

A conversation with Gloria Steinem

Gloria Steinem was in India in February 2007 at the invitation of Women's WORLD (India), part of an international free-speech network of feminist writers that addresses issues of gender-based censorship. She participated in a South Asian Colloquium of Women Writers called 'The Power of the Word,' and delivered a public lecture on the topic of 'Secret Censors, Public Solutions' at the India International Centre.

Participants at the colloquium included over 45 well-known women writers from five South Asian countries (India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Nepal) including Taslima Nasreen from Bangladesh, Kamila Shamsie from Pakistan and Manjushree Thapa from Nepal, as well as several eminent Indian writers.

• • •

By **Meenakshi Mukherjee, Ira Pande**

Meenakshi Mukherjee: During your current visit you have often mentioned the two years that you spent in India as a student. Will you tell us a little more about those years? Where were you located then, and what were you studying or researching?

Gloria Steinem: I came in 1957 and after spending some time in Delhi, travelled around in India. I wrote a bit about it in an essay called 'Doing Sixty', where I reflect on the important influences in my life that really transformed me. I wrote that going from village to village with Vinoba Bhave's followers and learning about Gandhian activism, probably helped me to become what I am today. I do not walk from village to village in the United States — I usually fly — but if you want to know how people live, you have to go where they live; if you want people to listen to you, you have to listen to them. I believe I learned that in India.

MM: How did you decide to come to India?

GS: I had always had a feeling for India because both my grandmothers and my mother were Theosophists. As a little girl, I would go with them to Theosophical meetings and sit

there with my colouring book, probably absorbing a certain amount of feeling for India as a country and the origin of much of Theosophical thinking. India was some place special for me even as a child. When I was in college, I took a course from a woman called Vera Michaels Dean, I don't know if you have ever heard of her, but she was a pioneer of US support for the United Nations and taught a very good course on India. In the mid 1950s, that was unusual. However, I have to also say that part of the reason I took the fellowship was because I was trying not to get married! I was engaged to a very nice man, but we would have been very wrong for each other in terms of shared interests. I realized that I had to go very far away; otherwise I would succumb because his life was so much more interesting than mine.

MM: What kind of fellowship was it that brought you here?

GS: It was a very temporary and rather unusual fellowship set up by Chester Bowles, who had been the ambassador here earlier. He donated the proceeds of a lecture he had delivered in the US to institute the fellowship. The total was \$1,000.

MM: Monthly? For two years?

GS: No, it was a thousand dollars altogether! I also just went to sit in an airlines office and offered to write free brochures until they gave me a ticket. But the fellowship was completely unperturbed and you could do what you wanted. Because it was such a new and unknown fellowship, there was nothing set up to help me get a visa, so I ended up working as a waitress in London for some months while waiting for my visa. It was all a bit haphazard. I left the States in the fall of '56 and arrived here in January 1957.

MM: And in India your first stop was Delhi?

GS: In Delhi, I lived in Miranda House for a few months and then I began to travel. I struck up a friendship with Ellen Roy, the widow of M.N. Roy who had been head of the Communist Party of India — I think until it was ordered by the Soviets to support the British during World War II, and then he left to form the Radical Humanists — so I lived in Mussoorie for a while with her. Then I began to travel to different cities, sometimes staying with her Radical Humanist friends whom I'd met

at one of their meetings. They were a group of very, very nice people. So after I lived for a month or so in Mussoorie, I was in Calcutta for several months. I journeyed down the east coast and learned a lot. It was then that I stopped at Vinoba Bhave's ashram. He was not there, so I did not meet him, but at the time when there was caste riots in the Ramnad district, they were sending male and female teams into the villages to try to encourage the women as well as the men to come to meetings. The rumours were bad, much worse than what was really happening, and they had run out of women. They asked me if I would go as one of the volunteers, and I said: Don't you think it would be a little odd for an American? They said, don't worry, you would seem just as odd if you came from Delhi. So I ended up walking through villages for maybe a week or ten days.

Ira Pande: Your stay here sounds like an intensely lived period. You probably managed to do much more than most Indians do at that age!

GS: It was amazing. You know, when you are twenty-two years old and you don't know what you are doing, you try things no matter what....

MM: You didn't have anybody else travelling with you?

