

UC San Diego

UC San Diego Previously Published Works

Title

Review: México y Filipinas: culturas y memorias sobre el Pacífico by Thomas Calvo y Paulina Machuca, eds.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1rb007x2>

Journal

Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos, 33(3)

ISSN

0742-9797

Author

Blanco, John D

Publication Date

2017-11-01

DOI

10.1525/msem.2017.33.3.449

Peer reviewed

Book Reviews – Reseñas de libro

Rafael Olea Franco, ed. *Mariano Azuela y la literatura de la Revolución Mexicana*. Ciudad de México: El Colegio de México, 2017. 380 pp.

The sixteen studies in this volume were originally papers presented at a colloquium hosted by El Colegio de México in December 2015 to commemorate the initial publication of *Los de abajo* one hundred years earlier. For some who research Mexican literature, the Novel of the Mexican Revolution represents an unfashionable genre, lacking the experimentation that makes later novels by Fernando del Paso or Carlos Fuentes so intriguing. Nonetheless, the studies in this volume should give pause for thought to those who believe this, because they offer a veritable wealth of original research shedding light on the wider context of the Revolutionary novel and the manners by which it was published, translated, and adapted for cinema.

Christopher Harris' chapter, "En México la literatura viril nunca existió," begins by recounting the famous debate between Francisco Monterde and Julio Jiménez Rueda in *El Universal Ilustrado* (Dec. 1924). Demetrio Macías, the protagonist of *Los de abajo*, was for Monterde and countless other readers "el parangón de la masculinidad villista" (20). Harris, however, argues that by the end of the novel, after the crushing villista defeats in el Bajío, the protagonist suffers from "lo que actualmente podríamos describir como una enfermedad depresiva" (22). This interpretation is not easily sustainable, however, for if this return to Juchipila is merely an attempt to commit suicide, so much of Azuela's rich symbolism of a noble struggle in vain is diminished. Characterizing the Revolution as a lost cause as early as 1915 was perhaps Azuela's most devastating critique of the soon-to-be-institutionalized popular upheaval. Furthermore, in the novel's third part, where Macías compares himself to a falling stone that will not stop until it strikes the floor of the canyon, he implies that he has lost control of his own destiny. Martha Elena Munguía

Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos Vol. 33, Issue 3, Fall 2017, pages 443–452. ISSN 0742-9797, electronic ISSN 1533-8320. © 2017 by The Regents of the University of California. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Reprints and Permissions web page, <http://www.ucpress.edu/journals.php?p=reprints>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/msem.2017.33.3.443>.

Zatarain's study looks at a much-underappreciated (or perhaps completely ignored) facet of the novel: its exuberance. Although it may seem counterintuitive, the Revolution did, in fact, give expression to what Munguía Zatarain calls "[e]l espíritu alegre y desbocado" (38), which is exhibited in various episodes of the novel. The chapter by Martha Celis Mendoza, "Los desafíos de la traducción," examines how Azuela's realistic dialogue, an essential and much-admired quality of the novel, presented difficulties for five different English translations. Insightfully, Celis Mendoza distinguishes between "la voz del pueblo" dialogue of the characters and the much more poetic voice that narrates the novel (65–67).

Rafael Olea Franco, the editor of the volume and a professor in el Colegio de México's Centro de Estudios Lingüísticos y Literarios, provides an excellent study of the first French translation of the novel, *L'ouragan* (*The Hurricane*), which appeared serialized in a weekly Parisian magazine in 1928. Olea Franco utilizes important correspondence between Azuela and different editors to show how the Spanish version was mistranslated to such an extent it became a commercial failure from which Azuela never earned a *franc* (102–103). Yet another dimension of Azuela's novel and its legacy is examined by Eduardo de la Vega and Rosario Vidal Bonifaz in their study of the cinematic adaptations of *Los de abajo*. What is particularly interesting here is not the two successful adaptations (directed by Chano Urueta (1939), and directed by Servando González (1978)), but the many aborted film adaptations, including one by the famed cinematographer Rafael Corkidi (122–23). The research for this chapter is particularly impressive, referencing not only memoirs and interviews with the novelist and Urueta, but archival materials from the Cineteca Nacional, including annotated scripts and periodicals of the era. In "Los de abajo de Mariano Azuela y 'El llano en llamas'," Françoise Perus suggests boldly that Juan Rulfo's short story of 1950 represents "una reescritura deliberada" (246) of Azuela's canonical novel, but with heightened irony (273). Beyond analyzing (con)textual similarities between the two works, Perus' investigation also led him to discover a 1930 edition of *Los de abajo* in the personal library of Rulfo. Antonio Cajero Vázquez offers convincing interpretations of several violent scenes from *Los de abajo*, comparing these with scenes from *El águila y la serpiente* (Martín Luis Guzmán, 1928) *¡Vámonos con Pancho Villa!* (Rafael F. Muñoz, 1931), and *El luto humano* (José Revueltas, 1943), providing along the way an especially penetrating psychological portrait of "el güero Margarito."

