherrie Moraga

**C.M:** My first essays reflect all the writing I read until then. At that time there was hardly a so-called Chicano literature written by women. I was writing against a void. So I didn't feel like I had an ancestor. I was writing in complete absence. I can tell you what I read though. I was reading the black women first. Because they were writing in the 70s and they were putting together issues of race and gender. I read James Baldwin as he was writing about both race and sexuality. I was influenced by black women more and some black men. And I was reacting against Chicano male writers who rendered us completely invisible. It was then so different from the new generation who are more than twenty years younger than me because they read us. I think it is now too early to say whether there is a response or not. The new generation writers have assimilated already their rights to talk about sexuality and gender. Then it was a taboo. So I felt that I was simply writing against a complete taboo. That's why I didn't know who was even listening or responding.

**I.B:** You have already told me about the African American writers that inspired you. When I read your play *A Circle In Dirt*, I liked it so much because it handled both the race and ethnicity issues so successfully. The idea that Asian Americans, African Americans and Chicanos came together and united against what was going on in Palo Alto,, was very interesting. I also noticed that Professor. Harry J. Elam also contributed to the project. Do you have other plays in which you collaborate with other people of color?

**C.M:** Yes, that was a great project that came together. Some kind of mission... I really enjoyed it. It is a vision I believe that people of color must come together and collaborate to make a change. It was because the nature of the project allowed me to do that. All my other works have been specifically Chicana. But I feel like I envisioned all women of color, not necessarily Chicanas. Even in the production of *Hungry Woman*, we had Asian, Black and Mexican women as a part of the tale. The work shows our multiplicity as people of color. In my fiction there are also other women of color besides Chicanas.

**I.B:** Would you tell us about the function of myths in your plays? How is it that you came across all that information about myths and legends of Chicanas? How did it really work? Did you go back to your roots and read Aztec and Mayan myths or were they already familiar to you? Or did you decide to use them in your plays or did it just flow? Can you say that you rewrite these myths in a contemporary world or do you intend to transcribe and re-remember them?

**C.M:** I think it's both. First of all when I was young, I went to Mexico and spent a lot of time there especially around the temples and the archeological sites. I mean around places which have invasion history. I got a lot of information and I was so impressed even though it wasn't directly my own inheritance... As you know Chicanos are attracted to this better known Indian nation that had a big civilization to study or have access to. For example in Northern Mexico where actually my people are from, the older people are Yaqui people. It's only when I

## Bilgin

started to write a certain subject that a myth would occur to me and I would realize that there is some relation between what I was writing and an old story. That's what myth is, an old story. As those stories passed orally, they changed with time and I think all I'm doing is telling the different version of the story. For example when I heard the story about the battle between the moon and the sun, it explained to me patriarchy for Mexico. That is not documented anywhere nor is there an official version of it but we as Chicana feminists started to think about it. The Mexican feminists started to think about it, too. It started to make sense to me that there is a story where the brother mutilates the sister and then the sister is broken into pieces and she is exiled into the dark to become the moon. And I started thinking, are we then the moon? Are we then this mutilated daughter? Who is my god? Then as the play *Hungry Woman* says my god is the mutilated daughter La Luna because she rebelled against the brother. Of course in my own biography there is this constant conflict with my brother. Because he had every privilege possible. He was just like a god. Then it became very representative to me that we had this second class status. When I heard about this myth, of course I found it great. It was not like I wanted to write a play about the myth. It was indeed the myth that told a different version of the story that we lived everyday in our lives as women.

**I.B:** So once more we make sure that `myths never die and they just transform`.

**C.M:** Exactly, they never die. So I guess my privilege as a writer is to keep telling them in a different version so that it may be useful for us contemporarily.

**I.B:** Having watched the Stanford production of *Hungry Woman: a Mexican Medea*, I also wonder how you decided Jason to be played by a male actor though in the book it wasn't suggested to be so.

