

2014

Introduction: Highways of the South

Daniel R. Quiles

School of the Art Institute of Chicago, daniel.quiles4@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/artlas>

 Part of the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#), and the [Latin American Languages and Societies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Quiles, Daniel R.. "Introduction: Highways of the South." *Artl@s Bulletin* 3, no. 2 (2015): Article 8.

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

This is an Open Access journal. This means that it uses a funding model that does not charge readers or their institutions for access. Readers may freely read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of articles. This journal is covered under the [CC BY-NC-ND license](#).

Highways of the South

Latin American Art Networks

Daniel R. Quiles, Guest Editor

ARTL@S BULLETIN

Volume 3, Issue 2

Fall 2014



Editor-in-Chief

Catherine Dossin
Purdue University

Béatrice Joyeux-Prunel
École normale supérieure

Guest Editor

Daniel R. Quiles
School of the Art Institute
of Chicago

Cover:

Vida-Americana. Revista Norte, Centro y Sud Americana de Vanguardia (Barcelona, 1921), Colección Instituto Nacional de Bellas Artes-Sala de Arte Público Siqueiros. Reproduced with the authorization of the Instituto Nacional de Bellas Artes y Literatura, 2014.

Editorial Statement

The *ARTL@S BULLETIN* is a peer-reviewed, transdisciplinary journal devoted to spatial and transnational questions in the history of the arts and literature.

The journal promises to never separate methodology and history, and to support innovative research and new methodologies. Its ambition is twofold: 1. a focus on the “transnational” as constituted by exchange between the local and the global or between the national and the international, and 2. an openness to innovation in research methods, particularly the quantitative possibilities offered by digital mapping and data visualization.

By encouraging scholars to continuously shift the scope of their analysis from the national to the transnational, *ARTL@S BULLETIN* intends to contribute to the collective project of a global history of the arts.

Copyright Statement

ARTL@S BULLETIN (ISSN 2264-2668) is published by the École normale supérieure, 45, rue d’Ulm, 75005 Paris, France and the Centre national pour la recherche scientifique 16, rue Pierre et Marie Curie, 75005 Paris, France. The online version of the *ARTL@S Bulletin* is hosted by Purdue Scholarly Publishing Services.

Compilation copyright © 2014 ENS-CNRS. Contents copyright © 2014 by the respective authors, artists, and other rights holders. All rights in the *ARTL@S BULLETIN* and its contents reserved by the École normale supérieure, the Centre national pour la recherche scientifique and their respective owners. Except as permitted by the Copyright Act, including section 107 (the fair use doctrine), or other applicable law, no part of the contents of the *ARTL@S BULLETIN* may be reproduced without the written permission of the author(s) and/or other rights holders. The opinions expressed in the *ARTL@S BULLETIN* are those of the authors and not necessarily of the editors or publishers.

Table of Contents

4	Introduction <i>Daniel R. Quiles</i>
10	Crossing the Atlantic: Emilio Pettoruti's Italian Immersion <i>Lauren A. Kaplan</i>
22	Vida-Americana, 1919-1921. Redes conceptuales en torno a un proyecto trans-continental de vanguardia <i>Natalia de la Rosa</i>
36	Réseaux culturels, réseaux politiques. Les archives du film en Amérique Latine des années 1950 aux années 1970 <i>Germán Silveira</i>
48	Between Paris and the "Third World": Lea Lublin's Long 1960s <i>Isabel Plante</i>
68	Contrabienal: Latin American Art, Politics and Identity in New York, 1969-1971 <i>Aimé Iglesias Lukin</i>
83	Vectors or Constellations? Curatorial Narratives of Latin American Art <i>Camila Maroja and Abigail Winograd</i>
97	All Creative Being: Interview with Anna Bella Geiger <i>Sarah Poppel</i>

Introduction

Following his appointment as Guggenheim UBS MAP Curator, Latin America in 2013, Pablo León de la Barra produced a series of “dispatches” for the institution’s website: reports on the cities, museums, project spaces, and artists’ studios that he has visited in his travels around Latin America.¹ These posts offer a rare view into the work of the itinerant curator, who comes across valuable information that might otherwise be territorially guarded. In this case, however, de la Barra seems to share everything, exposing his curatorial practice and sometimes-neglected artists to a potentially limitless audience. This social media-era openness also informed his exhibition *Under the Same Sun: Art from Latin America Today*, organized for the Guggenheim’s New York venue. As suggested by the title, *Under the Same Sun* had to do with connecting artists and works from different countries in the region, across both space and time, into a dynamic network:²

Under the Same Sun is a zone of activation, of tension, where different ideas are put in confrontation with each other. The basic idea for the title comes from thinking about this common ground that could be shared between all these countries which are very different.

