

The best articles of Goic's book are those devoted to Pineda de Bascañán and his masterpiece *Cautiverio feliz*. Goic wrote an insightful introduction to an exceptional critical edition of the text by Mario Ferreccio Podestá and Raïssa Kordic Riquelme (2001). His comments on *Cautiverio feliz*, his analysis of a recently found text, and especially the extremely well organized bibliography are useful references for investigators, students and the general public. The article on Chilean testamentary documents is a welcome, if brief, addition to underutilized documents which reveal, as Goic indicates, information on socio-economic status, as well as social and religious customs of the period; a mention here of the last wills and testaments of Catalina de los Ríos y Lisperguer, the infamous "La Quintrala," would have added an incentive to investigate further this fascinating area.

Goic is not a newcomer to colonial literature and his contributions in this area are noteworthy; however, the articles are like skipping stones that touch only on a few aspects of his subject and fall short of what the Introduction promises. Ultimately, the volume is more interesting for its parts than as a whole. One wishes his introduction could have been the gateway to a more thorough and well-developed book.

City University of New York, Lehman College
Bronx, New York

PATRICIO LERZUNDI

In Excess: Sergei Eisenstein's Mexico. By Masha Salazkina. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009. Pp. x, 222. Illustrations. Notes. Bibliography. Index. \$40.00 cloth.

In *The Originality of the Avant-Garde* (1985), Rosalind Krauss denounced the scholarly practice of approaching avant-garde artists as singular exceptions, disconnected from the cultural milieu in which they had created their works. Krauss also noted that scholars gave priority to male artists, paying little attention to women artists. Masha Salazkina overcomes these problems by looking at Sergei Eisenstein's *¡Que Viva México!* as a work drawing from a complex net of intertwined international connections of Soviet, U.S., and Mexican artists. In addition to establishing links between Eisenstein and Mexican-U.S. anthropology of the early to mid-1920s, Salazkina deepens our understanding of Eisenstein's connection to Mexican artistic practices, including that of Adolfo Best Maugard, and to the government's discourse on the importance of indigenous peoples to a national identity.

This book features key women intellectuals and artists of the 1920s working on projects similar to Eisenstein's. While the importance of the ideas of anthropologist Anita Brenner have been pointed out by Aurelio de los Reyes in *El nacimiento de ¡Que viva México!* (2006), Salazkina takes that relationship a step further by suggesting that Brenner was Eisenstein's interlocutor. The author also highlights women artists who were working on issues similar to the ones included in *¡Que viva México!* For instance, Katherine Anne Porter's *Hacienda* (1931) takes on the harsh life of peons at maguey plantations, as Eisenstein's novella "Maguey" does, and gives it a critical edge. Furthermore, Salazkina's work convincingly demonstrates that although Eisenstein includes women characters in his film, he does not create them as subjects.

The book's most important contribution, however, is to provide a solid ground from which to read *¡Que viva México!* as a complex modernist text that combines elements from vernacular and avant-garde modernism. Salazkina examines the way in which Eisenstein combines the premodern (the primitive, pre-Columbian cultures) with the ultramodern (the shock of modernization, movement, industrial technology). In particular, she looks at the tension generated by their interaction.

The structure of the book, however, does not contribute to Salazkina's overall clever, well-sustained analysis. She explains that her four chapters (Prologue, Sandunga, Fiesta-Maguey, and Epilogue) follow Eisenstein's film script, since the sequential order of the novellas was important for Eisenstein's theoretical work. While this claim may be true, the order misleads the reader into thinking that the author is attempting an *interpretation* of Eisenstein's work, and not an exploration of Eisenstein's cultural field. And most importantly, it undermines her insightful goal of illustrating the unresolved tension between the ultramodern and the premodern. The script's sequential order suggests the idea of progression and resolution, whereas Salazkina's overarching project is to stress unresolved tension, not resolution.

