

que con sus joyas mostraban la posición socioeconómica de la familia. Esto se vio muy claramente durante el Baile de la Victoria, donde la vieja aristocracia exhibió sólo joyas engastadas en plata mientras que los nuevos ricos las tuvieron engastadas en oro.

Los cambios en la posición de la mujer en la sociedad también se manifestaron en el concepto que se tenía de su manera de consumir. La mujer pasó de ser una criatura juguetona y caprichosa, aparentemente carente de culpas, y se convirtió en una compradora débil, manipulable y condenable, si no sentía culpa de su frivolidad (p. 99). Del Águila pone en evidencia la contradicción del discurso burgués decimonónico que por un lado busca que las mujeres conserven y muestren las virtudes de madre y esposa, pero que por el otro las convierte en sujetos de moda y espacio para la ostentación familiar. Los hombres debían ser elegantes mientras que las mujeres debían lucir vestidos lujosos a la moda. La autora usa estos y otros ejemplos de cómo la sociedad peruana fue cambiando a través del siglo diecinueve y de cómo se fue 'modernizando' al incorporarse a los cánones de un mundo cada vez más globalizado, donde la 'autorepresión' implicaba civilización. El relajamiento del orden social tras la independencia y las luchas caudillescas, que llevó a una mayor movilidad social y permisividad, terminó cuando a fines del siglo XIX y comienzos del XX se impuso un sentido del orden social más riguroso. Este libro nos permite conocer los detalles de la vida íntima de los limeños y limeñas de distintas clases sociales, logrando que el conocimiento del período sea más profundo. El intento de trazar el reordenamiento social a través del cuerpo y el género es exitoso, ya que queda claro cómo las prácticas varían con el tiempo, pero nos deja con ganas de conocer aún más profundamente el 'cuerpo social'.

Natalia Sobrevilla Perea

Universidad de Londres

ALBERTO MOREIRAS: *The Exhaustion of Difference: The Politics of Latin American Cultural Studies*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2001.

*The Exhaustion of Difference* is a multi-disciplined treatise on the state of cultural studies at the university. In his analysis, Alberto Moreiras merges culture, politics, and philosophy to comment on cultural identity within rampant globalization and assimilation to Western European, capitalist values. Moreiras censures the purpose of the university as a means of global domination. He

advocates reframing cultural studies through subalternity as an alternative to more traditional (e.g., area studies) conceptualizations of identity and difference.

Through an analysis of Latin American literature as proxy for Latin American culture, Moreiras advocates pressing Latin Americanist knowledge to its limits in order to initiate a critical, radical transformation. By radicalizing Latin American thinking, he hopes to defy university hegemony, and push “the institutional limits of disciplinary thinking, as much as we are able to . . . (p. 300).” This, he says, is Latin Americanists’ responsibility and enjoyment. With a dynamic redefinition of its own identity, cultural studies might survive as revolutionary, resisting the globalization of technopolitics.

According to Moreiras, continual renewal would protect cultural studies from being integrated into larger “institutional networks,” such as the university, that reproduce a North American style of knowing in an effort to contain Latin American studies as “the other.” He sees globalization as the impetus to homogenize Latin American studies through the appropriation of Latin American issues by both outsiders and insiders, pointing out that even many Latin American writers have internalized subordination to mainstream perspectives. As cultural studies maintains its newness, it can be the location where alternatives to neoliberalism and modernist notions of university ideology are formed.

Moreiras’ analysis encourages the reclamation of individual and collective identity and the right to self-representation. *The Exhaustion of Difference*, a meta-critical analysis of Latin American literary and cultural studies by Latin Americanists, highlights an anti-Euro/U.S. assimilation and appropriation of area studies. Recent immigration trends draw together peripheral and center (the marginalization and privilege of groups), by means of global capitalism, mass migration and telecommunications. As metaphoric borderlands within the mainland merge mainstream and subaltern values, hybridity and diversity reverse the “sameness” processes of globalization, creating greater plurality.

Moreiras showcases the rupture between modernity’s design and the new demographic politics. This rupture, he argues, is where global integration and fragmentation happen simultaneously, where dominated groups, their region, and their perspective become part of the conversation. He names ‘subalternist critical regionalism’ as the answer to the integration, fragmentation, assimilation and appropriation that result from capitalist globalization processes.

As an Associate Professor of Romance Studies and Literature at Duke University, a Brazilian, and Latin Americanist, Moreiras sets up his arguments in a musing nonlinear, contemplative, European style of writing. His frame is Marxist and post modern, and he bases his argument in his area of expertise: literature. But his method, joy, and real interest lie in philology and tropology. Through metaphor, figurative modes of argument, cross-disciplinary analyses,

and study of literature, he makes a case for keeping cultural studies independent from Euro-U.S. assimilation. Overdoing tropology and philology, though, can obscure ideas, confining cultural studies to the realm of elitist academic discourse. While his point is to be revolutionary in fighting internalized subordination, this obscure writing tends to intellectualize the struggle, cleansing it of the lived hegemony of everyday life.

