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analyze recent trends and fostered a global concern for ecological amelioration, Yearly shows that the situation is far more complex. Despite their ability to evoke the idea that environmental problems are essentially global in nature and that they require global solutions, he shows that environmentalists, policy makers and even scientists do not have a shared 'global' view of environmental challenges. Third World activists contend that environmentalists in the industrial countries have unfairly suggested that the problem of ecological destruction is primarily to be found in the developing nations. In addition, policy markers in these nations claim that international efforts to address environmental conditions hamper their development efforts. Third World scientists have also shows that the scientific evidence used by their colleagues in the industrial countries to diagnose the problem and offer policy solutions erroneously disparage the developing world. Despite the image of global concern which environmental issues evoke, there are major impediments to the emergence of a truly international understanding of the issues and the development of authentic international collaboration.

Yearly's analysis is incisive and well researched. He does not, however, offer detailed proposals for how the fragmentary tendencies within the environmental movement can be resisted. Although sociologists may not believe that analysis needs to be be linked directly to policy recommendations, the book would have been enhanced by a more thorough discussion of these issues. Nevertheless, this is an interesting work which deserves to be widely read.


In the hundred or so years since Charles Booth first sought to operationalize the concept of poverty and apply it to measure the extent of poverty in London, social scientists have developed a variety of poverty measures. These include absolute poverty lines based on minimum subsistence needs, relative poverty lines, indicators of poverty which utilize secondary data, and the official minimum income standards used by social welfare agencies to determine eligibility for income support. While it would seem
that there is little more to be added to this extensive corpus of knowledge, Nolan and Wheelan show that much more needs to be done if studies of poverty are to be accurate and useful for policy purposes. They point out that no standardized measure of poverty has yet emerged. Nor is there any consensus about the definition of poverty. Although an extensive literature on the subject is now available, studies of the incidence and nature of poverty are notoriously imprecise and unreliable.

Unfortunately, the authors do not seek to correct this situation. They tend to agree, if somewhat reluctantly, with the prevailing view that it would be futile to attempt to develop a single, standardized definition and measure of poverty. Instead, they offer a more modest refinement of existing approaches based on theoretical concepts of deprivation which move the discussion in the direction of standardization. This approach is illustrated with reference to survey data in Ireland where both authors currently work. In addition, the book provides very useful updates on recent developments in the literature including commentaries on the 'underclass' debate and the writings of Amartya Sen. These are particularly good and will be helpful not only to poverty researchers but to students looking for comprehensive summaries of the field.


Despite having the largest prison population in the industrialized world, political leaders in the United States continue to campaign for tougher sentences, more incarceration and the adoption of ever more punitive approaches to the country's pressing social problems. The United States also leads the world in scientific criminological and penological research but paradoxically, the findings of this research are seldom used to inform policy. While criminologists have long demonstrated that the use of incarceration is an ineffective means of dealing with the majority of criminal offenses, their studies are ignored in the rush to persuade citizens that more and more people need to be imprisoned. As the costs of incarceration escalate, and as the futility of current criminal justice policy become increasingly apparent, the need to