Conrado J. Arranz's "El maderismo en la obra de Mariano Azuela" takes a theoretical approach to *Los de abajo*, focusing on its

recognition as the prototype of the Revolutionary novel. Utilizing interviews with and articles by Azuela, as well as the work of critics such as Walter Benjamin and Tzvetan Todorov, Arranz underscores the novelist's decision to be no longer "un observador sereno e imparcial," as he had been for his initial novels, but, during the composition of *Los de abajo*, "parcial y apasionado" (185). Reexamining genres, and especially the flimsy boundary between that of fiction and novelized biography, Arranz discovers that Azuela himself admitted that *Los de abajo* was not a novel of the Mexican Revolution (182). The efficient use by Arranz of so many elucidative citations and references is nothing short of masterful.

The remaining studies in the volume turn their attention from *Los de abajo* to other novels by Azuela. Appearing eighteen years before the belated but resounding acclaim of *Los de abajo*, *María Luisa* (1907) has largely been ignored by critics. Nevertheless, after a thorough analysis of this early novel, Yliana Rodríguez González concludes that it may be read not merely as a late example of naturalism but "el augurio . . . de una poética en gestación" (148). Elena Madrigal takes the analysis of *La luciérnaga* (1932) beyond obvious questions of structure and its composition *vis-à-vis* the esthetics of Vanguardism, and instead discusses the ethical implications of Azuela's narrative, concluding that the novel may be read as a balanced treatment of two revolutions: "una social y regional; la otra literaria, de visos universales" (212). Marco Antonio Chavarín González provides a stimulating comparison of Azuela's *Andrés Pérez, maderista* (1911) with *La majestad caída* (1911) by Juan A. Mateos,—two novels considered by many researchers to be the first novels of the Mexican Revolution—describing how they depict the great social and political upheaval ironically. Chavarín González concludes by offering a twist on an earlier assertion by José Emilio Pacheco: while Mateos' novel represents the end of "la novela de folletín", *Andrés Pérez, maderista* makes the historical novel functional once more (175).

The remaining five chapters offer eclectic subject matter and methodological approaches. Alberto Vital and Alejandro Sacbé Shuttera look at the similarities between Victoriano Salado Álvarez and Azuela regarding the publication of their most celebrated works. Salado Álvarez, author of *Episodios nacionales mexicanos* (1901–1906), was a novelist with little in common with Azuela apart from being from Jalisco. Nevertheless, Vital and Sacbé Shuttera posit that Salado Álvarez's long novel and *Los de abajo* "son dos ejemplos significativamente distintos de la importancia del mediador entre los autores y los lectores de literatura" (278). In so many words, Salado

Álvarez did not enjoy the same vigorous promotion that Azuela did in 1925, and thereafter. Víctor Díaz Arciniega's "Dos lecciones foráneas sobre Azuela" offers an interesting, wide-angle perspective on the impact of Azuela's work beyond the Spanish-speaking world; in this case, inspiring a master's thesis in Brazil and a doctoral dissertation in Germany. Luz América Viveros Anaya's study provides a detailed treatment of autobiographies and memoirs of Revolutionary figures which were published between 1915 (the year of *Los de abajo*' initial publication) and 1925 (the year of its acclaim). Some of the texts she examines include: Porfirio Díaz' *Autobiografía*; *Pancho Villa, retrato autobiográfico, 1894-1914*; and *Vida de Francisco Villa contada por él mismo*.

