

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.

The two introductory chapters of the book outline the authors' key question, their chosen research method, the different variables to be considered in answering the question, and the major themes they see as characterizing the relations between science and policy-making in international environment affairs. As a guide to answering their key question, the authors hypothesize that the state of knowledge and type of problem (whether it is deemed to be malignant or benign) play a greater role in determining the degree to which science is reflected in policy outcomes than institutional arrangements. Five chapters follow, each covering one case study of a Multilateral Environmental Agreement (MEA) and its related scientific advisory processes. The cases address whaling, land-based marine pollution in the North-East Atlantic, transboundary air pollution in Europe, ozone, and climate change. The book concludes with a comparative analysis of the case studies with a view to identifying patterns that would provide insights into the impact of organizational structure on the use of scientific knowledge.

Each case study is developed as an empirical history of the institutional dynamics of the science/policy relations as they exist within that MEA. In each case, both the balance between scientific autonomy and involvement, and the importance of institutional design are analysed. With the exception of the climate change issue, the focus is on MEAs and subsidiary advisory bodies. In the case of climate change, the IPCC is highlighted, rather than the Subsidiary Body on Scientific and Technical Advice of the UNFCCC. In this case it might have been interesting also to analyze the relations between SBSTA and IPCC and their struggles for niche definition.

The authors of this book, like most observers, generally agree that science offers irreplaceable knowledge to environmental policymaking. However, depending on the case study and observer, opinions vary greatly on the precise role that it plays in shaping ultimate policy outcomes. The case studies here reflect this divergence. In his concluding comparative analysis, Arild Underdal seeks to identify some common patterns among this—as he observes—limited and very diverse set of case studies. His conclusions support the hypothesis to the extent that the state of environmental knowledge seems to be a more important determinant of the degree to which research-based knowledge is utilized in policies than institutional organization or procedure. An additional conclusion the authors make is that the skills and behavior of individuals occupying science-policy boundary positions are also important.

These are important conclusions, which certainly raise a number of issues to this reader. However, I would have been especially interested in learning what the authors thought about their collective conclusions, in particular their relevance and prescriptive value. In terms of relevance the authors might have expanded on what their work contributes to the science/policy relations debate that has been going on in International Relations since at least Peter Haas' 1989/90 study of the role of epistemic communities in pollution control in the Mediterranean Sea. The authors might also have looked at the implications of

their conclusions and commented on how scientific advisory processes could be more effectively structured to reflect the relative importance of scientific knowledge over institutional arrangements. In short, though the book offers detailed empirical histories and a good comparative analysis, it leaves important questions regarding policy prescription and academic relevance unanswered.

Overall, however, this book is a valuable contribution to the growing body of knowledge about exactly what and how science contributes to policy-making. I would therefore recommend this book to students and researchers seeking detailed information on the dynamic relationship between scientific advice and policy-making, especially as found in the five case studies covered here.