

A C T U P O R A L H I S T O R Y P R O J E C T

A PROGRAM OF
**MIX – THE NEW YORK LESBIAN &
GAY EXPERIMENTAL FILM FESTIVAL**

Interviewee: **Stephen Spinella**

Interview Number: **139**

Interviewer: **Sarah Schulman**

Date of Interview: **July 18, 2012**

ACT UP Oral History Project
Interview of Stephen Spinella
July 18, 2012

SARAH SCHULMAN: So start by telling us your name, your age, today's date, and where we are.

STEPHEN SPINELLA: Stephen Spinella, and my age is fifty-five. I think that's right. The date is July 18th, 2012 — 2012 — and we are in my apartment in Harlem, at 113th and Malcolm X Boulevard.

Q: Great. And thank you for welcoming us early in the morning – not an actor time.

SS: Oh, it's my pleasure.

If you hand me that cellphone, I will turn it off, because it will start doing that and there's no –

Q: So, where did you grow up?

SS: I grew up in Glendale, Arizona, which is a suburb of Phoenix, on the west side of Phoenix. It was a small, mostly agricultural town. We moved there in 1960, and then in the sixties, the fifties and sixties, they started building Sun City. So it was sort of in the vanguard of the retirement lifestyle that moved in, that entire cohort of people that moved into Arizona and has completely destroyed all of their politics.

Q: So basically you grew up with the sixties on television, but not around you. Would you say that that's accurate?

SS: Yes, yes, yes. Yes.

Q: And did your family — how did they respond to all those kinds of events, like when you were sitting there and Martin Luther King was assassinated?

SS: My dad was a really, really smart guy, who proudly said that he'd never voted for a president that didn't win. So I guess you could say he had his pulse on what the average American was going to do, his finger on the pulse. You know, I mean, he gave my sister a hard time when she worked for Hubert Humphrey in '68, and when Robert Kennedy was assassinated, he said it was the best thing that could ever have happened to him, meaning that he was never going to achieve much more than what he had already achieved and that this was going to put him over the top in terms of history. I don't think there was anything mean, necessarily, about Robert. Well, that's pretty mean. But he voted for LBJ and he voted for everyone who won.

Then he died in '69. Then it was just mostly dealing with my aunt and my mom, which was more of a miasma. I mean, it was like there was no clear sense of what the outside world was because we were dealing with my mom's interior world.

Q: So did you grow up with any sense of community?

SS: Community among—I mean, there were a variety of communities. There was the people I went to school with, which was probably the most intense, my peer group, and then there was the neighborhood, which was a different sort of thing, the people in your class. But in terms of politics and the world —

Q: Or church?

SS: No church, no. Catholic, but we never went.

Q: Because when you look ahead to the fact that you joined ACT UP, and let's just be clear that very few people did really, right? It's largest demonstration was seven thousand people at St. Patrick's Cathedral.

SS: Right.

Q: So one of things that we're interested in is why the people who went to ACT UP did so, and I'm wondering where in your life you start to see yourself identifying with other people, believing that change is possible, developing some kind of political commitment or at least hope.

00:05:00

SS: You know, I think for me it was the only sense that I had of really a larger world outside of my world was actually Mass. When I went to Mass, I had a sense that there was a greater subtlety and complexity in things than was apparent in day-to-day life, and that always existed in the background. And then when I discovered theater, there were a whole series of skills that you needed to have that you — little what they seemed liked tricks at first, but when you studied them more, you became aware of that they were much more deeply rooted, interesting ideas about the way people behave, and that added complexity to the way I was seeing the world.

Then when I was in high school, my sophomore year was the '72 presidential election, and I worked for Richard Nixon. As we were driving home one day, the woman who was running the Nixon reelection campaign in Glendale High School, Colleen, there were five of us in the car, and she said — and I'll never forget it — she said, "I think we're working for the wrong person." And it was shocking to me. It meant that there were layers of information, that when you got to a subtler layer of information you could read that in a different way than the apparent layer could be read. And that was stunning to me, because she was kind of a little bit of a hero for me, and that she would say that after we had invested all this emotional energy in Richard Nixon,

that she would say that was really shocking to me and kind of — I've never forgotten it. I can remember the moment sitting in the car.

