

oppressed by invaders . . . [possessing] only simple technologies, have little economic sophistication and be largely outside the market economy" (p. 111). This definition disenfranchises local communities with a historical cultural whaling practice that do not meet this definition.

The third contribution of the book is the explanation Kalland provides for the polarization of the whaling debate and the lack of communication between the two sides of the debate. He points out that each side speaks more to members of its own group than to the other side, which increases competition to become more extreme and polarized in views and actions. The IWC meetings, "an arena for tournaments of value" (p. 118), have become a place for like-minded activists on either side to compete for status within their cohort rather than to engage in debate on policy and science with the opposition group. The IWC, in other words, has become a highly political arena rather than one focused on dealing pragmatically with the whaling issue and reconciling differences between the whaling and anti-whaling nations.

Kalland also discusses the additional issues relevant to whaling communities in Japan with a strong historical culture of whale consumption. These communities currently face unemployment, and restrictions on catches in other fisheries may create additional pressure to continue whaling against the tide of the dominant international anti-whaling discourse.

The book provides enough detail and background so that it may serve as a textbook on the conflict between pro- and anti-whaling activists while providing a stronger focus on the whalers' perspective than do most other books on the subject. Although much of the material on the anti-whaling discourse is found in similar form elsewhere, it is a necessary component for a complete image of the conflict.

The book does not attempt to step beyond an anthropological description of events. In its entirety it provides a relatively pessimistic view for the future of reconciliation between the pro- and anti-whaling camps. It is hard to read any potential future other than continued discursive domination by anti-whaling activists, which will lead either to continued conflict with, or complete acquiescence by, the whaling communities.

Maniates, Michael, and John M. Meyer, eds. 2010. *The Environmental Politics of Sacrifice*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Alastair Iles
University of California, Berkeley

Environmental organizations and scientists have often called on societies to reduce their consumption, invoking worrisome trends in resource use and degradation. In response, politicians and citizens dismiss this summons as futile and naïve because they view forgoing consumption as too difficult and unfair. Sacrifice appears to be extraordinary, impractical, and impossible to integrate into

existing institutions and ways of living. The essays that Michael Maniates and John M. Meyer have assembled make an important argument about the role of sacrifice in environmental politics: not only is sacrifice not exceptional, societies are depriving themselves of a broader set of potential options by denying that sacrifice can be beneficial. Sacrifice, the editors note, can be understood in many terms: for example, forgoing something now in return for a benefit later; giving up something that is desired; or acting against one's self-interest for societal or communal gain.

The essays are grouped into four categories: the role of sacrifice in democratic politics; sacrifice in philosophy and religion; linkages of sacrifice practices to "everyday life"; and examples of sacrifice in the environmental arena. Sacrifice is rightly presented not as a single phenomenon but as a spectrum of varying types ranging from material, welfare, and political, to existential. As Meyer points out, evaluating who is asking for sacrifice, why, and how, can be critical. Some contributors point out that demanding sacrifice can be highly inequitable. The definition of sacrifice has focused on narrow materialistic interests to the exclusion of more socially grounded interests. Sacrifice is equated with loss, yet it can be a way to transform and expand the quality of human life through changing relations with fellow humans and ecosystems. These are much-needed counterarguments to the dominant negative depiction of sacrifice.

The contributors emphasize that sacrifice is already pervasive in our societies even if this is largely unacknowledged. For example, as Cheryl Hall and Paul Wapner show, the ways in which people live causes social and environmental impacts that are externalized and made invisible. In choosing to consume at high levels, people implicitly accept the health problems of air pollution, the economic costs of driving cars, and the psychological strains of working longer hours for greater income. By being kept hidden, this sacrifice imperils human and ecological life. Moreover, a variety of sacrifices are already deeply embedded in societies through the norms of social relations that people comply with. Parental sacrifice is the most obvious example: parents who refuse to support their children are ostracized as neglectful. Religious practices may also underwrite sacrifices that benefit the environment.

Many contributors view sacrifice as grounded in collective and social relations. Sacrifice lacks meaning without the social context in which it is practiced. The degree to which sacrifice depends on agency and choice—on judgments about whether a given sacrifice is meaningful, effective, or confidence-inspiring—seems central. Yet this agency is always embedded in a particular social world that may limit the scope for making "legitimate" sacrifices. In particular, as Justin Williams discusses in terms of bicycling, the broader political and economic systems that people live in can inhibit the range of options that they have, thus making abandoning cars impractical. Peter Cannavò shows that the cultural and historical evolution of sacrifice is important, using the case of how suburban lifestyles originated in early American pastoral ideals and now have values that make other ways of life less desirable.