We cannot talk about one “Latin America” only. What we can do is talk about a shared common ground and shared intersections that exist between the artists, the works, to a common history that comes from 300 years of colonial occupation by either Spain or Portugal... but also a shared history of modernity, an idea of progress that was very present in the whole of the continent, but also followed by periods of repressive governments—military occupation as well as economic crisis.³

Undergirding this affinitive unity, however, is another network, the product of de la Barra’s networking: the curator as circulatory agent, linking the region together through his geographical movement, intellectual work, and exchanges of creative and financial capital. This lattermost aspect is particularly important, as the exhibition showcased works already purchased by the museum under de la Barra’s advisement—his Pan-American optimism is superimposed upon market flows.⁴

Artistic networks bring into tandem surprisingly divergent perspectives or objectives, in the process unveiling relationships—and hierarchies—between different cities and nations. This issue of *ARTL@S BULLETIN* examines international circulations of people, artworks, and

¹ To date, the dispatches have focused on Guatemala City (the only city-specific “dispatch”), Costa Rica, Chile, Mexico, Colombia Puerto Rico, and Panama, at <http://blogs.guggenheim.org/map/dispatches/>, as of December 9, 2014. This project comes out of de la Barra’s longstanding practice of travel photography, which he has periodically exhibited as a digital slideshow work in its own right. See Antonio Sergio Bessa, ed., *Beyond the Supersquare: Art and Architecture in Latin America After Modernism*, exh. cat. Bronx Museum (New York: Fordham University Press, 2014).

² To the extent that a network is devised creatively by the curator, rather than through preexisting or historical connections, de la Barra’s approach echoes that of the “constellation” model employed by Héctor Olea and Mari Carmen Ramírez in their landmark exhibition *Heterotopías: medio siglo sin-lugar, 1918-1968*. See Daniel R. Quiles, “Exhibition as Network, Network as Curator: Canonizing Art from ‘Latin America,’” *ARTL@S BULLETIN*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Summer 2014): 62-78.

³ Video interview with Pablo León de la Barra transcribed by the author, at <http://www.guggenheim.org/new-york/exhibitions/past/exhibit/5740> as of December 9, 2014.

⁴ The critical reception of the show varied, with some commentators noting that the Guggenheim was “late to the party” in focusing on Latin American art compared with other New York institutions. See Holland Cotter, “Arriving Late to the Party, but Dancing on All the Clichés ‘Under the Same Sun,’ Art From Latin America, at Guggenheim,” *The New York Times*, June 12, 2014, at http://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/13/arts/design/under-the-same-sun-art-from-latin-america-at-guggenheim.html?_r=0 as of January 19, 2015.

texts that have produced influential networks of modern and contemporary Latin American art. With a trans-historical perspective and contributions from scholars based in six different countries, the aim is to contribute to a presently expanding field of knowledge related to what Kobena Mercer has termed “cosmopolitan modernisms,” while also taking into account the parallel machinations of art history itself.⁵

The example of *Under the Same Sun* conflates two types of networks. On the one hand, the show celebrated the curator’s ability to draw connections—to turn works, artists, movements, or cities into nodes in larger conceptual categories that might define the region. On the other, de la Barra’s own, highly successful migrations echo a much longer lineage of real, physical movements between cities and countries that has informed developments in Latin American art from at least the beginnings of modernism, if not well before.

