

expedition was in 1871. In reality, of course, Zemlya Frantsa-Iosifa had been discovered by the members of the Austro-Hungarian Exploring Expedition, which lasted from 1872 to 1874. Moreover, in the note on page 160 concerning the three fatalities on the Duke of the Abruzzi's expedition, the statement that three men 'died of starvation along the way' to Umberto Cagni surpassing Fridtjof Nansen's farthest north is very misleading. The support party of Francesco Querini, Henrik Stokken, and Felice Ollier simply did not return to Bukhta Teplitsa; how they died on the return is unknown.

Another editorial lapse is the failure to point out that the calendar used in this translation is the Julian (old style). In the Russian edition, both dates were provided for each day. This is quite important if one is trying to compare conditions during Al'banov's trip with those of another expedition.

Most importantly, the translation itself is considerably flawed. The translation was not made from the Russian original (Al'banov 1917), but from a French translation (Al'banov 1928), which was itself translated from a German translation (Breitfus 1925). It was inevitable that the end result of passage through three translations would differ from the original, but could it not have been checked against a copy of the original, which any competent inter-library loan department could have found?

As it is, so much flowery embroidery has been added that the style has been changed completely. The introduction mentions Al'banov's 'inborn knack for metaphor' and his 'apostrophic eloquence' (page xix). Nothing could be further from the truth. Much of this is 'embroidery' injected by the French translator (from the German). To give a couple of examples of passages that were inserted between the German and French versions and do not appear in the Russian: 'My pulse was racing in great anticipation, and when I fixed my apprehensive gaze once more on the vision that held such promise, I could discern a pale, silver strip with sinuous contours running along the horizon' (page 86), and

The men were completely transformed. A boisterous good humor replaced their disheartened lassitude; hope and courage blossomed before my eyes. Their spirits soared. I would never have believed that they could have enjoyed themselves so much. Heaven had sent us succor at a time of utter distress; and our gratitude for this miraculous gift was apparent in our overflowing happiness. (page 68)

Al'banov was a straight-talking sailor and could never have written such florid verbage. What makes it worse than putting it in this book is the emphasis placed in the introduction and the publicity material on a writing style that was simply not Al'banov's.

The translator also appears to be unfamiliar with standard nautical terminology. Thus passages on page 180 read: 'We had to lash up to the ice with our ice anchor,' instead of 'We had to make fast to a floe with ice anchors'; and 'piled in the coal bins,' instead of 'stowed in the coal bunkers.' On page 81 and elsewhere, 'plumb line' should

be 'lead line' or 'sounding line.' And on page 30 and elsewhere, the reference to 'oars' is clearly to 'paddles'; in the original kayaks are, naturally, paddled with paddles, not oars.

Then there are the totally incomprehensible mistakes in translation: on page 103 and elsewhere, the reference to a 'concave' ice cap actually reads 'convex' in the Russian; indeed a concave ice cap is a physical impossibility! On page 188, it should be stated that they obtained 'fresh fish' from the fishermen, rather than 'fresh milk.' And on page 182, the reference to flocks of fulmars wheeling overhead actually reads: 'There are fulmars swimming around the ship...they rock importantly in the slight swell.'

Probably the worst aspect of all of this is that much of the book is simply not Al'banov's, and the flavour is just not his. This is most troubling, because Al'banov clearly deserved better. His was an amazing story, and it is a shame that this is how it should first reach the English-speaking world. (Beau Riffenburgh, Scott Polar Research Institute, University of Cambridge, Lensfield Road, Cambridge CB2 1ER.)

References

- Al'banov, V.I. 1917. *Na yug, k Zemlye Frantsa Iosifa! Pokhod shturmana V.I. Al'banova po l'du so shkuny 'Sv Anna' ekspeditsii leytenanta G.L. Brusilova*. Petrograd: Hidrograficheskoye Upravleniye.
- Al'banov, V.I. 1928. *Au pays de la mort blanche*. Paris: Payot.
- Barr, S. 1995. *Franz Josef Land*. Oslo: Norsk Polarinstitut.
- Barr, W. 1978. The drift of Lieutenant Brusilov's *Svyataya Anna*, 1912–1914. *The Musk-Ox* 22: 3–30.
- Breitfus, L.L. (editor). 1925. *Irrfahrten im Land des weissen Todes*. Stuttgart and Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes.
- Holland, C. 1994. *Arctic exploration and development c. 500 B.C. to 1915: an encyclopedia*. New York and London: Garland Publishing.

PROTECTING THE POLAR MARINE ENVIRONMENT: LAW AND POLICY FOR POLLUTION PREVENTION. Davor Vidas (Editor). 2000. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. xxii + 276 p, hard cover. ISBN 0-521-66311-3. £45.00; US\$69.95.