In "Los orígenes de un género," Danaé Torres de la Rosa examines the system of publication and promotion for Revolutionary literature at the time of *Los de abajo*'s 1915 serialization and shortly thereafter. Quite ambitiously, Torres de la Rosa investigates the first instance of "novela de la Revolución" and discovers it used as a subtitle for *La ruina de la casona* (1919), "una obra con fuerte raigambre decimonónica" (315-16). The phrase would not assume its significance as the label for the entire genre until the famous debate in *El Universal Ilustrado* almost six years later. For future researchers, Torres de la Rosa's study of the Revolutionary novel's complex beginnings should be a requisite reference. The concluding study by Max Parra creatively analyzes Nellie Campobello's *Cartucho* (1931) through a close reading of Revolutionary-era photographs and postcards. Campobello's writing lends itself easily to this approach for, as Parra points out, "la habilidad técnica de Campobello consiste en resaltar lo visual . . . como si la intensidad e inmediatez de lo vivido se recordara mejor en imágenes" (345). Parra has the careful eye of the historian examining the photographs; the seventeen examples he provides do much to elaborate on Campobello's vivid vignettes.

Mariano Azuela y la literatura de la Revolución Mexicana is a notable achievement, demonstrating that more than one hundred years after its initial publication, *Los de abajo* continues to provoke stimulating (re)readings. This volume of studies is sure to reinvigorate interest in Azuela and his achievement, as well as serve as a fundamental reference for those who research the Revolutionary novel.

Daniel J. Nappo
University of Tennessee, Martin

Lori A. Flores. *Grounds for Dreaming: Mexican Americans, Mexican Immigrants, and the California Farmworker Movement*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016. 304 pp.

Grounds for Dreaming is an engaging, beautifully written, strongly researched monograph that gets at the heart of ethnic identity formation in America and how it is shaped by region, generation, citizenship status, and political activity, amongst other factors. Through her study of ethnic identity and community formation in the Salinas Valley, California, author Lori A. Flores sheds new light on old debates in U.S., Latino, labor, and immigration histories and in the process, opens up new lines of inquiry. Many scholars have investigated the tensions between Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans that have forestalled the development of a unified sense of community between the two (what historian David Gutiérrez so famously termed “the walls and mirrors” between the groups, in his book by the same name). Mexican immigrants have often served as lightning rods for critique around questions of legal status, ability to assimilate, and fitness for citizenship. As a result, Mexican Americans have sometimes wished to distance themselves from immigrants, hoping to avoid the racialization that labels all people of Mexican ancestry—immigrants and citizens, documented and undocumented—as outsiders. Flores introduces yet a third group into this dynamic: *braceros*, Mexican “temporary” guest program workers, who were documented but were not allowed to unionize. In the Salinas Valley, as elsewhere in the United States, *braceros* were often brought in to undercut the wages of Mexican Americans, demonstrating how racial capitalism divides groups, even co-ethnics (79). By viewing immigrants, Mexican Americans, and *braceros* as a triad, Flores is able to demonstrate the hierarchies and fault lines—or as she calls them, “battlegrounds”—that existed in this this community, battlegrounds that played out in every sphere from leisure (with zoot suiters) to work (labor competition).

Flores’s original research allows her to make bold arguments, such as that the Bracero Program not only heightened intraethnic conflict but undermined the strength of unions by providing a readily available and exploitable workforce to replace union organizers (72–74). Unions have historically been key to political consciousness and organizing amongst ethnic groups. Flores argues that in the absence of unions, a political awakening and social movement organizing were forestalled in the Salinas Valley. Her argument underscores the fact that, despite a rich canon in Chicana/o history, there is

more work to be done if we wish to truly get at the complexities of ethnic identity formation.