How sacrifice is framed can influence greatly the fate of environmental

policy-making. Two chapters provide particularly fresh insights on this topic. Shane Gunster examines British Columbia's adoption of a carbon tax in 2008. The provincial government decided to frame its new tax as a revenue-neutral economic measure that would not harm anyone, thus downplaying the idea that paying the tax would be onerous yet enhance the environment by reducing climate change risks. Interestingly, the electorate rejected the tax because it was not asked to make sacrifices, suggesting that appropriate framing matters to the reception of demanding environmental policies. Simon Nicholson criticizes the rush to geoengineering solutions to greenhouse gas emissions as lacking insight into the distributive effects of technological fixes. Such technocratic decision-making creates a sacrifice-free zone, whereas specific choices of technologies can have very different effects on who is asked to sacrifice and what. That sacrifices are being made is disguised by the lack of participation of diverse voices, which brings out the participatory justice dimension in ways that other essays do not.

While the collection provides a relatively cohesive and cogent critique of sacrifice, there are several key biases and gaps that need to be addressed in future work. The editors acknowledge that the essays largely concentrate on the United States, with limited attention to developing country contexts. There could well be different, culturally grounded, forms of sacrifice that can advance sustainable consumption in India, for instance. There is an excessive focus on parenthood and children as a model of socially acceptable sacrifice. Other types of family relationships and social relations may be important sites for sacrifice in the United States and other cultures. The communal nature of sacrifice is not fully recognized. For example, Cannavò suggests that suburbia can look very different but does not look at how communities of consumption may need to change: there is a rich literature on this topic that could have been woven in. This lack of attention to the process of change characterizes the book as a whole. Almost as an add-on, Maniates underscores the great challenges of building new social movements around sacrifice, using the case of demanding greater vacation time in return for lower pay. As Meyer advocates, there needs to be democratic politics that can expose and critique the sacrifices that humans already make. The essays are an important contribution to that goal.

Mikler, John. 2009. *Greening the Car Industry: Varieties of Capitalism and Climate Change*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Katja Biedenkopf
Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

Car manufacturing is a global industry dominated by a small number of large multinational corporations. Although they operate in a global market, car companies display significant differences in their approach to environmental protection and climate change. Japanese manufacturers are pioneers in hybrid technology, while their German counterparts focus on incremental improvements of their diesel technology. US car manufacturers lag behind Japanese and Ger-

reversals, bearish trends on capital markets, and finally the real threat of a global economic and financial crisis, emerging in the recent months, all these have confirmed. sceptics' misgivings and many observers' calls for having the sustainable growth idea. consumption " resource-plundering, expensive and inefficient " has been increasingly questioned in favour of a sustainable model, where people draw on consumer goods and services with restraint and a sense of responsibility for future generations. demand and behaviour towards such a pattern of natural resources' use and economic capacity's utilisation, which ensures that needs are met and quality of life raised for all consumers, while at the same time reproducing the nature's capital for the benefit of. No business or government entity is allowed under the order to require people in Florida to provide documentation of their vaccination status. State agencies will enforce the order, including compliance as a condition of state licensing and other authorization needed to do business, and companies that violate the ban won't be eligible for grants or state contracts. The order comes amid a global debate over the ethics of forcing people to take vaccines to be able to live as full-fledged citizens and restore freedoms that arguably weren't legally infringed in the first place. For instance, South Korea's prime minister said on Thursday that only those who get Covid-19 jabs will be allowed to return to their "daily lives." How does biofuel use differ from solar, wind, and geothermal energy use? a. Biofuels can have a more widespread use. b. Biofuels are less damaging to the environment. c. Biofuels are not a renewable energy source. d. Biofuels cannot be used as an energy source. C. Who administers the Clean Air Act? a. local police forces b. the Environmental Protection Agency c. the office of Homeland Security d. individual businesses. B. Which is true of solar, wind, and geothermal energy. They are dependent on location to be effective. This set is often saved in the same folder as The social costs of reso...