**C.M:** Initially it's because we were doing a collaboration with Campesino. It ended up not happening. One of Valdez's sons was a wonderful actor and we decided to try a man there. When finally the collaboration didn't work out, I had already visualized it as a man. Then we kept the idea that we are going to have a man there so as to give man of color an opportunity to be in this play. Because once I made a decision to do that I would not go back to the other again. But at the beginning I was a little nervous about having a man on the stage. Because of heterosexism, I was afraid everybody will be expecting Medea and him to get together. Then I might not have enough argument about the lesbian relationship since the heterosexist audience would not value it. Gradually I loved that. I loved making also his needs real and complex. And I really think it worked.

**I.B:** I totally agree because I was among the audience and as a heterosexual I can really say it really worked.

**C.M:** Well, yes. Then it is much more compelling because you made a heterosexual audience and allow them to witness that a lesbian relationship that is as



## An Interview with Cherrie Moraga

complex as any other relationship. Politically and artistically it is much more effective. So I would not go back to the other version.

**I.B:** By the way, I noticed that in your description of cast you underline that many characters may be acted by the same actor and actress. Is it merely for financial reasons that you note that at the beginning of your plays? I also wonder what the boundaries on staging your plays are. Does the lesbian representation lead to any difficulties in this case?

**C.M:** Yes. It's because I know that my plays are always too big. Nobody wants to produce it [Hungry Woman] because it requires at least eight characters. I once tried to write a play with three characters and already found it evolving to be a lot more. Playwrights think about economics all the time because it's just prohibitive. Because in a mainstream regional theatre which is largely white, theaters are supported by a subscription of people who are white upper middle class. So when they have a person of color work with them, they would rather do it one person's shows. In this case they are not going to spend a lot of money. Of course there are exceptions. For example if New York says that it's a valuable work, then the Californian theatres will do a person of color's work that is already sold in New York. But usually, they are not going to take risk with a big play by a person of color in this side of the country.

**I.B:** You just directed your own play. So how did it work with funding and how did it work in terms of having more space? I would like to hear that part of the story concerning the Stanford Production of your Medea.

**C.M:** What the department offered as a fund for the project was not sufficient. So a group of Chicana graduate students got together to fund-raise and bring it to the level it was. My experience in directing which means choosing my own designers and collaborators was absolutely the best. And the co-director was definitely marvelous. We had a very even collaboration. Because she is also an actress, her ability to work with people in terms of acting technique was something I don't have. But I know how to gather the elements. So in terms of staging and design, for the first time in my life I feel that my play was realized in such a way that the aesthetic and sensibility of it was totally mine. Mine meaning ours of course. But after this whole experience I would like to continue directing my own work. We could produce that because we had Stanford as a resource. Indeed there are very few sources of funds for the Chicano work now. In 90s there were more opportunities for us and now they are virtually gone. I think I would like to direct again. I really like having my say. Because it's very specific. You get either a director who culturally doesn't get that so you have to explain that or you get somebody who doesn't understand queerness or gender. You have so many acts of translation. At least for the premiere where you get the idea, I would like to do that. Some people say you can't direct your own work because you are so connected to it. I say what about Maria Irene Forness? She is a Cuban American playwright from New York and she was my teacher

Bilgin

when I was there. She has always directed her works. And she has directed one of mine. I watched her direct her work with such specificity. I taught at first that she was crazy. Because she knew exactly what she wanted. Now she is in her seventies and she is my model. It wasn't necessarily that they were the fanciest productions but they were exactly right.

**I.B:** So it seems like you could really represent what you depicted.

**C.M:** Yes. Particularly for the playwrights, it's `see`. The playwright is the painter. And I felt that I really saw my play there so I want to continue.

**I.B:** `Teatro Campesino` is considered not only as Luis Valdez's theatre but as the first Chicano representation on stage or the first appearance of the Chicano image on theatre. I would like to ask why this tradition of theater didn't continue with the female canon as much? I can't recall so many but you, Denise Chavez and Josefina Lopez for instance. How do you respond to Teatro Campesino as its daughters and how do you collaborate if you do?

