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This fourth edition of the ICAA Documents Project Working Papers highlights two winning essays of the Peter C. Marzio Award for Outstanding Research in 20th-Century Latin American and Latino Art: “Contrabienal: Redefining Latin American Art and Identity in 1970s New York,” by Aimé Iglesias Lukin, and “Retrato de la burguesía o el impulso gráfico dinámico en la plástica monumental,” by Paola Uribe. In honoring the late Peter C. Marzio, the director of the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston (1982–2010), who supported the founding of the International Center for the Arts of the Americas in 2001, the award aims to promote, enable, recognize, and reward new scholarship in the field. Chosen by a jury of distinguished scholars, these essays draw from the primary and critical resources available through the Documents of 20th-Century Latin American and Latino Art digital archive.

The politics of regionalism is at play as a factor of group identification in Aimé Iglesias Lukin’s work on the controversial catalogue Contrabienal (1971), produced by a group of Latin American artists active in New York during the early 1970s. In her essay, Lukin traces and analyzes the activities of the two main groups—the Museo Latinoamericano and Movimiento por la Independencia Cultural de Latino América (MICLA) and the Center for Inter-American Relations (CIAR, today the Americas Society)—which coalesced around the publication, framing their activities within a moment of intersection between Latin American artists who embraced conceptualist artistic practices and those who were starting to adopt identity politics into their work. Lukin’s essay also includes transcripts of interviews she conducted with César Paternosto (Argentinean, b. 1931) and Luis Camnitzer (Uruguayan, b. 1937), two significant artists involved in Contrabienal.

The historical role of artistic collaboration is also the focus of the essay by Paola Uribe. Her work focuses on the creation of the mural Retrato de la burguesía (1939–40) at the Sindicato Mexicano de Electricistas (SME) building, in Ciudad de México, by Mexican muralist David Alfaro Siqueiros (1896–1974), Valencian Josep Renau [Berenguer] (1907–1982), and a group of international artists living in Mexico in the late 1930s. Uribe aptly documents their use of mass media, synthetic materials, and mechanic tools in achieving the impressive visual effects of Retrato de la burguesía, and she also reflects on the experimentation and technical innovation that sprung from Siqueiros and Renau’s joint effort.

The ICAA is delighted to feature both essays as part of the Documents Project Working Papers series and is proud to provide researchers around the world with a key and continually expanding platform for accessing the growing body of knowledge on the field of Latin American and Latino art.
In 1971, a group of Latin American artists living in New York published Contrabienal to promote an international boycott of the XI São Paulo Bienial, which was to be held between September 4 and November 15, 1971, in protest of the spiraling censorship and torture in dictatorial Brazil (figures 1–2). One outcome of this collective endeavor was the profound influence that the project had on the participation of artists, particularly in terms of their political ideologies and their self-identification as part of a regional group. Contrabienal was aesthetically heterogeneous, including artists from across a number of generations and movements. Its organizers—Luis Camnitzer, Eduardo Costa, Leandro Katz, Rubens Gerchman, César Paternosto, Carla Stellweg, Liliana Porter, and Teodoro Maus, among others—nonetheless were surrounded by a strong shift toward Conceptualism when taking place. Irrespective of national or aesthetic origin, for those gathering around this emerging movement, Contrabienal represented a key moment of intersection between conceptualist artistic practices and nascent identity politics among New York’s young Latin American expatriate community.¹

The two main groups behind the publication of Contrabienal, Museo Latinoamericano y Movimiento por la Independencia Cultural de Latinoamérica (MICLA), were originally created to protest the cultural policies of the Center for Inter-American Relations (CIAR, today the Americas Society), which was one of the main agencies promoting Latin American art in New York at the time.² These groups gathered together and set up a space to discuss a variety of artistic and political issues related to the United States and Latin America. Their conversations centered on the ethics of the CIAR’s board and its relationship as characteristic of the entire region [which] had become firmly rooted in the US.¹³

Contrabienal, also known as the “printed biennial,” is a 124-page, limited edition book (only 900 copies were made) that participants distributed among their artistic circles.³ After two manifesto-like introductions written by each organizing group, the book proceeds to a series of written and photographic testimonies denouncing governmental torture and murder in Brazil (figure 3). The remainder of the book includes contributions from 65 artists as well as collective letters of support signed by another 112 sympathizers from throughout the Americas and Europe. While some participants verbalized specific demands and principles, others chose to use irony and humor in graphic form, and a few included explicitly violent images to raise awareness of the repression on their continent. Contrabienal was not meant to function as a stylistic manifesto. It included instead submissions by artists who practiced different aesthetics, ranging from Neo-Figuración to Op art and minimalism.

Contrabienal was not meant to function as a stylistic manifesto. It included instead submissions by artists who practiced different aesthetics, ranging from Neo-Figuración to Op art and minimalism. Nonetheless, the book crystallized an ideologically and regionally defined group consciousness. At the same time, Contrabienal’s publication coincided with a moment in Latin American art when many of the participating artists and organizers in particular were shifting their focus to increasingly more conceptual practices. For these reasons, Contrabienal is an ideal model through which to examine and critique the narrowing gap between politics and concept-based proposals that were becoming evident in Latin American art during the late 1960s and early 1970s, especially among artists living and working in New York.⁴ This essay thus maps the circles of participation and influence through which a number of these artists coalesced under the label “Latin American” in a new, ideologically charged artistic framework. It specifically considers the Contrabienal and the associations that organized it—Museo Latinoamericano and MICLA—as unified political forces for New York-based Latin American artists, and it reflects on how their lives and work were affected by being collectively slotted into such a category. But the essay also draws on recent scholarship in questioning how three fundamental terms—the political, “Latin American,” and the conceptual—engaged and operated with respect to the Contrabienal and more broadly with budding Latin American Conceptualism.⁵

Nueva York/New York

By the mid-1960s New York had displaced Paris as the new world art center and the place to insert oneself within the emerging languages of art.⁶ As part of this process and to strengthen links with Latin America, a series of policies were enacted by the United States government and supported by private sponsors to create a network of cultural exchanges through institutional connections, exhibitions, and grants to allow artists and curators to travel in both directions. The Guggenheim Fellowship was the main vehicle through which Latin American artists could spend time working and studying in New York City, supporting, among others, Camnitzer, Nicolás García Uriburu, Katz, Jorge de la Vega, David Lamelas, Marta Minujín and Luis Felipe Noé.⁷

