

The most valuable aspect of Fisher's chapter is its joint consideration of the Canadian and American Northwests. Fisher's analysis moves back and forth across what is now the international boundary, de-emphasizing differences between the British/Canadian and American Northwests. Looming much larger for him are the distinctions first between the maritime and land-based fur trades and then between the fur trade and settlement periods. National differences are subsumed within this thematic frame. The Northwest exception to Fisher's thematic rule is Russian America (Alaska), which he depicts as standing apart from the processes that characterize the rest of the region. Focusing British Columbia within the same analytic lens as Oregon, Washington, and Alaska is an apt and effective reminder that the meaning of political boundaries is never a given.

Following British Columbia past 1880 requires turning to Frederick

Hoxie's continental-scale chapter on the reservation period. Unlike Fisher, Hoxie's examples from British Columbia suggest that colonialism took a different shape in the Canadian province than in its counterpart American states. Whether this results from increasing national differentiation over time or simply from interpretive differences, the juxtaposition of US and Canadian Indian policies remains suggestive. It encourages further consideration of how national politics and policy played out in specific locales.

Overall, this volume is a promising start to the new Cambridge history series of Native Peoples of the Americas. (Forthcoming volumes will deal with MesoAmerica [Volume 2] and South America [Volume 3].) The series will provide readers accustomed to monographic studies with a valuable "big picture" and should prove an important reference tool for a wide readership.

*Seeing the Ocean Through the Trees:
A Conservation-Based Development Strategy
for Clayoquot Sound*

Vancouver: Ecotrust Canada, 1997. 105 pp. Illus., maps. \$20.00 paper.

By BRUCE BRAUN

University of California, Berkeley

Perhaps no other region in British Columbia has received as much attention from environmental activists, resource planners, journalists, and scholars as Clayoquot Sound on Vancouver Island. Indeed, since the early 1980s, when members of Nuu-chah-nulth communities and

other local residents first protested the extension of industrial forestry into the region, Clayoquot Sound has come to be staged as emblematic of resource and environmental conflicts in the province as a whole. It should come as no surprise, then, that one of the first efforts to imagine alternative

forms of economic development to industrial forestry should take Clayoquot Sound as its test case. *Seeing the Ocean Through the Trees* – a volume co-authored by members of an Oregon-based conservation NGO (Ecotrust), together with three BC-based writers (Ian Gill, David Greer, and Katrina Kucey) – does precisely this, wading into the fierce debates over the socio-ecological future of Clayoquot Sound with a strategy for what its authors call “conservation-based development.”

What sets this volume apart from the many books and pamphlets produced by other environmental groups is that it represents an important attempt to move beyond a singular “anti-logging” focus to envision a “new economy” that includes the *use*, rather than simply the *preservation*, of natural resources. This does not mean that the environmental critique of industrial forestry has been abandoned. On the contrary, in setting out the need for alternatives, the authors reiterate what is now a virtual consensus among Greens and many on the “Left”: that instead of bringing “prosperity” and “stability,” industrial forestry – with its singular emphasis on timber extraction – has brought only cycles of resource depletion, ecosystem destruction, and declining employment. It is precisely in response to its failures that the authors argue for a “new economy” based on the use of *multiple* resources (what they call an “economy of abundance”) and built on a new definition of “prosperity” (centred on the needs of local communities and the assumption that healthy ecosystems are necessary for healthy economies). Ideally, the authors contend, such a new economy would be regulated through decentralized planning processes and would be more attuned to how the pros-

perity of local communities is interwoven with the health of the surrounding environment. Just as important, the authors argue, for such an “economy of abundance” to be sustained, local residents and resource planners would necessarily need to attend to the intricate interconnections between terrestrial and marine environments, a set of relations virtually ignored in the existing regime of industrial forestry.

