

maintains his focus on the legacy of colonialism and subsequent impossibility of simply replacing development. The very critique of development inherent in the *Maya Atlas* project is itself rooted in colonial definitions and developmental discourse. For example, Wainwright convincingly argues that Mayan work was specifically gendered during the TRDP reform process, yet these gendered definitions of work are replicated in the Mayan counter-mapping project. Similarly, the Maya incorporate the European definition of the *milpa* agricultural system into their own cultural and spatial definitions. Thus, for Wainwright the very nature of counter-developmental resistance remains a discursive artifact of colonialism.

The book as a whole is an impressive piece of discourse analysis and a welcome synthetic alternative to entrenched development perspectives that seem more at odds with each other than the project of capitalist development. Having said that, proponents of both postcolonial studies and Marxist development studies will undoubtedly find the level of Wainwright's attention to discourse and capitalist structure wanting, but the sympathetic critique of both perspectives should not cause any substantial resentment from either camp. I did find the concluding chapter on possibilities of applied resistance of development somewhat lacking, perhaps because that the book is designed as an analytical critique of development, not a primer for movement resistance – or due to the enormity of the task: how to enable indigenous/subaltern redefinition *and* combat capitalist integration at the same time. As an analytical critique of development however, this book succeeds on many levels. Wainwright's scholarship is rigorous; his writing is clear, and organization impeccable. While he does not specifically address world-system(s) research, the issues raised in this book with regards to the development of an analytical critique of "capitalism qua development" will be of interest to anyone focused on the global capitalist system. This is a substantial and unique approach to studying development that should encourage development scholars to reassess their own assumptions about counter-development context and strategy.

Cory Blad
Department of Sociology
Manhattan College
cory.blad@manhattan.edu

Hicks, Robert L., Bradley C. Parks, J. Timmons Roberts, and Michael J. Tierney. 2008. *Greening Aid?: Understanding the Environmental Impact of Development Assistance*. New York: Oxford University Press. 344 Pages, ISBN 978-0-19-921394-8 Paper (\$35.00).

In *Greening Aid*, Robert Hicks, Bradley Parks, J. Timmons Roberts and Michael Tierney argue that current environmental crises make understanding international environmental aid flows crucial, but that a lack of data and empirical hypothesis testing have left the issue poorly understood. According to Hicks et al., the international community has identified environmental problems as global problems and recognized that developing states are simultaneously at highest risk for and least able to prevent environmental degradation nationally. As a result, the global North has repeatedly made agreements to assist the global South in environmental reform through international aid that should not detract from development aid generally. However, Hicks et al. argue that the amount of money actually transferred from North to South for environmental

purposes was previously unknown because no systematic analyses of international environmental aid allocation had been conducted.

Here they aim to inform policymakers, academic and laypeople alike through a comprehensive comparative study of environmental and development aid allocation patterns over a twenty-year period. In order to conduct such a comprehensive analysis, they compile the Project-Level Aid (PLAID) database, which allows for longitudinal comparison of donors and recipients of aid by sector. Consistency in coding allows for cross-national statistical analysis, which they supplement with illustrative case studies. *Greening Aid* addresses several debates through systematic cross-national analyses and case studies, including the motivation for giving environmental aid, which states get more of it and why and the effectiveness of environmental aid. The comprehensiveness of this data set allows them to analyze environmental aid donors and recipients as well as domestic and international aid agencies.

Hicks et al. enlist a single explanatory framework that can accommodate the wide range of considerations facing key actors involved at every stage of the aid allocation process. This framework is principle-agent theory, a variant of the strategic choice approach, which focuses attention on the causes and consequences of different choices made by donors in the aid allocation process, where aid allocation is treated as a series of nested games between strategic actors. This framework assumes that the aid allocation process begins with citizens in the Global North who elect government officials who then delegate funding to either domestic or international aid organizations who finally distribute the aid to countries in the Global South.

The first stage in their analysis considers overall patterns in aid allocation from 1980 to 1999. They begin this analysis by categorizing aid in terms of its impact on the environment and charting the overall trends in environmentally damaging, beneficial, and neutral aid over the twenty-year period. They find a large decrease in damaging, a small increase in beneficial, and a huge increase in neutral aid. The second stage of the analysis disaggregates types of environmental aid allocation by issue that environmentalists and governments deem critical. Hicks et al. find that the type of aid recommended by scientists is very weakly correlated with the type of aid given and that aid is not following to the places where it is needed the most in terms of environmental effects on human life.

The next stage of the analysis focuses on aid recipients. They begin this section by conducting case studies of five aid recipients in order to address the question of motivation for the particular cases donor states choose to give aid. Here, they infer donor motivation based on case studies of recipients with a comparative analysis of the relative need for aid and political benefits for donating between cases. They conclude that aid may be benefiting donors geopolitically more than it is benefitting recipients environmentally. The second component of the aid recipient analysis uses cross-national statistical analyses to further address the question of who gets aid and why. They find that need for environmental aid partially explains its receipt, but overall aid allocation patterns are better explained by national income, population size and colonial history of the recipient state, which supports their conclusions from the case studies of aid recipients.