Some of the first publications and shows of art explicitly identified as “Latin American” were organized outside of the region.⁶ It was the regional liberator Simón Bolívar who first proposed political networks across the Americas at the 1826 Congress of Panama. His rhetoric later informed the First International Conference of American States between 1889-1890, which led to the foundation of the Pan American Union in Washington, D.C. in 1910.⁷ The PAU hosted the first Pan-American Artistic Conference in September 1917, which initiated “a system of galleries, theaters, and conservatories to promote Pan-American exchange and understanding.”⁸ If Latin American avant-gardes at this moment sometimes concentrated on identifying nationally

specific modernisms, they also sometimes addressed the question of “American” art more broadly.⁹ Yet much of this initial formation of the field was instantiated by institutions, represented by traveling curators and exhibitions, which were themselves extensions of existing geopolitics, such as the neo-colonialist and “Good Neighbor” phases of the United States’ relationship with the region. Here art has at times served as a branch of “soft diplomacy,” as Claire Fox observes in her book on the Pan American Union in Washington, D.C.:

The . . . ethereal strategy for cultivating “the International Mind” . . . was the shared consumption of high culture. Cognac and piano concertos were not mere perquisites of the diplomatic service; rather, they were like water to fish, invisible yet essential, for culture was the very medium through which diplomacy was supposed to occur... cultural diplomacy should necessarily be “disinterested,” meaning free from the interference of political lines or exigencies.¹⁰

Then there is the matter of the more organic circulations that played essential roles in the formation of Latin American modernisms in the same period. Among recent frameworks for such dynamics, “translocality,” an “umbrella term’ to describe mobilities and multiple forms of spatial connectedness,” has recently been used to analyze international movement and migration in Latin American art history.¹¹ As is by now well known, the region’s national avant-gardes in the 1920s and 1930s resulted in part from Trans-Atlantic travel and the appropriation and vernacularization of modernist strategies in Europe.¹² Such

⁵ See Kobena Mercer, ed., *Cosmopolitan Modernisms* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005).

⁶ One of the earliest examples on record is *América Latina: revista de arte e pensamento*, edited by Tasso da Silveira and José Cândido de Andrade Muricy in Rio de Janeiro between 1919 and 1920. See also Guido Valeriano Callegari, *Arte antica dell’America Latina*, exh. cat. (Rome: Istituto poligrafico dello stato, 1933), *Latin American Art*, exh. cat. (Andover, MA: Addison Gallery of American Art, 1935), Concha Romero James and Robert C Smith, *Publications on Latin American Art in 1937* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1938), and *Study Book: Exhibitions of Contemporary Latin American Art* (San Francisco: San Francisco Museum of Art, 1942).

⁷ See Claire F. Fox, *Making Art Panamerican: Cultural Policy and the Cold War* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013), xv-40.

⁸ See Michele Greet, *Beyond National Identity: Pictorial Indigenism as a Modernist Strategy in Andean Art, 1920-1960* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), 26.

⁹ This is the case in the text that Natalia de la Rosa considers so closely in this issue, which was addressed to the “new American generation” but ended up being most relevant for Mexican modernist aesthetics. See David Alfaro Siqueiros, “Tres llamamientos de orientación actual a los pintores y escultores de la nueva generación americana,” in *Vida-Americana: revista norte centro y sudamericana de vanguardia* (Barcelona), No. 1 (May 1921): 2-3.

¹⁰ Fox, *Making Art Panamerican*, 2-3.

¹¹ See Clemens Greiner and Patrick Sakdapolrak, “Translocality: Concepts, Applications and Emerging Research Perspectives,” *Geography Compass*, Vol. 7, No. 5 (2013): 373-384 and Zanna Gilbert, “Something Unnameable in Common: Translocal Collaboration at the Beau Geste Press,” *ARTMargins*, Vol 1, Nos. 2-3 (2012): 45-72. The latter is one of the first attempts to use the “translocal” to address circulation in Latin American art—although it is noteworthy that Gilbert is primarily discussing mail art, in which it is not people, but correspondence, that serves to mobilize ideas between different localities.