Nonetheless, the book crystallized an ideologically and regionally defined group consciousness. At the same time, Contrabienal’s publication coincided with a moment in Latin American art when many of the participating artists and organizers in particular were shifting their focus to increasingly more conceptual practices. For these reasons, Contrabienal is an ideal model through which to examine and critique the narrowing gap between politics and concept-based proposals that were becoming evident in Latin American art during the late 1960s and early 1970s, especially among artists living and working in New York. This essay thus maps the circles of participation and influence through which a number of these artists coalesced under the label “Latin American” in a new, ideologically charged artistic framework. It specifically considers the Contrabienal and the associations that organized it—Museo Latinoamericano and MICLA—as unified political forces for New York-based Latin American artists, and it reflects on how their lives and work were affected by being collectively slotted into such a category. But the essay also draws on recent scholarship in questioning how three fundamental terms—the political, “Latin American,” and the conceptual—engaged and operated with respect to the Contrabienal and more broadly with budding Latin American Conceptualism.
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which, as publicized in the New York Times article announcing the program, would be “New York’s first real exhibition center for the art of the Americas.” Catlin also promised that the Center would look to “internationalize” the exhibitions and to “develop a program that would tax the ingenuity of any institution.” By problematizing the medium itself, Minujín challenged the role of the institution and the social interactions it entailed.

Very quickly after its foundation, the Center for Inter-American Relations became for Latin American artists in New York both a forum and an alternative space for the discussion and representation of their art. The foundational document of this émigré artists living in New York. The foundational document of the Museo Latinoamericano was signed in February 1971. Belkin, Katz, Gerchman, Leonel Góngora, Luis Molinari Flores, Puente, and Rolando Peña formed the original group. Soon thereafter their meetings were joined by artists Camnitzer, Porter, Maus, Costa, Luis Wells, and curator and writer Stellweg, among others. The group would quickly take on more adherents, and the gatherings—held in members’ studios and homes—ultimately included dozens of participants.

The group published a newsletter, Frente, that it distributed both locally and internationally. Its first editorial titled “Letter to Latin America” reiterated the demands made to CIAR and explained the group’s platform, encouraging the creation of alternative spaces “outside the control of foundations, corporations and other organizations which arbitrarily control cultural hierarchies.” As a first measure, the artists forming the Museo Latinoamericano decided to organize an alternative exhibition to be held during Latin American Art Week. Titled ContraBienal, this counter-exhibition would include twenty-five artists for any future participation in CIAR events. “Non à la Biennale” [No to the Biennial] was the title of their call for participation, the artists affiliated with Museo Latinoamericano and MICLA decided to call for a movement against participation in the 1971 edition of the Biennial and to prepare a publication under the title ContraBienal. As a result of a trip by Camnitzer and Porter to Europe, the proposal received the support of a contemporary Parisian group, the Provisional Committee for a General Assembly of Latin American Artists, which would become key in the international promotion of the boycott. Back in New York, the artists organized an auction of works to gather funds for an offset printer and materials necessary for the publication of the planned ContraBienal. The call for participation was sent to the artists’ networks in the United States and other countries, and submissions were sent by mail. Once the funds had been raised, the machine was installed in a house shared by Maus and Stellweg, and the almost five hundred copies were printed and distributed to American, Canadian, and Latin American networks. In this way, ContraBienal could also be understood partially as related to Mail art, both because participating artists submitted their work by mail, and also due to the fundamental role that its distribution had played as a network and as a political pamphlet.

The cover (see figure 12) of ContraBienal—conceived by Wells, who at the time worked as a graphic designer—was a typographic design inspired on a photograph focusing on two hands holding a red backgammon board and two playing cards. This chromatic choice suggested the political violence the work would expose and condemn, but might also have related to the pre- ferred color of the left-wing revolutionary ideology expressed by many of the artists.

**Images of Violence**

A letter inviting artists to join the boycott and to submit works to ContraBienal, which was later published as an introduction to the book, listed a series of declarations regarding a cultural event organized by a government that employs a system of repression based on brutal torture” and the São Paulo Biennial as an “instrument of cultural colonization in our countries, a function that this biennial shares with many other cultural activities that take place in the region.”
in Latin America.

The delicate balance and search for communion between art and life, typical of the avant garde of the 1960s, would be tested by the political situations in these countries. Many artists abandoned their work and refused their attention on direct political action, in some cases going so far as to join guerrilla movements. This was anticipated by Edgardo Vigni’s submission to Contrabienal, where under the acronym “T.N.T.” a message stated: “This cannot be solved any more with ideas but with DIRECT ACTIONS, like the use of the above mentioned.” In the case of Antonia Galbraith’s drawing entitled “Latinoamérica,” the Mexican artist addressed North American interventionism in the region by depicting a scissored tagged “Made in USA” next to silhouettes with simulated cut-out lines, reminding the viewer of paper dolls. Her entry was the most explicit account of the group’s initial concern in the way in which North American institutions conceived of Latin American art.

Contrabienal had no stylistic goals, the invited artists differed in their creative processes and in their view of art, but they remained united for political and identity-related reasons. The sixty-two individual submissions can be divided into two large groups according to graphic versus written participation. Among the first group, most artists created images that did not relate stylistically to the art that they regularly made or had been making. Two factors seem to have affected this decision: the restrictions of the two-dimensional, black-and-white format of the print, and the (perceived) limitations of abstract art as a denunciatory message in and of itself. Such was the case for Uruguayan painter and sculptor Leopoldo Núñez, who instead of his usual informalist painting sent a comic-style drawing in which a military figure is about to sodomize an artist under the word “award ceremony.” A parallel sexualized metaphor was used by Wells, who made use of the similarity between the words “Pablo” (the Spanish translation of São Paulo) and “palo” (stick) to create an advertisement-style graphic for a suppository he dubbed “san pano via anal,” with “imported scents, in fragrances minimal, conceptual, systems and more!!” Wells’s submission accounts for the concern they had regarding the imposition of mainstream styles and systems and more!!

The delicate balance and search for communion between art and life, typical of the avant garde of the 1960s, would be tested by the political situations in these countries. Many artists abandoned their work and refused their attention on direct political action, in some cases going so far as to join guerrilla movements. This was anticipated by Edgardo Vigni’s submission to Contrabienal, where under the acronym “T.N.T.” a message stated: “This cannot be solved any more with ideas but with DIRECT ACTIONS, like the use of the above mentioned.” In the case of Antonia Galbraith’s drawing entitled “Latinoamérica,” the Mexican artist addressed North American interventionism in the region by depicting a scissored tagged “Made in USA” next to silhouettes with simulated cut-out lines, reminding the viewer of paper dolls. Her entry was the most explicit account of the group’s initial concern in the way in which North American institutions conceived of Latin American art.

