

Of course, Milner cannot be criticized for failure to predict these events. Nobody would have been able to do so before 1988. But at the same time his analysis does not seem to allow for such turns of history. There is a tendency to take the situation in Sweden as that of the mid-1980s at face value.

Even then, there were distressing trends. Discontent with Feldt's policies was growing within the unions. There was an increasing rivalry between unions representing public and private sector employees, something Milner registers but plays down. Industrial unrest in the public sector, which is one of the main threats to the Swedish system, had increased alarmingly. Once again Milner has noticed this, but fails to draw any alarming conclusions.

If the development in Sweden continues, Milner's book could serve as an example to – Sweden.

Anders Widfeldt, University of Gothenburg

Andrew Dobson: *Green Political Thought. An Introduction*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1990, 224 pp.

The Green movement has been successful in many ways. One branch with particular success is the Green political parties. In every Western European country one or several Green parties have been formed and have had at least some success (i.e. representation in local councils). However, in a lot of countries the success has been even greater. Some Green parties have grown to become quite large parliamentary parties. Scholars have been tempted to talk about 'the success of green parties and alternative lists' (Müller-Rommel 1989). Die Grünen, of West Germany, have been the major symbol of this green party success.

However, 2 December 1990 was a gloomy day for the Green movement. That Sunday Die Grünen (from the western part of the country) did not pass the threshold to the new German parliament. The moderate success of their eastern counterparts was little consolation.

This failure of the German Greens sets the Green movement in a new perspective. Is the emergence of the Green movement to be explained by long-term factors (i.e. post-material value change) or short-term factors (i.e. the shifting political agenda)? If we focus on short-term factors, the failure of Die Grünen seems easy to explain. The environmental question was not a 'hot' issue in the 1990 German election and therefore voters turned away from the Greens.

But if we adopt a more long-term perspective the failure of Die Grünen is more confusing. Many scholars have interpreted the rise and success of the Green parties as a proof of the existence of a new Green cleavage in West European party systems (Müller-Rommel 1989; see also Inglehart 1990). New post-material values, it is argued, have become an influential factor when it come to explaining attitudes and voting behavior, and the post-material/material conflict is to be seen as a new cleavage within mass publics. The failure of Die Grünen makes one doubt the existence of a new cleavage.

How then should the emergence of the Green movement be interpreted? Is there or is there not a new cleavage in the party systems of Western Europe? Survey studies and electoral research do not provide the only possible answer to that question. This kind of research must be complemented with other studies. The problem survey researchers studying the Green phenomenon are facing is the vague

Of course, Milner cannot be criticized for failure to predict these events. Nobody would have been able to do so before 1988. But at the same time his analysis does not seem to allow for such turns of history. There is a tendency to take the situation in Sweden as that of the mid-1980s at face value.

Even then, there were distressing trends. Discontent with Feldt's policies was growing within the unions. There was an increasing rivalry between unions representing public and private sector employees, something Milner registers but plays down. Industrial unrest in the public sector, which is one of the main threats to the Swedish system, had increased alarmingly. Once again Milner has noticed this, but fails to draw any alarming conclusions.

If the development in Sweden continues, Milner's book could serve as an example to – Sweden.

Anders Widfeldt, University of Gothenburg

Andrew Dobson: *Green Political Thought. An Introduction*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1990, 224 pp.

The Green movement has been successful in many ways. One branch with particular success is the Green political parties. In every Western European country one or several Green parties have been formed and have had at least some success (i.e. representation in local councils). However, in a lot of countries the success has been even greater. Some Green parties have grown to become quite large parliamentary parties. Scholars have been tempted to talk about 'the success of green parties and alternative lists' (Müller-Rommel 1989). Die Grünen, of West Germany, have been the major symbol of this green party success.

However, 2 December 1990 was a gloomy day for the Green movement. That Sunday Die Grünen (from the western part of the country) did not pass the threshold to the new German parliament. The moderate success of their eastern counterparts was little consolation.

This failure of the German Greens sets the Green movement in a new perspective. Is the emergence of the Green movement to be explained by long-term factors (i.e. post-material value change) or short-term factors (i.e. the shifting political agenda)? If we focus on short-term factors, the failure of Die Grünen seems easy to explain. The environmental question was not a 'hot' issue in the 1990 German election and therefore voters turned away from the Greens.

But if we adopt a more long-term perspective the failure of Die Grünen is more confusing. Many scholars have interpreted the rise and success of the Green parties as a proof of the existence of a new Green cleavage in West European party systems (Müller-Rommel 1989; see also Inglehart 1990). New post-material values, it is argued, have become an influential factor when it come to explaining attitudes and voting behavior, and the post-material/material conflict is to be seen as a new cleavage within mass publics. The failure of Die Grünen makes one doubt the existence of a new cleavage.

