confront the United States. By contrast, numerous recent works, such as Claudia Kedar's revealing account of Argentina's efforts to join the International Monetary Fund, suggest that Perón was well aware of the structural bottlenecks of the economy and sought ways to reconcile with the United States from the early weeks of his administration. These gaps result in an exaggerated account of the "Third Position," which in many respects was simply an attempt to accommodate Argentina to the new US hegemony on the most convenient terms, providing an argument for a welfare state that proved quite effective in terms of social and economic inclusion.
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The last several years have revealed the start of a remarkable ferment among historians of postrevolutionary, and especially of post-1945, Mexico. We have both moved away from the overly reductive role of the 1968 student protests and simultaneously stretched out our periodization so that we now speak of the "long 1960s." Moreover, we now speak of a distinctively experienced Mexican cosmopolitanism, one reflected through novel expressions in cinema, poetry, music, and other aesthetic and literary practices. Alongside a nuanced dissection of the mechanisms of repression is a renewed emphasis on middle-class mobility, cultural iconoclasm, and modernist awakening. Mary Kay Vaughan's beautifully written, masterful new book, Portrait of a Young Painter, is situated precisely at the interstices of this historiographical revisionism.

Pepe Zúñiga is an Oaxacan-born artist of little renown outside of Mexican circles in whom Vaughan has found the ideal interlocutor, one whose life trajectory offers a vantage point from which to discern "the effects of the freedom-seeking, affective subjectivity" that marked many who came of age in the 1960s (p. 212). In 1943, Zúñiga migrated with his family to Mexico City, where they struggled to forge a new life alongside other rural migrants. Mexico, and its capital in particular, was on the verge of a prolonged period of extraordinary economic expansion and cultural dynamism. Zúñiga rode this wave, securing a job as a radio technician for the transnational company RCA Victor, but in 1959 he defied the upwardly mobile expectations of his family to follow his nascent artistic instincts. He enrolled as a student at La Esmeralda, the famous state-sponsored art school. It was a moment of intense artistic and political questioning, and the school, writes Vaughan, "opened for Pepe a new galaxy of knowledge, aesthetics, and sensibility—a humanist cosmopolitanism" (p. 147), one that proved enabling and transformative not only for Zúñiga but also for the nation itself.

Although the book advances chronologically, it is structured through an analysis of four intersecting social forces that Vaughan argues convincingly come together in the postrevolutionary period to produce by the late 1950s what she labels a "rebel
The first of these forces is the “mobilization for children” (p. 9). Vaughan demonstrates how increasing state investment in public education and child welfare was accompanied by an emphasis on the right of children to be happy and free from want. A new, secularist ethos that channeled such values as “work, study, respect, prudence, [and] punctuality” simultaneously fostered a discourse of play and entitlement, one that found resonance in popular culture and consumerism (p. 59). This idea intersects with a second social force, the flourishing of domestic and transnational mass media. Here Vaughan guides the reader with impressive agility through an analysis of foreign and domestic cinema, television shows, and other forms of mass entertainment that shaped and gave voice to Pepe Zuñiga’s changing subjectivity. This discussion intersects with a third social force, what she calls the “domestication of violent masculinity” and, later, “the feminization of male sensibility” (pp. 17, 222). In a fundamental sense, this analysis constitutes the heart of her argument, for it seeks to explain how a critique of traditional masculinity became the guiding force that shaped the 1968 movement, one “animated . . . [by] joy in love” (p. 17). In doing so, Vaughan brings to light the neohumanist philosophical ethos that suffused student culture. This was the counterpart, albeit deeply intertwined, to the resurgence of a heroic masculinity that gave expression to an ethos of violence that likewise played an important role in the long 1960s.

The fourth, culminating social force is a “critical public of youth” that emerges by the mid-1960s and pushes for a democratization of the public sphere (p. 22). Vaughan’s book at this point refreshingly departs from the prevailing historical narrative in two significant ways. First, she spends little time on the actual 1968 protests. Zuñiga “shared many sentiments, principles, and visions that energized the student movement” (p. 184), she writes, but his struggle was directed inward, toward finding his own artistic voice. Vaughan uses this opportunity instead to examine the cultural milieu—especially through theater, cinema, art, and conversation—shared by Zuñiga and his artistic cohort. Second, she spends considerable time on the ways in which the government mobilized youth, namely through the newly opened Museum of Anthropology (she touches only briefly on the similar mobilization later around the Cultural Olympics). Here she nicely reveals the tensions and contradictions between a state that was famously supportive—a “philanthropic ogre,” in Octavio Paz’s well-known phrase—yet simultaneously corrupt and arbitrary.

When Zuñiga accepts a fellowship from the French government to study at the École des Arts Decoratifs in Paris in 1972, the experience liberates him in a new way, for abroad he comes to recognize even more deeply the restrictiveness of social conventions that he faced at home. By the time that he returned to Mexico, the country was already in the process of an inexorable political and cultural democratization, one to which his generation—a rebel generation marked by “antiauthoritarian sentiment and longing for freedom and expression” (p. 222)—could proudly lay claim. In the final analysis, writes Vaughan, it was “the young rebels of the 1960s [who] created the pressure, the subjectivity, and, as they matured, the citizens for this democratization” (pp. 212–13).
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