Those artists who participated with written submissions in the form of letters and manifestos had the opportunity to develop their ideological positions in more detailed form. Many focused on institutional critiques of biennials and their system of prizes and national representations. Lorenzo Homar’s handwritten letter addressed the difficulties of colonizers like his native Puerto Rico, which was forced to participate under the representation of its colonizer and its imposed cultural standards. The contradictory role of artists in society was another prevalent topic in the book. Julio Le Parc’s two-page manifesto was formatted as a numbered list with the title “Social Function of Art in Contemporary Society” (Figure 7). Point twelve argued that to fight the totalitarian view of art promoted by power, the artist’s status needs to be leveled with that of a common blue-collar worker and that art must be conceived as a continuous exploration. León Ferrari’s letter also addressed the role of artists in bourgeois society. Almost all artists worked with their back turned to the people, creating pleasures for the cultural elite that promotes them, and for the money that buys them, and the avant-garde, with their back turned to their country, seek prestige in international art centers by collaborating in the creation of a Western art that will later be used as a justification of all the excesses committed by the West.47

Other artists presented more lyrical and even cryptic texts, notably Mathias Goeritz described a nightmare in which “a guerrilla of militant artists—among them some friends of mine—kidnapped me and took me to a gigantic hole full of contemporary art:*” the hole, with its awful stench, was the biennial.48

For many, participation in Contrabienal was not only an opportunity to air a specific complaint but also a chance to help create a new space for discussion that would permit them to identify as a group (Latin Americans) and even allow for an altered consciousness that could facilitate more stylistic expressions beyond the stereotype pressed upon them. Such utopian views are reflected in Porter’s handwritten letter, where she claims that the participation is also “a communication device with colleagues around this new consciousness,” and closes by saying that “[m]aybe, this shared focus can create a new language” (Figure 8). In addition to such individual expressions, Contrabienal also included a section with collective statements against participation in the São Paulo Biennial. The Museo de Arte Contemporáneo de la Universidad de Chile joined the boycott in a letter signed by the institution’s director and seventy-four artists. Two large groups also sent letters from Mexico and Argentina.

Figure 4 Museo Latinoamericano y Movimiento por la Independencia Cultural de Latinoamérica (MICLA) “Introducción: la sustitución,” in Contrabienal (New York, 1975), private archives of Luis Camnitzer, New York.

Figure 5 Squatting in the Contrabienal, New York, 1971.

Figure 6 Julio Le Parc, Escultura social de arte en la sociedad contemporánea, entry for Contrabienal (New York, 1975). Private archives of Julio Le Parc, Caen, France (CAAM Revisited: MFAH).

Figure 7 León Ferrari, T.N.T. (New York), 1971, entry for Contrabienal (New York, 1975), private archives of Luis Camnitzer, New York.
This brief survey of the book reveals it to function as a multi-dimensional and varied platform, presenting diverse visual and rhetorical strategies to address equally diverse ideological concerns. From serving as an anti-imperialist institutional critique to offering avant-garde reevaluations of the role of art and artists in society, the submissions in Contrabienal gave a textured account of the complexities of Latin American art and culture, positioned in contrast to the stereotype version of “Latin American” offered by CIA and other international institutions. Ironically, in these varied expressions, the artists, ultimately grouped themselves under the same contested label, “Latin American,” and as Camnitzer remarked, the actions offered them an unparalleled sense of community, thereby in some senses claiming for themselves and pursuing a collective identity that was internally externally derived. Contrabienal would thus become a symbolic battle over the regionalist denominator “Latin American.”

Art Systems: Matta-Clark vs. Glusberg

The section of group submissions of Contrabienal was followed by the publication of the letters of artist Gordon Matta-Clark, son of the Chilean painter Roberto Matta, and Argentinean curator Jorge Glusberg, who had engaged in a polemic over the exhibition Art Systems, which the latter was preparing for the São Paulo Biennial.50

The exhibition, which opened in Buenos Aires with plans to send the works exhibited in São Paulo would shamefully give importance to this totalitarian government and its allies.” Therefore, as Matta-Clark explained,” he would have to withdraw his work from the Glusberg exhibition and support the boycott from artists in both, in partial agreement, Robert Morris, Walter De Maria, Michael Heizer, Hans Haacke, Mel Bochner, Dan Graham, Richard Serra, Keith Sonnier, Vito Acconci, Lee Jaffe, Christo, Ferry Fox, and Les Levine. The letter went further still, questioning Glusberg’s ethical stance and asking artists not to send the pieces to the Buenos Aires exhibition. He warned that “my sense is that Glusberg fully intends to send the works he receives (for the Buenos Aires exhibition) to São Paulo, and that it probably is not easier making political statements in Argentina than in Brazil.”54

Glusberg swiftly responded, and his rebuttal was included in Contrabienal. Titled “Why I decided to participate with ‘Art Systems’ in the São Paulo Biennial and now I desist,” the text aimed to explain the reasoning behind his proposal. Initially hesitant about participating because of the precedent of the 1969 boycott, Glusberg decided that it would “constitute a positive event to allow Brazilian artists to inform themselves, dialogue and communicate with works and artists representing the whole world, allowing them to in a way break with the isolationism to which they are subjected by the police state.” The curator continued the missive by listing the participating artists, dividing the list according to whether they had agreed to take part in writing or simply verbally, Matta-Clark was mentioned in the first group. Glusberg continued by stating that due to a series of letters he had received after withdrawing from participation—even though he disagreed with the boycott as a useful strategy—he had decided to cancel the whole exhibition to show his ideological agreement with the larger cause. He closed the letter by defending himself against Matta Clark’s accusations of sending the works against the artists’ wishes, calling this a “gratuitous attack on an intellectu - al worker.”55

The exchange between Matta-Clark and Glusberg is ultimately about more than Art Systems and its relationship with the boycotted Biennial in that it actually also expresses many of the issues central to the Contrabienal, including a general exhaustion with models of inclusion and the representation of peripheral artists in the biennials.56 Glusberg’s proposal stated that it would be beneficial for Brazilian artists to be surrounded by international avant-garde artists and that through artistic dialogue they could break the boundaries established by their authoritarian government. Such a position was not simply representative of his intellectual naïveté, but a shared common stance by opposed agents under the influence of the increasingly influential internationalist trend toward developmentalism (desarrollismo), which postulated that a strong bond with centers of art could improve the quality of artistic production in the periphery.57 Even though Glusberg did not explicitly say so, the problem with his proposal was the paternalistic implication that mainstream art would help peripheral artists simply through simply by exhibiting together. In Camnitzer’s words, these “arguments with regards to piggybacking on hegemonic figure seemed like a ‘colonized’ attitude.”58