¹² For a range of approaches to such material spanning the last 30 years, see Stephanie D’Alessandro, *Still More Distant Journeys: The Artistic Emigrations of Lasar Segall*, exh. cat. (Chicago: David and Alfred Smart Museum of Art, 1997), Rachel Price, *The Object of the Atlantic: Concrete Aesthetics in Cuba, Brazil, and Spain, 1868-1968* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2014), Lowery Stokes Sims, *Wifredo Lam and the International Avant-Garde* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2002),

circulation was not limited to correspondence between individual Latin American countries and metropolises like Paris, however—approaches in figuration, for example, such as those of muralism and indigenism, were shared between different countries in the Americas, as the work of Michele Greet and others has made clear.¹³

Of the many studies that have traced institutional networks in the postwar era, among the most influential to date has been Andrea Giunta's exhaustive study of the promotion of Argentine art abroad in the 1960s.¹⁴ Giunta concludes that such efforts failed in their quest to increase the international legitimacy of Argentine art, but one wonders today if she might reconsider this claim, given the ever-increasing popularity of the country's abstraction and conceptualism in international museums and the market today (and this argument could be extended to Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela, if all the countries of the region). The stakes of international promotion and circulation are not merely spatial; they are subject to the same delays in reception as texts and other forms of artistic expression.

It is no secret that academic writing on Latin American art has frequently followed the lead of curators and exhibitions, but the manner in which circulation or networks might be traced in a scholarly study is necessarily different from that of an exhibition or catalogue. Predecessors of *Under the Same Sun*, such as *The Geometry of Hope* and

Nexus New York, concentrated on historical circulations of artists, exhibitions and institutional initiatives, redefining the region as they went. Both placed great emphasis on cities rather than entire countries; the former included Paris among the key cities for Latin American art in the 1950s and 1960s, while the latter looked at New York as a refuge for Latin American expatriates in the interwar period.¹⁵ Smaller exhibitions, such as *Oiticica in London*, have argued for this mode of investigation one artist at a time, isolating and unpacking cosmopolitan networks in specific metropolises (such as Oiticica's connections to exiled *Tropicália* musicians, his friendship with Guy Brett, and his access to the circle around *Signals* newspaper and gallery).¹⁶

The opportunity that networks provide for reimagining geographical axes of artistic production has perhaps been best exemplified of late by the academic journal *ARTMargins*, which is devoted to worldwide studies of encounter and exchange. *ARTMargins* recently published an edited volume on experimental art networks between Latin America and Central and Eastern Europe in the 1970s, edited by Klara Kemp-Welch and Cristina Freire.¹⁷ They argue that while both regions experienced

similar degrees of marginalization from the North American and Western European art historical narratives . . . constructed in relation to the frameworks dictated by the Cold War," exchanges between the two regions had to "embrace" a "spectrum of political persuasions . . . from more or less fervent revolutionary communism, to reform communism, to anticommunism."¹⁸

Initiatives like *ARTMargins* (much like the curatorial collective Red Conceptualismos del Sur)

Edward Sullivan, "From Mexico to Montparnasse—and back," *Art in America*, Vol. 87, No. 11 (November 1999): 102-9 and "Paris/San Juan," *Arts Magazine* 58 (May 1984): 120-4, and Vicky Unruh, *Latin American Vanguards: The Art of Continuous Encounter* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

¹³ See Michele Greet, *Beyond National Identity: Pictorial Indigenism as a Modernist Strategy in Andean Art, 1920-1960* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009). Greet is currently finishing a book manuscript titled *Transatlantic Encounters: Latin American Artists in Paris between the Wars, 1918-1939*, for which she and George Mason University students produced a website with interactive maps of interwar transnational exchange in Paris by Latin American artists. See <http://chnm.gmu.edu/transatlanticencounters/>. See also Laurance P. Hurlburt, *The Mexican Muralists in the United States* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1989), Anna Indyk-López, *Muralism Without Walls: Rivera, Orozco, and Siqueiros in the United States, 1927-1940* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009), and Mari Carmen Ramírez, ed., *El Taller Torres-García: The School of the South and its Legacy*, exh. cat. Archer M. Huntington Art Gallery (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992).

¹⁴ See Andrea Giunta, *Vanguardia, internacionalismo y política: Arte argentino en los años sesenta* (Buenos Aires: Paidós, 2001), later translated as *Avant-Garde, Internationalism, and Politics: Argentine Art in the Sixties*, trans. Peter Kahn (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007). See also Luis Castañeda, *Spectacular Mexico: Design, Propaganda, and the 1968 Olympics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), which explores the international promotion of Mexican culture through design, urbanism, and the Olympic Games in a moment of political turmoil.

