

include cases where, in the name of sustainability, national and international agents create inroads into regions whose continued forest cover and political autonomy have been garnered through physical isolation (see the chapters by van den Hombergh, van Dicjk, and Finley-Brook). In other cases, ideals of neo-liberalism have either removed the state from its role as critic and mediator or justified closer ties between state authorities and private enterprise (see Fairhead and Leach, Morsello and Adger, and Scholz). In response to the challenges and failure of partnerships, the authors generally conclude their chapters with lists of correctives. Among the contributors, Vermeulen and Mayers and Colchester go beyond individual case studies to offer comprehensive critiques of partnerships and their corresponding solutions. One senses, however, certain static and mechanical qualities in these lists, qualities that fall short of the dynamic and changing relationships that would otherwise be of interest to the volume's authors.

In this way, linguistic framing and social movements may be relevant precisely because they take process and change as their points of departure. For researchers and practitioners frustrated by their relative lack of power, linguistic framing and social movements offer a stronger position from which to effect sustainability. While this collection clearly shows the value of a wide variety of approaches to social forestry, it also implies that these approaches need to be deployed strategically in order to address the power imbalances and socio-ecological inequities associated with the global flow of forest products and local forest management.

Nora Haenn

North Carolina State University

JORGE CAÑIZARES-ESGUERRA: *Puritan Conquistadors: Iberianizing the Atlantic, 1550-1700*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006.

On the one hand stands the Spanish crusading hero, fiercely riding his horse in the spirit of the Reconquista, vanquishing the newly discovered land; on the other hand, the pious British Puritan, hard at work from dawn to dusk, endlessly seeking to prove his worthiness to the Lord. The former, an embodiment of chivalric values; the latter, prefigured by the Old Testament. Two distinct types that chose separate colonial paths which ultimately led to the formation of two different, almost opposite, societies.

Cañizares-Esguerra claims that this characterization lies at the heart of Colonial British and Spanish American historiography, which continuously segregated the histories of these two areas, concentrating on the differences while ignoring the similarities. Cañizares-Esguerra rejects this characterization and strongly

denounces Samuel Huntington's assertion that "Hispanics belong culturally and linguistically to a radically different civilization" (34).

By contrast, in *Puritan Conquistadors*, Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra chooses to emphasize the common religious heritage which formed a discourse that justified conquest and colonization in the Americas. His argument focuses on the role that demonology played in textual and iconographic works produced by both the British and the Spanish intellectual elites. He finds that although "there were important differences separating the Puritan from the Spanish American...", they were not two worlds apart, but in fact both "saw the world of colonization in remarkably similar terms" (16), as an ongoing struggle against Satan and his allies.

For example, writing in the late 16th century, both Gabriel Lobo Lasso de la Vega and Antonio de Saaverda y Guzmán viewed the conquest and colonization of the New World as a cosmic battle between good and evil. Using a similar set of tropes, the two described Cortés ruthlessly fighting rainstorms unleashed by the devil as he sailed across the waters of the Caribbean toward the Continent. With God's help, he arrived safely on land, only to encounter his next challenge, armies of bloodthirsty Indian devil worshippers. Cortés, of course, prevailed and the conquest is represented as the liberation of America from the claws of the devil. A hundred years later, Cotton Mather, in his famous *Magnalia Christi American*, depicted the Puritan settlers in a similar way. The hardship they suffered during their voyage across the Atlantic was described as a fight against the demon Leviathan and colonization as an ongoing battle against a devil in the shape of an Indian.

By the same token, typological readings of historical events have been considered by historians to be a particular Puritan characteristic. Refuting this assertion, Cañizares-Esguerra argues that "Catholics were every bit as interested in developing typological readings of colonization as were Calvinists" (83). The Franciscan Juan Torquemada, for example, published in 1615 a lengthy history of Mexico in which he read Aztec history as an opposite analogy of the history of the Israelites: mimicking God, Satan chose the Aztecs and led them to the "Promised Land" of Azatlán.

Cañizares-Esguerra's argument is well organized and highly informative, and voices a provocative call for a historiographical shift. Perhaps due to his strong rejection of the separation between the histories of Colonial British and Spanish America, and his firm disagreement with Huntington, he occasionally tends to overstate the extent of the commonality of identity between the two halves of the continent. Thus, since Cañizares-Esguerra limits his research to the intellectual elites, readers may have a hard time agreeing with such widely inclusive statements as: "These resemblances suggest that we are better off if

we simply consider the Puritan colonization of New England as a continuation of Iberian models rather than a radical departure” (215), or that “for all confessional differences, the English and the Spanish were ultimately cultural twins” (76). To judge by the sources, the author's argument might be valid only as far as literary models and representations are concerned. Any such claim to economic, institutional, political or other similarities would need further evidence and argumentation.

In addition, it is worth noting that although Cañizares-Esguerra presents a thorough analysis of the popular tropes and representations used by British and Spanish intellectuals, he is not as thorough when explaining how they promoted or contributed to practices of colonization and domination.

“For a historiographical dialogue to take place,” concludes Cañizares-Esguerra, “U.S. historians need to find a balance between the patriotic excesses that characterize the historiography of the North and the tragic visions that dominate the historiography of the South” (233). It is this position that makes *Puritan Conquistadors* essential reading for historians of both Colonial British and Spanish America. In a broader sense, it is an additional call for scholars in general to break out of the “ghettos” of area studies into a wider, more comprehensive framework of historical research and study.

Yael Mabat

Tel Aviv University

LISA GARCÍA BEDOLLA: *Fluid Borders: Latino Power, Identity, and Politics in Los Angeles*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

For decades, Latinos/Hispanics have been the proverbial “sleeping giant” who slept through the 70s, 80s, 90s, and now in the first decade of the twenty-first century, continues to sleep. In fact, in her book *Fluid Borders: Latino Power, Identity, and Politics in Los Angeles*, Dr. Lisa García Bedolla quotes Otto Santa Ana: “The Mexican sleeping giant never woke up. It died in its sleep in the summer of 1993.” *Fluid Borders*, however, is not a book about a funeral, but rather a well-researched, thoughtful, and timely book about Latino, but principally Mexican, political behavior. If the book reveals nothing else, and in fact it reveals much more, it shows us that thinking of Latinos as a giant fails to capture the complexity of the Latino, or even Mexican, community and the political behavior of its people.

There is little question that Latinos could form a very powerful political force in the United States, especially because of their concentration in the key electoral states of California, Texas, Florida, New York, and Illinois, which combined hold