

uncertain about the most important causes of these interconnected globalization processes. Is the globalization of ecological harm—the shadows, in Dauvergne’s terms—an inevitable or determined aspect of international capitalism? Is it the product of international anarchy? Does it result from the general indifference of wealthier societies and classes to the damage they cause to poorer societies and distant ecosystems?

The book argues that, in effect, the shadows of consumption result from a failure of environmentalism to show that consumerism shifts harm to distant places and future generations. While it is hard to disagree that contemporary environmentalism has failed in this way, are environmental social movements really the cause of the long and growing ecological shadows of consumerism? Even if they have failed to transform consumer discourses and societies, does this failure really cause the globalization of harm?

Shortcomings aside, this is an excellent book and an extremely important contribution to the global environmental politics and international political economy literatures. Its argument that ecological shadows are continuously shifting across communities, countries and geographies is convincing, well supported by the cases and of immense importance. It illustrates a central paradox of our age: that consumerism and its ecological and human damage have continued to accelerate even as environmental social movements and environmental policy-making have grown in political and social influence and have resulted in more stringent policies.

Hulme, Mike. 2009. *Why We Disagree About Climate Change: Understanding Controversy, Inaction and Opportunity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

*Reviewed by Joseph F. C. DiMento*  
University of California, Irvine

Before reading further in this review, pause for a minute and ask yourself: “Why do we disagree about climate change?” Chances are whatever answer you give will be treated in this comprehensive view of the phenomenon. Mike Hulme (a professor of climate change at the University of East Anglia and founding director of the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research) presents climate change as an idea as much as a physical phenomenon that can be seen, quantified and measured.

After an exhaustive coverage of various perspectives on climate change Hulme concludes that we “should use climate change both as a magnifying glass and as a mirror” (p. 362). Since much of what we think about climate change is socially constructed and political, we should decide on the basis of our values on how to act in the face of differentially perceived and valued physical phenomenon. But just as the topic of climate change is like a Rorschach test, so is this book: climate change deniers go to Hulme’s web page for support, but people with many different orientations will find inspiration in this book, in-

cluding those who will continue to work for mitigation of climate change and adaptation to its consequences.

On the phenomenon of climate change itself, Hulme reads the Rorschach this way: risks posed by the physical attributes of climate change are real and problematic, and require a human response. Physical functions of climate are changing as a result of human activities. The changes are important and serious. We should minimize risk by reducing vulnerability. But Hulme does not believe that the way these goals have been framed—through the Kyoto Protocol process—is the only way these issues should be addressed.

This is an important book. How it is used will depend on the reader. For those who have backgrounds in environmental and social policy, reading of the summaries will suffice. But for those, including educators, who wish to use the climate change example to teach a wide range of concepts and perspectives on social and environmental policy and decision-making, slicing the book into small pieces to be covered over a lengthy period, the complete book can be useful. Many now generally-accepted principles of policy analysis can be observed through the lens of climate change; how we frame, narrate, picture and interpret an environmental phenomenon is quite variable. Ideas on sound governance take different forms, from market-based to centrally regulated conceptions. The generalizability of strategies (such as those to address ozone depletion) should be seriously questioned, depending on the nature of the particular environmental condition addressed. Science has an important place in environmental decision-making but it is only one of many factors that need to be considered.

Hulme addresses his topic with an impressive command of many literatures, although one might point to important perspectives in American work not given adequate treatment: Oreskes on the history of scientific consensus in the field,<sup>1</sup> Matthew on the depth of the vulnerabilities of certain regions,<sup>2</sup> and Revkin on the communication of the science and on journalists' artificial creation of a sense of balance.<sup>3</sup> The British focus also leads to the use of British examples that may not be accessible to audiences elsewhere and that suggest a lack of focus on those populations most vulnerable to climate change.

This book is at times a sermon, in places an introductory lecture in policy analysis, and in parts a description by a scientist of areas in which he has considerable expertise. It will provoke, and in places irritate. It can be skimmed for its general points or used to address major issues in science and society including in the larger debate about the compatibility of science and religious belief, and will introduce unfamiliar information (for instance, that the Chinese National Climate Programme claims credit for the avoidance of carbon dioxide emissions by the avoided births from its population policies). Everyone will find something to discuss in this book.

1. Oreskes 2004.

2. Matthew 2005.

3. Revkin 2000.

## References

- Matthew, Richard. 2005. Sustainable Livelihoods, Environmental Security, and Conflict Management: Four Cases in South Asia. *IUCN Poverty, Equity and Rights in Conservation Working Paper Series*. Gland: IUCN.
- Oreskes, Naomi. 2004. Beyond the Ivory Tower: The Scientific Consensus on Climate Change. *Science* 306 (5702): 1686.
- Revkin, Andrew. 2007. Climate Change as News: Challenges in Communicating Environmental Science. In *Climate Change, What it Means to Us, Our Children, and Our Grandchildren*, edited by Joseph F. C. DiMento and Pamela Doughman, 139–160. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kochtcheeva, Lada V. 2009. *Comparative Environmental Regulation in the United States and Russia*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

*Reviewed by* Laura A. Henry  
Bowdoin College

When are states likely to introduce flexible environmental policies? Lada Kochtcheeva offers a historical institutionalist analysis of air and water regulation in the United States and Russia to address this question. Kochtcheeva contributes to the literature on comparative environmental policy by juxtaposing two states that are often considered “exceptional” in some way and demonstrating the common features that allow for (or fail to allow for) experimentation with incentive-based instruments for controlling pollution. These similarities, Kochtcheeva argues, hold lessons for all states—developed, transitional, and developing. While the US case has been well studied, Kochtcheeva offers a thorough overview of Russian environmental regulation from post-WWII to the present, drawing upon primary documents in Russian, and revealing a fascinating history that has been neglected in comparative analysis. The book is an impressive achievement, but also somewhat limited, as the focus on institutions inadvertently seems to de-emphasize the political, economic, and ideological context that inspired the creation of these critical agencies and policies.

Kochtcheeva’s stated intention is to go beyond a narrow and decontextualized focus on the merits of various flexible instruments, their costs and benefits and likely effectiveness. Instead, she examines the institutional context for the construction of environmental policy. Her comparative analysis identifies several important factors that create favorable conditions for the shift from command and control to more flexible regulatory approaches. These include the presence of an independent and centralized environmental agency, the initiative and capacity of the regulatory body (as opposed to the legislative branch), compatibility between new approaches and past regulations that allows for incremental change, the creation of effective systems of accountability, and past failure to achieve environmental goals with direct regulation alone. In the US case, the EPA has taken a leadership role in developing innovative regulatory