¹⁵ See Deborah Cullen, ed., *Nexus New York: Latin/American Artists in the Modern Metropolis*, exh. cat. Museo del Barrio (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), and Gabriel Pérez-Barreiro, ed., *The Geometry of Hope: Latin American Art from the Patricia Phelps de Cisneros Collection*, exh. cat. Blanton Museum, Austin (New York: DAP, 2007).

¹⁶ Guy Brett and Luciano Figueiredo, eds., *Oiticica in London*, exh. cat. (London: Tate Publishing, 2007).

¹⁷ An influential prior experiment in this regard was also an exhibition. See Hans D. Christ and Iris Dressler, eds., *Subversive Practices: Art under Conditions of Political Repression: 60s - 80s / South America / Europe*, exh. cat. Kunstverein Stuttgart (Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2010).

¹⁸ Klara Kemp-Welch and Cristina Freire, "Artists' Networks in Latin America and Eastern Europe," *ARTMargins*, Vol. 1, Nos. 2-3 (June-October 2012): 4-5.

underscore the political stakes of attending to networks and circulations in Latin American art, both historically and in the present.¹⁹ They are evidence of an increasing reluctance to isolate or essentialize given countries or the region as a whole—not in the service of outmoded arguments about derivation or belatedness, but to accurately attend to the way that artistic strategies are developed, revised, and shared across borders.

“Highways of the South: Latin American Art Networks” features case studies throughout twentieth and twenty-first century Latin American art. It is positioned against the present surfeit of glib invocations of the “global,” particularly by Northern institutions that until recently displayed open contempt for such an expanded purview yet now aim to capitalize on a hot trend. Certainly, networks, circulation, or historical instances of exchange are not methods in and of themselves. Our hope, however, is that by focusing on circulations as content, the traditional art-historical method of the “case study” might be altered from within. The struggle to elevate the periphery, or even eliminate it completely through the logic of the network, has succeeded—a new, hyper-connected “world art history” is in vogue. The task of altering our modes of inquiry into this newly limitless purview, however, has only begun. The sub-regions examined by this issue’s contributors echo the privileging of wealthier nations such as Mexico, Argentina, Brazil over what Gustavo Buntinx has called the “extreme periphery”: the less examined countries of the Caribbean and Central America as well as Paraguay, Bolivia, and others in South America.²⁰ These exclusions are in no way intentional on my part, but reflect the fact there is still plenty of work to be done—assuming that the next generation of scholars will indeed turn to these nations.²¹

¹⁹ For an overview of Red Conceptualismos del Sur’s activities, see Southern Conceptualisms Network, “Micropolitics of the Archive,” *Field Notes 02*, at <http://www.aaa.org.hk/FieldNotes/Details/1208> as of January 19, 2015.

²⁰ See Gustavo Buntinx, “Communities of Sense/Communities of Sentiment: Globalization and the Museum Void in an Extreme Periphery,” in *Museum Frictions*, eds. Ivan Karp, Corinne A. Kratz, Lynn Szewajka, and Tomás Ybarra-Frausto (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2006), 219-246.

²¹ Encouraging signs that this will happen include María Amalia García, “Hegemonies and Models of Cultural Modernization in South America: The Paraguay-Brazil Case,” *ARTMargins*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (February 2014), 28-54.

Focusing on questions of migration, Lauren Kaplan details Argentine artist Emilio Pettoruti’s formative period in Italy and close associations with Cubist, Futurist, and “Return to Order” avant-gardes in Europe. Kaplan argues that Pettoruti is an “international artist” rather than exclusively Argentine or Italian, which she sees as a parallel to his sampling from but never joining the various movements he encountered. Kaplan’s method recuperates a much-maligned biographical approach to art history that values the artist’s life story. In tracing networks, this is to some extent unavoidable, given that geographical movement is, by nature, part of the artist’s biography.²² While normally associated with more traditional methods such as connoisseurship, the question of national identity has new stakes for Latin American art at present. Kaplan’s biographical storytelling conceals a more radical contention: that the network undoes, to some extent, the very category of the “Latin American artist.” Several of the articles in this issue point to this tension at the heart of the field and its presuppositions.

