

Margaret Craham (Meg) Date May 15, 2003, New York City

MC: First contact I had was with Charles Wagley who then was the head of Latin American Studies at Columbia University and Wagley called me and asked me if I would be willing to help out organizing the visit of Marcio Moreira Alves who was, as I understood it from Wagley was serving essentially as the foreign policy spokesperson of Brazilians in exile. That's how it was explained to me in the period of the late 60s and the early 70s, and he asked me not only if I would I organize his visit in the United States on the East Coast but on the Midwest and Far West in conjunction with people organized in those areas, and secondly would I put him up, because Wagley knew that I had a spare bedroom, one of my roommates got married and we frequently had functions here of the Columbia mafia and so Wagley knew that we had space. My roommate at the time was Fran Della Cava, so there is another connection there.

JG: You're very coherent, so I want to see if we can do something more chronological. How you got involved in Latin American Studies, the Dominican Republic and then Brazil. ...also women in LASA...Second LASA in D.C. resolution is passed and sent out to ballot vote, another resolution on providing childcare for women is passed and sent out for a resolution vote and is defeated. Issues of shifts in LASA. ... Free free to weave the story.

MC: Background with Latin American Studies. I was thinking seriously about law school, College of New Rochelle, graduated in 1960, decided to go to graduate school largely because I had visited a number of law schools, had done very well on the law boards and even though women were not particularly welcome but because of my scores I was being recruited heavily and the more I saw their attitude toward women, the more I decided I wanted to go to graduate school, and then if after a year I didn't like it, I would have a Master's whereas if I went to law school for only one year it would be a waste and there were very strong financial considerations. Once I decided to go to graduate school I had to choose a field. I had an undergraduate field in U.S. and European history and at my school, US. history was essentially taught was unexciting in a way and European history was antiquarianism. Looking at my options, I had Spanish; it was the only language that I had; I'll do Latin American history. It was a practical decision. There was no knowledge of Latin America outside what I had read in the newspapers, and I went to Georgetown where I got the best fellowship, and within a few weeks I was enamored of the study of Latin America, number one because it seemed, this is 1960, 1961, it seemed to be a place of extraordinary movement, ferment things were happening. Secondly, one had a sense not only about Latin America but the field of Latin America that it was much less highbrow, much more open to younger people, and I was very lucky at Georgetown. Howard Kline who at the time was the head of the Hispanic Foundation at the Library of Congress was teaching and he provided me with a lot of opportunities. By the end of the first semester I was totally convinced that I wanted to get a doctorate in Latin American history.

Meanwhile, Lewis Hanke recruited me to Columbia. He had heard about me, presumably from Howard Kline, and I transferred after my first year. Masters at Georgetown, Ph D at Columbia.

JG: Who were the professors?

MG: Tannenbaum was still around in those days we were required to take Tannenbaum's seminar which involved drinking mate and listening to old friends talk about themselves. [don't use]. They had Stanley Stein in to teach a course. That was the most exciting course. Juan Lins came in at a certain point. He interjected an incredible amount of analysis in terms of theory. They also had Ron Schneider. He didn't stay. He went to Queens and he was replaced by Doug Chalmers. Doug came in after I had finished my course work. And the other person that really excited everyone was Chuck Wagley. Since there weren't a lot of course offerings, we all were essentially in the same courses. We all took Chuck Wagley. We all took Stanley Stein They were Brazilianists, so there was a strong emphasis on Brazil. There was also, I believe in 1962, the National Defense Foreign Languages came on line and that there were something like 180; 100 for Spanish language countries and 80 for Brazil, so you had this huge bulge of people who got funding to study Brazil and I think that contributed to a growing interest too.

Among the students were Ralph, of course, Luis Martin to SMU who worked on Columbia and is now retired, Riordan Roett at SAIS, he was actually there when I got there in 1961, Helen Delpar, Louisiana State University. Those are the ones who actually survived out of that first year seminar. In the next four years, you get Ken Erickson, Al Stepan, Ralph is there the first year, Maxine Margolis, Peter Eisenberg, Mike Hall, Miguel Marin (Mexican foreign service, now heading up international relations at the Universidad Hiberno-americano, Susan Kaufman Purcell (She is at the Americas Society, taught at UCLA in political science, worked for the government), Susan Eckstein. Brad Burns was already teaching. Hanke had left in 1967 because I had written two chapters of my dissertation between June and Dec 1966 and then Hanke told me he was leaving to go to Irvine and I went oh, who is going to replace him, I won't get through if he is not here, I had real financial problems, and so I sat down and wrote the next four chapters in the next eight weeks so I could defend in the spring which I did. I think actually Hanke never had doctoral students who finished up before that. This was a big deal for him. I think I may have been his first student.