Then when I went to college, there was a guy on my hall in the dorm who said — we went to hear Lillian Hellman speak, and she was kind of amazing. She did a very funny thing about Richard Nixon. And I liked this guy. He wasn't my best friend, but I liked him. And we were talking about something, and he just laid into me, just like, "Do you know what happened in this country four years ago? Do you know what this country is? Have you paid any attention to anything that has been going on?" And that was really shocking and scary, and I felt like an idiot.

Then when I got to graduate school, I tried, but it's so hard to know where to look. I tried to understand what was going on, but where do you start? What book do you read? How do you select the book that you are going to read? Someone once said about Vanessa Redgrave, she was a voracious reader, but she never read the right thing, and that it took her years to start reading the right thing. It's like that question of where do you start on the — how do find the path to the path that leads you to the road that takes you to the — you know what I mean? How do you find — and it's really hard.

Then it wasn't really until I got to graduate school and I met Tony Kushner, and he and Kimberly Flynn, and they said, "Read this, read this, read this. Think about this." And that opened up a whole way of thinking that finally felt right.

Q: Well, there's something in the actor profession where you have to be persuasive on any terms. In a way, that's your job. And a writer, obviously, is

the opposite, right? They have to have some kind of set point of view from which to approach –

SS: Oh, I see what you're saying. Yes.

Q: So it's interesting that there are some actors who are politically involved, but actually quite few, and it's interesting. I think about who was in ACT UP. There were a lot of writers, very few professional actors. I'm just wondering what was different about you, that somehow you stepped out of that fear or that mold.

SS: I don't know. I'm really angry, I guess. Reno. It was Reno's idea to go, and my shrink's. My shrink said the only — we went right after Gay Pride 1987, I think, and he said, "The only people who had any energy at Gay Pride this year," this is my shrink talking, "were the people of color and ACT UP." They were the only ones who had any passion or any teeth, and so that was —

Is that David listening to something?

JH: Yes. He seems to be doing something.

Q: Could you ask him to close the door? Sorry.

So had you ever been involved in a political organization before or any kind of — aside from Richard Nixon's campaign?

SS: I worked for the David Rothenberg campaign for City Council in 1984, I think that was. Might have been '85. And then right after that, one of the people who was working for that campaign, Gary — what was his last name? He and I and a third person, Bill, started this gay study group up at Columbia, because they had access to

the money that the Gay Alliance had at Columbia because they were running those dances, and they had this enormous amount of money. And we started this study group, and we wanted to know what the highfalutin thinking was around being gay, and so we read Carole Vance, and we read Simon and Gagnon, and we read theories about sexuality and theories about desire, and we read Foucault and we read, like, all that. And then we would get together and we would talk about it. But that wasn't really political. That was trying to get a sort of framework on what it meant to be gay.

Then one of the people I met in that group, David Winters, I think his name, David Winters, he was working for GMHC, was HIV-positive, and he was somebody — I started working on a project with him for GMHC about finding alternative medicines for — well, it was 1986, and there was nothing. So we started doing research into what you could possibly do so that GMHC could have some kind of resource for people to use if they wanted to try some of this stuff. And so we started working on that.

And then about a year after that is when Reno said, "Let's go to an ACT UP meeting," and so we went to the ACT UP meeting and then joined the Issues Committee.

Q: Okay. So tell us about the Issues Committee. Who was in it and what did you guys do?

SS: Well, Herb Spiers was running it, and, gosh, I don't remember.

Q: You used to meet in his loft.

SS: Yes, we used to meet in his loft. I don't really remember a lot about what we did. It was so hard to put your finger on what to do, because all I remember is

there was someone in the room who kept saying, “We don’t have the science. They haven’t done the science. We can’t solve these problems until they do the science,” which was very discouraging.

But at the same time, it was like the beginning. You had to carve out. It was the same thing as before. What book do you read? You had to carve out your path, and that process of being in that room and trying to figure out what are we going to argue for? What are we going to advocate for? What are the things that we need to really be advocating for? What should we be fighting for? And how do we move this thing forward? And it was really hard. It was like teaching somebody to read.

Q: There was so much responsibility, because I remember the debates in ACT UP about AZT, for example, right? If you’re advocating for AZT, then all the people are dying from lymphoma. If you’re telling people not to take it, then what are you asking them to do? So as soon as ACT UP or as soon as any committee or you would get behind a particular agenda, it’s an enormous responsibility.

SS: Responsibility and having to deal with the complexities of that issue. I mean, nothing was black and white. It was like the argument that we had, that incredible debate that we had about nonviolent or not nonviolent.