The Contrabienal as Test Case: Conceptualist, Latin American, Political

A renewed attention to the Latin American region was taking place in the United States during the 1960s and 1970s, both in political and cultural terms. The Center for Inter-American Relations was part of this process, as was the association of artists that created the Contrabienal! At the same time, a group of artists and the majority of oppositional strategies they were creating works that would come to be categorized as conceptualist. The art historical analysis of their production would later highlight the “political content” of their pieces as a differential, which facilitated their independence from the mainstream currents in North America. Political Latin American conceptualism would thus become the canonical label used to refer to Latin American conceptual art. An analysis, as well as a historicization of the central terms of this thesis—political, Latin American, conceptualist—helps to shed greater light on this trajectory that has been woven together to create this canonical account. As such, Contrabienal becomes not only a testimony of regionalist identification and of the important international networks of contact in between Latin American artists, but also a key object of study of the early associations in between Latin American emerging conceptual art and politics.

Conceptualism: Simón Munchín Fiz had briefly referred to the political character of Latin American conceptualism in the 1970s, but it was not until the 1990s, under the impulse of multiculturalism, that a characterization of “other conceptualisms” became necessary.59 In fact, it was in the United States, for the catalogue of MoMA’s 1992 exhibition Latin American Artists of the Twentieth Century, that Mari Carmen Ramirez wrote her groundbreaking essay “Blue Print Circuits Conceptual Art and Politics in Latin America,” which sparked renewed interest in the period 60 As this point, the argument was introduced that the political content of their distinctive character. Building on Marchán Fiz’s line of argument, Ramirez stated that the political logic of Latin American conceptualism rests on a different social and institutional model in which formalism and dematerialization of the network were not principal concerns, and as such the artwork could carry a “message” without betraying avant-garde intentions. She continued, arguing that for these artists, “the act of replacing tautology with meaning is grounded in the larger project of exiting exhausted political and ideological circuits through the revitalization of contexts.” Thus, the revisionist version of Conceptual Art offered by Latin America involved the “recovery of an emancipatory project... when most forms of contemporary art have run up the blind alley of self-referentiality.”61

Global Conceptualisms, a 1999 exhibition organized by Camnitzer, Jane Farver, and Rachel Weiss at the Queens Museum, had an even more ambitious goal: to take conceptualism to the international level by exploring its potential ramifications and posing that the movement had multiple points of origin.62 To do so, the exhibition made a distinction between the notions of “Conceptual Art” and “Conceptualism,” with the former referring to a mainstream self-ref-
maintained their allegiance to their culture.” 48 The use of categories such as “Latin American” and “Latin American conceptualism” thus becomes a double-edge sword, offering methodological tools for understanding a series of artistic manifestations but also packaging them as “universal” artists . . . but the category of ‘Latin American’ was very much present. It was a label that they would stick on you as soon as you was ‘Latin American.’ Coming from Buenos Aires, we all aimed to be such as “Latin American” and “Latin American conceptualism” thus be a 1950s left-winger.” 70 To be grouped as Latin American meant for assert their own identity.

This Contrabienal, then, was the one result of the rise of a new, politicized campus for Latin American art in New York in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The group of artists in question was innovative not only in terms of regional association and cultural activism, but also through the introduction of conceptualist practices in their personal art and on the pages of Contrabienal . Yet, one could argue that this campus also extended well beyond New York although El Museo Latinoamericano and MCLAA had originally been established with the specific goal of challenging the folklorist representation of Latin American art offered by the city’s Center for Inter-American Relations, the boycott against the XI Sao Paulo Biennial and the publication of Contrabienal involved the establishment of an international network of political and stylistic exchange. In this process, these artists redefined their personal art practices and identities, as well as the concept of Latin American art across the world.

Appendix A

Interview with César Paternosto, November 3, 2013 75

AIME IGLÉSIAS LUKIN: How did your insertion in the North American art scene develop? Which contacts did you have at your arrival to New York, and how were you received by the local circles?

CESAR PATERNOSTO: The truth is that a real insertion never took place. You would always feel, or rather, they would make you feel, like a “fish out of water.” Maybe if I had arrived when I was younger and studied there, a better form of insertion would have been possible. But I arrived when I was already grown up, immediately after winning the first prize of the 3rd Córdoba Biennial.

As for contacts, at the Biennial I had met Alfred Barr (later I realized his importance... ) (He) now less well thought-of by intellectuals who question his “formalism,” but without his eye this formidable MoMA collection could not have been formed. When I arrived, he called me to his office, and he granted me my first entry pass into the museum as an artist of the collection (he bought one of my Biennial prizes—winning objects for the museum’s collection). I had also established a good relationship with Sam Hunter, who unfortunately had shortly before that been hired as director of the Jewish Museum, an institution that was very “trendy” at the time. Also, around that time, a pret ty influential collector, William Weintraub, who had donated works to MoMA was taking me under his wing.

In the year after my arrival, in 1964, I got in contact with Abe Sachs, owner of the AM Sachs Gallery, who was excited about my work, and he gave me an exhibition in September of that year (something that many Latin American artists had been waiting for many years). His gallery was on 37th Street, years before Soho or Chelsea was the “cosmic center” of the art world. His gallery—even if it wasn’t “top notch” like Castelli’s or Emmerich’s, which formed the two poles of the establishment back then—was under the influential orbit of Greenberg (whom we had met in Buenos Aires). And that’s how my artistic life in New York began, full of highs and lows.

AIL: Did you identify as Latin American upon your arrival to New York? Was that “category” very present at the time, or not so much? Did association with the Museo Latinoamericano and the protests against the politics of the Center for Inter-American Relations affect that identification?

CP: It was in New York that I discovered that I was “Latin American.” Coming from Buenos Aires, we all aimed to be “universal” artists! And I don’t think that was any different in other Latin American countries. Moreover, I was chasing a fantasy: I was convinced that New York would be for Latin American artists what Paris was for the rest of Europe (L’École de Paris comprised a great number of other Europeans). But it wouldn’t turn out that way. It would turn out to be quite different. In the 60s, New York was consolidating the geopolitical power of its art, and Latin America was, particularly with regards to visual arts, more than ever “the backyard.” And a Latin American artist, especially if he or she aspired to make avant-garde art in New York, was perceived as an annoyance or as an intruder. No matter how many photographs Marta Minujin would make with Andy Warhol, she would never be considered his equal.