Natalia de la Rosa’s contribution examines a related case of prewar modernism: how the cosmopolitan intellectual milieu of post-World War I in Barcelona inflected David Alfaro Siqueiros’s one-off “little magazine” *Vida-Americana*, 1921. She argues that Siqueiros was “radicalized” by the conceptual network and international circuits to which he was exposed in Barcelona, where, in parallel to Pettoruti in Italy, he came into contact with futurist and ultraist writers as well as artists in the thrall of the “Return to Order” that had gained popularity in France. These many influences helped shape Siqueiros’s enormously influential manifesto “Three Appeals for a Modern Direction to the New Generation of American Painters and Sculptors,” which was featured in *Vida-Americana*. De la Rosa points up the irony of an “ex-centric” periphery—

²² For studies that use biographical details to theorize migration or exile, see Stephanie Barron, ed., *Exiles + Emigrés: The Flight of European Artists from Hitler*, exh. cat. Los Angeles County Museum of Art (New York: H.N. Abrams, 1997), T.J. Demos, “Duchamp’s *Boîte-en-valise*: Between Institutional Acculturation and Geopolitical Displacement,” *Grey Room*, No. 8 (Summer, 2002): 6-37, Terry Eagleton, *Exiles and Emigrés: Studies in Modern Literature* (New York: Schocken Books, 1970). See also Edward Said, “Reflections on Exile,” in *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 137-149.

the Mexican avant-garde—having one of its key starting points first constituted in a European city by a cosmopolitan network of Latin American and Iberian intellectuals.

German Silveira looks at postwar initiatives to archive Latin American films, and the different conceptions of the region that each set in place. He narrates the transition from the Sección Latinoamericana of Fédération Internationale des Archives du Film (FIAF), which was modeled on the European organization to which it was linked, to l'Union des Cinémathèques d'Amérique Latine (UCAL), an attempt at a strictly regional, autonomous organization positioned against dependence on foreign support or institutions. UCAL anticipates what Red Conceptualismos del Sur have called the “micropolitics of the archive,” which might be rephrased as the “geopolitics of the archive”: how a Latin American patrimony might be identified and protected, what role Northern institutions might have to play (or not), and how different Latin American countries might work together in a South-South network built on common interest and a shared political cinema.

Drawn from her book on Argentine artists who lived and worked in Paris during the 1960s, Isabel Plante's article considers Lea Lublin's movements between France, Argentina and Chile between 1966 and 1974.²³ The dramatic differences between Lublin's era and that of Pettoruti, who shocked audiences when he first exhibited modernist painting in Buenos Aires in 1924, are evident in Lublin's dexterous negotiation of multiple locales. She altered her work and sometimes made significant compromises in order to be shown in dictatorial Buenos Aires and Santa Fe, socialist Santiago, and Paris circa 1968. One only need consider how Lublin's signature environment, *Fluvio subtunal*, 1969, dialogues with Marta Minujín and Rubén Santantonín's *La menesunda*, 1965, for a sense of the complex dynamics of 1960s cosmopolitanism. Minujín's encounters with Nouveau Réalisme, happenings and environments in Paris deeply informed her

²³ See also Isabel Plante, *Argentinos de París: Arte y viajes culturales durante los años sesenta* (Buenos Aires: Edhasa, 2013).

1965 environment in Buenos Aires, which was used by the Instituto Torcuato di Tella to promote Argentine art on the global stage. Lublin enhanced her similarly playful, interactive environment, in this case in Santa Fe, with cybernetics, which was at that time equally in vogue in Argentina and Paris. Lublin certainly anticipates contemporary artists who adapt their work to heterogeneous platforms within a global panorama of biennials and art fairs.

