

Book Reviews

Administrative Ethics in the Twenty-First Century. J. Michael Martinez and William D. Richardson. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2008. 285 pp. \$32.95 (cloth).

Governance in Dark Times: Practical Philosophy for Public Service. Camilla Stivers. Washington, DC: Georgetown University, 2008. 176 pp. \$24.95 (paper).

Camilla Stivers' *Governance in Dark Times* and J. Michael Martinez and William D. Richardson's *Administrative Ethics in the Twenty-First Century* are very different books but share a common aim. This aim is to demonstrate the relevance of political and moral philosophy to contemporary public administration in the United States. With reference to seminal ideas in the history of Western political thought and pressing dilemmas facing the present-day civil service, and more specifically, civil servants, both volumes achieve this end. Importantly, the volumes' messages transcend the American case to speak more broadly to public administration in other democratic regimes.

Stivers writes wonderfully, weaving philosophies of Arendt, Kant, Foucault, Hobbes, Heidegger, and Dewey into an analysis of important demands currently confronting the public administration. She draws normative principles from our tradition of political ideas to specify a path for reforms to the existing administrative ethos, practices, and institutions. Quite remarkably, her book is comprehensive yet accessible. It covers key historical, empirical, and theoretical points while not glossing over too much detail. Moreover, this book has a literary quality to it—a quality that is most rare among books in public administration. While achieving a practical end, Stivers creates haunting metaphors of light and dark that serve as her book's leitmotif.

Drawing from Arendt, Stivers' primary concern is a fundamental darkness that is a consequence of extinguishing relations among citizens that give life and meaning to the public realm. Stivers explores this consequence in terms of the individual and collective ability of democratic citizens to grasp the existential impact of contemporary events that have caused a deep sense of fear and insecurity. She articulates rich understanding of the public realm, speaking less in terms of space and spheres and more in terms of interpersonal relationships. With Arendt, she argues that dark times emerge when citizens stop coming together to discuss shared concerns and divergent perspectives on truth. Similar to Arendt, she does not place a priority on collective agreement. Rather, she emphasizes the importance of committing to a shared grappling with issues important to

Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions, Vol. 22, No. 4, October 2009 (pp. 747–761).

© 2009 Wiley Periodicals, Inc., 350 Main St, Malden, MA 02148, USA, and 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK. ISSN 0952-1895

our public existence. Without this form of enlightening exchange, she sees us retreating into our private lives and homes and seeking from our governments, and ultimately our fellow citizens, only the upholding of our basic rights and freedoms. These would be dark times indeed.

The book comprises three parts. In the first, Stivers ponders lessons for public administrators emerging from the darkness caused by the fear of terrorism, warfare, and natural disasters. Specifically, she ponders 9/11, the anthrax scare, the so-called "shoe bomber," the war in Iraq, and Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. These events exposed the fragility of human life and the apparent inability of the U.S. government to provide basic protection to its residents. Had Stivers been writing this book in late 2008 and early 2009, she likely would have included the fear caused by the current economic crisis. The current precipitous demise of the U.S. economy is at least as poignant and serious for both individual citizens and their public realms. Its threat certainly seems more immediate and its consequences more grave for millions of Americans. Stivers goes on in the second part to contrast a Hobbesian and an Arendtian model of public life. The former takes the shape of a top-down guarantor of safety from a relapse into the state of war based on contractual authority. The latter is based on the possibility of mutually promising and spirited public dialog. She contends that Arendt's view is more clear-sighted and leads more plausibly toward meaningful public life. The third part takes a more pragmatic turn. She fuses Arendt's philosophical perspectives on democracy with Dewey's conception of associated living to layout democratic approaches to administrative decision making. Stivers concludes with reflections on the importance of public servants functioning within a matrix of interpersonal relationships that support ethical decisions and, more broadly, ethical life.

Her ultimate argument is that, in the current dark times, we are in greater need than ever of finding meaning in public service, of grounding ourselves in a sense of the public, and of actually connecting and collaborating with our fellow citizens. We are in need of a renewal of public spaces so that we, that is, citizens, officials, and administrators of democratic regimes, can meet to express our viewpoints on the issues confronting us. Our most important resource is the ties that interconnect us and help to illuminate for us constructive, productive, and ultimately ethical paths toward addressing challenges of security, economic growth, and environmental sustainability. This book's practical guidance is useful; its literary quality is refreshing.