**C.M:** All that history of the Teatro Campesino as the first Chicano Theatre really influenced me. Luis as a person is a very brilliant and forward-looking man. For his time he was amazing. He really anticipated where we needed to go as a movement. His move from using the theatre to organize people around UFW and then to go to a new indigenism. It has an incredible impact on me personally as a Chicana. He introduced that our work should respond to our certain conditions on a certain level and underlined that we are a people indigenous to this land. I am ultimately grateful not only to him personally but to all those early collaborators of Teatro Campesino. However their definition of social concern totally limited a complex understanding of women's, Chicana's, needs. I don't think the work has changed. He has some work in recent years which has this older woman figure. I don't think it's authentic and I don't believe that he has a good sense of the complexity of women's lives. What Teatro Campesino did is to establish a very beautiful aesthetic of what Chicano work is, inspired a lot from the Mexican populist theatre. I really honor that. Indeed Teatro Campesino doesn't exist anymore but Luis Valdez and his sons. That has to be acknowledged first. I think it's very unfortunate that the theatre wasn't able to make a transition to really produce a work outside of Luis Valdez's repertoire. I think it will not survive as it's basically a showcase for Valdez's work.

The vision of it was much more collective. He should have brought new playwrights all the time. Finally their son's generation wanted to do my work and that failed. It failed because they are no longer an innovative organization. This is their inability to really integrate new ideas and to integrate women's point of view or to integrate queer writers. Or even to integrate a more complex rendering of a male experience. This all led to a lack of function for this organization which has an incredible history. I feel like there is no Chicana canon of drama. There can't be. Because the issues they are discussing can

## An Interview with Cherrie Moraga

hardly come through the stage play but through the individual artists. When we talk about Latina drama, though, it is different as I already mentioned María Irene Fornes for instance. She is great. There are some Latinas out there but not Chicanas, with the exception of Josefina López who has gone into film industry. Campesino produced her work for example. They just produced her plays which were like her little girl's plays. They didn't produce *Real Women Have Curves* for example. They produced her *Simply Maria* which is a teenage play. So in Campesino they don't produce plays by women but produce plays by a girl. It's not much different from the sexism of the Chicano movement. There is so much censorship and so little access for us to produce because of funding. If Chicano theatre is given a chance then the priority is men. There is really no real market for Chicana playwrights. There is, however, a market for Chicana fiction writers and that's where people are working.

**I.B:** How do you foresee Chicano Theatre? There are new playwrights trying to find their own places in the market. What does the future offer them? Are you optimistic about the breaking of prejudices?

**C.M:** There are some Chicano queer writers now emerging like Ricardo Bracco. He was my student and now he is producing in New York. There are some queer Latino men who are producing more. There are some Chicana performance artists. But Chicanas are skipping theatre altogether. If they are not going into fiction writing, then they are going into film industry. I work with young Chicano student playwrights. I hope some of them will emerge. As they are very young, they may also continue with an MFA. They may surprise us but I think if they stay in California, most of them will start writing for film. So there are some young Chicano filmmakers now. Certainly their issues are outside the Chicano canon. They are queer and their style is more experimental.

**I.B:** Any hope for future funding?

**C.M:** Nobody is optimistic because the funding is all corporate now. Government now spares very little money on art. There is some stuff going on in Los Angeles. There is Evalina Fernández who writes for them and produces her work. There is still some theatre companies remaining. There are productions of José Luis Valenzuela's group and Luis Alfaro. Alfaro is a Chicano playwright. He wrote *Electricidad* and produced that in Chicago and in LA, all in mainstream ones. So these are exceptional. I don't think this is indication of the time.

**I.B:** Thank you so much Miss Moraga, for this very sincere conversation. I wish you the very best for your future work.