

the needs of “extractive reserves” by Cleary and Sérgio Rosendo; on floodplain management by Fábio de Castro; and a final one on fire use in the Amazon by Larissa Chermont. All the book save one chapter is about Brazil’s Amazon: only Martina Neuberger’s chapter is about Bolivia, focusing on political reforms, including decentralization and popular participation in developing sustainable solutions in that nation’s Amazon region. All in all, this is a spectacular contribution to the study of the Brazilian Amazon region; after a long spell with little published in English on the region, this book makes a major contribution.

J. Timmons Roberts *Oxford University Environmental Change Institute /
The College of William and Mary*

MIRJAM A. F. ROS-TONEN (ed.), with Heleen van den Hombergh and Annelies Zoomers: *Partnerships in Sustainable Forest Resource Management: Learning from Latin America*. Leiden & New York: Brill, 2007.

This book begins with the premise that there is an inherent tension between the global flow of forest products and local forest management. The partnerships that have been created to mediate this tension have considerable social and environmental effects. The volume describes these effects in 13 case studies with an introductory chapter that readers will find useful. The contributors express their concern about risk and conflict management in partnerships, the retreat of the neo-liberal state, and power differences, as these topics apply to arrangements spanning a wide range of geographical scales: deals involving communities and private companies, communities and NGOs, multi-sector partnerships, and partnerships built on political advocacy.

This review focuses on the volume’s approach to linguistic framing and social movements as especially fruitful areas for the authors’ combined interests in theoretical analysis and policy intervention. “Partnership,” as the introduction notes, is a tricky concept. The word suggests social equity, which is missing in most of the cases that are described. In fact, the strongest common thread among the contributors is an interest in how the partnerships’ demand for global markets creates arenas for the exercise of different kinds of power.

In analyzing these arenas, Mirjam Ros-Tonen, Heleen van den Hombergh, and Annelies Zoomers lend great weight to questions of linguistic framing and social movements as keys to understanding forestry partnerships and re-orienting them toward more equitable and sustainable ends. However, while the book’s introduction suggests an emphasis on linguistic framing and social movements, linguistic framing is directly addressed in only two of the subsequent chapters, one

by van den Hombergh and another by Fairhead and Leach; and social movements are addressed only in a chapter by Scholz and in a chapter by Colchester. The bulk of the book examines company-community partnerships in chapters by Cleuren, Vermeulen and Mayers, Morsello and Adger, van Andel, and to some extent Rival; multi-sector partnerships are discussed in chapters by van Dijck, Finley-Brook, Rosendo, and Otsuki. On what basis then do linguistic framing and social movements take analytical and practical precedence? And, what might this precedence say about the authors' central concerns? The authors are concerned that partnerships reconcile multiple interests and power imbalances, as well as contribute to social justice and ecological sustainability (p. 27).

In their introduction, the editors emphasize linguistic framing and social movements in a review of academic debates and the "dangers and pitfalls" of forestry partnerships (p. 21). They consider four approaches to forest and tree management partnerships: A sustainable-livelihoods approach analyzes the various costs and benefits of partnerships. An entitlement approach examines the legal frameworks surrounding natural resource management and marketing. An approach centering on the "politics of scale" questions "the divergence between the scale at which environmental problems such as deforestation occur and the scales at which they can and should be tackled" (p. 20). In contrast, the editors employ a subtle shift in terminology as they describe social movements as partnerships that "more so than in the case of other types...deal with the underlying causes of deforestation" (p. 20). While not discounting the usefulness of the other approaches—indeed, most of the contributors demonstrate their inter-dependence—the editors seem to suggest that research on or in the service of social movements most ably contributes to sustainable forestry. In summarizing the dangers and pitfalls related to forestry partnerships, the authors dedicate most space to linguistic framing. Linguistic framing can constitute a danger because the way people talk about partnerships and their forestry aims often conceals their hidden motives and their actual practice. From a research perspective, the authors describe the deconstruction of linguistic frames as the key to revealing the power plays at work in forestry partnerships. From a natural resource management perspective, they describe the winners of discursive battles as "capable of determining what [ecological] options are being considered" (p. 23). The authors write that if social movements deal with the underlying causes of deforestation, then a deconstructive approach to the discursive strategies that shape partnerships in practice "provides insight into the real environmental and socioeconomic effects of partnerships" (p. 25).

Although an emphasis on framing and social movements is shared unevenly across the volume's contributions, I highlight them here as possible responses to the book's otherwise pessimistic findings. Some of the more repeated findings

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