Martinez and Richardson's *Administrative Ethics in the Twenty-First Century* is a very different book. It is much less metaphorical; it is much more literal. It succeeds nonetheless in integrating ideas from the history of Western political thought into ideas concerning the reform of the public service. The authors intend their text as an introduction to ethics in the civil service, expounding upon its importance and its instantiations. The book is well organized toward this end, with study questions and cases at the end of each chapter. What it lacks in literary finesse, it makes up for in pedagogical exercises.

Similar to Stivers, Martinez and Richardson contextualize their book with reference to acts of terror against the United States. They argue that in light of the attacks of December 7, 1941 and September 11, 2001 on the United States and the American democracy, there is an ever-pressing need to bring virtue back into political life. In light of these attacks, they argue that the American people must unite, and that for a people to unite they must nurture a particular *ethos*. Drawing from Aristotle, they argue that combinations of virtues and vices characterizing a *demos* distinguish their regime. Personal constitutions, in other words, distinguish political constitutions. As the ancients of the Western intellectual tradition held, *arete* and *kakia* are indicators of the strengths and weaknesses of regimes. They indicate prospects for the preservation or deterioration of the political collectivity and the regime. Yet, the focus of Martinez and Richardson's analysis is not the character of the American people but rather of American civil servants. As in any contemporary democratic constitution, unelected civil servants wield a large degree of discretionary powers in the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of public policy. The authors claim that the character of those wielding this power is vitally important. This character, they claim, can reassure those they serve (i.e., the *demos*) that this power is being appropriately exercised. As such, civil servants can contribute to ensuring the preservation of the regime in good health.

Martinez and Richardson divide their book into five parts. The first provides background in the ethical theory of the history of Western philosophy. The authors, similar to Stivers, provide a nice overview of major ideas while not sacrificing too much detail. As they put it, their intent here is not to enable readers to become experts in the philosophies of Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas, Machiavelli, Hume, Kant, and Rawls, to name a few of the philosophers they cover. Instead, they intend to introduce readers to the important connection, drawn historically by these philosophers, between the character of citizens, their democratic representatives, their civil servants, and their regime. They then trace the rise of the administrative state and its inevitable challenges of democratic legitimacy. In Part Two, the authors examine the nature of bureaucratic power and the challenges more specific to establishing its legitimacy. The essential problem is to justify the discretionary powers of unelected bureaucrats. They go on in this part to assess current decision-making models entrenched in the civil service, including the rational-comprehensive, incremental, and flow-of-work models. Importantly, they elucidate the restraints imposed on policy decisions by both law and ethics. The authors in Part Three take a broader look at the organizational and legal environment of the administrative state. In particular, they highlight the contributions of Wilson, Weber, Taylor, Goodnow, White, and Gulick to understanding and to evaluating organizational behavior in the context of policymaking. Moreover, they show how these schools have absorbed pressures (e.g., political, economic, psychological, sociological, and ethical) that impact policy decision making and policy decisions. They then outline the legal context

in which bureaucrats exercise their discretionary powers. This context includes laws enshrined in the constitution, statues delegating legislative and executive powers, regulations promulgated as a result of this delegation, and judicial oversight. In Part Four, they survey the historical development of ethical decision making in light of these challenges of legitimacy. In particular, they focus on the ethical dimensions of finding and distributing scarce resources. Their discussion outlines how the government has attempted to raise revenues, how the public expenditures have affected the domestic economy, how the public budgets have been devised, and how the ethical public administrators should exercise budgetary discretion. The authors then explore ways of encouraging civil servants to become ethical by making ethical decisions. They look at models of decision making that are amenable to realizing this Aristotelian principle. In the fourth and concluding part, Martinez and Richardson ponder the future of the public administration and the ethical implications for it. They conclude that contemporary dilemmas can be addressed by administrators who uphold the ethical link between their own virtue and the virtue of the organizational model and administrative state in which they must operate.

Both student and professor will benefit from these books. The former volume entices with its rich metaphors and interesting historical examples; the latter offers a good synthesis of ideas and reforms and helpful exercises and study questions. Each achieves the end of highlighting the importance of ethics in civil service.