Readers will find these principles sketched in the opening pages of this short volume. How they might work out “on the ground” becomes the subject for the remainder of the volume. Initial chapters provide background, summarizing the ecological character and historical context of the Sound, providing a sketch of Nuu-chah-nulth understandings of the land and its resources, and outlining the major fault lines in contemporary struggles over how development should proceed in the region. Subsequent chapters introduce and evaluate a range of forest- and non-forest-based economic opportunities that might co-exist in the region, from limited value-added wood processing and nature-based tourism to aquaculture and the development of an array of educational institutions.

Together these chapters present an important and long-awaited vision of an economy built on, rather than against, ecological and cultural diversity. It will be read with interest by resource managers, planners, and environmentalists alike. But the volume is notable for other reasons too. Although the volume purports to outline the basis for a “new” economy for Clayoquot Sound, its central focus arguably remains burying the “old.” The centrepiece of the volume, for instance, is a series of maps by which the authors seek to determine “the

ultimate effect that implementing the [Clayoquot Sound Scientific] Panel's recommendations will have on the volume of timber that can be removed from the forests of Clayoquot Sound" (29). This merits further attention for it raises a number of important, even troubling, questions. The Scientific Panel – as is widely known – called for forestry to be reorganized around the principle of sustainable *ecosystems* rather than sustainable *yield*, and it set out a series of recommendations to this end. Not unexpectedly, the authors accept these without comment – such is the “authority” of science – and through a method called “constraint mapping” set out to identify all the regions in the Sound where forestry should, on the basis of these recommendations, be ruled out. Constraint mapping, in this case, consists of superimposing a series of maps that, individually, introduce additional “filters” (the panel’s recommendations) and, thereby, add *incrementally* to the area “off limits” to forestry. Thus, to an initial map that identifies areas where recommended rates of cut for the past decade have been exceeded, the authors add additional “filters” like “sensitive and highly valued hydro-riparian ecosystems,” “protection required for unstable slopes,” reserves to protect “late successional forest” conditions, “important cultural areas,” areas with “high scenic and recreational values,” and so on until a final map is achieved that combines all of the above.

Few would deny that the final map provides powerful support to the authors’ contention that forestry should play only a very limited role in the region’s economy. But along the way, it becomes easy to forget that, despite the great power of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to combine

an immense amount of data into a single, coherent picture, GIS remains a *material* practice and not a “disinterested” representation of the “truth” of the matter. Haunting the margins of these maps, then, are a number of questions that the realist conventions of the “map” encourage us to overlook: How are the Scientific Panel’s recommendations being interpreted? What assumptions are the authors making? Should the panel’s recommendations be taken as general principles that inform planning? As laws that govern practice? Or as guidelines open to interpretation? Does it make sense to map, cumulatively, successive recommendations? Or does it make more sense to understand the panel’s recommendations within some hierarchy, whereby some are more important than others? My point is *not* that the panel’s recommendations are unimportant but, rather, that *how* they are interpreted and combined matters greatly. By rigidly interpreting and applying the panel’s recommendations, for instance, the authors conclude that 91 per cent of the Sound is covered by constraints that *rule out* forestry. This is a profound conclusion, with enormous consequences for different social groups in the region. Moreover, the authors go on to criticize the panel for not also recommending the protection of all “intact” or “pristine” watersheds and, thus, add as a final “filter” the principle that there should be no development in pristine areas. By adding this last “filter” the authors produce a final map of “constraints” that covers fully 95.8 per cent of the territory and conclude that sustainable forestry in the region could potentially harvest no more than 20,000 cubic metres of timber annually (down from the 600,000 cubic metres first forecast by the pro-

vince after the release of the Clayoquot Land Use Plan in 1993 and the 900,000 cubic metres that the industry had previously been harvesting).

Such a conclusion – and the maps on which they are based – must be closely examined, in part because Ecotrust's call for a "new economy" turns on the reader accepting them as valid. There are immense political and economic stakes involved in how the recommendations of the Scientific Panel are interpreted and mapped. And it becomes especially clear with the introduction of the last "filter" – preservation of the "pristine" – that such interpretation and mapping can never be an entirely disinterested practice. Indeed, this last case is particularly curious and verges on embodying a serious contradiction: if carefully following the panel's recommendations is assumed to lead to "sustainable ecosystems" – as the authors of the volume themselves accept – then the preservation of "intact" and "pristine" watersheds is entirely unnecessary!

