biografía (1990), de Sergio Chejfec, Ran trata el tema de la lealtad y la Otredad reconstruyendo la memoria de maneras diferentes. El tema universal de la *Shoah* en esta novela va sobre las diferencias culturales y étnicas de la sociedad.

Finalmente, *Mozart lo haya yehudi* (1992) de Gabriela Avigur-Rotem, viene a cerrar el ciclo de la errancia identitaria. Ran propone que Avigur-Rotem da otra vuelta de tuerca a esta problemática agregando a Israel--y al idioma hebreo--como fin de la diáspora y locus de una nueva forma de hibridización y conflicto entre etnias y grupos sociales para el judío argentino. Ran elige acertadamente el tropo del judío errante para comparar el tratamiento de la lealtad y la Otredad en estas novelas, ya que es particularmente maleable y lo suficientemente complejo. Pone énfasis en códigos culturales y de lenguaje, distancias temporales y geográficas, y analiza las fracturas del sueño del *melting pot* para mostrar los cambios que impuso el fin del milenio a la producción cultural y literaria judeo-argentina. El texto se organiza siguiendo las líneas de lecturas mencionadas y poniendo a los textos en diálogo en cada capítulo.

Made of Shores es un libro esencial para todo lector y estudioso de la cultura y literatura argentina contemporánea. Este libro es de especial valor para estudiantes de pre- y posgrado que trabajen la relación entre la historia y la literatura. También será crucial para personas interesadas en cuestiones de género, clase, y relaciones inter-generacionales. Aquellos que estén en la temática de la Diáspora, la identidad nacional y étnica, encontrarán herramientas teóricas muy valiosas. Asimismo, es admirable el aporte que hace a la discusión sobre la presencia de la *Shoah* en la literatura latinoamericana contemporánea. Finalmente, este libro debe ser leído por aquellas personas interesadas en nuevas conceptualizaciones de problemas relacionados a la historiografía y a los estudios culturales latinoamericanos en general.

Ariana Huberman *Haverford College*

DANIELA GLEIZER: ***El exilio incómodo: México y los refugiados judíos, 1933-1945.*** México: El Colegio de México, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Cuajimalpa, 2012.

Daniela Gleizer declares, not once, but twice in *El exilio incómodo* that "México *no es, ni ha sido, un país de inmigración*" (pages 15 and 41). This statement surely would surprise the 30,000 Spanish Republican exiles in the 1930s and appreciable numbers of Central and South American refugees during the Cold War, who fled their homelands and found safe haven in Mexico. It likely will come as a revelation to many Mexicans. But as Gleizer makes clear,

nations can be welcoming to some and inhospitable to others. Jews during the 1930s and 1940s fit into this latter category. In this, they were not alone: during the period between the World Wars, the Mexican government found Asians, Eastern Europeans, gypsies, and blacks undesirable as well. President Lázaro Cárdenas' generous offer of political asylum to Spanish political refugees in the aftermath of their Civil War was the aberration.

Nor was Mexico alone in excluding Jews; it had plenty of company in the region. One hundred thousand Jews escaped Nazism and the Holocaust by going to Latin America during the years of the panic migration, but nearly 90 percent of those went to three countries – Argentina, Brazil and Bolivia. A paltry two thousand came to Mexico. Gleizer mines a rich vein of Mexican and U.S. government materials, the records of the nation's small Jewish community and international Jewish organizations, to illustrate how both endogenous and exogenous forces combined to keep Jewish refugees from entering the country. Her narrative tracks many of the key actors – the Foreign Ministry and the Ministry of Gobernación who were frequently at odds about this policy, the Congress, Cárdenas, pro-fascist groups, the 10,000-strong Jewish community, and international Jewish relief organizations. This institutional study accords little attention to the refugees themselves. She concludes that the paucity of Jewish immigration to Mexico during this period was caused by indifference, a conspicuous absence of political will, inchoate policies, and a societal predisposition that held that Jews, for reasons of faith and temperament, were incapable of assimilation.

One of Gleizer's most salient findings is that *mestizaje*--an ideology that emerged out of the Mexican Revolution and was regarded as progressive for its time because it sought to integrate the historically maligned indigenous with those of Spanish descent – in reality fostered racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, and the exclusion of undesirables. To reverse a colonial legacy of racial and ethnic hierarchy, the Revolution's ideological project not only promoted social integration by exalting the *mestizo*, but also dictated who was acceptable (the indigenous and the *criollo*) and who was not. Nativism was not only given pride of place among pro-Nazi groups and other reactionary organizations, but also suffused government reports and correspondence. This was most palpable when, after the Evian Conference in July 1938, immigration officials pigeonholed Jews as "racial refugees" in order to make it exceedingly difficult for them to obtain political asylum.

Gleizer is careful to note that government agencies often worked at cross purposes and for every obstructionist bureaucrat (generally found at the Secretaría de Gobernación) there were others like the diplomat Gilberto Bosques, who moved heaven and earth to save Jewish lives in Europe, including the family of the beloved historian of Mexico, Friedrich Katz. But taken as a whole, immi-

gration policies were inconsistent at best, and a penchant for improvisation and *la mordida* rather than any grand design characterized this period. Corruption was endemic, Gleizer notes, as bureaucrats and diplomats working within and outside the country profited from the fortunate few who found a home in Mexico. It is instructive that the cabinet member in charge of immigration during the presidency of Cárdenas' successor, Manuel Ávila Camacho (1940-1946), was none other than Miguel Alemán, who subsequently presided over one of the most corrupt presidencies in Mexican history.

Tata Cárdenas is portrayed as a Mexican Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who kept above the fray of the immigration debate, and delegated the nuts and bolts of exclusion to his ministers. Hampered by the same high unemployment that FDR confronted while digging out of the Great Depression and all too aware that public opinion was decidedly against opening the doors to Jews, the steps taken by his administration were reactive and ineffectual. Just as it was with Roosevelt, rhetorical indignation coupled with inaction was emblematic of Cárdenas' response to the refugee crisis. This stood in stark contrast to his very public intervention on behalf of Spanish Republicans.

Gleizer is keen to demonstrate how domestic politics shaped immigration policies. As the narrative progresses throughout the 1930s, we see how economic conditions, the repatriation of tens of thousands of Mexicans who had been working inside the United States, and the conservative backlash against Cardenismo during the last two years of his presidency, all conspired to inhibit a more liberal immigration policy.

We learn that fledgling Jewish organizations were by and large ineffectual as lobbying groups for their kinsmen. In part, that was a reflection of their inexperience and their lack of political and economic clout. Yet, they labored to make their voice heard on behalf of the refugees. It is telling that they turned to international Jewish relief organizations to help make their case before a reticent Mexican government. Thanks to her work in North American archives, Gleizer also tracks how Mexico cooperated with Roosevelt's efforts to build an American fortress against Nazi infiltration and sabotage. Ávila Camacho moved in lockstep with the Roosevelt administration, refusing to take any Jewish refugees from German-occupied territory because of the widely held perception that settlers with family back in Europe made tempting targets for Nazi blackmail.

In sum, Gleizer's fine-grained analysis of refugee policy and practice during the 1930s and 1940s reminds us that who a country accepts or rejects tells us much more about who it is than who it claims to be. We are in her debt for this first-rate monograph.

Allen Wells *Bowdoin College*