GS: In the beginning at Miranda House, there was one other American on this fellowship, Kayla Achter, but she was doing other things, so at this point I was by myself. I travelled through Kerala, which was then Travancore Cochin... then I stayed in Pondicherry for a bit, which was interesting because the Holy Mother was still alive.

IP: Did you ever get to meet her?

GS: No, I didn't try, she only gave audience at certain points, so it didn't happen while I was there. I met other people, including one American who lived on an island retreat. Anyway I couldn't go to Goa, it was closed at the time, as it was still a Portuguese colony. I went to Bombay and spent quite sometime there, living in the YWCA.

MM: A fellowship that allows you to do whatever you want sounds great! But a thousand dollars was all that you had.

GS: My parents also sent me a little money whenever they could, and I also began to write articles for Indian newspapers. It was a way of making a little

extra money. Theoretically, I was supposed to go home after nine months, but I didn't really want to go home, so I financed myself by writing for magazines, and also writing a guide book for Indian Airlines, which was then trying to entice tourists into spending more time in India, and visit places other than the usual Delhi-Agra-Jaipur circuit. I am not sure if they published it as one book, or as brochures, but they paid me and — more important — they gave me air tickets.

MM: When you look back now, how do you feel about those two years?

GS: They made a big difference. When I came home it was 1959 — there was no place for this energy to go. I would try to talk to people in America about India but there was no understanding at that point, or very little understanding... Even the Beatles hadn't come to India yet! So I couldn't integrate into the rest of my life these two very, very crucial years. It was only after the Women's Movement started that links began to be forged. I met Devaki Jain again — she had been Devaki Srinivasan when we knew each other in New Delhi the 1950s — in the late '60s or early '70s, and we found that we were finishing each other's

sentences, because we both had become feminists in the interim. So I became tied into activism in India in a different way.

MM: You said in your talk at IIC yesterday that your second trip was 30 years ago. What was that about?

GS: It was a lecture tour in 1976; Devaki arranged it through the ICSSR.

IP: 1976? At the height of the Emergency?

GS: It was a very difficult time and I was suspect as an American. And it was difficult for Devaki and L.C. Jain, who were perhaps being followed. But the ICSSR had arranged a trip to Ahmedabad and I was able to visit SEWA (Self Employed Women's Association), a trade union for women that was founded and run by Ela Bhatt.

MM: I remember reading what you wrote about SEWA later. I think it was in your book 'Revolution from Within'.

GS: I had always wanted to come back after that and Devaki had been saying you must come back ... but there was such a high level of activism at home,

including responsibilities for Ms. Magazine, that somehow the years just passed.

MM: You say feminism became your link with India. Is this an example of what you call 'hidden globalism' in your writing? A net-working of ideas that travel across boundaries of nations?

GS: I agree. It is clear to me that I have more in common with and I feel more loyal to feminists, women and men, in other countries, than I do to my own government. So it is globalizing democratic values as opposed to economically divisive values.

MM: Going beyond national boundaries seems very important today. When we talk of globalism, frontiers of nations seem unimportant. Yet in your writing you have emphasized the importance of economic self-sufficiency as a necessary condition for the self-esteem of a nation. How does one reconcile the two?

GS: I think they are overlapping realities. For instance, the United States is an overdeveloped nation but within it are third world countries: those of the Native Americans on reservations and the poor in urban ghettos. Moreover, I think

there is a way in which women – wherever we are – are an underdeveloped country: we are low on capital, low on technology and labour intensive; the three measures of underdevelopment. A substantial portion of women could be described in that way. Wherever there are sweatshops, you see this very clearly. In the United States, there are sweatshops as well, and women form about 80 per cent of the work force of these sweatshops, and also of sex-trafficking and labour trafficking.

MM: You have come here after many decades. What kind of changes do you notice?

GS: There are a lot of obvious changes, especially in Delhi, the huge buildings! This time I went to Bangalore, Kerala, Hyderabad... The skyline is different everywhere.

MM: Of course, physically India has changed in many ways, city architecture and all that, but do you notice a change in the people you meet?

GS: Yes, I think so. I hesitate to generalize because I have been here such a short time, but I would say there is a much greater

sense of possibilities, and more confidence, definitely. India was then only a decade into independence, and now it is a great nation among peers. A large slice of the population feels connected to the world via the Internet, though of course globalization has also been a huge penalty for many farmers and others. It also feels different socially. When I was here living in Miranda House, the young women and also the young men were so wary in the company of anyone from the opposite sex other than a family member, that the classrooms were just alive with tension. It is very difficult for people to learn, I think, if there is so much tension. Now there is much more ease and honesty.