As someone who thinks about race relationally, I was compelled by Flores's discussion of "meeting grounds," the counterpart to "battlegrounds." One example could be found in the corporate farms of the 1930s, where agribusiness employers, working in tandem with law enforcement, violently clamped down on Filipino fieldworkers and "Okie" packinghouse workers who migrated to California fleeing the Dust Bowl in Oklahoma. This action foreclosed union organizing for nearly four decades, locking poor whites and U.S. colonial subjects into the status of disenfranchised workers and shaping the conditions of possibility available to a later generation of ethnic Mexican workers (33–38). Flores demonstrates the ways this status served as a "meeting ground," outlining the ways groups bonded over a shared identity as "outsiders," regardless of ethnic and racial identity: sharing food, caring for the sick, and enjoying leisure time together (57–64). As Flores deftly points out, "similar economic struggles blunted the potential sharpness of racial difference" (30). Mexican Americans and Mexican immigrants often clashed, with Mexican Americans viewing the recent immigrants as job competition and blaming them for the stigmatization Mexican Americans received at the hands of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Yet they still found common ground around shared cultural values, such as the establishment of "Salinas's first 'Mexican' Catholic church" (95), as well in the romances that blossomed between Mexican American women and *braceros*.

The United States continues to come to terms with its often conflicting use of Mexican immigrants for low-wage labor while failing to pass immigration legislation that take immigrants' whole lives and not just their roles as workers into account. This struggle is playing out on many levels, in particular in the fate of the majority Mexican DREAMers, the 800,000 youth brought to the U.S. by their parents without authorization (Granadas and Uhrmacher, 2017). In this environment, *Grounds for Dreaming* will serve as an important primer for us to understand and evaluate the stakes in these important conversations.

Natalia Molina

University of California, San Diego


Reference

- Granados, Samuel and Kevin Uhrmacher. "What we know about nearly 800,000 'dreamers' in the U.S.," *Washington Post*, September 6, 2017.

Accessed October 9, 2017. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2017/09/06/what-we-know-about-nearly-800000-dreamers-in-the-u-s/?utm_term=.a260db930c6e.

Thomas Calvo y Paulina Machuca, eds., *México y Filipinas: culturas y memorias sobre el Pacífico*, Zamora, Michoacán (Mexico): El Colegio de Michoacán & Quezon City, Manila (Philippines): Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2016. 411 pp.

The study of trans-Pacific networks and histories prior to the late twentieth century has grown considerably in the past several years. While the designation of a “Pacific Rim” served chiefly to focus interests of a primarily economic and diplomatic nature in the 1980s, academic scholarship in the social sciences and the humanities has turned increasingly towards the role of the Pacific as a laboratory of what world-systems historian Immanuel Wallerstein famously called “the worlding of the world.” Some of the main threads of investigation that this idea has produced include a reconsideration and exploration of “globalization” in the early modern period; the birth of the first truly world-market established by the Manila-Acapulco galleon trade; the rise of inter-European conflict overseas; the emergence and development of modern international law; the environmental legacies of colonialism, empire-making, and transculturation; and the proliferation of models for understanding the center-periphery dynamics of capitalism, the military industrial complex, and the survival and transformation of indigenous communities. *México y Filipinas: culturas y memorias sobre el Pacífico* traverses many of these threads as a collection of essays loosely exploring the legacies and futures of a shared culture between both countries.

As editors Thomas Calvo and Paulina Machuca narrate in the introduction, the occasion that provides the basis of this book was a conference that took place in the Juan José Arreola Public Library of the State of Jalisco, Guadalajara, in 2014. The conference itself served to commemorate the twenty-year anniversary of what must be an almost entirely forgotten decree in Mexico and the Philippines, in which then President (of Mexico) Adolfo López Mateos declared 1964 to be “el Año de la Fraternidad  México- Filipinas.” Of course, President López Mateos’ decree was not completely random: 1964 marked the 400-year anniversary of Admiral Miguel López de Legazpi (former alcalde-general of Mexico City) and Augustinian missionary

priest Fray Andrés de Urdaneta's fateful journey across the Pacific to the Philippine archipelago, in 1564 (16). And yet, the three dates mark like buoys the veritable ocean of historical amnesia that separates the two nations: both inheritors of the most extensive formal empire in modern history. It is to this amnesia of a shared condition and culture that *México y Filipinas* addresses itself.

