

how and when to transition between jobs, careers and/or into and out of the labour market over the life course. In turn Salais foregrounds the need to recognise our interdependence alongside autonomy by suggesting that greater democracy and participation within/beyond the workplace would foster the collective deliberation necessary to embed and manage fluid labour market transitions.

In Chapter Seven, Zimmerman argues that flexicurity be imported from the policy sphere into the operational activity of the firm through committing employers to invest in staff capability. This is viewed as a means of improving both intra and intercompany labour market flexibility and enhancing worker autonomy within the labour market. Dean in Chapter Eight focuses on how welfare reform might be re-imagined and reframed through a 'life first' discourse that recognises mutual interdependence and prioritises people's capacity to lead a good life over securing paid employment. Work remains as a necessary and desirable life activity but the collapsing of work into paid formal employment and the link to income security is rejected, whilst responsibility is shifted from the individual towards the state. The broader conceptualisation (and valuing) of what desirable work is meanwhile implies a break with productivism and erosion of labour market segmentation and exclusion. Decent work also features in Chapter Nine (Méda), which explicates the role of the OECD in popularising flexicurity, particularly the Danish flexicurity 'welfare imaginary'. The suggestion is that the Danish model functions as a means by which proponents of labour market flexibility have been able to disarm opponents of reform, incorporate them as advocates of labour market flexibility and obfuscate how such reforms are rarely accompanied by the income security found in Nordic welfare states.

The strength of the collection is its willingness to foreground the contingent nature of flexicurity and how it (re)produces unequal relations of power and domination. The inclusion of a distinct set of chapters that propose possible policy alternatives provide a valuable jumping off point for further research and is a reminder of the value to be found in exploring different social policy imaginaries. If I have one criticism it is that the collection does not include a specific discourse analytic contribution that could have offered a deep insight into how flexicurity is discursively constructed by EU institutions and member states and/or different labour actors. Overall though the collection provides a timely, empirically grounded and theoretically informed critical analysis of flexicurity, its rise to prominence, its (problematic) assumptions and outlines a number of alternative paths for labour market reform.

JAY WIGGAN  
University of Edinburgh  
[j.wiggan@ed.ac.uk](mailto:j.wiggan@ed.ac.uk)

Rob White (2014), *Environmental Harm: An eco-justice perspective*, Bristol: Policy Press, £24.99, pp. 216, pbk.  
doi:[10.1017/S0047279416000878](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279416000878)

Rob White's book is an excellent introduction to and further analysis of the concept of 'environmental harm'. It successfully achieves its aim to establish a moral basis for intervention and action to eradicate such harm. As the author points out, harm is ubiquitous and ingrained in structures; not always intentional, sometimes arising from omission and indifference; preventable; often lawful and/or perceived to be legitimate. For me, this is exemplified in the findings of a recent report by the Royal College of Physicians and the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health (2016) which found that outdoor air pollution causes at least 40,000 deaths a

year in the UK, with a further death tally from indoor pollutants. Most of the practices that cause these deaths are legal, such as seemingly innocuous air fresheners, though their impact can be deadly. Yet, whilst social harm is generally framed in terms of human needs and rights, this book also applies to the non-human. It is structured around three interconnected approaches to harm – humans, eco-systems and non-human animals. This relates to three dimensions of justice – environmental justice, ecological justice and species justice.

The book highlights and discusses the different views within the field of green criminology and some of the key tensions around whose rights should be privileged; degrees and dimensions of harm; how to measure harm; and the dynamics of power and decision-making processes. The author is Professor of Criminology in the School of Social Sciences and the University of Tasmania, Australia. His previous work has explored key concepts in environmental criminology – providing a framework of analysis for ecological degradation. This background has enabled him to produce an extremely clear and thoughtful book on environmental harm. It clarifies many relevant concepts, such as ‘environment’, ‘environmental crime’, ‘harm’, ‘risk’, ‘justice’. The author draws attention to and explains the key issues at stake, such as the uncertainties about what constitutes ‘harm’; the contestations around concepts, such as the ‘precautionary principle’; and controversies about how harm can be measured. He points to a ‘moral fissure’ between green criminologists who view nature instrumentally and those who view the exploitation of nature as harmful. He also provides evidence in the form of numerous current issues such as land grabbing, the loss of global commons etc. and he uses examples and illustrations from many national contexts. For me, there are only two slight problems with the conceptualisations. Firstly, one of the sub-categories (ecological justice) is very similar in name to the main topic (eco-justice) which could cause confusion. Secondly, sometimes it is implied that environmental justice is solely focussed on humans. A number of environmental justice analysts and activists take a much wider approach, including myself, for example, when I include other species in my environmental justice framework (see Bell, 2014). However, environmental justice complexities and other ways of considering the topic are acknowledged and discussed later in the book. In general, though, the book was extremely well organised; very easy to read, understand and engage with; and aided superficial grasping as well as deep understanding of some important philosophical debates. As such, it will be useful for a wide range of students and academics in the fields of criminology, sociology, law, geography, environmental studies, philosophy and social policy.