GENEVIEVE FUJI JOHNSON, *Simon Fraser University*

Elites, Ideas, and the Evolution of Public Policy. William Genieys and Marc Smyrl, Eds. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. 228 pp. \$74.95 (cloth).

Since the 1990s, a growing number of scholars have explored the determinants of policy change in advanced industrial societies. For example, some of these scholars have criticized institutionalist theories that they claim emphasize stability over change. One aspect of this policy change debate concerns the role and the nature of the actors who are in the best position to bring about change. In this recent edited volume, political scientists William Genieys and Marc Smyrl address this important issue. According to them, one of the most significant sources of policy change in advanced industrial societies is the competition for legitimate authority between actors known as "programmatic elites." Directly involved in the policy process, these professionals struggle to justify and reinforce their policymaking authority. For Genieys and Smyrl, ideational programs help these actors define their interests and identities in the context of a struggle for legitimate authority that largely takes place within the state, which is described as a fragmented and contentious political site rather than one possessing coherent and homogenous order. Clearly, the two editors call

into question Weber's distinction between "administration" and "politics" (185) while downplaying the role of public opinion and electoral forces in policymaking. From this perspective, their book is a powerful challenge to the recent literature seeking to "bring the public back in" to contemporary policy analysis (Burstein 2003).

Theoretically, the book draws extensively on the recent sociological literature on elite formation, and to a lesser extent, on the role of ideas in policymaking. As far as the latter is concerned, the editors draw extensively on—and boldly criticize—the work of French political scientists Pierre Muller and Bruno Jobert, the founders of a major school of policy analysis in their country. The list of the eight case studies used to back the editors' claims about the role of programmatic elites also points to a strong "French connection." For instance, if we exclude the two transnational cases on trade issues (chapter 3), four of the six country-based cases are about France. As for the substantive topics at the center of the eight case studies, the following enumeration should convince anyone of their diversity: service trade liberalization (Cornelia Woll), the international politics of food labeling (Andy Smith), primary health care in Catalonia (Xavier Ballart), economic development policy in France (Marc Smyrl), the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement (Stephanie R. Golob), the end of military conscription in France (Jean Joana), French social policy reform with a focus on health care (William Genieys), and the French cement industry and environmental politics (Laura Michel).

Although the list of case studies could lead potential readers to the conclusion that the volume does not hold together well, that would be a mistake. By and large, it is a very coherent edited volume. This is true mostly because the contributors share and engage with the basic framework formulated in the theoretical chapters, and more importantly, because the two editors insert a short discussion section at the end of each case study. These sections stress the specific contribution of the case study to the volume as a whole and to our understanding of the role of programmatic elites in the politics of policy change. If the quality of the case studies themselves is uneven, they all serve a clear purpose in the context of the volume as a whole. Moreover, these well-researched case studies are informed by qualitative interviews with policymakers, the most central method used to assess the policy impact of programmatic elites. Overall, despite the excessive number of typos, the volume reads quite well and offers significant insight about the nature and sources of policy change in advanced industrial societies.

The book is not without flaws, however. First, the disproportionate reliance on French cases will make it harder for international readers to assess the applicability of the volume's framework to other national cases. For example, a case on U.S. domestic policy would have been useful. Instead the editors speculate about the status of programmatic elites in the United States. Second and perhaps even more important, the editors are probably going too far in downplaying the role of elected officials and

electoral logic, something that Peter Hall notes in his foreword (xii) to the volume. Third, the role of national cultural and ideological repertoires is not acknowledged by the volume's theoretical framework, even if the case study about the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement alludes to this issue. From a sociological standpoint, the volume is lacking, as it fails to recognize the structuring role of shared cultural symbols and social assumptions and the ways in which actors can reframe them. By focusing on a narrow set of actors and ideas, the volume is missing significant aspects of the "big picture." Finally, as far as the literature on ideas and public policy is concerned, the editors fail to acknowledge that some of their claims about the role of ideas in the construction of interests and identities are anything but new (e.g., Jenson 1989). Such critical remarks should not prevent scholars interested in policy change from reading and engaging with this coherent and thought-provoking volume.