Next, Hicks et al. focus their attention on the donors of environmental aid. They conduct case studies of five major donors, two of the greenest, two of the least green and one that went from least to most green within the span of a decade. This analysis reveals a strong convergence in donor behavior regarding the environment, where all five cases become increasingly 'green,' albeit at different rates, over time. They compliment the case studies of aid donors with an investigation of donor behavior through cross-national statistical analysis. They find that GDP

and 'post-materialist values' predict aid allocation, especially the fall of 'dirty' aid. However, they are surprised to find that strong national environmental policies are negatively related to environmental aid expenditures.

In the final stage of their analysis, Hicks et al. investigate the use of multilateral aid agencies compared to domestic bilateral options. They begin by analyzing the patterns in aid allocation over time for multilaterals and find an overall 'greening' trend. They proceed with case studies of the multilaterals that rank the highest in overall environmental friendliness in order to investigate the 'greening' process. They find contrasting motivations between agencies. In the final component of this section they investigate the motivations of donors for choosing multilateral versus bilateral organizations for aid distribution and find consistent motivations where donor governments with small or ineffective bilateral aid agencies and small populations and economies are more likely to prefer multilateralism. They conclude with a call for further research and attention to environmental issues and acknowledge the limitations of this study.

As promised, *Greening Aid* delivers empirical evidence on a range of questions relating to international environmental aid that had previously been neglected due to data limitations. Hicks et al. are able to accomplish this through a massive data collection project paired with a mixed method approach. Their cross-national statistical analyses paired with in-depth case studies gives the project considerable breadth and depth and allows them to address a wide range of issues relating to environmental aid.

This study sheds light on crucial aspects of development and environmental aid but also leaves many questions unanswered. For instance, Hicks et al. set out to compare environmental aid to development aid generally in terms of allocations patterns and to provide a complete, coherent account of the causes and consequences of environmental aid to developing countries as a whole. While they pay considerable attention to the causes of development aid, the consequences are neglected in comparison. They consider the effectiveness of aid only indirectly through inferences based on allocation patterns. The under-treatment of environmental impacts of development aid is especially surprising considering the subtitle of the book. However, *Greening Aid* provides a solid foundation on which to build future work in this area thanks to their tremendous accomplishment in data collection and identification of key areas requiring further systematic investigation.

The methodological comprehensiveness of this work is impressive. However, world-systems scholars will likely find the theoretical framework employed somewhat limiting. The focus on individual and group-level decision making as the casual mechanism for aid allocation ignores, or at least downplays, the importance of the historical context of current environmental problems. Rather than locating the source of global environmental problems in a broad historical context where the system of global capitalism drives degradation and resource consumption, Hicks et al., along with the international community, treat peripheral states as the main culprits of environmental problems and developed states as benefactors acting on behalf on the global good. From this perspective, the aid allocation processes is driven by the choices made by key actors in the global community. The actor oriented theory of *Greening Aid* puts considerable power in the hands of individuals at the expense of global historical processes, which will likely leave world-systems scholars unsatisfied.

Although this analysis departs substantially from a world-systems perspective, the work done by Hicks et al. provides a promising avenue for development studies within the political economy tradition. For instance, Hicks et al. highlight the importance of determining the

relationship between particular types of aid and particular development outcomes that are now possible with their PLAID database which is scheduled to become publically available in 2010. Overall, this is a methodologically complex analysis that, although departing theoretically from the perspective advocated for by this journal, offers new insights and future possibilities for world-systems scholars. *Greening Aid* is an ambitious project that promises to be useful to policymakers, concerned citizens and scholars from a wide range of academic disciplines. Anyone who is interested in global environmental issues would benefit from adding *Greening Aid* to their collections.

Kristen Shorette
 Department of Sociology
 University of California, Irvine
 kshorett@uci.edu
<http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~sgsa/2006/2006-kristen.html>

Bush, Roderick D. 2009. *The End of White World Supremacy: Black Internationalism and the Problem of the Color Line*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. 258 pages. ISBN 978-1-59213-573-8, Paper (\$28.95).

[Ed. note: Rod Bush received the 2010 Marxist section's The Paul Sweezy Marxist Sociology Book Award for 2010].

White world supremacy is both a metaphor for racial domination on the global level and an expression of the structural and social conditions of racial hierarchies, racist practices, and subordination by race within historically constructed conquering systems. This ambitious and wide-ranging book about the "End of White World Supremacy" particularly within the lens of "Black Internationalism" and the "Problem of the Color Line" written by Professor Bush manages to present these arguments in a cogent, well-developed work that analyzes the Black international tradition using world-systems theory.

Black social movement history, ranging from Fanon's critique of colonialism in both the Caribbean and in Africa, through the struggles of the Jim Crow south and emergence of racial stratification on a global level, is developed as a central theme of the modern world-system, and a primary problem of systems that see themselves as democratic and free. Bush's discussion of the Black intellectual tradition and its many scholars, especially W.E.B. Du Bois, is particularly brilliant and will remain as a major contribution to race studies on its merits alone.

Bush develops his work within two large and familiar analytical constructs of Theory (part 1) and Radical Social Movements (part 2). Within the first couple of chapters, he takes us through World War I and into the struggles between the great wars, with the gradual emergence and early development of Black internationalism and some of its leading voices, such as the evolution of the New Negro radicals. Later, with terms such as the "Blackening and intensification of U.S. radicalism" (p. 178) Bush demonstrates linkages between movements, including the Black Power and Civil Rights movements. Here is where he observes how neoliberal globalization intersects with an official and popular "color blindness" (p. 88) as the structuring of power and socioeconomic position, found in "strata that exist in all of the core