Rob White’s conclusions are radical but, in my opinion, necessarily so. His book highlights the need to establish a moral and institutional basis for action. Acknowledging that we are not all equally responsible for environmental harm, he states ‘...action to prevent and remedy harm ultimately must be directed at dominant power arrangement and towards fundamental social change’ (p.145).

In the final chapter, he explicitly argues that environmental harms result from the way that societies are organised. He identifies capitalist pressures, with the necessity to accumulate profit, to cost-cut, to compete and to waste as the driving force behind environmental harms, stating that production and consumption within capitalism are subversive of human needs. Hence, the resulting patchwork regulatory and legislative measures do not fundamentally protect the environment because of ‘systemic imperatives and philosophical vision’ (p.160). At present, we tend to focus on mitigating impacts rather than prevention of harm, for example by reducing unnecessary consumption. His writing produces some very quotable extracts, for example:

‘It quickly becomes clear that political economy is at the heart of the exploitation of humans, non human animals and environments – that capitalism, in particular, demands profitable use of such as a means to assign value’ (p.160).

And:

'The overarching modus operandi and raison d'être of global capitalism have dire consequences across the planet, but the specific impact will manifest differently depending upon particular social, economic and political context' (p.161).

I particularly appreciated this book in that it fills a gap in the literature on environmental justice within the field of criminology. In 2006, Zilney *et al.* noted that there was little two-way communication between the two fields with few green criminological studies addressing environmental justice issues and the environmental justice literature failing to penetrate into more traditional criminological research. This topic was recently revisited by Lynch *et al.* (2015) who found that criminologists have tended to ignore environmental justice.

This complaint can be widened to incorporate the exchange between environmental and social policy research and education more generally. It is of vital importance for social policy practitioners and academics, in particular, to think more about and engage more with ecological issues. The interests of people and the rest of nature are intertwined. Yet social and environmental policies are too often considered in separate silos. This book provides another cogent argument for considering social justice and environmental sustainability as aspects of an integrated system, rather than separate goals. It is important to understand that what benefits nature, also benefits humanity and 'Environmental Harm: An eco-justice perspective' is exemplary in doing so.

## References

- Bell, K. (2014), *Achieving Environmental Justice*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Lynch, M. J., Stretesky, P.B. and Long, M.A. (2015), Environmental justice: a criminological perspective, *Environmental Research Letters* 10, 085008
- Royal College of Physicians and the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health (2016), *Every breath we take: the lifelong impact of air pollution*, London: Royal College of Physicians.
- Zilney, L., McGurrin, D. and Zahran, S. (2006), Environmental justice and the role of criminology: an analytical review of 33 years of environmental justice research, *Criminal Justice Review* 31: 47–62

KAREN BELL

University of Bristol  
[karen.bell@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:karen.bell@bristol.ac.uk)

Andrew J. Jolivet (ed.) (2015), *Research Justice: Methodologies for social change*, Bristol: Policy Press, £27.99, pp. 240, pbk.  
 doi:[10.1017/S004727941600088X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S004727941600088X)

The National Community Development Project was a major 'anti-poverty programme' established by the UK government in 1968 to explore the causes of inner city decline: it was one response to growing unrest in inner city areas, including amongst minority populations which felt increasingly marginalised by government policy. Twelve local teams, each including a number of community development workers, and some researchers attached to local universities, spent up to five years in deprived neighbourhoods working with local community groups. Although it became clear that the government took the view that deprivation was essentially the fault of local people themselves, the CDP teams developed an alternative analysis which pointed to the impacts of economic disinvestment, cuts in public services such as housing, health and transport, and the incipient effects of globalisation as largely responsible for the decline in these areas. The major legacy of the CDPs was a series of both national and local reports which spelled out this analysis across the country as a whole<sup>1</sup>, whilst demonstrating how these processes impacted on local communities. One of the most significant of these reports was one produced