Q: Can you tell us about that?

SS: Well, it was incredibly — I was absolutely convinced that we had to be nonviolent, and we had this immense — I mean, it was so intense, and we took that vote and it lost, and it felt devastating to me.

Q: Okay. You need to back up, because I don't remember this –

SS: Oh my god. Oh really?

Q: , and nobody's told us about it. Who put it on the table or how did they put it on the table?

SS: I don't remember. But I remember I think Maxine — no, I don't remember. I remember Maxine had a big voice in it, but I don't remember whether she was nonviolent or not nonviolent.

Q: Is this when Larry said we should take up arms like the Irgun? Was this that speech?

SS: I have no idea. I have no memory of that. But I do remember it was the passions ran very, very high, and it was inconceivable to me that I would be in a group of people where some people were saying, "We should not vote that we are nonviolent. There may come a time where that is a vote we will regret." And, I mean, that was essentially the argument, and it was kind of extraordinary. I just thought, you know, "Gandhi, Martin Luther King. Why wouldn't we want to emulate those guys?" And yet they voted it down. They voted putting nonviolent into our description. They voted it down.

The first person I saw after that, I was devastated, and the first person I saw after that was David Barr, and David said, "Ah, well, democracy at work." And it was just like that [snaps fingers]. It was just, like, "Yeah, I guess that's right." I mean, that's fundamentally what we're doing here, what ACT UP really is. You can't have ACT UP outside of this kind of political structure that we are part of. You can't have

ACT UP in the Dominican Republic under Trujillo. You can't do it. You've got to have a democracy. You've got to have a place where people have the right to assemble and do this kind of thing.

And in doing that, in that liberal ideal where you can believe you can live together with people who have different ideas, we embodied it, and that we had voted it down suddenly became this incredibly — I mean, I romanticize everything, but it became this incredibly right, yeah, absolutely, and we can still function and we can still be a group. We can still work together. Some of us believe this, others of us believe this. We can coexist together believing two different things.

Q: But also ACT UP was never violent. They remained nonviolent through their entire time.

SS: Yes, exactly. Yes, exactly. But it was the idea that we would purposefully vote down that we would describe ourselves as nonviolent, that we by a majority didn't want to attach that to who we were. And I thought that was extraordinary. And I don't know. I don't know if that makes us better or worse. I don't know if you can quantify it, but it certainly made the sitting in a room with people — it's the liberal idea, sitting in a room with people who disagree with you, and you can still function together, and who have different ideas, and you can still function together as long as you accept certain basic rules.

Q: At what point did you believe that ACT UP could actually change the situation?

SS: I always believed it.

Q: From the beginning, you had faith?

SS: Yes, I always believed it. I always—

Q: What was it about it?

SS: Because I believe it's possible.

Q: But was there something about — you had been at GMHC and then you came back —

SS: I had only worked with David on a project for GMHC. I never actually — I think I was in the building twice. But I just have always believed that things could change. I just have always believed that if — I just always believed it. I believed that if we went out there and we were vocal enough and we had the right ideas and we got heard, that the logic and the truth of what we were saying would win out, that we would have to be listened to. I don't necessarily think that's true of all movements, but I felt that that was true of that one. I mean, once I joined, I had great faith that it was going to work, otherwise I wouldn't have kept going.

Q: Do you remember any particular victories that were really encouraging, or setbacks?

SS: No, I don't remember ever feeling like this wasn't going to work, that we weren't going to change something. I remember being at meetings and people would say, "I saw the Silence = Death sticker at the tollbooth on the way to Poughkeepsie," and everybody cheered, and it was like a victory. And it *was*, because somebody was actually piercing through the cloud. People were actually getting through the miasma, and you think about that and you see that, and you think, oh, well, somebody's just done some

graffiti. Then you see somebody with a tag on or a button on, or you see something on TV about it, and things begin to connect. I mean, that's how I think.

Q: Were you in an affinity group?

SS: That was Gran Fury. Is that what you're saying, an affinity group?

Q: Well, they're like the Marys. There were the Costas.

SS: No, no.

Q: You didn't do that?

SS: No.

Q: Did you ever get arrested?