There was a barrier, as transparent as it was unbearable. In literature, García Márquez and Borges were already very influential, and in music, Astor Piazzolla was widely recognized. It was always the visual arts that there was a certain chauvinism, in the end is not more than the rest. Maybe it was an unresolved and intimate sense of inferiority to Europe? I do not know if it is clear today, almost half a century later, when everybody tries to emulate or work among the canon that was formulated in the United States during those years—conceptual art (topmost), installation, video— that what I say sounds like a table. Or, let me paraphrase, it does not contradict it, because if you follow such rules you have more chances to have a career, to be invited to biennials, to Documenta, etc. But those of us who lived during those years in New York, we have another experience.

The category of ‘Latin American’ was very much present. It was a label that would stick on you as soon as you arrived. A label of discrimination. And it was the discrimination of galleries, curators, and the establishment in general, the decisive factor that led to the formation of the so-called Museo Latinoamericano. In other words, discrimination meant lack of access to galleries, meaning the [an obstacle to the] development of a career. And one would feel the discrimination because most Latin American artists already had a name in their home countries, and they rightfully aspired to continue their professional life in New York.

The Museo Latinoamericano came up spontaneously from conversations with colleagues and friends. By 1972, when the group was created, I was an exception because I had already had two solo shows in important spaces such as the AM Sachs Gallery. However, I had also received strong discriminatory messages from the establishment, so I acted in solidarity with my friends. Before my arrival in 1967, Camnitzer had already participated in political actions against the CIA, protesting its role as an extension of the Rockefeller power.

In my view, a great animator of the actions was Arnold Belkin, who was born Canadian but had lived and worked many years in Mexico, where he studied with Seiquerès and from whom he assimilated the sociopolitical ideology of muralism. León Gómez. Colombian painter and teacher in Ahmerst. I also remember the early participation of Mau. Finally Alejandro Puente, along with many others that I do not remember right now.

From those initial meetings was born the idea to do “something” politically. These were years of political revolt: the opposition to Vietnam, the Black Panthers, May ’68 in Paris. Somebody had the idea to name the group “Museo Latinoamericano” to refer to an ideal museum, whose location would be our own An application to MoMA was taken under his wing.

AIL: Who do you remember as participating in Museo Latinoamericano?

CP: The founders of Museo were Arnold Belkin, Leonel Góngora, Leandro Katz, Luis Molinari Flores, Alejandro Puente, Rolando Peña and myself. The word spread and soon our meetings had large groups of people.

AIL: Who do you remember as part of Movimiento por la Independencia Cultural de Latinoamérica (MICLA)?

CP: The undeniable leader of the group was Luis Camnitzer. He was surrounded by Liliana Porter—his wife at the time—Teodoro Mau and his wife Carl Stellwag, and Luis Wells. They joined the meetings of Museo Latinoamericano a little bit later, and then gradually dif ferentiated from the group.

AIL: How did the division of the group come about? CP: This is for me a very delicate story to narrate, mainly because it involves colleagues and friends. And also because over the years I have heard very selective memories of it, built in very self-indulgent perceptions. I will try to be as objective as possible.
As the meetings became more and more numerous, two wings of the movement started to take shape. The first, the majority, wanted to open a professional path, put pressure on galleries and demand that the Center offer more services to help artists through the “unionized” tendency. The majority of the group did not want to take an open political position that would sacrifice their careers. The CIMLA wanted to organize exhibitions of the groups’ participants in prestigious galleries under its auspices, and we in MICA saw that as an “installment payment,” an insufficient compromise.

AIL: How was the call for participation in Contrabienal promoted?
LC: The call for participation was open but not truly public. We wanted to make the publication a more attractive forum for discussion than the Biennial, which at the time represented a heinous power structure.
AIL: Where did you obtain the testimonies and description regarding violence in Brazil that opens the publication?
LC: I think Teodoro Mauz had contacts, and that the information came through him, but I am not sure.

Another interesting fact is that to gather funds for a small offset printer, the two groups held a joint auction of artworks. We installed the printer in Maus and Stellweg’s loft, where we produced A Principality of Its Own: 40 years of Visual Arts at the Americas Society (New York: Americas Society, 2006). Fabiana Serviddio offers the richest approach to the polarizing role of CIAR among the community of Latin American artists residing in New York as part of a larger research project on the history of regional representation in North American institutions. Her analysis is brief and does not mention Contrabienal, but it nonetheless firmly situates the important role that CIAR, Museo Latinoamericano, and MICA played in identity construction during the period. See Fabiana Serviddio, “Exhibiting identity: Latin American identities between the Imaginary and the Real,” Journal of Social History 44 no. 2 (Winter 2010): 447–68.

The best account of the events that led to the publication of Contrabienal’s La Comisaria’s essay, “The Museo Latinoamericano and MICLA,” included in A Principality of Its Own, a book celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the Americas Society. The Uruguayan artist was one of the main organizers of Museo Latinoamericano, and this text gives a detailed description of the main events leading up to its publication. Luis Camnitzer, “The Museo Latinoamericano and MICLA” in Farings and Range’s, La Comisaria, Interview with Luis Camnitzer, the album and the current article).

AIL: Who do you remember being part of Movimiento por la American Identity in 1970s New York, and how were you received by the local circles? LC: Teodoro Maus, Liliana Porter, Carla Stellweg, Eduardo Costa, Antonia Galbraith, Luis Wells, and me. All of them had participated in Contrabienal. Luis Felipe Noé, César Paternosto, Eduardo Costa, Teodoro Maus, Carla Stellweg, Leónel Góngora, Leandro Katz, Rolando Pefa, Viva Giorgi, Arnold Belkin, Antonia Galbraith, Luis Wells, me, etc. I would say we were twenty-five in total.
AIL: Who do you remember being part of Movimiento por la Independencia Cultural de Latinoamérica (MICLA)?
LC: Teodoro Maus, Liliana Porter, Carla Stellweg, Eduardo Costa, Antonia Galbraith, Luis Wells, and me.
AIL: What were the divisions among and between the groups? LC: A part of Museo Latinoamericano—I would say the majority—demanded that the Center offer more services to help artists through their personal careers. In the group from MICA, we wanted to politi- cize it in a more radical way in defense of Latin American interests. The majority of the group did not want to take an open political position that would sacrifice their careers. The CIMLA wanted to organize exhibitions of the groups’ participants in prestigious galleries under its auspices, and we in MICA saw that as an “installment payment,” an insufficient compromise.
AIL: How do you see, in retrospect, the role of these two groups? LC: As you know, the most notable result was the book...
They were also to abstain from relations with any organization involved in repressing activities not conducive to the liberation of Latin American coun-

50 Jorge Glusberg (1932−2012) was an Argentinean writer, curator, and professor. In 1968, he founded Centro de Arte y Comunicación (CAYC) with artist and friend Luis Camnitzer. Minujín’s photoperformance 


52 "The São Paulo Bienal was the most important international art event in the hemisphere, Anthony Loeb, "To the Soviet Museum on Park Ave. till 2016: A Center as a Latin American Living in New York and included paintings from twenty-eight artists presenting a wide panorama of stylistic tendencies. Alfredo Beltrán was probably the most important debtor of the time and had gallery spaces in Buenos Aires and Rio de Janeiro. His New York space was located at 37th Street. For a brief account of its history, see "The Galería Beltrán, in its ten years in New York," 1989, typed manuscript, Galería Beltrán Archives, Fundación Eudeba, Buenos Aires. With regard to Stuart Katz, see note 41 above.