JG: [about Brad Burns]

MG: Brad was no more than three years. Sept. 1967 to June 1970 at most, not there very long, he did not enjoy New York; he really missed Los Angeles, his roots were planted there. He talked with us about it. By the end of the first year he was looking to go back. Then they brought in Herb Klein. I continued to be involved in the Institute.

I finished in 1967. I was always a visiting professor, didn't teach, but handled doctoral students 73-77 had an office at the Institute.

When Marcio came I was already teaching at Hunter in the Bronx. In 1967 Lehman was still Hunter in the Bronx, it changed its name and became independent in 1968. I was literally hired by Hunter downtown. When I came back, I got tenure at Hunter in the Bronx (three years to tenure).

JG: ...Were things happening before the Dominican Republic?

MC: Yes, it was extraordinary. There was an extraordinary sense of community, in part because, not everyone was in every course, but there was a high percentage of us who were taking the same courses, history, anthropology, literature because we had to fulfill our schedules, so that brought us together. Number two was the political stuff. Virtually everyone was highly politicized. It was the era. Students were coming out of undergraduate school even as early as the late 1950s and the early 1960s were already highly politicized around civil rights and then of course later around anti-Vietnam sentiment. But I remember vividly at the time of the Cuban missile crisis there was a tremendous amount of coming together to discuss the issues, what could be done, and remember Columbia was a political hotbed for students' rights. It is very difficult to imagine today how little input students had in those days, including graduate students, in terms of curriculum, evaluation of professors, so that you became very much more politicized in the context of Columbia at the time. And that was also going on at Berkeley and at other places.

Because we were Latin Americanists, there was tremendous focus on what was going on in Latin America as people began to go abroad for field research or had already spent time in Latin America like Ralph, Al Stepan and others, you had those networks being integrated. The Columbia student faculty network together with network of Latin Americanists in Latin America or political types. There wasn't much distinction. I only remember in the group of 70 of us who went through at that time, I only remember a few who were political, what we regarded as political, so that and issue would arise; I remember the biggies, but I'm sure there were less ones; I remember Argentine student repression and getting involved in those early years. And of course the first big one was the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Bay of Pigs was the Dominican Republic invasion in 1965. And Peter Eisenberg, I remember was the leader and when Connie Carter Crowder, who I think is still in Indiana, she never taught much, but was very political, and Mike Hall, was involved in that.

JG: About Peter.

MC: Rosario his wife when she was living here said that she had some of his papers dating way back.

JG: Talk about the DR activities.

MC: Basically, I remember Peter calling us all up and saying we've got to organize something to protest this. He made contact with the some of the faculty. We all had the sense, and this is pretty typical of the time, that in order to have impact we needed names

and that meant the faculty, so a committee was put together and we had several faculty members, I think that Chuck was involved, and it wasn't just Columbia, there were others.

JG: The NYT ad has people as far afield as Don Bray from California, out of Stanford. They were students. They weren't faculty. Ken Erickson remembered that he contacted people by letter to sign on and get it published.

MC: Basically it was to get media attention; public opinion attention and as you indicated it was done a lot by mail because you didn't have fax and email and most of us couldn't afford to make a slew of phone calls so the resources were slim as compared to today. I remember working very hard on it. One of the things about the Columbia group was I don't remember that people said no we should get involved in this. We talked about the issues and then there was always unanimity about doing something.

JG: Ken remembered that there were two cafeterias where all the graduate students came to that served as a general clearing house.

