

Despite the book's high level of philosophical abstraction, the authors' point of departure "is not the big picture of 'our common future', but examples of actual and public conflicts over the environment" (p. 3). Their theoretical claims are strongly grounded in real-world events. Throughout the book, they continually refer to three global environmental conflicts that occurred in 1995: the unsuccessful attempt by the Anglo-Dutch corporation, Shell, to sink one of its obsolete oil rigs in the North Atlantic; French underground nuclear testing in the Pacific atolls; and the mining of metallic ores in Papua New Guinea by an Australian transnational mining firm. These three cases demonstrate a number of important factors: the truly global nature of many environmental conflicts; the interplay of governments, corporations, NGOs, and indigenous communities; and the persistent impact of inequity on outcomes.

Perhaps the boldest and most controversial claim of the book is that real progress towards environmental and ecological justice will require some form of world government, not merely global governance. Given their clearly articulated concern for local communities throughout the book, the authors do not appear to be over-eager globalists. The primary justification for their position is that "as long as there is global capitalism—and a global market—there must be a countervailing power of similar scale to provide the aegis under which an environmentally and ecologically just society of societies . . . may gradually take shape" (p. 175). In other words, global governance already exists, but its effects are neither environmentally or ecologically just. While the authors are careful to address a range of potential criticisms, readers will need to assess for themselves the soundness of the defense. Whatever one's conclusion might be, one must admire both the willingness of Low and Gleeson to put forward such a visionary proposal as well as the intellectual appeal of their arguments.

Though the level of philosophical discourse is fairly sophisticated, the book is remarkably accessible even for those without a firm foundation in ethical philosophy. Having used the book successfully in two upper-level undergraduate courses, I have found that students can grasp the ideas with just a bit of explication. Indeed, they have been grateful for the opportunity to join Low and Gleeson in thinking big about big problems.

Lee, Yok-shiu F., and Alvin Y. So, eds. 1999. *Asia's Environmental Movements: Comparative Perspectives*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

2000 Winner of the Harold and Margaret Sprout Award for the Best Book in the Area of International Environmental Affairs.

Reviewed by Kate O'Neill and Stacy D. VanDeveer.

Lee & So's *Asia's Environmental Movements* is a valuable and welcome addition to the literature on international and comparative environmental politics.¹ This

1. This review draws on the deliberations of the 1999–2000 Sprout Prize Award Committee, whose members were Ken Conca, Philippe LePrestre, Kate O'Neill, Laura Strohm and Stacy VanDeveer.

edited volume addresses a part of the world where environmental movements are relatively new and undocumented. The book's stated objectives are "(1) to identify the political, economic and socio-cultural conditions under which Asia's environmental movements have emerged; (2) to outline the characteristics of Asia's environmental movements; (3) to trace the history and transformation of these environmental movements over the past three decades; (4) to examine the impacts of these movements on the state, economy and society; and (5) to examine the similarities and differences between and among Asia's environmental movements" (p. 16). The book's organization reflects these objectives. Five country case study chapters follow a substantive introduction by the volume's editors on environmental movements in Taiwan, Hong Kong, South Korea, Thailand and the Philippines. A second group of chapters focuses attention on a group of factors the authors argue have significantly shaped Asian environmental movements: democratization, culture, anti-nuclear campaigns, and the business sector. A somewhat disappointing chapter comparing United States grassroots movements and Asian environmental movements is also included.

Asia's Environmental Movements has many strengths as a comparative volume, and has an organizational framework many could follow. The book's topic is woefully underdeveloped in the literature. Simply bringing Asia into research on international and comparative environmental movements is a major contribution that helps scholars and students rethink their theorizing about social movements, and ask themselves whether their approaches are as universal, culture-free and non-contingent as they think. A clear conceptual framework, allowing for comparability without functioning as a straitjacket guides the country case studies. The chapters on crosscutting themes (culture, democratization, anti-nuclear movements and industry) are illuminating, and an innovative model for this sort of collaborative work. The authors, nearly all from the region they study, bring perspectives to the book that complement and do not imitate Western scholarship on Asian social movements. The clarity of writing and attention to history, basic information and context make the book worth assigning to classes at all levels. Each of the case chapters covers main events in the evolution of national environmental movements from the 1960s onwards, examining key groups, leaders and issues in each country. Each chapter touches the main theoretical bases of the social movement literature—resource mobilization, issue framing and political opportunity structure, and how these have affected activism and policy at local and national levels. Cultural and institutional factors are accorded importance across the board. As in the West, grassroots or local groups remain divided from national, often wealthy and elite environmental groups.

Perhaps the volume's most important contribution is the discussion of the extent to which Asian environmental movements in each of the cases examined have become culturally indigenized. While environmental movements originated in the West, "local activists have engaged in a process of indigenization through which Asian religions, cultural values, and rituals are incorporated into environmental movements" (p. 291). The crosscutting chapters on culture and

business demonstrate this nicely. One highlights the interaction of environmental movements with religious values and institutions and activists' tendencies to "invoke indigenous traditions in order to protect their communities and lifestyles" (p. 227). The chapter focusing on business interests illustrates some of the ways that environmental movements in Asia have begun to alter the views and strategies of business sector actors in the region. Some may find this a surprising finding, given the privileged position of business in the region's states and the priority placed on economic growth and development.

The book does have weaknesses. A few of the chapters could benefit from a more critical stance on issues such as democratization and the relationship between states and environmental groups. The transnational dimensions of environmental movements are noted only briefly. One wonders, for example, who sets the agenda for environmental movements in Asia. Is it domestic social movements, international environmental politics or some other factor(s)? Also, the US chapter by Andrew Szasz primarily summarizes the author's early work, only briefly drawing comparisons to Asia. Finally, the book's lack of attention or reference to China and Japan as comparative cases remains somewhat puzzling given the existing literature on environments in these countries. However, these concerns that are easily outweighed by the book's many strengths. Lee and So's *Asian Environmental Movements* is strongly recommended for scholars interested in social movements, NGOs, comparative environmental politics and Asian development. It is also recommended for adoption in international and comparative politics classes.

Andresen, Steinar, Tora Arild, Arild Underdal, and Jørgen Wettestad. 2000. *Science and Politics in International Environmental Regimes: Between Integrity and Involvement*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Reviewed by Jan-Stefan Fritz.

To what extent is science used in international environmental policy-making? Attempts at answering this seemingly simple question have resulted in an ongoing debate reaching back over a decade. At stake are issues such as whether scientific consensus is a necessary precondition for effective policy outcomes, as well as the specific place of scientific advice in policymaking processes.

Andresen *et al.* address the above issues by asking whether the way in which science-policy relations have been organized affects the use of science in environmental policy-making. The authors focus on two institutional dimensions of these relations: first, the integrity and autonomy of scientists, and, second, their responsiveness and involvement in policy-making processes. The book is the result of ongoing research efforts that began in 1993. Though each of the chapters is written by a different individual, all are listed as authors on the cover. For this reason, I also attribute the observations and analyses in each of the chapters to all of the authors.