The volume is published within the framework of an international research project on polar oceans and the law of the sea sponsored by the Fridtjof Nansen Institute. It contains an introduction and 11 essays written by nine experts from institutions located in Australia, Canada, Croatia, Norway, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

In light of the recent developments occurring in international environmental law in general, as well as in both polar areas — in particular the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (1991) and the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (1991) — the volume addresses two basic questions. The first is how *special* the polar areas are, namely to what extent the various global instruments of environmental protection are applicable to, or relevant for, the Arctic and the

Southern oceans. The second is how *similar* the polar regions are, namely to what extent the so-called 'bi-polar approach' can provide a regulation of environmental concerns taking place in both areas.

In his paper on globalism and regionalism in the protection of the marine environment, A. Boyle examines the different models of regionalism, one restrictive and the other more liberal, and the consequent advantages and disadvantages. He concludes that nothing prevents the making of regional arrangements, provided that the area of application of any new legal regime is precisely defined (which is not yet the case in the polar seas). But the real test of such arrangements is the existence of institutions with the political will and scientific input to make them work effectively. Addressing the issue of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and the polar marine environment, B. Vukas points out that all provisions of the law of the sea that do not relate to the unresolved problem of the status of Antarctica are applicable also to marine areas of the Southern Ocean. However, the drafting history of Article 234 of the UNCLOS ('Ice-covered areas') and the fact that it is based on the notions of 'coastal State' and 'exclusive economic zone' show that its applicability to Antarctica is still a controversial issue. The review of global environmental instruments, especially in the fields of ship-sourced pollution, dumping at sea, land-based pollution, maritime emergencies, and marine protected areas, leads D.R. Rothwell to conclude that marine protection of the polar regions is no longer the responsibility of the polar states alone, but is increasingly becoming a truly global concern.

Other contributions deal with recent aspects of polar regional and sub-regional cooperation, such as the 1991 Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (paper by C.C. Joyner), the environmental co-operation in the Barents Sea (by O. Schram Stokke), and the domestic perspectives of three of the most active countries in the polar areas (Australia, Canada, and the United States; by Rothwell and Joyner). Some selected issues where environmental concerns are growing as a result of existing or planned human activities are also specifically considered: land-based marine pollution in the Arctic (by D. VanderZwaag), the dumping of radioactive waste in the Barents and Kara seas (by O. Schram Stokke), navigation in the Northern Sea Route (by R.D. Brubaker), and the emerging International Polar Navigation Code (by L.W. Brigham). Worth noting are two remarks made in the last two papers: that most of the requirements of the Russian legislation on navigation in Arctic waters, which is often considered as 'straining' existing international law, have their counterparts in the legislation of both Canada and the United States; and that the initial development of a bi-polar code of navigation has met a very uncertain future.

The main responses to the questions asked in the volume are given in the contribution by the editor of the volume, who is the director of the polar programme at the Fridtjof Nansen Institute. According to Davor Vidas, the

international instruments and institutional arrangements for environmental protection of the two polar oceans reveal a somewhat paradoxical situation. In the Southern Ocean, where the overall threat of pollution appears generally low, a comprehensive environmental protection treaty has been adopted, which also includes a special annex on the prevention of marine pollution. In Arctic waters, where the studies published within the framework of the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy confirm the existence of serious actual and potential sources of pollution, no specific multilateral instrument for the protection of the marine environment has so far been concluded. Besides the two obvious explanations (is marine environmental protection in the Arctic underestimated? or is it overestimated in the Antarctic?), there is also another possibility, as Vidas rightly supposes: that the issue is neither solely, nor even primarily, a matter of environmental needs, but rather of various other concerns, mostly of political and strategic nature.

After the failure of the Convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activities, the Consultative Parties to the Antarctic Treaty System had substantial political incentives that prompted them to agree expeditiously on issues relating to environmental protection. These incentives were basically the need to react to the challenge to their legitimacy in governing the Antarctic, coming from subjects external to the system, and the goal to maintain internal cohesion and balance within the system, especially as regards the Pandora's box of the sovereignty issue. In the Arctic, where no sovereignty questions on land territories are today open, the vital strategic interests of the major powers, beginning with the United States, still prevent the conclusion of a legally binding instrument in the sphere of the marine environment that could limit naval mobility. This consideration can explain why, in the Arctic, environmental co-operation, in the form of soft-law instruments, has mostly addressed the problems of land-based marine pollution, the regulation of which is the least threatening to the interests of the maritime fleets. More generally, this consideration also explains why the bi-polar approach is unlikely to become an effective tool to address polar problems.

In conclusion, the volume recommends itself for combining updated information with thought-provoking analysis, as was to be expected from the leading legal authorities in polar or marine issues who contributed to it. A last remark may be addressed to the elegant jacket illustration, which shows a polar bear in the vicinity of Nansen's vessel *Fram* bound by ice during its Arctic drift. (Tullio Scovazzi, University of Milano-Bicocca, Piazza dell'Ateneo Nuovo 1, 20126 Milan, Italy.)

GLOBAL WARMING: THE HARD SCIENCE. L.D. Danny Harvey. 2000. London: Prentice Hall. xxvi + 336 p, illustrated, soft cover. ISBN 0-582-38167-3. £18.99.

It is difficult to be entirely dispassionate about the topic of 'global warming,' and it has generated a substantial, and at times probably unhelpful, polarisation of attitudes. The