While a delightful, intellectual journey, I see several problems. First is a symbolic marginalization of women and second, an unclear European writing style, both of which serve to alienate groups of readers who might otherwise be allies in confronting global hegemony and its efforts at appropriating and delegitimizing difference.

The title, *The Exhaustion of Difference*, and book cover, a sea of muted (male) hats, promise a unique critique of the field from a post structuralist perspective, yet this promise is unfulfilled. The male hats may hint at Moreiras' perspective, too, where a rich, extensive discussion of male writers prevails. The first mention of a female writer is not until page 30, where Catherine Manegold is introduced as one who stereotypes and romanticizes the Latin American 'other.' Symbolically, this is a first and negative impression of women Latin Americanists, particularly Anglo, which ignores the rich body of literature by Latin American women. Not until page 43 is there a second mention of a woman author, Beatriz Sarlo, one of the few women mentioned more than once, and in a more positive way.

A metacritique in post structuralist language that focuses primarily on male authors is guaranteed to leave many people out of the conversation. His critique is not without mention of women, but for the most part they are only briefly referred to and then dropped, while male authors typically are woven throughout the text. This sets up a hierarchy placing women Latin Americanists at the periphery of postmodern literary analyses.

Chapters five through eight focus on specific Latin American literature as case studies in Moreiras' discourse on postmodernity. Three of the four chapters showcase male writers (Cándido, Borges, Arguedas). In the only chapter that highlights a female writer, Moreiras chooses a highly contested anthropological piece (by Rigoberta Menchu, with Elizabeth Burgos-Debray) problematizing both the anthropological credibility and the literary value of the work. Instead, why not tap into comparable texts written as literature by Latin American women? Even in the chapter on magical realism in Mexico, Moreiras uses male authors, when there are legions of good women writers in the genre.

While critiquing the hegemony of European oriented U.S. capitalism and the university, Moreiras uses a European writing style that, compared to the more direct U.S. academic style or other more cyclical styles, seems repetitive,

embellished, and self-absorbed. His stream of consciousness prose, with fifty to seventy word sentences and multiple parenthetical phrases, takes deliberate attention and patience to follow. Giving new meaning to words and expressions (“identitarian space-in-resistance,”), creating verbs from nouns (“outsiding”), can offer much to contemplate and give newness to concepts, but at the same time can obscure meaning. While I respect Moreiras’ refusal to conform to a U.S. style of efficiency and conciseness in language, this style severely limits his audience to elite academics in similar fields.

Moreiras raises important points on the nature of hegemony and the place of cultural studies in resistance to neoliberal globalization strategies. But to be truly revolutionary, cultural studies will need to be more inclusive of women and more accessible to non-academics, thereby including the everyday politics of freedom so important to Moreiras. Herein is praxis.

**Susan J. Rippberger**

*University of Texas at El Paso*

HORACIO MACHIN y MABEL MORAÑA (editores): ***Marcha y América Latina***. Pittsburgh: Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana / Universidad de Pittsburgh, 2003.

La revista uruguaya *Marcha* y la figura de Carlos Quijano, su fundador y director, representan una era dorada en la memoria de muchos intelectuales rioplatenses: una época en que la sofisticación del gusto cultural, el rigor crítico y la búsqueda de alternativas sociales y políticas parecían estar en armonía y podían exhibirse como rasgos identitarios. Por su larga vida y sus muchas virtudes, *Marcha* simboliza el prolífico ambiente cultural de la posguerra en el Río de la Plata, el dinamismo social de América Latina en los sesenta y su destrucción brutal en la década siguiente. El cierre del semanario y la detención de algunos de sus miembros en 1974 confirmaron, a menos de un año de los golpes de estado en Uruguay y Chile, la dramática clausura de la vida democrática de la región y de las esperanzas de cambio de algunos sectores. Por eso, la nostalgia por las oportunidades perdidas tiñe todo intento de reflexionar sobre la historia de la revista. En el caso de esta desigual recopilación de artículos editada en Estados Unidos por los uruguayos Horacio Machín y Mabel Moraña, la nostalgia viene acompañada de una buena dosis de desconcierto: ¿qué hacer con el legado de *Marcha*, además de añorarlo?

Este desconcierto es, en gran medida, un signo de los tiempos que corren, dentro y fuera de los ámbitos académicos. Pero en lugar de asumirlo como una