SS: No. I laid down on — I'm the only person who did this. I laid down on the floor of St. Patrick's Cathedral, and then when they came over and said, "If you don't get up, we're going to arrest you," I got up. And all the people, all the parishioners around me were like, "Oh, well, he got up. Oh, look it, they just should arrest him anyway. He got up." But I couldn't get arrested, because I had to go to L.A. to do a version of *Angels* that we were doing out in L.A. So, literally, the next day I had to fly to Los Angeles, so I couldn't get arrested.

Q: So considering what Mass had given you in your life, how did you make the decision to disrupt St. Patrick's?

SS: Well, I had stepped away from the Catholic Church a long time before that, and I thought I was really furious at the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church is a large and very complicated entity that does a lot of good, but the Catholic Church around these issues was horrific and still is horrific. And I thought it was the right thing to do,

and I thought I was fully in support of them doing that. I thought it was absolutely the right thing to do.

Q: So you were simultaneously in two communities that were devastated by AIDS: the theater community and ACT UP.

SS: Uh-huh.

Q: But they treated it really differently. In the theater community, there was a lot of silence for a long time, right? People were afraid to come out or to come out as HIV-positive, and the organizing didn't start till later.

SS: Uh-huh.

Q: So how did you balance these two realities that were having oppositional reactions?

SS: Well, I guess because my theater career really didn't start until the nineties, and so I was in this period between graduate school and when *Angels* went to Broadway, when *Angels* started, where I really wasn't a part of the theater community. I did a couple of plays, but I really wasn't a part of—I was a cater waiter, and I did a function for Actors Equity. They had a big dinner, and all of the producers were there, and it was huge. Meryl Streep was there, and it was like it was this big hoity-toity thing. It was probably around 1988, '89, maybe even earlier, '87, because Colleen Dewhurst — it was when Colleen Dewhurst was the president of Actors Equity.

I remember David Rounds saying — he died of AIDS a few years later, several years later. No, it wasn't David Rounds. It was — shit, it was somebody else. Anyway, all of this is jumbled. But Colleen Dewhurst got up and in her speech she

literally leaned onto the podium as though she was in like a private back room somewhere, and she said, “Listen. We got to deal with this. I know you’re all — I know there are different opinions out there, but we’ve got to step up to the plate.” And she just talked to them like they were at a bar having — and they were a little drunk and they were all like going —and she –

[Electronic music starts playing.] Shit, shit. Hand me my iPad.

Q: Colleen Dewhurst said, “We have to deal with this.”

SS: So we’re at this, and there are hundreds and hundreds of people here, and she got up and she just, like — she just, like, laid into them. It wasn’t aggressive. It was just so matter-of-fact and so with her finger on the pulse of exactly what was going wrong and exactly the old-timers who didn’t want to deal with “the gay thing” and didn’t want to deal with the illness thing and who wanted to pretend like the world was the same world that it was in 1965. And that’s who she was talking to, and she knew all those people and she was speaking to them personally and from this podium.

It was like every single waiter — I mean, you know, I was a waiter. Every single waiter in that place, it was just like we all went “Brrup” [sits up at attention], and it was intense, and it was the first time that I ever got any sense that there was something different happening in the theater community, and really the only time, because when I got into the theater community, I got into the theater community with *Angels in America*, and so I never heard any of that bullshit.

And in fact — in fact, I remember there was a Robert Brustein article about Frank Rich, trashing Frank Rich. I read that article, and this is probably the very

early nineties, late eighties, early nineties. And I was like, I was like – this entire article is trashing Frank Rich, and every single playwright that he mentions that shouldn't be championed by Frank Rich is gay. Every single playwright he's mentioned is gay. What the fuck is that?

There was a — that was another eye-opener for me. I always expected the theater community to be incredibly gay-positive. Then when I — when I got the first Tony and I thanked my husband at the Tony Awards, every question I got after I got off that stage — because you go back and do this press thing. Every question I got was — every interviewer asked me, “Did it take a lot of nerve to thank your boyfriend up there? Was that something you had really planned on doing, and were you making a political statement?” I mean, it was 1993. The degree, it's seventeen, eighteen, fifteen — seventeen, nineteen years. The world has totally changed in terms of those gay issues now. And HIV/AIDS was all wrapped up in that and had its own special bow.

Q: I want to ask you something. This is a real question, actually, a question that I personally have about this. Like in almost any field if you come out as gay, it's a disadvantage. There's very few fields where it advantageous. But there's something about the rhetoric around the theater where many actors justify staying in the closet because they think it's a special case, that somehow they would lose more, or they have more at stake, or we're all supposed to understand. And I've never really understood that. Do you have insight into that?