How then should the emergence of the Green movement be interpreted? Is there or is there not a new cleavage in the party systems of Western Europe? Survey studies and electoral research do not provide the only possible answer to that question. This kind of research must be complemented with other studies. The problem survey researchers studying the Green phenomenon are facing is the vague

definitions of the new, Green or post-material cleavage; whatever we choose to call the phenomenon. It is the lack of careful ideological investigations into the Green movement that has caused that problem. This is not surprising, however. The Green movement is a relatively new phenomenon.

In my opinion Andrew Dobson's book *Green Political Thought. An Introduction* gives us a tool for more careful definitions of what we should mean by the concept 'green dimension'.

Let us note that Dobson holds up a warning sign. 'Some will no doubt object that this is too rosy a view of the Green movement's political prescriptions, and that its history is full of suggestions more accurately described as authoritarian than democratic' (p. 26). An authoritarian interpretation of Green ideology is provided by Bramwell (1989); see also Ljunggren (1990) who stresses the importance of authoritarian perspectives when it comes to understanding the ideology of The Green party in Sweden; Miljöpartiet – de gröna.

It is quite easy to find support for both an authoritarian and a 'radical democratic' interpretation of Green ideology. Both views are present in documents provided by the Green movement. However, the question is, which view describes the Green movement best? I think that Dobson is correct, and that the major part of the Green movement is best described as 'radical democratic'. Some support for this thesis is given by electoral research. On the mass public level it is mostly voters with libertarian attitudes, not authoritarian, who support Green parties.

Dobson stresses the importance of distinguishing between ecologism (or Green politics with capital G, as he calls it) and other sorts of concern for the environment, which could be either conservationism or environmentalism; a managerial approach to the environment called Green politics (pp. 2–14). One example of a conservation movement is the National Trust in Britain which is mostly concerned with old buildings and their grounds. Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth are examples of environmental movements, according to Dobson. They confront the negative effect of modern society on environment and their methods are spectacular direct actions and careful expert lobbying, respectively (pp. 2–3). Organizations like these are, though concerned with the environment, not concerned with 'deep ecology' (pp. 47). We have to distinguish between public ecology (concern for the environment) and 'deep ecology' which means concern for the environment not only motivated by care for the survival of the human race, but also for its own sake; for ecological principles such as complexity, diversity and symbiosis.

Dobson's book is about Green politics, 'inasmuch as a Green concern for the environment leads not (only) to the care of country houses or the saving of the whale, but to the desire to restructure the whole of political, social and economic life' (p. 3). It is not a book about environmentalism, nor is it a book about Green parties. However, Dobson states, 'The relationship between ecologism . . . and Green parties is of the same kind as that between, say, socialism and social democratic parties' (p. 3).

Dobson means that the limits to growth thesis is one of the most important foundations of Green politics. Greens are convinced that 'continuous and unlimited growth is *prima facie* impossible' (p. 15). This conviction makes the Greens suggest radical changes in our social habits and practices. If there are limits to growth then there are limits to consumption. Thus, political ecologists argue, we have to have a small-scale 'sustainable society'. They argue for the need to bring down consumption in industrial societies; people have to realize that human needs are not best satisfied with material goods. Some Greens are even of the opinion that the world population will have to be decreased as well (pp. 16–18).

Greens often consider themselves as neither left nor right. They mean that Green ideology 'goes beyond' the left-right dimension. 'The basis for this claim is that from a Green perspective the similarities between communism and capitalism are greater than their differences.' But, says Dobson, 'In some respect we can talk of the Green movement quite happily in terms of left and right because the terms we use to discuss the difference between the two can easily be applied to it' (p. 30). The thought that man, if possible, should not interfere with nature is an old conservative thought. Greens should not be accused of preserving wealth and privilege, however. In many other ways the Green movement makes a leftist impression (see pp. 182-183). Empirical research suggests that Left and Green attitudes tend to go together. In a study of Swedish parliamentarians the correlation (Pearson's r) between how members placed themselves on a left-right scale and a green scale was 0.44 (Bennulf & Holmberg 1990, 179).

Dobson's book is divided into five chapters (plus introduction and conclusion). The first chapter, 'Thinking about ecologism', is the one mostly referred to above.