IP: In the earlier generation, women like Ela Bhatt or Devaki Jain entered the public arena to make a genuine change in women's lives and to raise issues that needed voices like theirs to articulate them. To me, the level at which they pitched that discourse was nobler and higher than the level now. Now, issues of racism and gender discrimination are discussed at a level which is somehow lower. The other unfortunate thing is that the media is such an obtrusive force that we have forgotten our own minds.

MM: I agree with Ira about the huge influence of the media today which definitely lowers the level of discourse. Yesterday you talked about the censorship by advertisers. What about the censorship of the media which decides what is news and blacks out what, according to them, is not news. They shape people's perceptions and ensure that that they think in a particular way and not in any other way. All this is very much a reality in India.

GS: Yes, and it was pioneered in the United States — the whole emphasis on consumerism, on shortness of attention span, on women's bodies as ornaments, rather than instruments. This is something that we mutually suffer from. We have been fighting it. I think we can use it to teach with and we can fight it in other ways. But the distance between the media and reality is very severe. There is a woman who has been working in Ladakh for about 30 years and she has initiated a kind of reverse Peace Corps. Ladakh's culture is isolated; it has maintained its autonomy and way of life for much longer than the rest of the country. Of course, now that there are roads, Indian popular culture is coming into the region and the world is coming in through television. She arranges

for people from Ladakh to go to the United States to see that it is not like television, that even in the USA there is poverty, there is discontent, there is obesity, there are a lot of people getting cancer. There is over development and there are the penalties of over development plus a lack of economic democracy.

MM: What is your impression of the colloquium of Asian Women Writers, which you have been attending for the last few days?

GS: These writers are speaking with remarkable confidence. It takes a long time to decolonize our minds from whoever the national colonizer was, and it takes even longer to decolonize our minds from patriarchy, which is so universal ... They are doing that, they are speaking in their own voices, telling their own stories, stories that are unacceptable by traditional standards but are true, and personal, and universal, and important. Many of them write in languages other than English, and some are getting translated into English. It is very heartening. I think translating is a revolutionary act. It allows thought to be shared by many more people across the world. There is so much being written in India — we can only

read what is written in English or translated into English. But I see the richness of the regional language and poetry; I hope more is translated so it reaches more people. I do think that the rest of the world is beginning to understand that India is a kind of goldmine of great writing.

MM: You say you can read what is written in English and what is translated into English. But the two sets hardly occupy the same space. Yesterday at the colloquium there was some discussion initiated by Nabaneeta (Dev Sen) about how books from India which are written in English, reach the global market, but books which are translated into English do so very rarely. These are hardly picked up by publishers abroad, hence they do not have a wide circulation. Perhaps mainstream publishers are not interested in translations.

GS: That cannot be true because we read the Russians, and so much else, in translation. I do not know why books from India do not circulate. There is a readership for translation.

MM: You are right. The Latin American boom wouldn't have happened but for translations. Kundera and Orhan Pamuk and Paulo

Coelho are read all over the world in translation. There does indeed exist a world market for books translated into English but for some reason there seems to be no share for India in it.

GS: I wonder why. The only thing that comes to my mind is that books by Indians written in English are written in an English that is different; it is poetic, the imagery is different, the construction is different. So perhaps the Indian language books, when they are translated, tend to get over translated; perhaps they are too literal. Or perhaps they become too English or too American in the process of translation.

MM: Of course, one can say we have a large enough readership within the country not to bother about readership abroad. Yet the difference in the reception of books abroad is somewhat puzzling. It is not that they are necessarily different in kind. Contrary to expectation, literature written in Indian languages is not always about rural areas or about traditional life. In theme and treatment there is no perceptible difference between what is originally written in English and what is written in the other Indian languages.

GS: That is a very interesting observation; I don't have any answer as to why the translations are less popular than Indian writing done originally in English — unless it is just the sheer economic cost of paying for a good translation.