SS: Well, I think the argument about not being publicly gay for certain actors is once the audience knows that you're gay, that the fear is that they won't be able

to see you as straight, that when a straight guy plays a gay character, you can sit back — it's based on a level of homophobia. The people thinking about the audience thinks that the audience can feel comfortable with the straight guy playing the gay guy, because they know he's straight, but the audience will feel uncomfortable with the gay playing the straight guy because they know he's gay, and that there's a disconnect about what the actor is able to do and that they don't think that the actor is able to convince the — there was the big thing about the writer for *Time* magazine who said, "I can't watch Jonathan Groff play a straight character because he's just so obviously gay."

It was the whole reason that Sean Hayes and Kristin Chenoweth made out at the Tony Awards, was because this guy said, "I can never believe that Sean Hayes is straight when he —."

Q: Right. I don't want to belabor it, but, I mean, it's true in any profession. I'm a teacher. If you come out in front of the classroom, you lose authority with certain people, right? If you're a doctor, there are some people who don't want a gay doctor touching them, right?

SS: Right.

Q: So in every profession, it's detrimental, but there's something about actors where it's supposed to be special.

SS: Well, because you don't get the job.

Q: Okay.

SS: You don't get the opportunity to do it if they think that that is going to get in the way of you — of the audience seeing you in the role. And especially if you

play a character that is sexualized, that is, has to, has to convincingly be in love with this woman or this man. Although I think it works less — I think it's less — I think it's less about lesbians than it is about gay men. I think they — because a lot of this is men thinking about this, and when men think about this, it's like — when men think about this, they think about, well, you know, lesbians are only lesbians because they haven't found the right guy.

Q: Right.

SS: And it's that ancient cliché. And then there's something hot about it, so it's a muddle and it's a mess.

I came out. I did this movie, and I, for the first time in my life, hired a press agent. The press agent got me an interview with Larry King, and I went on *Larry King*, and I thought, "Wow, I'm on *Larry King* for this little tiny movie." Then I realized the reason I was on *Larry King* was because the second or third question he asked me was about *Angels in the America*, the movie that had just — the HBO thing. "How come you're not in that? Why aren't you in that? You're young." I said I was a little too old, and he said, "No, you're young," blah, blah, blah. And then he said, "There are no gay actors in this *Angels in America*, in this movie. Do you think that a straight actor can play a gay character?"

And I said, "Sure, of course, because I also think that a gay actor can play a straight character." And I said, "I'm gay and I do play straight characters, and I like playing straight characters."

But then after I got off the show, I realized that I should have said the other half of that, and that is that, “But I do have a problem that this movie doesn’t have any gay actors in it. I think that what a gay actor will bring to a gay character is a breadth of cultural knowledge and community knowledge that a straight actor just is not going to have any access to.” And I think that you lose a great deal about that, and because gay people, at least my generation, had to wear masks, we know what the straight world looks like, but the straight actor playing a gay character they only have like a stereotyped idea of what the gay world is like.

Q: Well, it’s interesting, because you were in ACT UP, which is this huge community of gay people saving each other’s lives, and then you’re in *Angels in America*, which is one of many, many representations of AIDS, in which that community really isn’t at play, and gay people are presented as alone or in some cases dependent on straight people to help them. And it’s the same thing in *Philadelphia*, right? He’s dependent on the homophobic lawyer to save him.

SS: Ah.

Q: Or Prior is dependent on the Reaganite Mormon to take him to the emergency room. But in your real life in ACT UP, gay people were doing all those things for each other.

SS: Right.

Q: So I’m just wondering how you negotiated that kind of weird through the looking glass —

SS: I never thought of that. That never occurred to me. That never occurred to me. And also because Prior, while he — he does have — look, it's a play, you can't really put fifty people on the stage. But he does have his best friend who is gay. But I never really thought of that.

Q: Is this because straight people are very comfortable with the idea that gay people are alone and that they betray each other? It's a cliché, right?

Anyway —

SS: That's a conversation you should have with Tony.

Q: No, no. But it's not just in *Angels in America*; it's pervasive through almost all the mainstream representations of AIDS. That's the paradigm.

SS: Right.

Q: Yes. But, you know, in ACT UP, it's the opposite.

SS: Right.