53 "Packaging Latin American in New York in the 1960s and 1970s," Thomasson. It is possible that Maus obtained the material from the 1971 work of Bernardo Arana, César Paternosto, interview with the author, November 1, 2013.


55 "Luis Camnitzer, interview with the author, November 6, 2013."

56 "Fue en Nueva York, que descubrí que era ‘latinoamericano’. Para mi generación que hablaba ‘portugues’ o ‘bilingüe’ no había un concepto de la categoría ‘latinoamericano’ que pudiera entenderse como tal. Pero la llegada.” César Paternosto, interview with the author, November 3, 2013.
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A lo largo de la década de los treinta, David Alfaro Siqueiros (1896-1974) emprendió lo que él mismo denominó una Revolución Técnica en el muralismo. En 1937 participó en la guerra civil española y su retorno a México, produjo su siguiente trabajo mural Retrato de la burguesía (1939-40) en el Sindicato Mexicano de Electricistas (SME). Para llevar a cabo la ejecución del mural, Siqueiros convocó en junio de 1939 al Equipo Internacional de Artistas Plásticos conformado por artistas mexicanos —Antonio Pujol (1902-95) y Luis Arenal (1908-85)— y artistas españoles exiliados y de la guerra civil española que figuran: Antonio Rodrigo Luna (1906-95) y Miguel Prieto (1907-56) y el valenciano Josep Renau (1907-82). En el proyecto presentado tanto a Siqueiros como a José Clemente Orozco, este último impuso como tema pintar mujeres desnudas. Con esta respuesta el sindicato dio el mural a Siqueiros (6).

El 28 de agosto de 1939 el pintor se comprometió a realizar el trabajo de la obra que denomina “El abismo de desaliento y desunión”, un mural destinado a la remodelación del mural de la casa de síndico del Sindicato en los Talleres de la Mujer. El trabajo se puso en marcha el 1 de septiembre con la participación de los artistas internacionales, uniéndose a la lucha de la guerra civil española, experiencia bélica que determinó su siguiente trabajo mural en el SME, Retrato de la burguesía. Un grupo de dirigentes del sindicato defendía incondicionalmente la lucha antifascista sostenida por la II República Española e invitaron a Siqueiros a elaborar un mural para su nueva sede de la calle Artes núm. 45 (actualmente Antonio Caso) en la colonia Tabacalera de la Ciudad de México construida por el arquitecto Enrique Yáñez en colaboración con Ricardo Rivas.7 Dentro de este grupo había interesados en aspiraciones culturales como David Roldán y Luis Espinosa Casanova, quienes impulsaron la realización del mural. El proyecto fue presentado tanto a Siqueiros como a José Clemente Orozco, pero este último propuso como tema pintar mujeres desnudas. Con esta respuesta el sindicato dio el mural a Siqueiros (6).

Retrato de la burguesía es el último mural que Siqueiros pintó para el Sindicato Mexicano de Electricistas (SME). Para llevar a cabo la ejecución del mural, Siqueiros convocó en junio de 1939 al Equipo Internacional de Artistas Plásticos conformado por artistas mexicanos —Antonio Pujol (1902-95) y Luis Arenal (1908-85)— y artistas españoles exiliados y de la guerra civil española que figuran: Antonio Rodrigo Luna (1906-95) y Miguel Prieto (1907-56) y el valenciano Josep Renau (1907-82). En el proyecto presentado tanto a Siqueiros como a José Clemente Orozco, este último impuso como tema pintar mujeres desnudas. Con esta respuesta el sindicato dio el mural a Siqueiros (6).

El compromiso sociopolítico

La mayor parte de la iconografía del Retrato de la burguesía está basada en los archivos de imágenes de la guerra civil española que Siqueiros traía a México. En este sentido el mural se convirtió en el espacio en donde se representaron las imágenes actuales de guerra. Por lo tanto Retrato de la burguesía es un testimonio de la guerra civil española y representa las consecuencias catastróficas de la emergente guerra actual (imagen 3). Pero, al mismo tiempo, Retrato de la burguesía fue producto del pensamiento científico en el arte, es un ejemplo de lo artístico conforme a la tradición moderna de la pintura pero con métodos y técnicas que incorporaban nuevas tecnologías, materiales y medios masivos de comunicación, así como una construcción innovadora para la percepción óptica. Además de representar el contexto internacional y nacional sobre la lucha entre el fascismo y el comunismo, al mismo tiempo, el dicho mural, podemos hacer la lectura de las técnicas plásticas que utilizaron Siqueiros y Renau en relación con las tecnologías audiovisuales (7). Entre estas, se sitúan el uso de la cámara fotográfica y la cinematográfica, así como las herramientas y materiales industriales.

En 1937, Siqueiros viajó a España como miembro de las Brigadas Internacionales, uniéndose a la lucha de la guerra civil española, experiencia bélica que determinó su siguiente trabajo mural en el SME, Retrato de la burguesía. Un grupo de dirigentes del sindicato defendía incondicionalmente la lucha antifascista sostenida por la II República Española e invitaron a Siqueiros a elaborar un mural para su nueva sede de la calle Artes núm. 45 (actualmente Antonio Caso) en la colonia Tabacalera de la Ciudad de México construida por el arquitecto Enrique Yáñez en colaboración con Ricardo Rivas.7 Dentro de este grupo había interesados en aspiraciones culturales como David Roldán y Luis Espinosa Casanova, quienes impulsaron la realización del mural. El proyecto fue presentado tanto a Siqueiros como a José Clemente Orozco, pero este último propuso como tema pintar mujeres desnudas. Con esta respuesta el sindicato dio el mural a Siqueiros (6).

