

Does this mean that the cause to protect whale species globally is a facile exercise? Absolutely not! However, the threat to whales does not come from indigenous communities taking a few animals to sustain their cultural and economic lifestyle. It comes instead from a strong machine driving the commercial interests that have led to the critical environmental situation we face today. Perhaps one of the least known threats to whales is contamination, which arises from activities in the south, rather than from the actions of Inuit or other indigenous hunters in the North. Chemical pollutants are absorbed through atmospheric and marine pathways. Recent research on contaminants is evaluating the effects of global pollution on wildlife species harvested by Inuit communities.

Engaging in rhetoric that promotes superficial, moralistic judgements does not help the cause of the whale; it simply leads to polarization and lack of understanding. Neither the whale nor the indigenous community benefits. Such rhetoric keeps the debate in the realm of dogma and detracts from meaningful discussion. Perhaps the current situation only serves to help raise funds for environmental organizations to raise their corporate profile in the media. It is not so puzzling why other, less-known species like the snail darter (*Percina tanasi*) are not as appealing for a society used to blaming others for its own excesses. For environmental organizations, such species are not photogenic enough to raise funds. They do not fit the corporate marketing strategy. Such institutions are becoming global bureaucracies, and their main function seems increasingly to be self-promotion. According to the authors of *Inuit, Whaling, and Sustainability*, the International Whaling Commission manifests such tendencies.

Why is whaling important to the Inuit? The authors, seeking to answer that question, recognize the complex relationship with the whale, which is both viewed as food and revered as a creature of great beauty and intelligence. In the case of the Inuit, the hunting of the whale cannot be neatly divided between the material and the spiritual. The economic and nutritional needs supported by whaling cannot be divorced from its cultural and spiritual contributions. Whaling and other subsistence activities reinforce values such as sharing, concern for the common good, leadership, disciplined behaviour, a deep respect for nature, the symbiotic relationship between man and woman, and a deep connection between the Inuit and the community of wildlife that surrounds them.

Industrial society and neo-liberal economic policies have diminished these values in favour of profit and individual wealth accumulation. It is ironic that many business schools and social science departments in North American universities are ablaze with buzzwords such as “social capital” and “civil society” but are completely uninterested in applying them to indigenous societies that thrive in spite of the capitalist global economy. Industrial development and capitalist growth models have hardly provided any security to indigenous communities in terms of stability and well-being. Consistently, traditional or

subsistence hunting activities have provided food security to the Inuit. Even today, under the so-called victory of capitalism over communist society, the source of food security for Inuit and other indigenous communities comes from subsistence hunting.

The authors chronicle the twin challenges faced by the Inuit: the constant industrial demand for nonrenewable resources such as oil, gas, and minerals on their lands and the growing, though ill-informed, popular support for the anti-whaling movement. Paradoxically, both the environmental and the commercial threats to Inuit whaling come from large, wealthy, international corporate bodies that have financial backing and use similar organizational tactics to mount an assault on subsistence harvesting. While environmentalists seek to stop whaling through policy and in the realm of public and political opinion, the commercial activities can seriously alter the health of whales. Seismic activity for exploration can change the migration patterns of whales, causing them to swim away from traditional feeding grounds and Inuit harvesting areas. In either case, the result—suspension of whaling—can devastate an indigenous community.

Inuit, Whaling, and Sustainability provides a wonderful background to historical and contemporary whaling in Canada, Alaska, Greenland, and Russia. It is a circumpolar response by the Inuit and their supporters, who call for greater dialogue and understanding on the issue of whaling. Thought-provoking and easy to read, it is a useful book for the scholar, the student or the layman.

Karim-Aly S. Kassam
Faculty of Communication and Culture
University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta, Canada
T2N 1N4

CREATING REGIMES: ARCTIC ACCORDS AND INTERNATIONAL GOVERNANCE. By ORAN YOUNG. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1998. xii + 230 p., maps, index, bib. Hardbound. US\$35.00.

Readers with an interest in polar politics should read Oran Young's book, which examines in detail the development of two of the most important international polar institutions created in the 1990s—the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS) and the Barents Euro-Arctic Region (BEAR). The core theoretical element of the book is regime theory, which the author applies to AEPS and BEAR as case studies to examine how international regimes are created and put into operation.