DANIEL BÉLAND, *University of Saskatchewan*

References

- Burstein, Paul. 2003. "The Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy: A Review and an Agenda." *Political Research Quarterly* 56 (1): 29–40.
- Jenson, Jane. 1989. "Paradigms and Political Discourse: Protective Legislation in France and the United States before 1914." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 22: 235–258.

Making Laws Matter: Environmental Protection and Legal Institutions in Brazil. Lesley McAllister. Stanford, CA: Stanford Law Books, 2008. 288 pp. \$55.00 (cloth).

In *Making Laws Matter*, Lesley McAllister examines how Brazil enforces strong environmental laws enshrined in the Constitution and national laws. She argues that Brazil's prosecutorial approach to enforcement through the *Ministério Público* succeeds in enforcing the country's environmental laws, while in other countries with similarly strong laws on the books, corruption, and inefficiency impede strong enforcement. The book offers an informative account of an institution that could serve as a model for other countries struggling with how to solve environmental challenges. It is clear that strong laws are not enough; strong, independent institutions are necessary for improving environmental governance. While the lessons of the book can be applied to many policy fields and the author has carefully crafted a detailed account of the benefits of the *Ministério Público* in Brazil, it is less clear whether the experience of the *Ministério Público* could actually be replicated in other contexts. In other words, is the successful enforcement of environmental laws dependent upon a strong civil society? What role does a strong civil society play in the process?

The institution of the *Ministério Público*, literally translated as the "Public Ministry," has evolved over several decades, gaining greater independence and responsibility under the Constitution of 1988. The

Ministério Público investigates complaints of environmental violations from individuals, organizations, and other government agencies, ending in judicial and extrajudicial actions. The Ministério Público may also investigate problems on its own initiative, and its mandate reaches beyond environmental abuses to other “diffuse interests,” as specified in the Constitution. McAllister tests her argument using the states of São Paulo and Pará. She finds that the state Ministério Público in São Paulo succeeds in environmental law enforcement because of its high level of political independence from the executive branch. In Pará, on the other hand, the federal Ministério Público has been more effective than the state institution constrained by political interference.

The author presents a compelling, well-researched case for the effectiveness of prosecutorial enforcement of environmental regulations in Brazil. She identifies an important gap in empirical research assessing “the operation of environmental regulation in developing countries,” and she presents a detailed description of Brazil’s unique system (3). The cases she chose for study display great variance: São Paulo state in the southeast, anchored by the mega-city of São Paulo, is encumbered by significant industrial pollution, while in Pará in the north of the country, the city of Belém serves as a gateway to the Amazon. Within these two case studies, McAllister traces the creation of the Ministério Público and the challenges faced due to dysfunction in environmental agencies, lack of resources, and political intervention.

The strength of this book is in understanding of how a legal institution may hold government officials and private entities accountable, particularly, as the author argues, when there is a mismatch in political strength between those opposing regulations and those who benefit. The independence of the Ministério Público, and the respect it engenders from citizens, enables it to overcome political obstacles to enforcing strong laws. While corruption, weak capacity, and a public uninformed of their rights traditionally impede enforcement of environmental regulation—particularly in developing countries—an independent Ministério Público in Brazil overcomes these limitations. The strength of this institutional arrangement provides a model for other policy areas where regulations appear strong on paper but fail to translate to tangible benefits for the population they are meant to benefit. For instance, in social policy areas, including health and housing, an independent legal body, rather than an internal ombudsman, may also serve to hold government officials accountable for implementing regulations often won through hard-fought battles with civil society.

However, how the institution of the Ministério Público travels to other contexts within and outside of Brazil is not well defined in this book. For instance, the author does not identify specific political variables that might influence the effectiveness of the Ministério Público, such as the political party of the president, governor, or mayor. Given the author’s admission that accountability of the Ministério Público can be difficult to maintain, it

is unclear whether other developing countries or even other Brazilian states have the capacity to achieve the balance achieved to some degree in these two cases. The author does include a small section in the end of the book noting that other Latin American countries are similar to Brazil in their focus on democratization through public participation and accountability, though she does not define specific variables or give country examples to illustrate how the Ministério Público might be replicated elsewhere. Given the importance of improving environmental regulation enforcement throughout the developing world, understanding whether successful institutions like the Ministério Público can be replicated elsewhere is a key area for future research.

