

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

not access to the policy process is open or closed, ie. the extent to which public objections are incorporated into the policy-making process, will affect a country's tendency to import waste; countries with relatively limited public policy access are more apt to import. 3) Regulatory style, seen on a continuum of two extremes, rigid and flexible, is also a factor in waste import policy. This framework is then applied to the countries mentioned above. The United Kingdom, Germany, France and Australia are seen to conform to the theoretical model; Japan does not.

The institutional model O'Neill presents has a great deal of explanatory power in deciphering certain aspects of waste policy. The theory seems to work rather well, for example, in explaining why the UK is more likely to import waste than Australia. Historically, waste policy in the UK developed such that matters of transportation and disposal (even concerning waste of overseas origin) are considered to be purely local matters, prohibiting the formation of a national waste foreign policy. In Australia, on the other hand, the combination of a centralized waste policy and ample opportunity for political participation, has stymied any attempts to increase waste importation. While O'Neill's theoretical construct works well in these cases, it is not (as evidenced by Japan's failure to conform) equally germane under all circumstances. This creates the rather cumbersome challenge of determining when it would in fact be most appropriate to apply.

In addition, O'Neill's account of Japan's failure to conform to the model, which she traces to the precedent set by its four big pollution cases, is not entirely convincing. Given Japan's limited land area and isolation from the continent, wouldn't a capacity-based argument be more appropriate in aiding our understanding of Japan's failure to import wastes?

How important is the fact that the US, which, by O'Neill's own admission, has perhaps the most highly decentralized system of all OECD countries, was excluded from this study? Inclusion of the US in the study, and findings consistent with the claim above (that decentralized systems are more apt to be hazardous waste importers), would lend more credence to O'Neill's theoretical framework.

Additional questions need to be asked, such as: How important are geographical factors (such as land area, percentage of landlocked borders, proximity to and number of neighboring countries) in determining a country's willingness to accept the importation of hazardous wastes? Surely a deepened understanding of specific geographic context, such as Japan's limited land area (and hence limited waste processing capacity) and Germany's geographical confinement within Europe would also shed light on each of these countries' tendency or adversity to the importation of hazardous waste. In addition, historical context might play a more crucial role in the tendency to export waste.

Although she does dedicate a short section of Chapter One to a discussion of the Cold War, the author does not conceive of historical factors as particularly relevant (except in their influence on institutional arrangements) to under-

standing the form hazardous waste policy should take. Individual countries' historical experiences must be examined in more general terms, not just for their influence on institutional arrangements. A path-dependency understanding of the waste export phenomenon, for example, might hold a lot appeal. It could easily be claimed, for example, that Germany became one of the largest waste exporters largely due to the historical precedent of waste exportation that started during the Cold War, when much of West Germany's waste was shipped to East Germany and other Soviet bloc states.

While O'Neill perhaps falls short of the goal of building a generalizable model of waste importation tendencies, the elegance and simplicity of her three-pronged (institutional structure, policy access, and regulatory style) approach to understanding waste trading has much appeal. In addition, *Waste Trading Among Rich Nations* is one of the most exhaustive cross-national studies of waste policy yet published and, to that end, it will surely serve as an invaluable reference to students of global environmental politics for many years to come.