

appears to have no systematic basis. His examples are useful for his argument that the Black Legend shapes the United States policy towards Latin America, but they do not add up to a scholarly case that would support his thesis.

Since the first publication of *Tree of Hate*, several excellent studies have appeared about the racialized character of the policy of the United States towards Latin America.<sup>2</sup> These newer works better fulfill Powell's goal to help Europeans and North Americans in "recognizing and resolving [their] anti-Spanish, anti-Hispanic, and anti-Catholic beliefs," as Robert Himmerich y Valencia states in a new introduction to the book's third printing (xvi). In light of the solid scholarship now available, there was no need for the University of New Mexico Press to re-print *Tree of Hate*.

**Philip Brenner and C. Althea Skinner**

*American University*

### Notes

- 1 George Kennan, "Report on Latin America, March 29, 1950" in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950*, Volume II (Washington, DC: US Department of State), pp. 598-624.
- 2 For example, Frederick B. Pike, *The United States and Latin America: Myths and Stereotypes of Civilization and Nature* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992); Lars Schoultz, *Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy Toward Latin America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998).

FRED ROSEN (ed.): *Empire and Dissent: The United States and Latin America*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008.

This is an ambitious but often frustrating book. Its goal, as laid out by Fred Rosen in the introduction, is to "explore the ways in which the contours of dissent and resistance have been generated by the activities of empire, as well as the ways in which the contours of empire have been given shape by opposition, resistance, and disaffection" (5). The ambition is to demonstrate the causal relationships between the empire of the United States on the one hand, and the resistance that has emerged as a result.

My frustration stems primarily from the fact that the book offers no definition of "empire" despite its centrality to the chapters. Rosen does not define it in the introduction. Indeed, one has to dig deeply into Alan Knight's impressive discussion of U.S. imperialism and hegemony to find the following in endnote 24: "I have deliberately refrained from trying to define *imperialism*" (47; emphasis in original). Endnote 99 states very plainly that "I have made the prudent but

cowardly decision to avoid attempting any definition or discussion of “resistance,” a concept that, due to overuse, may be yielding diminishing returns” (52).

For a book offering a comparative analysis of empire and resistance, this is obviously a bit of a problem. It means that each chapter is operating under its own assumptions, which may or may not have anything to do with any other chapter. It conjures up Potter Stewart, the U.S. Supreme Court Justice who wrote in 1964 that hard-core pornography was difficult to define, but “I know it when I see it.”

So, for example, Carlos Marichal’s highly informative analysis of the U.S. government’s role in Latin American debt tends to focus more on economic hegemony rather than empire per se. He also blames the “lemming-like behavior” of Latin American governments in the 1970s as they accumulated debt (99). These were not government officials acting at the behest of imperialists, but rather self-serving politicians making short-sighted decisions. Similarly, Alan Knight argues that “informal empire” and hegemony are synonymous (24), but without a more clear definition, that distinction is not examined sufficiently throughout the book.

Interestingly, Marichal also argues that in the case of Argentina’s economic crisis in 2001, the United States should have used its hegemonic position *more* forcefully: “It is now recognized, even by the IMF, that lack of adequate supervision in the 1990s by the multilateral agencies was heavily responsible for the financial debacle in Argentina” (107). This is a curious assertion for a book that is critical of the U.S. role in Latin America.

I was puzzled by the inclusion of Gregory Evans Dowd’s chapter on the treatment of the indigenous population in the United States (both before and after independence), and by John Richard Oldfield’s examination of British abolition of slavery. Neither brings Latin America into the analysis.

After the first section’s focus on historical reflections, the final five chapters of the book are country case studies. Neil Harvey is one of the few authors to define empire specifically: “a global network of power relations that perpetuate capitalism through the constant reorganization of social life and natural resources” (120). He uses this lens to examine Zapatismo. In his view, globalization and empire are nearly synonymous. The chapter centers primarily on criticism of Mexican political parties, none of which address the concerns of the Zapatistas.

Other chapters are quite interesting, but just lack a connection to the book’s theme because they relate only partially either to the United States or to international factors in general. Jeffrey Rubin analyzes the reasons why Lula did not pursue more redistributive policies in Brazil, and largely emphasizes domestic reasons, such as lack of effective leadership in the Worker’s Party and a weak party system. Daniel Cieza details the negative effects of Carlos Menem’s economic policies and the rise of Néstor Kirchner. The role of the United States,

however, is mentioned only in passing with regard to Menem's positive relationship with the administration of George H.W. Bush. Steve Ellner's chapter on Venezuela provides an overview of how *chavismo* affects Latin America, but does not examine how it will shape the future of U.S.-Latin American relations.

Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui's analysis of coca markets in Bolivia views empire from two angles. The United States stigmatizes the licit use of coca, so that chewing it becomes a sign of dissent. At the same time, pride in ethnic identification went along with political resistance to the Bolivian state. An important question for the future is whether Evo Morales successfully changes indigenous views of the state, though this has more to do with domestic politics than imperialism.

Overall, then, the parts of this book have merit but do not add up to a coherent whole. Many of the social movements and protests were not generated by resistance to empire per se, but rather had a number of different domestic and international influences.

**Gregory Weeks**

*University of North Carolina at Charlotte*

DAVID LUIS-BROWN: *Waves of Decolonization: Discourses of Race And Hemispheric Citizenship in the United States*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008.

David Luis-Brown's meticulously researched *Waves of Decolonization: Discourses of Race And Hemispheric Citizenship in the United States* contributes much to the nascent but growing field of transnational and hemispheric studies. In this project, the author has produced an astute and imaginative analysis of interrelated, radical early twentieth-century Latin American and North American authors, texts, and movements. The book's scope and focus are ambitious and inventive. Indeed, the author posits crucial, substantive questions, employing a comparative interdisciplinary methodology with far-reaching implications. In doing so, his study advances and contributes to the continuing transformation of American Studies.

In this comprehensive study, Luis-Brown argues that intellectuals and revolutionaries in the U.S., Cuba, Mexico, and elsewhere forged distinct, local, nationalistic movements of resistance and rebellion, but specifically in the context of other hemispheric struggles. These interconnected struggles, as the author shows, largely advanced "decolonization" in a chronology of complex, contradictory, and potentially liberatory "waves." Luis-Brown employs this key word, first elaborated by W.E. Du Bois, to create an intriguing, flexible framework