El 28 de agosto de 1939 el pintor se comprometió a realizar el trabajo de la obra que denomina “El abismo de desaliento y desunión”, un mural destinado a la remodelación del mural de la casa de síndico del Sindicato en los Talleres de la Mujer. El trabajo se puso en marcha el 1 de septiembre con la participación de los artistas internacionales, uniéndose a la lucha de la guerra civil española, experiencia bélica que determinó su siguiente trabajo mural en el SME, Retrato de la burguesía. Un grupo de dirigentes del sindicato defendía incondicionalmente la lucha antifascista sostenida por la II República Española e invitaron a Siqueiros a elaborar un mural para su nueva sede de la calle Artes núm. 45 (actualmente Antonio Caso) en la colonia Tabacalera de la Ciudad de México construida por el arquitecto Enrique Yáñez en colaboración con Ricardo Rivas.7 Dentro de este grupo había interesados en aspiraciones culturales como David Roldán y Luis Espinosa Casanova, quienes impulsaron la realización del mural. El proyecto fue presentado tanto a Siqueiros como a José Clemente Orozco, pero este último propuso como tema pintar mujeres desnudas. Con esta respuesta el sindicato dio el mural a Siqueiros (6).
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Para Siqueiros, la fotografía debía ser usada como modelo o documento gráfico de la pintura, puesto que la fotografía es el soporte que da cuenta de la realidad social y científica. En este sentido, Siqueiros, pensaba en el realismo pictórico en estrecha relación con la fotografía. "Sin el boceto fotográfico el pintor seguirá siendo un auténtico místico, es decir un parasito de la belleza. Su obra no tendrá un valor social alguno." La fotografía es la materia prima en imagen de la realidad histórica.

No es innovación de Siqueiros el uso de la fotografía en el bocetaje de la pintura, desde el siglo XVI se usaba la cámara oscura para lograr ilusiones ópticas. El muralista siguió una tradición renacentista pero con tecnología avanzada. Lo que si hizo, fue "la deserotización de la fotografía en una tradición pictórica que mantiene secretos lo implícitos" sus 'trucos' o procedimientos técnicos." (imagen 2) Sin duda, el "traer a la luz" al registro del proceso como auxiliar en la composición de los pintos de vista, fue otro descubrimiento sobre la función de la fotografía. Un joven fotógrafo acompañó a Siqueiros mientras organizaba la ejecución de los murales angelinos: "pero un día nos puso de golpe delante de un cuadro [...] la proyección de los murales en cámara, a partir de las fotografías, sí que son teoría plástica fotográfica el pintor seguirá siendo un auténtico místico, es decir un parasito de la belleza. Su obra no tendrá un valor social alguno." La fotografía es la materia prima en imagen de la realidad histórica.

Después de hacer nuestros primeros bocetos, usamos la cámara y película para ayudarnos en la elaboración de nuestros primeros dibujos, particularmente de los modelos [...]. La proyección con una cámara fue el método para ampliar nuestro dibujo y de este modo proyectar nuestro diseño directamente en el muro.24

Siqueiros también experimentó con el montaje, tenía como referencia su práctica poligráfica "es decir, el montaje de todas las expresiones artísticas" en el montaje de recortes de imágenes de revistas y el uso de la pistola de aire, procedimientos que ya venía utilizando desde el diseño de revistas ilustradas y de carteles de propaganda para la guerra civil. Sobre los fotomontajes de Renau, Alfonso Morales detalla que "hablan de un ojo educado, de una portentosa memoria visual y de una enorme capacidad de tender puentes entre imágenes separadas por el tiempo, el espacio y la intención, por todo ello son brillantes testimonios de la praxis específica del artista plástico como bricoleur de imágenes" (imagen 3).
La aproximación de Renau y Siqueiros a la fotografía coincidía porque ambos reconocían el valor objetivo de la realidad social y política. Utilizaron el montaje como estrategia visual y política: su relación con la fotografía se situaba dentro de una de las vías posibles de la fotografía moderna mexicana en la década de los treinta y cuarenta "ligada al concepto discursivo del muralismo, el cine, la publicidad y por lo tanto a los medios masivos de comunicación". 43 Estos planteamientos quedaban claramente expuestos en los fotomontajes mexicanos de Renau además de los escritos de Siqueiros de esta época. 43

Renau siguiendo la idea establecida por Siqueiros en la configuración del mural de unidad continua con un estilo foto-cinematográfico, realizó un estudio de los posibles golpes de vista que haría el espectador al recorrer el mural a través de la trama del espacio revolucionario, donde el pintor nos muestra a través del techo del edificio, la acción concreta de los obreros fundiendo metales, le sigue la imagen del famoso "muro de cartulinas" con el que el muralista estaba pensado para causar efectos emocionales con imágenes propios de la cinematografía, por la yuxtaposición de distintos planos funcionando como un segundo nivel de narración. 58 Retrato de la burguesía dialoga con el fotomontaje político como vía y estrategia de la crítica visual que practicaron muchos fotografos de la década de los treinta en México. 59 En esta línea estaban los montajes de Yáñez Alcántara en el periódico El Sol de la ciudad de México, 60 y el acercamiento "terriblemente siniestro y extraordinariamente plástico" 64 de Renau a la teoría del montaje de Eisentein que consiste en el uso simultáneo de elementos objetivos y subjetivos (en ciertos momentos separados) expresado mediante un estilo moderno. 64 Los fotomontajes y el trabajo fototécnico que realizó Renau estaban compuestos por imágenes documentales de recortes de revistas y negativos fotográficos de él. Los recortes o las fotografías eran proyectados en el muro para después trazar encima de ellas sobre la pared, proyectando la imagen según el punto de vista del espectador para visualizar las distorsiones naturales de la vista. 65

El estilo que proponía el muralista fue el realismo dinámico: "implica el uso simultáneo de elementos objetivos y subjetivos (en ciertos momentos separados) expresado mediante un estilo moderno" 54. El hom bre frente a la tecnología bélica 23 de la serie de obreros fundiendo metales. Le sigue la imagen de un hombre monitoreándolo; le sigue, desde una perspectiva en picada, otro aspecto de la teoría del montaje de Eisentein que consiste en el uso simultáneo de elementos objetivos y subjetivos (en ciertos momentos separados) expresado mediante un estilo moderno. 64 Los fotomontajes y el trabajo fototécnico que realizó Renau estaban compuestos por imágenes documentales de recortes de revistas y negativos fotográficos de él. Los recortes o las fotografías eran proyectados en el muro para después trazar encima de ellas sobre la pared, proyectando la imagen según el punto de vista del espectador para visualizar las distorsiones naturales de la vista. 65

