

apart. Finally, there is no table of acronyms, even though acronyms permeate the book.

*Pollution Control in East Asia* is a worthwhile contribution to our understanding of East Asian environmental practices. It is not, however, as one reviewer enthused on the back cover, "a magnificent study." It is a rough-cut path, a work-in-progress, to be further expanded by Rock and others.

Steinberg, Paul F. 2001. *Environmental Leadership in Developing Countries: Transnational Relations and Biodiversity Policy in Costa Rica and Bolivia*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Reviewed by Howard Warshawsky  
Roanoke College

This volume is the most recent addition to a series on comparative environmental policy edited by Kamieniecki and Kraft. Since policy decisions made in developing countries are likely to have great impact on the future state of the global environment, this book represents a significant contribution to better understanding of how and why such decisions are made. It argues that while we should not necessarily be sanguine about environmental protection in developing countries, we need not be pessimistic either. While focusing upon case studies of Costa Rica and Bolivia, Steinberg also develops a framework of analysis which could be applied on a broader, comparative basis to other developing states.

A "spheres of influence" model is introduced in the first chapter. The interaction of both international and domestic spheres is seen as providing the resources and dynamics which affect environmental policy decisions. The international sphere encompasses science and technology, financing, and policy ideas and norms, while the domestic sphere includes a variety of political and social resources and the policy culture indigenous to each society. Key to understanding the policy outcomes of these interactions is the role of what Steinberg defines as "bilateral activists." These are actors who are comfortable operating simultaneously in both spheres and who can use their knowledge of global ideas and resources as well as their knowledge of and access to domestic decision making to attempt to advance environmental awareness and protection. Steinberg invites others to test this model of analysis by application to other case studies. Acceptance of this challenge could lead to major advances in comparative policy analysis and public policy theory.

Much prior literature has questioned the ability and will of poor, developing countries to give priority to environmental concerns and exercise leadership in ecological protection. Chapter two challenges such assumptions. Based upon polling data, public opinion about the environment in both poor and rich countries is seen as not significantly different. Environmentalism is not something that has been forced upon unwilling actors in developing countries. As a consequence, Steinberg questions whether financial inducements are always

necessary as a tactic to encourage environmental protection. It is suggested that leaders of developing states often discuss the need for such financial support more as a bargaining tactic rather than as a requisite for their environmental efforts. Social support for environmentalism is evident, though not guaranteed, in both developed and developing states.

Chapters three and four focus upon case histories of environmental policy making in Costa Rica and Bolivia. While both are Latin American and share some characteristics, they are very different societies. The former is more stable, literate, democratic and prosperous, yet both have made significant progress in environmental protection. The fact that this progress was not always easy, did sustain setbacks, and occurred on a different time line in each, are used by Steinberg to illustrate the crucial role of bilateral activists in these countries. It was these actors who not only developed ties to global scientific and environmental communities, foreign governments, nongovernmental organizations, and intergovernmental organizations, but who also understood local conditions and needs, formal and informal policy processes and possessed personal access to decision makers. Steinberg draws upon and integrates survey data, literature reviews, speech and media content analysis and extensive personal interviews in order to describe events and draw his conclusions.

Chapter five applies the spheres of influence framework to explain these case experiences. Bilateral activists are seen as maintaining a consistent focus on environmental conditions over the long term. They provide the requisite institutional memory and have the capacity to outlast changes in domestic political leadership. They articulate international goals and norms for the domestic audience. Many of these activists are scientists, but their influence may be more due to their political and social access and skills.

While chapter five focuses upon the evolution of institutional reform, chapter six addresses the spread of the concept of environmentalism. Steinberg discusses the importance of developing a supportive "policy culture." This he distinguishes from "political culture," by defining policy culture as issue-specific and mutable over time. Steinberg argues that the relative ease of linking or "bundling" environmental issues with one another, and with developmental, social, or human right issues, serves to keep the public attentive to environmental concerns over time. This also allows bilateral activists to more easily adapt global concepts to local conditions and agendas.

In his conclusion, Steinberg acknowledges that external influences have great impact upon domestic policy-making, but reminds us that we need to better understand how national decisions influence the efficacy of global environmental regimes. How can we design global regimes to better support bilateral activists? Will further research support these conclusions about the nature of bilateral activism?

This is a well-written, researched and documented analysis of an issue that warrants greater attention. It offers a credible framework which may be applicable to many cases, thus enhancing both comparative politics and public policy

theory. It could find a wide audience with policy makers, environmental activists, academics and upper level students.

Conca, Ken, and Geoffrey D. Dabelko, eds. 2002. *Environmental Peacemaking*. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

*Reviewed by Robert Darst*  
Mount Holyoke College

### **Environmental Peacemaking's Catch-22**

Can regional environmental cooperation serve as a catalyst for regional peace and stability? Can it promote "post-Westphalian" forms of governance and identity that transcend the boundaries of the state? *Environmental Peacemaking* brings these questions to bear on six cases, ranging from the US-Mexican border to the Aral Sea basin.

The volume's findings contain news that is good, bad, and ironic. The good news is that a hostile or insecure political environment does not necessarily doom regional environmental cooperation. The bad news is that environmental cooperation appears to generate little "spillover" for the resolution of broader regional conflicts. The ironic news is that if regional environmental cooperation is to become effective enough to spill over into other issue-areas, we need more interstate trust, stronger regional identity, and more post-Westphalian governance. It's a Catch-22. Jean Monnet, meet Joseph Heller.

*Environmental Peacemaking* is a product of the authors' frustration with the current limitations of "environmental security." On the one hand, those who argue that environmental interdependence will force states to transcend traditional ways of thinking about "national security" have failed to demonstrate how environmental interdependence might lead to interstate peace. On the other hand, those who argue that environmental degradation and natural resource competition will generate violent conflict tend to overlook ways in which these conflicts can be cooperatively diffused.

In order to fill this gap, the authors identify two theoretically promising pathways leading from regional environmental cooperation to regional peace and stability. First, regional environmental cooperation might create a habit of cooperation and an atmosphere of trust among the states involved, thus lowering barriers to cooperation on other issues. Second, regional environmental cooperation might strengthen transnational linkages among nonstate actors, leading to the emergence of "post-Westphalian governance" and, ultimately, the creation of an "imagined security community" within which the use of force to resolve disputes becomes increasingly unthinkable.

These hypotheses are brought to bear on six regions in which environmental cooperation coexists with conflict and instability: the Baltic Sea basin, South Asia, the Aral Sea basin, Southern Africa, the Caspian Sea basin, and the