

Book Reviews

Rosaleen Duffy. 2000. *Killing for Conservation: Wildlife Policy in Zimbabwe*. London: The International Africa Institute. In association with the Weaver Press, Harare, Zimbabwe; Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Indiana; and James Currey, Oxford, England.

*Reviewed by Geoffrey Wandesforde-Smith
University of California, Davis*

This is a refreshingly direct and stimulating book on several levels, and it deserves a wide readership among students of global environmental politics.

The book developed from a doctoral thesis at the University of Lancaster, where the author of the book lectures in politics. The publisher is an organization, based in London and affiliated with the School of Oriental and African Studies, which has been promoting the careful study of African cultures and languages since 1926. The book's most obvious claim on our attention, then, is the "on the ground" view it offers from field research of the sum and substance of national and international wildlife management, separately and in interaction, in a part of the world that has magnificent wildlife resources but is still poorly served by the scholarship of international law and policy.

For most of us, a superficial acquaintance with wildlife policy in Zimbabwe probably extends to prohibitions through CITES on the rhino horn and elephant ivory trades and perhaps to the use of a much-vaunted participatory management program known as CAMPFIRE (the Communal Areas Management Program for Indigenous Resources). There is, it turns out, a great deal more to wildlife management in Zimbabwe than this. And the evolution of policy choices since colonial times about these resources turns out to be a delightfully human and complex story, quite inaccessible to anyone who spends no time in the country.

But while Duffy's main contribution may turn out to be the fascinating—I would even say compelling—sketch she is able to paint of how Zimbabwean politics shape choices about wildlife conservation, through the patronage of party politics, competition among political elites, internal bureaucratic struggles, land distribution choices, and racial conflict, the book also takes aim at a broader range of targets. There will be some concern with the reliability of the necessarily limited empirical data on which Duffy can rest the analytical claims she makes, both about the influence of domestic political actors and about the power of global institutions to shape policy. For good reason, Duffy cannot always attribute to specific informants some of the key statements upon which

Global Environmental Politics 2:1, February 2002
© 2002 by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology

her analysis relies, and this weakens her ability to associate those statements with the concrete behaviors and consequences to which she believes they are related.

I think most readers will look beyond this and recognize that Duffy has more than a sufficient basis in this book to reshape the way we understand wildlife and environmental politics in Zimbabwe and, with the help of her occasional comparative allusions, in other parts of Africa. Moreover, they will judge that, in the light of what she can reasonably claim to know about the impact of Zimbabwe's sometimes harsh and even unpleasant personal and party politics on the intellectual pretensions of modern wildlife science and law, Duffy is justified in extending the implications of her case. She does this by bringing under sustained critical scrutiny and, thus, usefully disaggregating a series of core beliefs about wildlife conservation that have proven appealing far beyond the boundaries of Zimbabwe and Southern Africa and which animate the policy preferences of many of the most powerful management institutions and international environmental groups.

One of these and the first to be dealt with in the book is sustainable development, which Duffy evaluates with characteristic bluntness and aplomb as a "notion" that "has become so fashionable amongst governments, the private sector, NGOs and donors that its adoption by practically every conceivable type of institution has ensured that it has become a meaningless tag." (p. 4). In Zimbabwe, the reality on the ground is that this global idea in good currency actually translates into a policy of sustainable utilization of wildlife resources, a policy which "serves to negotiate a political settlement between potentially competing interest groups in the domestic context . . . [and which] . . . allows diverse interest groups, ranging from tourism businesses to local communities, state conservation agencies and local non-governmental organizations (NGOs), to be cemented together, because each group derives (albeit differential) benefits from the policy." (p. 9).

Let there be no misunderstanding about Duffy's stance. "Zimbabwe," she writes, "needs a wildlife policy that is politically acceptable to its domestic constituency, and the pursuit of sustainable utilization is the Parks Department's response to that need. Sustainable utilization is about finding a solution to the human versus wildlife conflict that is socially acceptable, politically tenable *and* environmentally sustainable" (p. 177, emphasis added). The difficulty comes from Zimbabwe's failure to tackle poaching by highly organized, armed interest groups. This makes the policy of sustainable utilization vulnerable to criticism by the international environmental groups, who also feel they should derive benefits from Zimbabwe's wildlife resources and who can lobby against utilization on the grounds that, as implemented and enforced, the policy tolerates adverse impacts on wildlife populations that are too high. Their preference is for preservationist policies derived from a quite different moral and political ideology of conservation. But their advocacy of this alternative to sustainable utilization does not acknowledge what Duffy calls "the demonstrable failure of

preservationist policies, which have proved to be politically untenable and will result in wildlife being removed from Africa slowly but surely, because local people have no reason to conserve animals that have no benefit beyond the aesthetic." (p. 177).

In this limited space it would be unfair to try to depict the fate of each of the core beliefs of modern wildlife conservation that come under Duffy's gaze. Suffice it to say that, in addition to reappraising sustainable development, her analysis forces us to take a fresh look at the way we approach several propositions, including the notion that institutional (in)capacity lies at the root of much policy ineffectiveness (chapter 2), that vigorous law enforcement will sustain better policy implementation (chapter 3), that privatization of wildlife resources will on balance yield acceptable outcomes (chapter 4), that local involvement in resource management can be consistent with broader conservation agendas (chapter 5), that the delivery of aid and development projects through conservation NGOs can be politically neutral (chapter 6), and that international law can usefully regulate wildlife that is considered a national resource (chapter 7). This is, in short, an ambitious book, nicely crafted to resonate with many of the central concerns running through the literature of global environmental politics. It manages to be theoretically provocative without being pretentious and by keeping its feet firmly planted on the ground.

Kate O'Neill. 2000. *Waste Trading Among Rich Nations: Building a New Theory of Environmental Regulation*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.

Reviewed by Anna Levine
University of Washington

In *Waste Trading Among Rich Nations: Building a New Theory of Environmental Regulation*, Kate O'Neill presents a theoretical framework for conducting cross-national comparative analysis of environmental regulations' divergent trajectories. A study of hazardous waste trading among OECD countries, specifically the UK, Germany, France, Australia, and Japan, forms the empirical backdrop of her study.

Following a general overview of the comparative approach to the study of waste trade, O'Neill surveys the array of existing methods of explaining cross-national differences, identifying three common strands of interpretation: 1) Regulatory diversity accounts for the dissimilarity of policies. 2) Stances are determined by financial advantage. 3) Comparative advantage, ie., the capacity or capability to process these imports, is the main factor that determines a country's propensity to accept hazardous waste imports.

Upon detailing the shortcomings of each of the approaches above, O'Neill proceeds to lay out an institutional theory of waste importation. Her framework is built on three central hypotheses: 1) Countries with highly decentralized systems of government are more likely to import hazardous waste. 2) Whether or