Aimé Iglesias Lukin examines the radicalization of the Latin American artist community in New York at the start of the 1970s through *Contrabienal*, an artist book-cum-catalogue-cum-protest against the 1971 Bienal de São Paulo. Her article shares common ground with Plante's in looking at the nascent conceptualism among expatriate Latin American artists at this time. This is an example of a South-South network that was nonetheless reliant on a Northern center such as New York to catalyze its associations and activism—one that was inspired in part by the city's woeful treatment of Latin American artists.²⁴ Her article features an incipient critique of Luis Camnitzer's distinction between a “conceptualism” produced on the periphery and what he terms “mainstream conceptual art”—the allegedly formalist and apolitical conceptual practices of global centers. If inarguably “mainstream” artists such as Gordon Matta-Clark (in a rare indication of his Chilean background as the son of the artist Matta) could have played such an important role in the boycott of the Bienal de São Paulo, and *Contrabienal* could have been produced in the new “center” of global art production, we might begin to produce a more complicated picture of the politicized “conceptualist” impulse in this period, one shared between contexts and practitioners of divergent sensibilities. *Contrabienal* is also part and parcel of New York's ability to gather together, and collectivize, both Latin Americans and Latinos/as

²⁴ There is, of course, no hard and fast rule that South-South networks must necessarily form in Northern centers. Guatemala City and Mexico City, for example, served as gathering points for the region's leftists and intellectuals at different moments in the postwar period—Guatemala prior to the military coup orchestrated by the United Fruit Company in 1954, and D.F. in the 1960s and 1970s when, despite its democratically elected government's tragic instances of repression against student protesters, the country sheltered many exiles from dictatorships in the Southern Cone.

(born in the United States of Latin American descent), in its proximity to initiatives such as the Museo del Barrio.

In a co-authored study, Camila Maroja and Abigail Winograd examine an instance of circulation and revision of curatorial models for surveys of Latin American modern and contemporary art. To some extent, this story is something of an inheritance between the era of the 1960s and 1970s and the present-day expansion of the field. Frederico Morais, the Brazilian curator behind the first Mercosur Biennial, first began working in the 1970s, and from the outset his goal was to group together the art of different Latin American countries. His 1980 proposal, with Aracy Amaral, to replace the Bienal de São Paulo with a Latin American Biennial (that planned, interestingly, to include artists from other parts of the world as well) was a direct predecessor of Mercosur. Yet only two years earlier, at the Amaral-curated Bienal Latino-Americana de São Paulo (which replaced a Brazil-only biennial, not the international Bienal de São Paulo itself), Hélio Oiticica, one of the most prominent artists in the institution, expressed his disdain for this sort of grouping, arguing in a statement that “Brazil has nothing to do with Peru.”²⁵ The proximity of Morais’s “vectorial” organization of the art history of the region and Héctor Olea and Mari Carmen Ramírez’s “consellations” for their *Heterotopías / Inverted Utopias* exhibitions exemplifies not only how ideas are shared in the field, but how they are debated and revised as they migrate between countries, venues and titles. Maroja and Winograd call welcome attention to the curatorial network shared by Morais and Ramírez—one that has redefined both the canon and the market for Latin American modern and postwar art.

Finally, in a contribution to *ARTL@S BULLETIN*’s practice-oriented “Projects” section, Sarah Poppel’s interview of the Brazilian artist Anna Bella Geiger addresses the dramatic changes in postwar Latin American art from the perspective of an individual. Detailing her own formation

within the Brazilian academy, Geiger points to the central role that World War II-era migration played for art that would emerge as late as the 1960s and 1970s. In particular, Geiger identifies pedagogy—both in terms of her educators and her own ambitions as a teacher in her own right—as a discursive site around which key ideas initiated in the Western European context were disseminated in Brasília and Rio de Janeiro in the 1950s. These personal reflections on the challenges of being simultaneously scholar, artist and mother enrich our reading of her 1970s map-based works, providing a path beyond homogenizing associations with global conceptualisms.

Geiger, to whom we extend our gratitude for participating in this issue, is one of many artists who emerged in the 1950s and 1960s that anticipate the contemporary, itinerant “Latin American artist,” who may live “between Mexico City and Berlin” or some such combination of neo-centers. In looking to networks and circulations in Latin American art, we excavate the prehistory of our biennialized present, in which Latin America is, paradoxically, characterized more than ever as a delimited, specific region and at the same time infiltrated more than ever by globalized institutions and markets. To pinpoint the hierarchies of power, and therefore the politics, within this translocality is the task of this issue’s writers, as well as that of future art historians of the region.

²⁵ See Isobel Whitelegg, “Brazil, Latin America: The World—The Bienal de São Paulo as a Latin American Question,” *Third Text*, Vol. 26, No. 1 (January 2012): 131-140.