MC: I don't remember the name of the building right now but the Butler Library was immediately to the left and it is absolutely correct. One of the things was physical proximity. There weren't as many options of places to eat back in those days on campus and if you went off campus there were only two or three places; one of them is still in existence at the corner of 160, and that was the after class place and Stu Schwartz was always saying, let's go to Annie's or something or other where you go down and they had pastries, and we would go to discuss not only what was said in class, but there was also a sense that [off the record—there was a sense that what we were getting in class not from everyone was pretty old-fashion, not theoretical and up to date in terms of theory there was virtually nothing outside of Burns' class. Descriptive]. So everyone went there after class. I remember going very frequently and would say, ok, what does this mean, and people would chip in and a more complex analysis would emerge. We also discussed the political things there and that's all I remember. Either political questions or the class.

JG: Effect of the Cuban Revolution?

MC: Mixed. It communicated a sense of excitement, ferment, in terms of whether there would be other revolutionary movements, focusing on revolutionary movements, focus on labor and students. The sixties generation although many finished in the early 1970s was very much focused on a set of actors who many of whom had an orientation toward socialism, some to revolutionary politics, some to armed struggle—students, labor, political parties of the left, and therefore my memory is that the Cuban Revolution was discussed more about its impact on Latin America in general than on Cuba. I don't remember anyone who was working on Cuba per se.

JG: Or anyone who traveled to Cuba?

MC: A few. People didn't start going down. The Cubans after 1961 weren't very welcoming. They were very suspicious. I went down the first time in 1973 and have gone

down a few dozen times since but it was very rare even in 1973. At that point they had begun to invite academics down. The first group of academics went down earlier in 1973. I went down later in 1973. It wasn't so much Cuba per se as the example of Cuba. We tended to focus on the countries that people were working on, so a lot was focused on Brazil.

JG: Could we not say that Columbia was the main center of Latin American Studies in the country?

MC: It was. In the 1960s and the early 1970s, there is no doubt about it. We used to talk about it. We were aware that there were many more people studying about Latin America than were at Berkeley or at Texas, and basically the competition if you want to call it that was Berkeley or Texas.

JG: Not at Stanford which generates Chilcote, Bray, Conniff.

MC: Not as many and they seemed to far away. We didn't have a sense of them, whereas we were constantly getting stuff from other people. It had to do with the numbers. And I think that Columbia at the time was putting a lot of money into Area Studies. There was Bob Levine at Princeton who used to come and hang out with us and some of the Columbia people thought he was a Columbia PhD. And there were a couple of people at Harvard, including Tom Skidmore, was up at Harvard, maybe three or four people that we knew about. You have to remember, there weren't Latin Americanists around. Beginning with the 60s generation, the Wisconsin program was built on the basis of recruiting people, Tom Skidmore from Harvard and Peter Smith from Columbia. Same thing with Indiana, Joe Love and other people they brought in. New Mexico, Pittsburgh it didn't get going until there was money for area studies. There wasn't a legitimization for area studies until the United States became aware of competition with the Soviet Union, etc. The difference with Columbia is that there were so many students; there was a real problem with the scarcity of professors and courses offered. The other thing I remember that everyone had money with increased fellowship. I had a Columbia fellowship and I gave it up for an NFDL because essentially it was greater, because I was the only female fellow of the Columbia. They said, how can you give it up, because they pay summer as well.

JG: Language and area studies?

MC: You could do anything as long as it was linked with Latin America. I think we were all on NFDL except, ?, who worked for Hanke.

JG: Irony of the program.

JG: Marcio Moreira Alves. He spoke so highly of you.

MC: Number one. I wasn't a Brazilianist so I didn't know who was who and I wasn't familiar with Marcio until Chuck Wagley called me and asked me to do this. I would do

anything for Chuck Wagley, quite frankly. He was a gentleman of the old school. He cared enormously about his students and he also cared and loved immensely Brazil and that is what he communicated. All of us took to Wagley's courses. I can't remember anyone who didn't. We were all in there. I remember sitting there with all these guys and it was a big class, and we just admired him enormously. It was very clear that if he asked you to do something that you felt complimented that he had confidence in you. And he asked me if I would do this. I said yes. I don't know if it was in the first conversation or the second, I don't remember, he said that Marcio was not born with a silver spoon in his mouth that he was born with a platinum spoon in his mouth and he might be ?. I talked with my roommate, Fran Della Cava and we were very generous. It was in the student days when everyone helped everyone else so it wasn't much of a problem. So we put him up.