In the next chapter, 'Philosophical foundations', Dobson deals with different aspects of Green ideology. The theoretical physics of Fritjof Capra have had a tremendous impact and physicists like Niels Bohr and Werner Heisenberg are also popular within the movement. Ernest Hæckel (German biologist) first used the term 'ecology' in 1870 and is the founder of the science of ecology. Discussion of 'The Gaia hypothesis', environmental ethics ('deep ecology'; Arne Næss) and 'anthropocentrism' is provided.

In chapter 3 'The sustainable society' is discussed at full length. The limits to growth is the most important theme in the book, and also the most important ideological foundation for the Green movement. Most observers would trace the environmental movement back to 1962 and Rachel Carson's book *Silent Spring*. But, 'the prescription of a fundamental change of political and social direction in response to this description, and the ready availability of the message to a wide audience - first came together in 1972 with the publication of *The Limits to Growth*' (pp. 33-34). Thus, Dobson suggests, 'in 1962, ecologism (and therefore the possibility of being Green) did not exist, and that Rachel Carson's book and the period in which it was written are best viewed as part of the preconditions for ecologism' (p. 34).

In the fourth chapter, 'Strategies for Green change', Dobson deals with the question of 'ecologism's strategy for social change' (p. 130). People within the Green movement argue for change through liberal-democratic political structures (i.e. governmental representation; but also extra-parliamentary actions). However, other types of action are also supported. Under the heading of lifestyle and community strategies Greens are arguing for change in behavior at both the individual and the community levels. Dobson also discusses the possibility for Greens to adopt a class-based strategy to obtain change in lifestyle and communities.

In the fifth chapter, 'Ecologism, socialism and feminism', Dobson discusses how ecologism can go together with other perspectives. He finds a lot of common ground for ecologism and socialism. When it comes to feminism Dobson refers to the so-called ecofeminism which is built around three principles. First, there exist specific female values. Second, the domination of nature is related to the domination of woman. Third, woman is closer to nature than men. Taken together these principles mean that woman is more Ecological than man (pp. 192-193).

The most important contribution in Dobson's book is the clear-cut distinction between Green politics (Ecologism) and environmentalism. I think that this distinction can help us understand what is happening in the Western European party systems.

Elsewhere I have argued that the Green phenomenon, according to Swedish data, has an elite character. Green attitudes are not particularly constrained (compared to left-right attitudes) among the Swedish public. We have to look at members of parliament or well-educated persons with a high interest in politics to find constrained attitudes on environmental matters (Bennulf & Holmberg 1990, 176-179).

I would argue that Green politics, with capital G, is not present to a large extent in public attitudes. Care for the environment, or environmentalism, however, is. Almost everyone is concerned about the environment and wants it to be better. Without the ideology that comes with Ecologism it is hard to imagine that a new cleavage is present in Western European party systems. Voters from all parties care for the environment and agree on many environmental policies.

With this view in mind it is quite easy to understand the failure of Die Grünen in the 1990 German election. There is no new cleavage in the party systems, only environmentally concerned voters. Support for Green parties are better understood as a function of how 'hot' the environmental issues are. With a shifting political agenda support will tend to flow away from the Green parties.

The concept of Green politics, and its opposite, the defenders of modern industrial society, is better reserved for elite groups like members of Green parties and other Green movements. The ideology of ecologism is not well known to ordinary people—for the time being they are only concerned about the environment. The long-term survival of Green parties is probably dependent on the marketing of Ecologism. If the Greens can make Green politics part of political attitudes of the mass publics, then they have a safer future. Then the willingness to vote Green, or support other Green movements, will be less determined by short-term changes in the political agenda.

REFERENCES

- Bennulf, M. & S. Holmberg 1990. 'The Green Breakthrough in Sweden', *Scandinavian Political Studies* 13(2), 165-184.
- Bramwell, A. 1989. *Ecology in the 20th Century. A History*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
- Inglehart, R. 1990 *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ljunggren, S-B. 1990 *Den gröna rörelsen. Från miljöengagemang till hembygdsfascism*. Stockholm: Timbro idé.
- Müller-Rommel, F., ed. 1989 *New Politics in Western Europe. The Rise and Success of Green Parties and Alternative Lists*. San Francisco/London: Westview Press.

Martin Bennulf, University of Gothenburg

Jonathan Wolff: *Robert Nozick. Property, Justice and the Minimal State*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991, 168 pp.

Since 1974, when Robert Nozick published his book *Anarchy, State and Utopia*, many political philosophers have tried to show where Nozick and the libertarian theory go wrong. In 1982, the critiques by different writers were assembled in the volume *Reading Nozick*, edited by Jeffrey Paul. It seemed that Nozick's theory had been exposed from every possible angle. However, libertarianism has continued to