McAllister argues that the Ministério Público provides civil society with “access to justice.” Civil society organizations often file complaints with the Ministério Público because it has greater resources to investigate these complaints and use judicial action to enforce environmental protection laws. But it is not clear how exactly civil society participated in the creation of the Ministério Público system or what difference a strong civil society makes that allows the institution to better enforce the laws and maintain accountability. The book would provide a deeper understanding of how the institution functions in Brazil as well as whether it would function elsewhere if it contained a more detailed description of the actors in civil society who are concerned with the Brazilian environment, and how their role varies in different contexts.

In sum, this book is a valuable resource for legal scholars, environmental activists, and anyone interested in how governance institutions may surmount implementation barriers. The book succeeds in demonstrating how to overcome obstacles to implementing rules that look good on paper but rarely live up to their promise. As all countries look for solutions to environmental challenges, this book offers reason for optimism.

MAUREEN M. DONAGHY, *University of Colorado, Boulder*

Site Fights: Divisive Facilities and Civil Society in Japan and the West. Daniel Aldrich. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008. 272 pp. \$39.95 (cloth).

Daniel Aldrich has written an extraordinary book in *Site Fights*. He examines the siting of facilities that are public “goods” but local “bads” in Japan and France. *Site Fights* argues that the strength of a community’s civil society is the primary predictor of whether it will be the recipient of these undesirable facilities and influences how long the project takes to complete. His book joins an increasingly large body of literature on civil society in Japan (e.g., *The State of Civil Society in Japan* 2003; *Japan’s Dual Civil Society* 2006; *Politics and Volunteering in Japan* 2007; and *Fighting for Foreigners* 2008, to name a few). What is particularly valuable about Aldrich’s contribution is that he demonstrates, quite convincingly, that civil society organizations have the power not only to respond to state

policy, but they can actually *prevent* unwanted state action. Furthermore, moving away from simple dichotomies of “coercion” and “persuasion,” the book carefully documents a wide range of state strategies designed to gain compliance from host communities. *Site Fights* is an important book that will find relevance for scholars in public policy, environmental policy, as well as comparative politics.

Aldrich’s main argument is that “bureaucrats seek to avoid costly resistance and choose weak civil societies for sites” (x). Furthermore, communities with active civil society resistance can force states to delay project implementation, offer compensation to host communities, or even cancel projects. He supports these findings using a sophisticated analysis of an original data set (generously made available to the public through Harvard University’s Dataverse: <http://dvn.iq.harvard.edu/dvn/dv/daldrich>) of approximately 500 cases in Japan, as well as the case studies of airports, dams, and nuclear power facility siting in both Japan and France.

The ultimate take-away for the reader is that states are, as Aldrich describes them, “Machiavellian” in their efforts to find host communities for public facilities. In other words, they are sneaky and mean. The case studies in the book were filled with horror stories of states exercising their coercive power against communities who resisted hosting controversial facilities. Although they are both ostensibly democracies, both France and Japan frequently lied to their citizens, seized their land, withheld state funding, etc. in order to gain compliance from host communities.

In and among the horror stories were also accounts of highly creative strategies to placate citizens and win over the hearts and minds of host communities. One of the most innovative of these was a comic book developed by the Japan Dam Federation and the Ministry of Construction, approved by the Ministry of Education, and distributed to school systems across Japan. The comic discussed the importance of water conservation, the benefits of dams, and the government’s efforts to ensure water access for all Japanese. Similar “educational” tools were also developed for nuclear power plants (108–109). Aldrich argues that these types of “soft social control” strategies were becoming more common in the 1990s and 2000s in both Japan and France for all three types of controversial facilities.

Site Fights is a methodologically sophisticated book about a complex topic, so it is not surprising that some areas of the text are stronger than others. This reader was quite convinced by the quantitative data that demonstrated that bureaucrats avoid siting controversial facilities in communities with demographic conditions that suggested higher levels of community solidarity, and that communities that mobilized were able to delay and sometimes cancel projects in their areas. The quantitative data were supplemented by interviews with bureaucrats that confirmed this argument.