El estilo que proponía el muralista fue el realismo dinámico: "implica el uso simultáneo de elementos objetivos y subjetivos (en ciertos momentos separados) expresado mediante un estilo moderno" 54. El hombre en el submundo de la pared derecha se ve un centro de control y ahí un híbrido mitad máquina, mitad pájaro. También hay una pareja de soldados que se cruzan, cada plano que nos presentaba a un observador ideal móvil en el tiempo y el espacio". 47
En la pared central, el piso está cuarteado y vemos a tres personajes, portando máscaras antigas, representan a Francia, Gran Bretaña y Estados Unidos que sale de una gran máquina. Sigue la imagen de una lica, que sobrevuela la escena y encima de ésta una madre y una niña máquina que atraviesa la tierra hasta llegar al submundo con sus hornos. La máquina produce el dinero alimentándose de vidas humanas. También vemos primeros planos, la cara del hombre con el rifle y una bandera roja hondeando detrás de él el cual le asigna un papel protagónico y dramático en la narrativa del mural.

Finalmente, en el cielo, comenzando del extremo izquierdo vemos la continuación de la ventana que se encuentra en la arquitectura del edificio. Gracias a la ventana las nubes de humo reciben luminosidad, el humo sube hasta llegar a tres chimeneas que se unen con antenas de electricidad, en la parte central del cielo se ve una estación de trenes y encima una gran torre eléctrica en punto de fugación tocando el sol y hondeando en su punta la bandera del sindicato de Electricistas. La estación ferroviaria está envuelta por las nubes que salen del portaviones. El centro del cielo es iluminado por el sol. Todo el cielo está a travésado por cables (imagen 8).

En todas estas escenas se mezclan diversos puntos de vista, encuadres o planos: picada o contrapicado, primeros, generales, medios; "cada plano, al mismo tiempo que determina el campo de atención, orienta un campo de significación."

En este sentido la cámara cinematográfica fue una aportación, gracias a su movilidad, al proporcionar diversos puntos de vista, "es la variación de la distancia desde el punto de mira al objeto mirado", muchas veces con perspectivas que el ojo humano no puede tener. Así en el mural vemos planos en contrapicado como la perspectiva del gran barco hundiéndose, que hace que la figura adquiera monumentalidad. También vemos primeros planos, la cara del hombre con el rifle y una bandera roja hondeando detrás de él el cual le asigna un papel protagónico y dramático en la narrativa del mural.

Después del Retrato de la burguesía

En julio de 1974 el historiador del arte norteamericano Laurence Hurlburt iniciaba una conversación con Renau sobre cual y cómo fue su participación en Retrato de la burguesía. La correspondencia entre el artista y el historiador describe muy bien cómo fue la colaboración de Renau y los otros miembros del equipo. En este tiempo Renau vivía en Berlín y apenas estaba escribiendo el artículo en donde cuenta cómo fue su experiencia con el "coronelazo". Este artículo, como ya mencioné, fue publicado en 1976 en la revista de Bellas Artes con el título "Mi experiencia con Siqueiros".

En la primera carta Hurlburt pregunta cómo fue formada la composición, por qué fueron cambiados los elementos del mural y cuál fue el papel de Renau sobre el uso del fotomontaje.

En esta misma carta el historiador menciona una entrevista con Pujol quien le contó sobre la construcción de una maqueta, la cual fue destruida, así como de los documentos del proceso, por causa del atentado de Trotsky.

Jefe de la Central Hidroeléctrica de Necaxa y de la figura de Antonio Pujol, como modelo para la gran figura del obrero revolucionario del mural.

Fue en 1967 cuando Renau comprendió la importancia del mural mexicano en el acto de transmitir una postura política frente al momento internacional. El acomodo iconográfico lo pensaron con base en el montaje de un espacio pictórico no-euclidiano. La mirada del espectador permite el paso a múltiples interpretaciones y reflexiones sobre la construcción de un mundo tecnológico. Pero, ¿cómo enlaza a Siqueiros y Renau en los problemas axiológicos que plantearon algunos filósofos de la tecnociencia con los que se relacionaron? En esta misma carta se le encargó a Renau elaborar una maqueta, la cual fue destruida, así como muchos documentos y negativos que yo conservaba.
Parte de la Revolución Técnica, emprendida por Siqueiros, fue la utilización de la fotografía de revistas ilustradas, las cuales fueron llevadas al mural mediante el montaje, convirtiendo el mural en un paradigma del muralismo por el uso del procedimiento de recortar y pegar transaplanado a la pintura, pero además también se implementó un montaje cino-imaginación para el montaje del espectador, por el espacio que ocupa en el edificio de tránsito y por la yuxtaposición de distintos puntos de vista, logrando con esto una narrativa secuencial. Además, Siqueiros utilizó la piroxilina como material principal para la producción del mural, esto fue un reto para los integrantes del equipo, utilizar esténciles y la proyección de las imágenes en el mural para trazar la forma. Tanto Renau como Siqueiros consumieron las imágenes fotográficas en los carteles, murales, portadas y postales. Principalmente Renau hizo “del banco de imágenes una preciada herramienta de trabajo y cultivaron con fuerza el arte del rescate”. El mural parece un pastiche ilustrado que a su vez revela una narrativa gráfica. Ambos artistas compartían muchas ideas sobre la técnica y la función del arte. Albert Forester señala que los dos artistas empleaban imágenes simbólicas, el tema comunista, el uso del arreglado y las técnicas de proyección fotográfica. La implementación en mural del fotomontaje y la composición poliangular se conjugaron con el uso de materiales industriales, en específico la piroxilina (laca automotriz) aplicada con brocha de acri, además de utilizar proyectos y esténciles para trazar las figuras de manera real. esto hace el mural una obra vanguardista de su época.

El mural representa imágenes de guerra. Denuncia los efectos devastadores de la guerra y la intervención en la tecnología. Muestra la paradoja del progreso técnico además de las imágenes de guerra como parte de la cultura visual. La temática antifascista y anticapitalista con los iconos clásicos utilizados por el arte comunista de la época escuadrones mar- chando, máquinas, ahorcados y niños víctimas de la guerra. El mural forma parte de una serie de obras que dejan huella sobre el acontecer histórico en tiempos de guerra, mantiene relación con cuadros como el de Picasso, uno de los clásicos utilizados por el arte comunista de la época: escuadrones mar- chando, máquinas, ahorcados y niños víctimas de la guerra. El mural representa el murales como medio de visión para la información actual sobre aspectos políticos y sociales.
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