Readers interested in the development of new international institutions in the Arctic will find here a new set of insights into how these two bodies were created and their international role in the post-Cold War era. Young provides a detailed explanation of the politics behind their formation. However, those with no background in the study

of international relations theory could find this book problematic, as Young does not explain what he means by regime theory, but merely cites briefly the major literature on the subject. Even readers familiar with regime theory will not necessarily find a clear explanation of how Young understands that concept. Young accepts the most common definition of a regime posed by Stephen Krasner (1983:2) as the “sets of rules, decision-making procedures, and programs that defined social practices,” but he misses several opportunities to demonstrate fully how the specific development of AEPS and BEAR is best explained by such an approach. For example, he has little to say about the participation of the international indigenous organizations that play a key role in the activities of the AEPS, treating these groups as mere observers. Yet one can argue that their full participation on all of the working groups and the task group of the AEPS is an important new contribution to the decision-making process and represents a new social practice. Hence their inclusion is an important factor in the development of the new international Arctic regime. Young also does not consider the different understandings of sustainable development that have developed among the various actors involved in the AEPS. When the AEPS was created, for example, the government of Canada attempted to expand the definition of the term “sustainable development,” in marked contrast to the position taken by the United States government. As the AEPS was developed, major disputes arose over which definition would be reflected in the composition and mandate of the working groups. Thus, Young missed an important opportunity to explain how a common understanding of sustainable development was reached. Such an account would have been an important addition to our understanding of the important role that ideas play in regime formation.

Another critique is that Young focuses on the role of the European states, to the exclusion of Canada. He appears to give almost total credit for the creation and work of the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP) to the Norwegian participants. The reality is that much of the success of the working group may be attributed to Canadians and, in particular, to the work of David Stone and his colleagues in Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. The key role of Canada and Canadian participants in the creation of the sustainable development task group is also not mentioned.

Young’s inclusion of BEAR as his second case study also illustrates his focus on European politics. A better case study for this book would have been the Arctic Council. Since in many ways the Council continues and further develops the regime created by the AEPS, it would have provided both a more interesting and richer examination of regime formation in the polar region and insight into the importance of Canadian participation. Young’s neglect of Canadians is also shown in his failure to mention Mary Simon, the first Canadian ambassador of circumpolar relations and the first Inuit to hold an ambassadorial position in Canada or the United States.

In short, this book contains some useful insights on the development of both AEPS and BEAR, but it does not measure up to Young’s usual standard of scholarship. By focusing on the role played by European officials and ignoring the actions of the Canadians, the author presents only a partial picture of the formation of the two organizations. He also misses the opportunity to explore the role of nongovernmental actions in international regimes, and to expand the theoretical understanding of regime theory.

REFERENCE

KRASNER, S., ed. 1983. *International regimes*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Rob Huebert
Department of Political Science
University of Calgary
2500 University Drive NW
Calgary, Alberta, Canada
T2N 1N4

FANTASTIC ANTONE GROWS UP: ADOLESCENTS AND ADULTS WITH FETAL ALCOHOL SYNDROME. Edited by JUDITH KLEINFELD, with BARBARA MORSE and SIOBHAN WESCOTT. Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press, 2000. xviii + 424 p., bib., appendices, index. Softbound. US\$20.00.

Alcohol has been identified as a teratologic agent in pregnancy since biblical times. However, identification of a specific constellation of features in the child is relatively recent. Some have attributed the first description of the relationship between alcohol consumption and subsequent birth defects to Dr. Paul Lemoine and his colleagues in Nantes, France. In 1968, they described a group of 127 children born to alcoholic mothers with what is now a familiar constellation of features: unusual facies, increased frequency of malformation, psychomotor disturbance, and growth retardation. In 1973, Jones and Smith, in the *Lancet*, made observations on the “Fetal Alcohol Syndrome.” Over the last 30 years, a plethora of studies and observations in the scientific literature have established the toxic relationship of alcohol and pregnancy.

Prevalence studies have become more and more disheartening, despite public health and policy efforts. While original incidence of FAS/E (fetal alcohol syndrome/effects) is commonly identified as 1–3 per 1000 births in North America, it is increasingly clear that in some communities, those figures are many times higher, even up to 9–10 per 1000 live births, or one affected child in every 100 pregnancies.

What is equally clear is the social reality of many of these children, whose homes are marked by poverty, substance abuse, and social chaos. Many children, and in