Aldrich’s second argument, that states shifted their strategies from more coercive techniques on communities with weak civil society to more persuasive (incentives and “soft social control”) techniques on

communities with strong civil society, is parsimonious, but it was not as strongly supported by the evidence presented. One of the greatest contributions of the book is that it highlighted the very wide range of strategies, some of them highly creative, employed by states as they tried to convince communities to host controversial facilities. However, in numerous cases it appeared that the state was using the full range strategies within a single community—paying some people off, threatening the jobs of others, and holding public meetings all at the same time. Aldrich noted this possibility himself when he wrote, “Though Japanese officials have developed soft social control strategies and larger incentives, these should not be viewed as having displaced older tools of coercion and hard social control” (110). Although Aldrich documents a change over time in both Japan and France toward the use of more persuasive and less coercive policy instruments, it was not entirely clear from the evidence that these tools were selected based on the extent of civil society organization in a particular community as stated in his argument. Similarly, it was sometimes difficult to discern the lines between hard and soft social control or between weaker or stronger levels of resistance. For example, is cutting financial aid for children (111) “hard social control” or “coercion”? Why is a demonstration of “tens of thousands protesters” only “moderate” resistance (113)?

Finally, Aldrich’s theory does not adequately address the importance of scale. The book contained no comparison chart of how many of each facility were actually sited in each country and little theorizing about how the sheer number of facilities might influence either civil society organizations’ or governments’ strategies. The two countries are, in fact, dramatically different in terms of scale for two of the three facilities—France has more than four times as many airports and less than one-tenth as many dams as Japan (they both have about the same number of nuclear power plants).

Overall, *Site Fights* is an important piece of scholarship. It asks and answers an important question (how are host communities selected for public facilities), and puts forward a clear argument concerning this process that is well supported by original data. *Site Fights* will be of great interest to a wide range of researchers and would be very good for classes on public policy, environmental policy, Japanese politics, and comparative politics.

MARY ALICE HADDAD, *Wesleyan University*

Firm Interests: How Governments Shape Business Lobbying on Global Trade. Cornelia Woll. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008. 186 pp. \$39.95 (cloth).

Political economy revolves around actors pressing their interests. Nevertheless, scholars have spent relatively little time attempting to understand what these policy preferences are and where they come from. In *Firm Interests*, Cornelia Woll tackles this theoretical lacuna head on. Offering a

novel argument based in sociological approaches to uncertainty, Woll attempts to explain business preferences vis-à-vis the liberalization of services trade. In addition to making a much-needed contribution to theoretical discussions of preferences formation, the monograph is among a growing number of innovative works that examines the politics of services trade.

The driving empirical puzzle centers on the fact that monopoly operators in the telecommunications and air transport markets supported global trade liberalization, despite the fact that this move would threaten their home market dominance. Woll uses this puzzle to confront standard materialist claims that explain firm preferences by identifying their relative factor mobility. Such arguments fail to predict the outcomes in the cases (e.g., telecommunications companies with large fixed national infrastructures and relatively few profits derived internationally are the most vocal supporters of liberalization).

To understand firm preferences better, Woll builds an elegant argument that centers on uncertainty and identity. In many instances, the effect of public policy on a firm's bottom line is unknowable. As companies engage in a diverse set of business activities, units find themselves differentially affected by public policy, the complexity of global markets clouds identification of winning business models, and a shift in business-government relations can upend standard organizational practices. In short, public policy is often not just about managing risk (i.e., the probability that a given outcome will occur), but managing uncertainty (i.e., cases where a firm cannot calculate such probabilities).

Drawing on recent constructivist work, Woll argues that rational action must be understood as informed by the social environment. When a company is uncertain about means-ends relationships, it relies on its beliefs and identity to guide its behavior, which is in turn a product of business-government relations. For example, while all firms want to survive, this basic interest means different things to a public sector company than a newly privatized one. The former might understand survival as the provision of universal service; the latter focuses instead on profit. Woll argues that particularly in the case of services, where domestic regulations are extensive, governments play an important role in such identity formation.