This coffee-table size ~~volume of essays~~ volume of essays and full-color photographs, maps, and tables represents a rare collaboration not only between Mexican and Filipino researchers, but also institutions: the book was co-published by el Colegio de Michoacán and the Ateneo de Manila University. Dedicated to the pioneering comparative work of Mexican diplomat to the Philippines Rafael Bernal (11), the book consists of thirteen essays that run the gamut of environmental and cultural histories of contact, interchange, and transculturation across the Pacific Ocean. The essays in Part I tackle three general areas of comparative study, albeit somewhat unevenly: these include comparative social and cultural responses to natural catastrophes that both regions share (Padilla Lozoya); the divergent paths of nationalization and international regionalism followed by both nations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Ramírez Bonilla); and what might be called a "comparative psychological history" of Spain's last stand against the Mexican War of Independence (in 1825) and the Philippine Revolution (1898–1899), the latter memorialized in the Spanish film "Los últimos de Filipinas" during the early years of the Franco dictatorship (Calvo). Part II examines the material and cultural bases of the colonial Church, highlighting the divergent histories of missionary wealth and power in both countries (Alonso Álvarez), as well as the comparative histories of black icons like the cult of the black Nazarene in Quiapo (Zialcita) and that of the child Jesus in Cebu (Philippines), referred to as "Manuelito" in the coastal regions of Guerrero, Oaxaca, and Chiapas in Mexico (Torre Yarza). The first two essays of Part III investigate the transcultural exchanges between Mexico and the Philippines: the first explores the reciprocal development of weaving traditions (Ramírez Garayzar) and the second pairs courtship dance traditions common to both regions (Mijares). This part concludes with two essays on Philippine architecture and the shifting commitments to and articulations of Spanish cultural heritage (Akpodonu, Loyzaga). The three essays that comprise Part IV concern the environmental histories of the coconut palm, which traveled from the Philippines to Mexico (Machuca); maize, which traveled in the opposite direction (Manalastas); and the various uses and consumption of green (unripe) papaya in the Central Visayas region of the Philippines (Magno).

In the introduction, Calvo and Machuca frame the comparative register of these studies as a “third way” for understanding and exploring the web of connections that tie both countries to one another: one that tries to avoid the curse of “Occidentalism,” even while considering its own pitfalls, and the postcolonial response of imagining or inventing an autochthonous national origin and tradition (15–34 in Spanish; and 35–53 in English). Machuca later identifies these histories as “traces of cultural *mestizaje*,” very much in the spirit of Rafael Bernal’s adoption of Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz’s theory of transculturation in Bernal’s *México en Filipinas* (385–397). Beyond a new catalogue of objects for future investigation, however, it is clear that some of the authors aspire to something greater. Ramírez Bonilla’s piece, for example, begins with a survey of various “futures” explored by the leaders of the Mexican war of independence, in order to highlight not only the roads taken and not taken by Mexico and Latin America in the nineteenth century; but also the attempt of some leaders to maintain sight of Mexico’s transpacific frontier in an imagined future based on a shared identity (79–98). Akpedonu, by contrast, uses his cultural anthropology of the value of “Hispanic Heritage” (267–304) in the Philippines, to highlight the very different articulations of identity and *mestizaje* in the national traditions of both countries. These essays, among others, underline the critical value of connected histories across the Pacific. In (re)discovering the connections that allow Filipinos and Mexicans to recognize a common cultural heritage, they also oblige us to measure the representation of our worlds as they exist today against the representations of those worlds and their imaginary futures during the colonial period.

With the exception of Alonso Álvarez’s rather solid history of friar missionary land ownership of haciendas in the Philippines, as well as the environmental histories that comprise Part IV, many of these studies leave the reader with more questions than answers: questions meant to either drive further research or develop new frames and categories of analysis. In certain essays, the rather schematic lines of open inquiry can be frustrating (for example, Zialcita). At other times, the larger implications and stakes of the comparative enterprise remain obscure; and, as the editors admit themselves, the larger stakes remain largely unwritten. ~~At the same time,~~ however, the collaborative effort represents a marked departure from the insularity of area-based studies and invites scholars and readers to see their perceived histories and identities in the eyes of a not-quite-similar, not-so-different other. While it remains for future generations of scholars in the Philippines and Mexico to deepen and broaden the traces of

transculturation across the Pacific, this volume serves as an important signpost of existing research on the subject, as well as a signpost for future directions of investigation.

John D. Blanco
University of California, San Diego