Marcio arrived. Did he go to LASA. My records indicate that he did.

JG: He spoke at some venue there.

MC: The Brazilianists dominated LASA and they dominated the students. There was no doubt about it. We were the step children those of us who focused on Spanish speaking Latin America. Mexicans were more important on the West Coast. We here on the East Coast. There were the Brazilianists and then the others.

JG: Who were the other heavy weights?

MC: Joe Love, Stu Schwartz, I'd have to look at the LASA list, Margaret Tadara, didn't stay in academia but part of the group, Stu? gone into administration in Chicago. Brazilianists and the rest of us. We weren't even disaggregated it was just the reality. There wasn't discrimination, just the focus on Brazil was enormous. My memory is that Marcio came in just before LASA and then we went to the LASA meeting and at LASA there was tremendous amount of putting together a schedule and meeting with people. It was the only opportunity for us to coordinate with people who we would meet in the Midwest, so his basic schedule was done there, then we returned to New York.

JG: Second LASA meetings.

MC: You should interview Richard Fagen who was the most political person in the LASA hierarchy. Lives in an island off Seattle. LASA is interesting because the first meeting was in 1968 in New York. I attended that. I was the only female who was there as a member. A lot of the other females such as Sue Eckstein and Sue Purcell and others were there manning the tables, and I remember when I arrived at the hotel, these were people I knew from Columbia. They said are you actually registered. You are the only woman who is here as a member.

JG: How many people?

MC: Two to three hundred. They were outside, they were not attending the sessions.

... They were students. I finished up in 1967 and in history Luis Martin finished before I did, I was the second and the first woman, but among the students there were quite a few women. I remember that we had the sense that we were half and half, now whether that was accurate but we had that sense that there were as many females and males.

All of the faculty was male, not a single female faculty. In 1968 I remember going there and walking up to the table and their commenting that you are registered.

The 1970 meeting was pretty active politically and Fagan was leading the charge even though I think that he was a member of the Executive Council. There were women in Washington, and the meeting was tremendously focused on Brazil, and the women organized after that 1970 meeting, into the Women's Caucus of Latin America. Elsa Chaney and myself, Helen Safa and June Nash. The meetings were here. WCLA stuff I also tossed. Elsa at the university of Nebraska should have Elsa's papers. She was superb and had that archival mentality. She was dying of cancer she was at the University of Nebraska (or it may have been Iowa). The next meeting, the Madison meeting in 1972 there were no women on the program and the nominees came out and there were no women. There was a husband and wife team.

JG: Had you presented a paper proposal and hadn't been accepted.

MC: I'm pretty sure that there were but the explanation was that they were no senior enough and it's true that we were all graduate student (at that time a graduate student couldn't be on the program; the notion of best quality and senior was coterminous though between 1970 and the Madison meeting we organized the Women's Caucus here and we made contact with women on the west coast, particularly Jane Jacquette and when the program for Madison came out with no women on it and then just half a woman, after protests, we called it half a woman, then we protested even more and decided to organized WCLA and have write-in candidates. I was the write-in candidate from the east coast and Jane Jacquette was the write in candidate from the west coast. There was another write-in candidate; the older guys thought that they were being ignored and so Lewis Hanke was the other write-in candidate. So it was Jane Jacquette, Lewis Hanke and me. And Lewis Hanke and I got elected as write-in candidates. It was interesting because he was the grand old daddy and also my professor at Columbia. I was elected in 1973. As a result of the pressures, they then put Karen Spaulding as an official candidate and she was elected. So then Karen and I were the two females on the Executive Council. We went on in January 1973. This was after the Wisconsin meeting. There were a whole slew of political and gender resolutions. And the gender resolutions went through. As I recall, so did the political ones. Again there was tremendous amount of ferment at the Madison Conference.

JG: At the 1970 meeting Ralph had presented the dossier, report on Terror, which you gave me a copy of that you distributed there, which was a hot item and brought the dynamic that got the resolution passed. Height of the anti-war and radical movement.