One aspect that deserves special attention is Salazkina's approach to the tension in Eisenstein's project through an examination of the sensorial experience of the body of the spectator. Salazkina defends the position that tension surfaces in the film as excess specifically related to the baroque aesthetic. The baroque, on the one hand, comes from Eisenstein's preference for the overdone, and, on the other, from his use of Mexican architecture. The combination of the two results in a film that directly affects the senses of the spectator, and not just the intellect. Salazkina claims that "the very *excess* evident in *¡Que Viva México!* can serve as a governing metaphor in Eisenstein's cinematic theory and practice at large" (p. 3). For Salazkina, excess can also mean waste. Taken in this sense, Salazkina finds support for her claim about Eisenstein's excess in Upton Sinclair's accusation that there were "thousands of feet of pure wasted film" (p. 3). I remain unpersuaded that Eisenstein practiced an excess manifested in his waste of film and resources. Salazkina says that Eisenstein shot "over 200,000 feet of film rushes" (p. 1), which is an overestimation. As Harry M. Geduld and Ronald Gottesman note in *Sergei Eisenstein and Upton Sinclair: the Making & Unmaking of ¡Que viva México!* (1970), Sinclair told Amkino that the footage was between 175,000 and 180,000 feet, while the Film Trust estimated that it was between 175,000 and 200,000 feet. In any case, it was *under* 200,000 feet and not over 200,000. Salazkina also suggests that Eisenstein's excessive shooting resulted in overspending. However, when compared to a similar film, shot the year before on location in Mexico, *¡Que Viva México!* was made on a shoe string. Juliet Barrett Rublee spent \$150,000 making *Flame of Mexico* (1932), whereas most sources suggest Eisenstein would have spent about half of that, including editing. Furthermore, Salazkina argues that many of the scenes shot were unnecessary. This conclusion comes from focusing on Grigori Alexandrov's version of the footage; a look at Marie Seton's version, *Time in the Sun* (1941), shows otherwise.

These production details, however, do not invalidate Salazkina's overall argument of the role baroque aesthetic and ideology played in *¡Que viva México!* The connections she

establishes between the Day of the Dead, the influence of Spanish baroque literature, its manifestation in the art of José Guadalupe Posada, and its use for revolutionary purposes by Eisenstein make this book indispensable for any person interested in Mexico, modernism, or Eisenstein.

*State University of New York, Plattsburgh
Plattsburgh, New York*

ISABEL ARREDONDO

Cold War Exiles in Mexico: U.S. Dissidents and the Culture of Critical Resistance. By Rebecca M. Schreiber. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008. Pp. xxv, 303. Illustrations. Notes. Index. \$67.50 cloth; \$22.50 paper.

In the 1940s and 1950s, Mexico became a popular destination not only for vacationers from the United States looking for beautiful beaches and “exotic” locales; it also became a destination for a number of left-wing writers, artists, and filmmakers from the United States who fled their country in reaction to government harassment and obstacles they faced in creating, exhibiting, and distributing their work. These cultural producers, according to Rebecca Schreiber, “contributed to the formation of a culture of critical resistance” (p. xii) that was distinctly transnational in perspective and which “deliberately countered the dominant ideology of ‘American nationalist globalism’ championed by the United States during the early Cold War era” (p. xiv). Combining archival research into the historical contexts and lived realities of these exiled artists with perceptive formal analyses of the cultural forms they produced before, during, and after their time in Mexico, Schreiber skillfully demonstrates how the artists’ experiences in Mexico reshaped their aesthetic strategies and cultural production and how these, in turn, reshaped oppositional art movements in the United States and Mexico. Indeed, the author’s ability to weave together a transnational understanding of both the form and content of early Cold War cultural production on both sides of the United States-Mexico border is the work’s most important scholarly contribution and merits the attention of both Americanists and Mexicanists.

The book begins by tracing the circumstances that precipitated the artists’ decision to relocate in Mexico. The author does not provide precise figures on the number of artists who fled the United States, but notes that they constituted a “significant political exodus” (p. 1). Few had any familiarity with Mexico before moving south. Schreiber divides the exiled artists into three general groups: African Americans looking to escape racism and political persecution born from their political beliefs; blacklisted Hollywood professionals; and left-wing and Communist authors and editors blacklisted from the publishing industry. Elizabeth Catlett is illustrative of the first group. An African American who left “in part because she believed that ‘the New York art scene offered no opportunities for a black woman’” (p. 37), Catlett saw her art transformed in Mexico. Although her work continued to explore the contributions of African American women to U.S. history, through her collaboration with the Taller de Gráfica Popular (an influential artist collective that created politically charged prints primarily for poor and working-class communities in Mexico), it took a “global perspective, in which she linked the concerns of African Americans in the United States