Q: Yes. So it's just a really interesting — anyway, moving on —

SS: I have never thought of that.

Q: Okay.

SS: That's really — but then, I mean, anyway. All right.

Q: Anyway, let's keep going. Okay.

SS: Yes.

Q: So, after the Issues Committee and the Herb Spiers loft experience, did you go and did you work on any specific projects in ACT UP?

SS: Then Mark Harrington and I and Jim Eigo and — who else worked on it? We created the FDA handbook for the big demo at the FDA, and that was a big event.

Q: So you were involved with conceptualizing parallel track, the whole concept of expanded access?

SS: No. I mostly worked on the background of the creation of the FDA and how the FDA functions and how we got to the place that we are now or were then with the FDA. And then I think Jim and Mark worked on what we were asking the FDA to do. So that's mostly —

Q: We interviewed Garance [Franke-Ruta]. Remember Garance?

SS: Oh, yes, Garance.

Q: She was saying that ironically what we wanted the FDA ended up helping corporate pharmaceuticals because they had lower level of proof —

SS: Right, right.

Q: — in the long term, even though we needed that, those changes. It was a huge victory for us.

SS: Right.

Q: Yes. So that was an irony.

SS: Right. It was the double-blind study and all that sort of stuff where they needed people to get on those drugs simply because that was their only chance.

Q: And did you have any issues about standing at a government building and raging at it?

SS: No, it seemed like the most joyful thing that I could do at that particular point in my life. Still.

Q: So I don't want to take too much time, just a few more questions.

Did you friends in ACT UP who died of AIDS while you were there?

SS: No, no.

Q: So you were never involved in caring for them?

SS: You know, honestly, I didn't know — I didn't have a large number of — very few friends, actually, who died of AIDS before — well, really ever, really ever. I wasn't in that community in New York in the eighties. I didn't know a lot of those guys. I had a very small group of friends that I hung out with, and none of us were HIV-positive. We read about it, and I remember sitting in my friend's apartment in the summer of '83, I think it was, fall of '83 or spring of '83, and we read Larry's article in *The Native* and just sat there stunned, just like what the — but I didn't know a lot of those people. I didn't go to the Saint. I never went to the Saint. So, I mean, not to say that everybody went to the Saint, but I wasn't in that circle, and so I didn't. Or any of those circles. And I wasn't into that theater circle where a lot of people died. I had this kind of strangely insulated group.

It wasn't really until that I was in that gay study group that I started meeting a lot of people who were HIV-positive, so I didn't know a lot of people who died. Then I got into ACT UP, and a lot of the people I've met in ACT UP, I don't — I can't think of any of them that have passed away. I mean, a lot of them — I know I've heard of a few of them along the way who've passed away, but I didn't really. Thank

god. But it's like I didn't go through that thing that a lot of – like my friend David Hay had to move. He had to leave New York. It was just too much. It was just, like, you know, thirty, fifty, sixty, seventy.

Q: But there's a critical mass of people in ACT UP who are like you. They just joined ACT UP because it was a historical cataclysm, and they stood up to it, not because it was themselves or their boyfriend of something like that.

SS: But, you know, on the other hand, I don't want to — I don't want to elevate my impulse.

Q: No, I'm elevating it.

SS: Well, thank you. But, really, I went to ACT UP because I had spare time, it seemed like a cool thing to do, meeting a lot of new people. And then you would get in that room, and that room was like — I don't know. It was like the best drug ever. It was like it was people who believed in something, who worked together, who were ferocious, and who were gay, and who were and fighting with an enormous amount of energy and intelligence. And it was thrilling. I pity anybody who wasn't there. I can't believe anybody could go to three of those meetings and then not go back. It was just where else would you want to be? It just seemed, apart from the good stuff that we were doing, the just fight we were fighting, it was incredibly exciting. It was a place where you could — everything came together. It was like everything they told you about what it must have been like to be in the revolution. I mean, to fight for the Union. I mean, to liberate Auschwitz. It was like everything they told you, and we were doing it.

Q: So I just have one last question. So looking back, what do you think of as ACT UP's greatest achievement and what do you think was its biggest disappointment?

SS: I think ACT UP's greatest achievement was Bill Clinton standing up at the Democratic National Convention and saying, "Healthcare is a right," in 1992. I think that is directly related to ACT UP. And the biggest failure, I don't know, we didn't cure AIDS.

Q: Okay. Thank you.

SS: Sure