MC: There was a sense of being the younger generation; people who had just recently finished and a substantial delegation from the West Coast, for a lot of us we had not had a face to face before and there was a lot of commonality. The biggest group were youngsters like myself from primarily the East Coast and Columbia. A lot of people had been in the field by then and were very much loaded for ? There were a tremendous number of resolutions. I remember John Johnson to being very resistant. The vast majority of people showed up for the business meeting. I remember Fagen going back and forth. The President, Vice President and the Executive Council were up on the stage and Fagen running back and forth negotiating. It was fascinating; they expected us to negotiate, water down the resolutions. The notion of having political resolutions was no way. This was an academic association and it was inappropriate. That was their attitude. On the other hand the numbers were on our side. And also the nature of Latin Americanists; you're not just academics, if you work on Latin America you become directly involved in a whole series of issues. And it just tipped, it really did tip. I would say even before Madison, there might have been some resistance, but it became clear that we could outvote them.

JG: Why did the Union of Radical Latin Americanists emerge out of this, if the majority were...did you have contact with them. URLA and URPE.

MC: Most of us were historians, political scientists, a few anthropologists. Not many economists. I think it went political scientists, historians, anthropologists and then sociologists. Political scientists far outweighed the others. And we met here, URLA and URPE were pretty substantial. As people finished up graduate school and got jobs like Jim Bass at Queens and John Weeks both of whom had come out of Michigan, remember that Michigan had been the center of antiwar activities with Eric Wolfe and others, and they were producing a lot of economists in those days and when some of those economists come to the east coast to teach there was a core of these guys at Yale and U Mass and some of them began teaching and some of them had become a political mass.

JG: Marcio's trip.

MC: He came in. I had never met him before. The only thing that I knew about him was the little that Chuck had told me about him. And I think that there was some acculturation. [Off the record, but it epitomized it, Fran and I had talked about this. ... Fran was still a graduate student and working, and we really didn't have much. . . roll away bed, bikes were in there, it was basically a roll away bed and a little desk; it was spare. Came out and asked who is going to press my pants. Both of us turned around and said the ironing board is over there, and we both said, and what night are you going to cook? We didn't have a schedule. We didn't eat out because of money and we both asked without consulting. Tuesday and Thursdays are open. But I only know how to make one thing, spheghetti ? sure enough he cooked. Years later in 1984 I went to Brazil I went to a meeting in Brazil cosponsored by Riordan Roett ... went to Rio, human rights work, interviewing people, arrived in Rio, cab to Marcio's place...He wasn't there, butler was there, penthouse where his mother had lived. Butler there shows me my room, etc. and then says, no doubt you clothing is wrinkled from the trip. Yes. No doubt it needs pressing,

well you'll have to do it yourself because you made D. Marcio had had to do his own. I think he had heard it many years before. ...Butler had communicating him...Marcio had to explain why he had a butler...I inherited him from my mother...

JG: [...]

MC: The schedule was jammed packed. There were no breaks at all. We really. It would not have been possible if I hadn't driven him to places.

JG: You are an assistant professor at the time. Due to the Cambodian invasion you were free.

MC: Yes.

JG: Marcio spoke at Johns Hopkins, do remember? [...]

MC: I don't think I was there. I remember that Marcio came back. Wasn't that one of his earliest?

...How Marcio gained my respect. Marcio liked to be waited on and was lazy. When he had to do it he was focused and extremely intelligent and extremely astute and extremely articulate in English. When we drove from place to place we used to play these word games to try to best each other using exquisite terminology. Two weeks or three where all we did was travel around like mad from place to place. I heard the speech repeatedly. The one thing that I remember which was at Columbia where he gave a talk and someone from the audience in a somewhat patronizing fashion said to him: "How did you develop such good English. Answered "a dictionary with skirts". There a certain patronizing attitude toward a person who was Latin American, Marcio might have been able by himself...patronizing. . . had an English girlfriend, amongst the many.

JG: Other issues...local color...?

MC: It was the same stump speech. Sometimes he gave it three times a day. He would try to tweak it and we'd be the only people who knew and he would do it to amuse me and he particularly in the question and answers would sometimes give people a zinger in part to amuse me. Marcio in those days was very angry and this was one of the things that we talked about, if he was going to convince people he couldn't get angry.

JG: Angry at the U.S. government.