The empirical core of the book examines the liberalization of the telecommunications and aviation markets during the 1990s. The chapter on telecommunications centers on the multilateral negotiations conducted under the General Agreement on Trade in Services. After years of deadlock within the International Telecommunications Union, liberalization was achieved by shifting negotiations to the trade arena. In both regions, companies that stood to lose control over their home markets advocated for opening. Surprisingly, Regional Bells in the United States such as NYNEX Long Distance Company with few international profits actively promoted the trade agenda. On the European side, the European Commission

educated anew group of private telecommunications companies about the potential benefits of liberalization. Woll argues that the counterintuitive result was driven in large part by a shift in firm identity that resulted from domestic privatization and re-regulation. For example, internal market reforms in Europe created a host of new companies that were being taught about the benefits of market competition. Similarly, in the case of air services, former national carriers with protected markets moved to support liberalization. Once again, Woll argues that internal regulatory changes on both sides of the Atlantic, which promoted competition, altered firm identity. The shift from monopoly provider to market competitor transformed the firms' understanding regarding their public policy goals.

There can be no doubt that Woll makes a major contribution to the political economy field with the book. She offers a persuasive and original argument about firm preferences, which is a needed corrective to strict materialist arguments about production factors. Additionally, she confronts the growing complexity of globalization and services trade while offering an excellent analysis that allows for rigorous empirical evaluation.

In conclusion, I want to draw out three points that emphasize critical themes in Woll's analysis that are ripe for extension. First, much of the heavy lifting in the book comes from interventions by the European Commission and the move toward European as opposed to simply national politics. While Woll focuses on the role of the competitive environment (i.e., public vs. private sector firms), a change in jurisdiction seems equally important. Firms embedded in Europe must come to understand their interests in a new light as paths of interest expression and aggregation shift. Although Woll does not want the book to be solely a story of Europe, one could easily imagine an important extension that focuses on the role of jurisdictional change in firm identity formation.

Second, the relative sequencing of public policy change in the relevant domestic markets played a central role in the ultimate outcome of international liberalization. Two domestic efforts—the single market initiative in Europe and the Telecommunications Act of 1996 in the United States—set up the identity transformation that facilitated global trade talks on services. Had only one jurisdiction restructured its market prior to the trade negotiations, it is very likely that stalemate and not compromise would have ensued. This underscores the importance of temporality in studies that examine the interaction of domestic and international factors, particularly the relative development in one critical market compared to another.

Third, and finally, it is highly possible that Woll undersells the scope of her argument. In chapter 3, she makes a strong claim that the politics of services trade is distinct from trade in goods because of the extensive nature of domestic regulation of services sectors. In short, services liberalization rarely centers on quantitative quotas but instead on regulatory barriers that prevent market access. Such regulation engenders a distinct form of lobbying, requiring expertise instead of brute interests. While I find the core of the argument extremely important and a major innovation

in trade politics, I am unconvinced that its application should be limited to services. In a host of product markets, from chemicals to agriculture, regulation has replaced tariffs as the focus of trade disputes. The critical move, then, is to identify when divergent domestic regulations have become the dominant point of conflict and to recognize how this transforms international politics.

ABRAHAM L. NEWMAN, *Georgetown University*

Biobanks: Governance in Comparative Perspective. Herbert Gottweis and Alan Petersen, Eds. London and New York: Routledge, 2008. 234 pp. \$45.95 (paperback).

As part of the growing comparative policy literature on biotechnology and genomics, this edited volume addresses the governance of biobanks from a comparative perspective in the tradition of critical policy analysis. Biobanks are "collections of human biological material" (5) that are stored with data on the donors or patients such as their medical history, lifestyle, or environment. As the editors Herbert Gottweis and Alan Petersen argue, the governance of biobanks has been discussed so far mainly from the perspective of patient rights and with a focus on the question of sharing benefits. The two introductory chapters argue concisely, and the empirical case studies demonstrate convincingly, that the governance of biobanks cannot be reduced to these two aspects. By employing a theoretical distinction between the governance *of* and *through* biobanks (Part 1: Conceptualizing Biobanks), the book emphasizes the political and social impact of biobanks.