JP: There is also the role of publishers in India. I recently wrote a book on my mother who was a very well-known Hindi writer, and it did very well here. So I asked my publishers why they hadn't thought of sending it to some publisher abroad. I was told that in England, particularly, they are only interested in books from India which have an English connection. If that is your mindset, then I would imagine you are defeated by your own limitations.

MM: Gloria, you have been a writer, the editor of an influential magazine like *Msi*, an activist, as somebody who has worked consistently for changing attitudes and practices in public and private life in your country, and you have lectured extensively around the world. If, at this point of your life, you had to channelize your energy to one particular activity, what would you choose?

GS: A lesson in the opposites, a lesson of reduced importance or value, would be Gandhi himself, most of his writing was just letters, if at all. Our lives are an example; we do what we see, not what we're told. Perhaps that is an old-fashioned idea, or perhaps it is frustration on my part, not having been able to write as much as I wanted to. But if you ask me that now, I will say that it seems to me that writing is an opportunity to go deeper.

GS: Writing. Somehow, speaking seems to me like writing on the wind. I have learnt over time to

MM: In the 1980s, after your book *'Outrageous Acts and Everyday Rebellions'* — you came out with

something quite different — a biography of Marilyn Monroe. How did you happen to take up that project?

GS: On the tenth anniversary of her death, I had written a cover story on her. She is such a mythic figure and I began to think that if there had been a Women's Movement while she was alive, perhaps we could have saved her life. Her mother, who had been abandoned by her father, could not support her. She was sent to foster homes where she was sexually abused. Later she was turned into this stereotype of a sexual icon when what she wanted was to be taken seriously as an actress. She was also made to feel that her career was over at 30. So much that happened to her was an exaggerated version of what happens to all women, so we as women have a rescue fantasy about her. I wanted to write about her for that reason. Then, there were some newly discovered photographs — not wonderful photographs — but made by a very nice man who respected her; those were discovered, and they asked me to write the text for his book of photography.

MM: What were the sources from where you gathered material about her early life?

GS: I tried to interview as many people as I could who knew her, even though I realized such accounts can be unreliable when the subject is not alive. Patricia Newcomb — who worked with her as a publicity agent for many, many years — was, I suspect, the only human being who knew the reality of her death and her relationship with the Kennedys. She wouldn't talk to me but I kept sending her things and asking: Do you think this was how it really happened? Do you recognize Marilyn in this? When she said yes, I felt I was on the right track. I also heard from the son of her psychiatrist whose family she lived with, and he said that he believed that this was the only book that had managed to capture who she was. So I thought I hadn't gone too far wrong.

MM: Did she write diaries or journals or anything that you could use?

GS: No. There were interviews and comments, but nothing as far as I know in the form of a journal.

MM: One book of yours that does not seem to be available in India is your last one, *'Going Beyond Words'*.

GS: This is more like a collection of small books. The essays in this

volume are much longer. There is also a more personal essay is a long essay in which I take all of Freudian work and research and just reverse it. It's called 'What if Freud Were Phyllis?'

There's another about women and money that argues that we will never solve the feminization of poverty unless we solve the masculinization of wealth. I was trying to take on that subject and support the woman in families of inherited wealth who are fighting legally to get their fair share of the money and give it away to women.

'Revaluing Economics' talks about the importance of attributing an economic value to the unpaid work that mostly woman do, and also to the environment.

It tries to make visible the 30 per cent of work in the United States that is done primarily by women: raising children, care giving, taking care of invalids – that is treated as if it had no economic value. Sixty per cent of work in agricultural countries is done by women and not counted at all because it is not monetarized. In fact, we could attribute an economic value at replacement level, and also attribute a value to a tree that is growing and giving us oxygen, not just a tree that has been cut down. So the book is actually a series of essays. There

is also a more personal essay called 'Doing Sixty,' which is where I look back on how living in India changed my life.

MM: You made a statement in one of your books: one great revolution has taken place in our lifetime – now women can do everything that men can do – but the opposite revolution has not yet taken place. We still have to learn that men can do what women do. Until that happens, women will go on having two jobs while men have only one. Have you any further comment on that? Is the situation changing?

GS: I think there are a number of men who are allies in the new revolution because they have come to realize how much they are deprived of closeness to their children and their parents. But their number is still very few, and those men also are penalized by the work pattern. They are penalized in the United States, the only developed country that doesn't have any national system of childcare. It doesn't even have any national system of health care and this penalizes women much more since because of childbearing, we need the health care system about 30 per cent more than men do. So we have a long way to go, but I do think

that the idea is gaining ground. I suspect the change is perceptible more in America than here.