MC: Yes, but also angry at people, also at the United States not just at the government. There was a tendency to be totally begrudgingly receptive to gringos, we weren't as political, we were naive, and politically we were ingenuous. He had a tendency to make these broad statements about the United States and U.S. citizens. To get him not to be offensive was not an easy task and would say, you've got to listen.

JG: Give me an example.

MC: I don't remember the specifics but it was along the lines that people in the United States are naïve, they're led by the nose by their government, they are excruciatingly provincial, but it would be phrased in even more aggressive terminology.

JG: Basically, he is coming in with a culture shock and a notion of what the United States is, and how people are and he is trying...

MC: He had a chip on his shoulder. I remember vividly not only talking to Fran about this, but also Wagley about it and I think if I remember correctly I spoke to Wagley to talk to Marcio about this in the first few talks, and I figure that he would take it from Wagley who was his godfather. And he changed? He did. Over time.

Wagley and his wife met Marcio's parents when they were on their respective honeymoons.

JG: That's why Marcio goes to Wagley. When he's in Chile goes to the U.S., who contacts you, contacts Ralph.

MC I know that he [Marcio] met with the editors of the New York Times and I also know that he met with people from *Time* magazine. I think *Time* magazine was first and then the New York Times. He was positive about that. I think that Wagley was instrumental with the NYT. I remember that Marcio came back thinking that it really went well. He met with a negative sense that this is part of the establishment and they listened and it went well.

JG: When we talk on the phone, Marcio was a real live person representing Latin America.

MC: It was very important that Marcio had been a member of Congress and on the other hand had had to leave the country because of political repression. There was at the time a growing sense of the extent of political repression and that offended U.S. sensibilities. The fact that Marcio could talk about torture and the extent of it in Brazil and the fact that it impacted middle class people and students, and labor leaders and what not that people here could relate to was exceptionally important. And again he was a genius in terms of language. He had no problem whatsoever after about a week identifying what would touch people.

JG: What was it that touched people.

MC: The logic of the critique of the Brazilian government but any government that used torture to maintain the level of repression and social control. He was able to tie it into the types of things that in the United States people would take for granted. If I remember he even would use this here you take for granted (and he wouldn't use the term the right to free association) the fact that union leaders can meet, the fact that people can express

their opinions wherever they are, the fact that they can criticize the government without fear of being shot, and then he would give a few examples of labor leaders who were detained and tortured, organizational meetings being broken up, he talked about in the Northeast when he was a journalist covering rallies when they were attacked and he himself was supposedly shot in the leg, he would mention at the end of the talk and things of that nature. He was able to present a very sustained analysis and yet the human element. He is a wordsmith and his books reflect this. And he was able to balance it particularly for an academic audience he wouldn't lose them because it was just a spiel appealing to the emotions. He was able to integrate the analysis and incredible clarity and internal logic and coherence and his responses to questions were the same way. ... I admired the clarity and the clarity to the logic, the internal logic, he's much smarter than a lot of people.

JG: Part of this book is going to cast people in a very positive light. They know he was exile and he was in Europe. Huge interest in Brazil...

JG: Marcio comes back in 1972 when Boal is here.

MC: I ran out of money and I had a Fulbright and I came back and then I didn't have money, Fulbright was for Spain...got a job...Joanne was another person reading applications.

MC: Marcio was here for meeting with Brizola and other Brazilians in this room.

JG: Joan Dassin said that there was an articulate with Brazilian journalists and others on the amnesia campaign to get people to come back.

MC: I didn't sit in on those meetings. Exclusively Brazilian.

JG: 1972?

MC: Boal was all over the place. He had an affiliation with NYU and doing basic spade work in raising consciousness. Chile is really the breakthrough in terms of consciousness about human rights across the board, expanding beyond the academic world to the general public.

JG: Why?

MC: Chile was regarded as the stereotypical democracy and there were so many people from the states from the academic world who had spent time in Chile or doing research, late 1960s and 70s, primarily Brazil, secondarily and then Mexico. Chile was where it was out. The Ford Foundation was much more active at that time and in the arts too, there was much more awareness. People were making connections. This was post 1968 70 student rebellions, the 60s generation was out of graduate school and undergraduate school teaching, and the expansion of NGO's and church activities. I myself had been

working in Washington in Human Rights issues and you by 1973 we knew everyone in the State Department Joe Bruneau, Dept. Ass. Sec. of State as was Al Fishlow under Ford.