This approach counteracts the idea that biobank governance can separate and discreetly consider technical and scientific issues, on one hand, and political issues, on the other. While the governance *of* and *through* biobanks is intrinsically linked (9), the former points to analyzing the policymaking processes, while the later emphasizes the impacts of biobank governance on the relations between politics, science, society, and economy. The governance *through* biobanks, as Gottweis argues, drawing on the work of Michel Foucault (chapter 2 of part 1), feeds into a new form of biopolitics "with respect to *surveillance*, with respect to *bodies*, and with respect to . . . the shaping of the structure and organization of institutions of monitoring bodies and populations" (25, italics in the original). According to Gottweis, biobanks contribute to important shifts in biopolitics: the shift to micro-management of health care, where self-steering gains in importance and the central role of the state are replaced by medical and health care actors (28); the importance of patenting and international competition over research (29); and personalized medicine where the burden of health is shifted to the individual level (32). The theoretical introduction is followed by case studies (chapters 3 through 8) on the governance *of* biobanks in Iceland (G. Pálsson), Estonia (R. Rensaar), France (M. Mayrhofer), Germany (I. Schneider), the United States (A. Fletcher), and Japan (R. Triendl and H. Gottweis). The case

studies analyze the *policy narratives* that have been constructed in order to justify the specific mode of biobank governance. While some countries have national population-based biobank projects, others have unsuccessfully tried to establish such biobanks, and others again have never undertaken such efforts and biobank governance remains local. The case studies evoke historical-cultural and institutional factors in order to explain the policy narratives—yet without explicitly subscribing to a historic or cultural institutionalist approach. Nation-building discourses were important for some of the national biobank projects. Some of the factors mentioned to explain the country-specific narratives and thus the forms of governance include: the impact of state structure, the organization of research, characteristics of the health care system, and national history. The case studies reveal, furthermore, that the same kinds of actors have played very different roles in the governance of biobanks. For example, patients and the medical or research communities acted as policy entrepreneurs in some cases but were opposed to emerging projects of biobank governance in other cases. The third part of the book (Part 3: Biobanks, Publics and Citizenship), chapters 9 through 13, looks at governance *through* biobanks in the United Kingdom, Scandinavia, Australia, and Israel. Three of the five chapters critically scrutinize current practices of public participation and of addressing donor concerns. Corrigan and Petersen, in their sharply argued chapter focused on the United Kingdom, highlight the role of bioethics in defining public participation primarily in terms of risk management, that is, anticipating and managing the possible adverse reaction of the public, which simply needs to be educated about the value of biobanks. In the same vein, Ursin, Hoeyer, and Skolbekken, in their comparative and empirically well-grounded study on Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, demonstrate the reductionist role of ethics in addressing donors concerns. Concerns about the “egalitarian and altruistic ideals of Scandinavian public health service” (190) remained unaddressed, while donor concerns were framed in terms of how to manage the relations between donors and biobank operators. The concisely argued chapter by McNamara and Peterson on the Australian experience likewise highlights the reductionist vision of public participation in governing biobanks, which adheres to “the so-called deficit model of public understanding that assumes that any opposition or lack of engagement is due to the public’s ignorance of the project and its benefits.” (205). The two remaining chapters link the governance of biobanks to questions of identity and community. Prainsack, in her fascinating account of the Israeli experience, analyzes how the political construction of community and the categories of genomic research interact with each other in defining the Jewish state. Tutton’s innovative contribution analyzes the relationship between the representation of ethnic minorities in British multicultural society and their conceptualization in the U.K. Biobank. His study highlights how identity, community, and the governance of biobanks are tightly linked.

While all of the case studies are worthwhile reading individually and comparatively in their detailed account of biobank governance, I would have wished for a more systematic approach to comparison through a broader set of common research questions and a stronger comparison with other policy issues in biotechnology and genomics. I expected this comparison because of the extensive scholarship of both editors on other policy issues in biotechnology and genomics. Nevertheless, this volume is worthwhile reading for any policy scholar interested in biotechnology, genomics, and health care policies; questions of identity and citizenship; or the application of Foucault's concept of biopolitics, as well as scholars working on public participation. Given the rich empirical material and the sound scholarship used to analyze and reconstruct modes of biobank governance, I would also recommend the volume to scholars of public policy who do not share the editors' theoretical approach. The volume could be used in graduate classes on science and technology policy, health care policy, or critical policy studies in general. Practitioners will particularly benefit from the critical analysis of the impact of biobank governance on society and politics at large.

CHRISTINE ROTHMAYR, *Université de Montréal*