MM: The Women's Movement has succeeded to the extent that I think the present generation – our daughters – do not always think these are causes to fight for. They take for granted the new values that were once bitterly contested. They stand on the ground that has been won by their mothers and agitate for other changes.

GS: I know what you mean, but I think we need to remember two things: one is that activism looks different in their generation than it did in ours. For instance, my generation of women get alarmed that young women are not concerned about the loss of abortion, which is threatened, as you know. But young women are angry because there is no sex education in the schools because our ultra right has suppressed this. They are angry, but about different things.

The second thing is that the pattern of activism for women in general – I just mean culturally, not inevitably – is to be conservative when they are young, and get more radical as they get older. The pattern for men is the reverse: to be rebellious in youth, and get more conservative as they

get older. As men replace their fathers, they gain power, but as we replace our mothers, we lose power. It's not fair to look at young women and expect them to follow the male pattern. The same young women – once they have been in the labour force for a while, once they have children and find out who takes care of them, and who does most of the work – will have a different view. Finally, in many countries, if you look at the public opinion polls, many more young women today are feminists and are more supportive of the issues that we care about, than older women.

MM: In many universities Women's Studies is gaining acceptance as a regular part of curriculum. How do you respond to this development? Do you think that this has helped wider acceptance of gender equality, or – by making the issues theoretical and abstract – is it making feminist ideas a little remote for most people?

GS: Women's history and women's studies are absolutely crucial for all students. Maybe we should call them 'remedial studies,' which is what they really are – and will remain until we have human history and human studies. For instance, in 1976, Devaki and I thought we had a

great idea to take Gandhi's letters and writings and make a little book or pamphlet for women's movements around the world, since his non-violent tactics were so well suited to women's movements. And we were going full steam, interviewing people and so on until we came to Kamaladevi (Chattopadhyaya). She listened to us with great patience and then she said, 'Well, my dear, we taught him everything he knew.' The methods he used were often the methods of the women's movement used in fighting sati and child marriage. The independence movement subsumed and absorbed them, so we end up looking to or waiting for another Gandhi for what we ourselves invented. That is the great penalty of the absence of women's history: you not only have to reinvent the wheel, but you end up by being grateful to men instead of honouring what women have accomplished – and continue to accomplish. There's a quote: 'I honoured dead men for their strength, forgetting I was strong.' In that sense I am very grateful to women's studies – very, very grateful.

The problem comes, I think, not so much from women's studies as from academia itself, which rewards obscurity. In order to get published in academic journals,

in order to fit in with this academic culture, I fear that feminist academics also find themselves writing in a way that is much too obscure. What is the point of writing if no one can take it off the page? I am always threatening to put big signs on all roads to Harvard and Yale that say 'Beware: Deconstruction Ahead!' I understand that 'problematize' is a useful word, but why not just say something is 'a problem'? I understand that 'discourse' is a legitimate word, but why not just say 'talk'? I have an activist-journalist's impatience with obscurantism. I understand that my sister academics may need to write a certain way to get on in the profession. But what distinguished women's studies for me is that the theory came from the practice – not the other way around. We demand that doctors de-mystify their professional words so that we can understand and use their advice. We have a right to demand that academics do the same.

MM: Do you think a healthy interaction is possible between academics and activists?

GS: Of course. Academics are vital to activists in researching and incorporating new bodies of knowledge so they can be

accurate and passed on. In the United States, the first decade of women's studies was spent creating the scholarly underpinning for the insights gained in the activism of the women's movement. The question is: Does an academic work improve the life of more than the one woman who is writing it?

MM: Sometimes I think Women's Studies tend to attract mostly women scholars and women students. Would 'Gender Studies' be a better term since it would also extend the academic scope of the discipline?

GS: Perhaps, but we don't want to lose half the space. For instance, Black Studies might become Race Studies, but one wouldn't want to give half the space to white people, who have most of history anyway. On the other hand, we do want to deal with the reality of white privilege, and there is now a field called White Studies. It's also often power that attracts students. Courses in Wordsworth once attracted more students than those in, say, Tagore because people had been coerced into thinking that anything English was superior. I certainly don't want women to dominate, but I do think that when women are more powerful,

there will be more male students taking women's studies.