He and Joe Bruneau were in there Joe knew the ...Joe had done this work on Chile and Al on Brazil. Deputy Sec. of State.

JG: Wagley? How would you characterize him.

MC: ...There were so few Latin americanists, you could name the names, Wagley due to his warmth and charisma was a very attractive person so that I think that he was very well liked, to be the head of LAS even at Columbia means a lot more then than today and being in New York, and he was very well known and respected in Brazil. He was progressive, he was moderate in his presentations.

JG: 1972 visit.

MC: Running around. Hysteria. Big thing. Much hullabaloo. When you got Boal and Marcio in the same room, too bulls in the same room. Same with Brizola. Marcio was more competitive with Boal, than with Brizola.

JG: Impact in your life.

MC: I was there before I met Marcio I grew up in upstate New York in a very small town that was impoverished when I was a child when I went to school it was a parochial school, kids were poorer than public school, first few grades, cardboard box for coats and shoes and kids who came without shoes, and I inherited an expensive wardrobe from the daughter of the butcher, but I realized that people didn't have shoes and so I was aware of poverty. And my parents always had dinner together with an older brother and we always discussed on what was going on in the world, they read the papers voraciously, and I am not idealizing this, but from that time I was aware about what was going on in the world, we were focused on what was then called current events. My father worked for Prudential Insurance as an agent, and didn't make a lot of money, went on strike (first white collar strike) my father when house to house collecting ten cents and they were out, my mother was working as a teacher in the local public schools so we survived, I remember that we ate span, and that was the period when there was a lot of discussion of unions and labor rights, when I went to a Catholic College, not like today, but there was a history professor who told us about the internment of the Japanese; nobody had heard about. We had gone through courses and hadn't heard. Mother Roberta in history....who introduced us to this ideas. ...civil rights, also human rights, at the time of the Cuban Revolution in 1959 we had a debate on campus on the summary executions and my roommate and I were put up against each other, and I did a lot of reading about rights; particularly a course on constitutional law, and she was big on human rights... and I was the inclination was to think that that was justified among students (JG: because they were corrupt); because they had tortured people and I said that that people who are torturers must be prosecuted. And then I went to graduate school and got absorbed in Latin America, it was so much fun; I was learning all of this stuff and it was fun...it was so exciting to learn about this

processes that were going on and people like Herbert Klein were really in love with the topic not just teaching and when I came to Columbia everyone was so engaged and we talked about it. We were all happy, intellectually we were happy, there was a sense of community that other people noted. There were terrific people there. We were in the cafeteria and pastry place we would be sitting there a long time, energized. It wasn't that we were talking all the time. I learned as much by listening. Others like Ralph and Al Stepan had lived in Latin America. There weren't any Latin Americans, most had had experience as undergraduates.

JG: dissertation

MC: 17th century church state conflict in Peru

JG: After the coup in Chile is a watershed you become involved in work about Chile.

MC: Elsa Chaney had done her dissertation and moved in here, Fran had gotten married in January 1973, around June Elsa moved in. . . when the coup occurred in September she got a call from someone in Chile and so this place became the center of things around Chile.

JG: NACLA wasn't playing that role?

MC: No the first three weeks it was here. We were getting a lot of information from Chile. We were working with LASA; I was on the EC and with Ford, ...we were getting information and passing it on to Ford, there were a bunch of people. Two telephone lines. One was open for calls in and another for calls out.

JG: ...

MC: I began working with NACLA when the Cuban Resource Center was organized, I think with Bill Wipfler was involved in that, and . . . Bill got me involved in the Cuban Resource Center that was funded out of his office in the NCC and at the beginning the CRC and NACLA, Latin Bureau of NCC; NACLA was so bogged down in ideological struggle that they weren't able to do a lot. Nothing would get done; NACLA was pretty much by-passed...so then WOLA was organized I remember going to Joe Eldridge ...then I got invitations to write books on Human Rights, then got invited down to Georgetown to organize their human rights projects in Sept. 1977 to 1992 produced two volumes on human rights...that at the time was the Center for Human Rights; then started doing evaluation of human rights projects for Ford...