This suggests a wider set of questions that the authors of the volume fail to raise: Whose "interests" are served by this mapping? Which social groups in Clayoquot Sound would benefit most from the "new economy" outlined in the volume? Ultimately, whose vision of "conservation-based development" is this? It has become popular to appeal to "local residents" or to the "community" as the relevant unit of analysis, such that anything that devolves authority to these levels is taken as a "good." This is understandable, given that existing state and corporate planning processes have often marginalized those closest to the landscapes under question. Yet, it is not enough to simply use these terms uncritically. Although at points the authors attend to the many different

social and cultural groups that hold stakes in the future of Clayoquot Sound, too little attention is paid to how the costs of the draconian reductions in timber harvest that they recommend, and the benefits of the alternatives they suggest, may be distributed *unevenly*. The "local" is never homogenous but involves interwoven dynamics of class, race, and gender. In Clayoquot Sound, just like everywhere else, this is crucial. It is no small irony, for instance, that just when First Nations land claims are being taken seriously in legal and political arenas – and thus just when Native communities stand poised to benefit from industrial forestry – Clayoquot Sound's forests are deemed "out of bounds." Likewise, the "alternatives" suggested – aquaculture, ecotravel, and so on – may open opportunities for women but may not address other structural inequalities in the region around race and class. Indeed, without careful attention to the legacies of colonialism and uneven development in the region, these could exacerbate rather than resolve existing economic and social inequalities. Are Nuu-chah-nulth communities the ones "reinventing" the Sound as a series of "kayak routes," as in the map that opens the volume? Certainly, educational institutions would bring much-needed capital into the region and could do so without degrading local environments. But is it Nuu-chah-nulth communities or, for that matter, former forestry workers who would share the benefits? In Canada, not only education, but *employment* in higher education, remains the privilege of non-Natives rather than Natives, and professionals rather than wage labourers.

Similar questions could – and should – be raised at every turn. None of this diminishes the need to reinvent

"prosperity" in ways that integrate ecology and economy. There is a pressing need for this on Canada's West Coast, and in *Seeing the Ocean Through the Trees*, Ecotrust shows itself to be at the forefront of those engaged in the task. But as important as this volume is, it also usefully alerts us to the need to remain vigilant about whose "vision" and whose "voices" are heard in these efforts. Like the Ministry of Forest's management plans did only a decade ago, our solutions – despite their laudable intentions – may just as problematically "disembed"

the environment from its local relations, such that distant experts are given more authority than those whose lives are most closely linked to the environments in question. Likewise, our language of "community" and the "local" may render us unable to think in terms of the complex "tangles" of difference found in British Columbia's forest communities. Both through what it accomplishes and what it leaves out, *Seeing the Ocean Through the Trees* provides a valuable forum for debating the future of British Columbia's coastal communities.

*Echoes of Empire:
Victoria and Its Remarkable Buildings*

Robin Ward

Madeira Park: Harbour, 1996. 362 pp. Illus. \$32.95 paper.

Exploring Victoria's Architecture

Martin Segger and Douglas Franklin

336 pp. Illus., maps. \$31.95 paper.

By TERRY REKSTEN, *Victoria*

Robin Ward is best known for his weekly column in the *Vancouver Sun*, in which he explores Vancouver's urban design. In *Echoes of Empire*, he turns his attention to Victoria, a city he describes as having the "most cohesive and best preserved" collection of nineteenth-century architecture in Canada.

Perhaps Ward intended, initially, to produce an architectural history of the city, tracing its different stages of development by examining and discussing surviving buildings. If so, he

was diverted by the richness of the material he encountered. "What a past – what people!" he exclaims.

Almost seventy buildings and sites are included, but they are used not as an opportunity to discuss changing styles and tastes but as a framework on which to construct a history of the city. And in spite of wildly shifting timelines and with biographical tidbits revealed over widely spaced sections, Ward has managed to produce an entertaining story of Victoria's past and present.