MM: In some parts of India today, particularly in the south, caste is perceived as a major factor of social inequality – more important than gender.

GS: There is no competition of tears. Injustice is injustice. The important thing is to see that gender and caste are so intertwined that they have to be fought together. After all, women's bodies are the means of reproduction for caste, which is a major reason why women's freedom is restricted. One injustice also illuminates the other. There is a natural coalition. For instance, untouchability is a special circumstance that exists, as far as I know, only in India, but women suffer all over the world from touchability. In both cases, the problem is having no sanctity, no space, no possession of one's own body; of living in a supposedly inferior body. We also need to explain that all the polarized divisions – good/bad, victor/victim, subject/object – stem from the false division of human nature into the 'masculine' and 'feminine'. Gender politics dig a trench in the mind that normalizes superiority and inferiority.

If in one's own family, one will accept the idea that a brother is more important than a sister, that a father is more important than a mother, we will accept caste, race, class, everything else outside the home. The definition of radical feminism – radical just means going to the root – is that the sex/caste system is a root of class, caste, ethnic [differences], and is necessary to continuing them. Once we see it that way, we can work in coalition together against all forms of injustice.

MM: Certainly, the two issues are not unrelated. Yesterday at the colloquium, Bama (a Dalit writer), said that all Dalit writers have a problem in getting published, but women more so because of the problem of language. Part of the resistant power of Dalit literature comes from the raw idiom used by the writers – close to the language actually used by them in speech – something not accepted in written literature so far. When a woman uses it in her book, she is told that women don't write these words, it would not be acceptable.

GS: When I was here many years ago, I was looking at what was then called untouchability, and the problem of the Dalits, as a problem of exclusion. However, I see now the positive culture that

is represented here and is more ancient and valuable to us all. This situation corresponds to our Native American matrilineal cultures in which women and men were in balance. They inspired the suffrage movement. They were the only place on the North American continent that women could see cultures in which women were equal and were in balance with men. Female elders chose the chief and were part of all decision-making councils. Women controlled their own fertility [a fact], which was common, as far as I can tell, to the original cultures in Africa, to the aborigines in Australia, to the Dravidians. This was pre-patriarchal society, and it is precious and inspirational for us all. It was true for 95 per cent of human history, and it can be again. Perhaps feminism is memory.

I was reading a book by M.C. Raj called *Dalitthink*. He says the most current Dalit demands include the restoration of the primacy of Dalit women in governance, five acres of land for each Dalit family registered in the name of the woman, and building a global alliance with other original cultures. In one wonderful phrase he talks about Brahminization and globalization – and of course, they are the same thing, just a few millennia

apart! It's a very down-to-earth book of philosophy; a perfect balance of head and heart.

MM: Let me shift gear and come back to your lecture at IIC yesterday. You mentioned a woman who said: When I get angry I have tears in my eyes. That is my problem, too.

Because if you have tears in your eyes you are looked at as a weak person. This is a familiar problem relating to popular perceptions of behaviour. How did this woman solve it?

GS: She got angry, cried and kept talking. She said, 'You think am crying because I am sad; I am not sad, this is the way I get angry. I am angry.' Part of the problem is that we don't express anger when we are first angry; we wait and wait and wait until we're backed against the wall, and by that time we swallow so much that we explode. So part of the solution is saying it right away. But I never forgot that woman.

I thought it was such a genius solution! And why not? What's wrong with tears? Actually tears lengthen your life because they get rid of stress chemicals. Part of the reason men may live less long is because they are afraid to cry.

We can find public solutions to what we think are private problems. As long as we think they are private, we blame ourselves, but when we talk about them, we discover that most of them are not private and we can get solutions from each other.

MM: After listening to you yesterday I wanted to tell you that not only are you a brilliant speaker, you have the unusual capacity of picking up an inane question and giving it relevance and value through your response. They had a session for you at the writers' colloquium and, by the end of it, you made everybody a part of it and that was great.

GS: It is very important that we make a circle, not just a hierarchy of speaker and audience. I'm rewarded because then I also get to learn.

MM: Are you ready for another book?

GS: I have a book called *Road to the Heart* about being an organizer on the road in America. It's nine years overdue now, but my on-the-road life is due to India, so I'm going home to work on it.