In a recently published book-length interview with Jorge Luis Borges, the Argentine poet discusses how he had first met Federico García Lorca when they both were young and the poet reacted with an instant dislike to the Spanish poet-playwright.

*Lorca wanted to astonish us, he said, and he was obviously very much troubled about a very important subject: his role in the contemporary world. A character in which you could see the future of America's life. And then he went on in this way: I will say this. This is the character who is yourself, Mickey Mouse, I suppose he was trying to be clever, And though you may say that you might say you are very young and you want to astonish somebody. But after all, we were a generation that had no need, he could have talked in a different way. But when he started in about Mickey Mouse being a symbol of a revolution, I remember that line of mine there and he looked at me and I looked at him and we both knew that we had been both too old for that kind of thing.*

*In Dennis Hopper's EASY RIDER, Hopper makes his semi-chronicle gastro-coupe bigger. He has a character who is constant-ly staring into the future. The Hopper movies of the Twenties always included a scene of a whimsical character actor getting into a car, yelling into a megaphone, making faces, and finally cooking out. Today we have Jack Nicholson, the small town, AC/DC layover, mumma's boy, getting high on grass, making faces, and finally cooking out. The sentiments are the same, and so are the buggies.*

*When the freshly-turned-on Nicholson is murdered and Peter Fonda muses something about his being a good man I thought I could see for one fleeting moment, in double exposure, the bulbous figure of John Wayne hoe-vering over the traitor-wal- ler Brennan's fresh grave. We are deep in the heart of the West when Fonda visits a hippie commune and tells the seed- ewing inhabitants, "They're going to make it.*

*Instead of the musical redundancies of Max Steiner, we now have Jimi Hendrix and the Hopper reveries to reinforce the film's overt sexual passages, One could take such triple passages in a dual spirit if Hopper hadn't revealed his sensitivity to be soppor-tic at most every turn. He created the siren of a horse with the changing of the American mood, a mix of modal riddles, and a spiritual Christian in (all of placed) a whorehouse.*

*Hopper's idea of making point is something like this: Long tracking-shot of poor black blouses, Even poor Blandy Kramer, who is ever-ridden by film students' sick example of liberal preoccupations, is more than worth the effort, this film finds no new metaphors for the drug culture, but simply steals movie stars' hoary hoary situations to the contemporary screen. The liberal cliches have changed, but they are still cliches. Hopper's villain is every liberal's favorite scapegoat: the redneck, there is no need for motivation, characterize, or develop. The Alligers—movie part has taught us that Southern poor whites commit such heinous crimes as a matter of course. Fonda has said that they could have just as well sit killing in the North, This is true, but it would have made Hopper define his villains more precisely (unless he wanted to transport Southerners to the North), not merely have deprived him of the fun of wriggling the Southern stereotype. Surrounding by magistrates (azure sign of decadence) and speaking in a drawl, the redneck is the ideal villain for a jive-director being for that villain woods-like being against, for plot sake, LOVE.*

*The college students who complain about Sidney Poitier's two-dimensional Superape goldie up to Hopper's point with its qualms, I guess it matters which side of the paranoia fence you are on.*

*A friend of mine who likes EASY RIDER* admits the film is superficial, but says, *That's the beauty of it, It gets you after one inch into these hippie characters, but there is all there is to them anyway.* I refuse to believe that anyone is an easipheal as Hopper's hippies and rednecks— even when they act that way. There are feelings (perhaps undetectable) that I share with both groups and I want a film to ex-plore and understand that identification.*

*What makes EASY RIDER look like every other gutless piece of Hollywood marxism liberal is Hopper's refusal to play with anything but a stacked deck. You cannot lose when you play stereotypes against straw men. The problem for a propagandist like Hopper is that humans are always more interesting than slogans and to risk theatricality is to risk failure. If the characterization is too honest the audience might not identify with the right group, as is the first half of Lee McCarey's 1920s soft-communist film, *My Son John,* where McCarey portrayed communist Robert Walker too one-dimensionally, (one can image the format of EASY RIDER being used to convey any type of agit-prop. It could be a Nazi film with Hitler and Göring evoking their choppers through the Rhineland, finally gunned down by a rabbi, mokey, heartily-accorded.**
group of Jewish bankers, scientists, and artists (at least it would have been funny that way). At the risk of being facetious one could say that "Easy Rider" was a Sam Yorty fund-raising film. The right-wing voters would have liked Mayor Sam's coiffers after one viewing. There is no danger that conservatives would be moved or changed by seeing the film; they react as automatically as the leftists.

"Easy Rider" deals with the most important issues facing America—and for that reason its superficiality is the more deplorable. I find it helpful to make a distinction between documentary and fiction films about political trends, I recently saw a powerful documentary called "American Revolution 2" which dealt with an attempt to unite two ghetto militant organizations, one poor Southern white, the other the Panthers. "American Revolution 2" goes no deeper into its characters than "Easy Rider" and is just as superficial, yet I was much more affected by it than by "Easy Rider". There is a need for an honest portrayal of events which, however superficial, can inform viewers of trends around the country. But when a filmmaker weaves people and places out of his own imagination, he is responsible for much more—he is responsible for their souls and minds as well as their actions.

"Easy Rider" would have been a powerful film if Hopper had been able to catch these events as they happen (and I don't doubt they do happen) but as a work of art and imagination it falls completely short, I demand more of art than I do of life; I desire the sensitivity and insight that only an artist can give. And the more important the subject matter, the more crucial that insight becomes.

If the mass media decides to exploit the Hopper-Fonda paranoia it will acquire something as worthless as last year's mod fashions and nude plays, Hopper and Fonda are in the infancy with the idea of themselves as pundits, Christ's, martyrs, and Porky Pigs to examine their heroes, villains, or themselves—and this form of harmless paranoia is easily stolen and marketed throughout the media, But we are all too old for this kind of game, no?