was one of the living moments that led tragically to its unraveling. Our three authors did much to demonstrate that the black legend is more myth than reality, and their fellow Colombians did much to show that they have good reason to believe in the myth instead.

Karl’s work is intellectual history at its best, a soft telling of the intricate moment-to-moment interplay between ideas and daily life, between daily life and ideas. His creole telling is facilitated by the abiding faith that Colombians have in the power of words. Perhaps it is too strong a belief, for in Colombia—as in so many other countries—the words of war are more ready to the mouth than the words of peace. This is not a story of an elusive peace, but of a forgotten one. Colombians made the creole peace, that huge accomplishment at the center of Robert Karl’s unexpected book, a peace that they quickly forgot they had accomplished.

As he draws his narrative to a close, Robert Karl states that the creole peace shows us that the past is possible again. That Colombians have forgotten it makes the search for that past now more difficult.

HERBERT BRAUN
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia
hb3r@virginia.edu

MODERN ART


Olga Herrera meticulously chronicles how modern art became “a strategic instrument of national security” (1) through the establishment of the Art Section of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CI-AA; later known as the Office for Inter-American Affairs) in 1941. Comprising six chapters, each corresponding to different activities sponsored by the CI-AA, Herrera’s book maps out the many interconnections and relationships motivating the circulation of modern art and design from the United States in Latin America and vice versa.

Herrera expertly charts the historical details that drove the United States to implement art initiatives as a strategy of national security and cultural defense. Determined to supplant Latin America’s cultural dependence on Europe, the United States actively deployed modern art during the World War II era as a means to disseminate ideas of freedom and democracy, all the while asserting its dominance in the hemisphere. One example of such deployment was the CI-AA sponsored exhibition Contemporary North American Painting, which circulated throughout South America in 1941. Showcasing the work of 112 US artists, the exhibit relied on the infrastructure of the Museum of
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Modern Art (MoMA); it is clear that MoMA's institutional trajectory is closely imbricated with that of the CI-AA. One notable consequence of the traveling exhibit was the establishment of artistic circuits between North and South America where none had existed before, thereby paving the path for the global art networks that mark our contemporary moment.

Herrera’s methodological approach, briefly touched on in the introduction, is informed by among other sources, Peter Dicken's concept of networks. She quotes Dicken as allowing us “to think in terms of connections of activities through flows of material and non-material phenomena, of the different ways that networks are connected, and the power relations through which networks are controlled and coordinated” (7). I am not convinced by the need for this framing device, and instead would have liked to see more on how this study relates to extant scholarship from the United States and Latin America about hemispheric cultural diplomacy during the Cold War.

In addition to documenting the activities of the understudied Art Section, Herrera sheds light on numerous figures that played pivotal roles in establishing the field of Latin American art in the United States. For example, Grace McCann Morley (1900–1985), then director of the San Francisco Museum of Art curated a selection of artworks from Central and South America for the museum, to coincide with the San Francisco Golden Gate International Exposition of 1939–40. Having traveled throughout the region, she “stressed the importance of considering each country’s art within its proper national context” (167), advocating for more focused art historical research to better understand the modern art of South America. In this vein, she also traced the trajectory of Lincoln Kirstein (1907–97), a better known and more documented figure, who was charged by Nelson A. Rockefeller and MoMA to travel to South America to acquire modern art, with a budget of $12,500. Kirstein traveled to Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, Peru, Ecuador, and Bogotá, compiling extensive reports on the artists that he visited; a complete list of his purchases is included in the book. Upon his return, he encouraged MoMA to establish a department of Latin American Art.

It is clear from the frequent glimpses into her archival findings via reproductions of correspondence, memos, photos, diagrams, advertisements, entry stubs, exhibition posters, and other memoria that Herrera conducted extensive and rigorous archival research in the United States. I found such ephemera extremely valuable in visually reconstructing the context of the period covered. However, there was no reference to research carried out in Latin American archives, which could have contributed a unique perspective to this history.

Herrera’s expansive study elucidates how governmental, private, and public spheres converged through the initiatives spearheaded by the CI-AA, providing crucial knowledge of the postwar period for both the United States and Latin America. It is
clear that this chapter in twentieth-century modern art deserves more attention and integration into existing narratives.

**ELENA SHTROMBERG**

*University of Utah*  
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**CUBA**


Emerging out of the early stages of what might be termed post-normalization studies on US-Cuban relations is a book examining a rarely-acknowledged geography: Cuba’s Isle of Youth (Isla de la Juventud), or what prior to the 1970s was known as the Isle of Pines. In his book, Michael Neagle aims to put the Isle on the historiographic map and to “rescue this overlooked story of American imperialism from obscurity” (7). The book is a timely, if at times overwrought, analysis of the Isle’s significance in the context of US empire and Cuban sovereignty.

The work is a valuable contribution to transnational foreign relations history that zooms in on non-state actors—US speculators, farmers, business owners—rather than Washington bureaucrats. In their day, these men and women acted within the legacy of Manifest Destiny: what Neagle calls “Isle colonization” was a form of settler colonialism, so that the Isle stood as a new frontier for northerners that fit within an expansionist creed energizing modern US empire across the Americas.

The monograph forks into two periods. The first, the “Hay-Quesada era” (1898–1925), was the highpoint of US emigration, when prospectors flooded the Isle; their numbers peaked at roughly 2,000 in the second decade of the twentieth century. Neagle brings to the surface their interests and the US-Cuban politics they represented and combatted. Though mostly overlooked, the infamous Platt Amendment also stipulated that the Isle of Pines would be excluded from Cuban territory until a later date, which turned out to be 1925, when the Hay-Quesada Treaty was ratified and the Isle officially placed within Cuban jurisdiction.

In the years before the treaty, Neagle reveals, arriving US Americans purchased 90 percent of the Isle’s arable land (8), developing commerce around fruits and vegetables, and levied considerable cultural influence in its schools, churches, and tourist services. On one hand, these groups upheld a settler colonial/imperial discourse that ratified American modernity and Cuban backwardness. Yet, on the other hand, arrivals from the United States found an untapped, Edenic land, where tropical weather made for decent land and a convalescent