

comparable to Ridington's, but his circumstances left him with little data and no texts, save an indelible visual memory. Like Ridington, Osgood eventually decided to write about his personal journey, but it was capped by a solitary epic trip by dog team around a region that denied his intelligence and challenged his very presence.

Ridington's journey is also ultimately solitary, detached, intellectually distanced, but travels a mindscape that challenges his intelligence, and denies . . . that final letting go into myriad intimacies that are tacitly demanded, and yet casually taken for granted by the people we know, but do not stay with. I too have made the twenty-five-year journey of depth ethnography in another northern hunting culture, and I feel the profound, mute tension between the writer of books and monographs and the persons we commit our academic careers to representing to a larger world. Native authors like Tomson Highway and Billy Diamond add much more to the mosaic, but no person is without their points of challenge and denial in speaking of humanity, to humanity.

McMaster University

RICHARD PRESTON

REFERENCES

- Highway, Tomson. *Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing* (Saskatoon: Fifth House Publishers, 1989).
- MacGregor, Roy. *Chief: the Fearless Vision of Billy Diamond* (Markham: Viking, 1989).
- Osgood, Cornelius. *Winter* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1953).

Environmental Ethics: Philosophical and Policy Perspectives, edited by Philip P. Hanson. Simon Fraser University: Institute for the Humanities, 1986. Pp. 199.

Environmental Ethics, Volume II, edited by Raymond Bradley and Stephen Duguid. Simon Fraser University: Institute for the Humanities, 1989. Pp. 215.

These are two soft-cover volumes. The first, *Environmental Ethics: Philosophical and Policy Perspectives*, is edited by Philip P. Hanson of the Department of Philosophy, Simon Fraser University. In the Preface Mr. Hanson explains that a research workshop on "environmental ethics" was convened in Montreal in December 1983. Lead papers were prepared and distributed in advance, as were designated responses. While some of the

papers were subsequently revised, it is those papers prepared for that particular workshop which form the core of this volume.

While the length of this review prohibits a thorough discussion of each paper, the object of the workshop was to explore the moral rightness and wrongness of human actions insofar as they affect the natural environment, such that theories and principles might emerge that would form the basis of an ethic governing man's treatment of the environment. The participants, who prepared the various papers, were diverse in their backgrounds, being leaders in and representing the fields of law, economics, ecology, biology, philosophy, and sociology, and also included researchers in environmental and communication studies.

The various papers, taken together, represent a vigorous debate among intellectuals. Pierre Dansereau takes the view that a new ethic may well be the very condition of human survival itself. Donald A. Chant defines man's two notions of dominance and of perpetual progress as the "seeds of disaster" for the environment and calls for a modern Environmental Ethics "based on our increased awareness and understanding of our dependency on the natural system. . . ." Norman H. Morse makes a memorable comment when speaking of the way man has allowed things to drift toward the species that are more adaptable, letting the highly specialized ones succumb. He says "our experience may in the last analysis become an endurance test for survival between something like rat and man." J. Stan Rowe makes the comment: "Once humans see themselves as integral parts of the natural world rather than separate from it an ethic that embraces that wider environment ceases to be optional."

While it is difficult to summarize such a debate, L. W. Sumner attempts to divide the combatants into three categories. First, there is the anthropocentric school of humanism, which holds the view that all and only human beings have moral standing. Next, there are the sentientists, who hold the view that all and only sentient beings have moral standing. "Sentience" is defined as the capacity to experience pleasure and pain. So the sentientist would extend moral standing not only to man but also to certain animals. Finally, there is the unitarian, which is also described as the "new-ecological paradigm" or as "deep ecology," which would extend moral standing beyond sentient beings to plants, trees, and rocks. If you can think like a mountain, then you are in unity with nature.

Volume II of *Environmental Ethics*, edited jointly by Raymond Bradley and Stephen Duguid, comprises twelve papers, six falling under Part I, "The Domain of Environmental Ethics," and six under Part II, "Environmental Crisis: Causes, Cures and Questions of Policy." Each of the twelve

authors participated in one or other of a series of three conferences organized by the Institute for the Humanities of Simon Fraser University, and several authored papers in the first volume.

In the Introduction Messrs. Bradley and Duguid reduce the three categories of ethical theories referred to by Sumner to two categories: "anthropocentric" and "nonanthropocentric." The non-anthropocentric group is also referred to as "ecocentric," and into this latter category are grouped both the sentient and those who espouse "deep ecology."

In Part I, the debate from the first volume is simply continued, with five of the six authors falling into the category of being non-anthropocentric and therefore taking the view that rights and obligations should be extended to animals, plants, species (specifically to endangered species), and to the ecosystem at large. One author, Phillip S. Elder, took on all comers and rejected the argument that non-animal and perhaps non-living objects ought to have legal standing. He felt that everything that needed to be accomplished could be done within ordinary ethics and the legal framework as it exists.

Part II of Volume II is an attempt to state the seriousness of the problem. John Livingston, for example, believes that an ecological disaster may already be upon us, though he admits that he cannot prove it. For this situation he blames Western ideology generally. William Vanderburg believes that there is a possibility of an ecological collapse of catastrophic dimensions and allocates blame to our cultural drive for technological efficiency. Kai Nielson points his finger at capitalist ideology alone and advances the claim that pure socialism would promote the values cherished by environmentalists. Doug Bisset, on the other hand, believes that the steady and thoughtful application of technology will solve the problems that technology itself creates.

Both volumes are organized well. The Introductions provided in each case by the editors are excellent and serve the purpose well of tying the papers together, analyzing where the various authors agree and disagree with each other.

Having studied the debates between those who would be anthropocentric and those who would be ecocentric, is it not common ground that each espouses action to save the environment, but the first group would do it for the sake of man and man's survival while the other would do it for the sake of the ecosystem and its survival? What I could not be persuaded of is how man can stand separate and apart from earth's ecosystem, upon which he relies for life.

Further, if we accept John Livingston's belief that an ecological disaster may already be upon us, then, as Mary Anne Warren said, "We need a wedding, not a war" but between anthropocentrism and ecocentrism so that the common purpose of saving the environment, for whatever reason, may proceed with dispatch.

I compare the above debate to two people standing at the fork in a road. They both agree with respect to which branch of the fork they should take. They only disagree as to how far each will go along that same branch.

University of British Columbia

DAVID H. SEARLE, Q.C.

This Was Our Valley, by Earl K. Pollon and Shirlee Smith Matheson.
Calgary: Detselig, 1989. Pp. 401.

When the history of twentieth-century British Columbia is written, the 1960s and 1970s will be remembered as the decades of megaprojects. The Arrow Lakes, Mica, and Revelstoke dams on the Columbia River, the Bennett and Canyon dams on the Peace River, the southeast and northeast coal projects and the extension of the British Columbia Railway to Fort Nelson were all built in these "decades of development." Each of these projects grew out of its own political and economic context, involved very large capital expenditures (both public and private), and all were undertaken in the name of progress and economic opportunity. Each had, and continues to have, major socio-economic and environmental consequences for the people and places in which it is located. In *This Was Our Valley*, Earl Pollon and Shirlee Matheson write in a semi-popular way about the inter-relations between the upper Peace River and those frontier people who went to live in its valley in the 1930s and the changes brought about by the construction and operation of the Bennett and Canyon dams. The book contains a number of photographs (some poorly reproduced) but has no index or collated list of references. The legibility of the maps on the inside cover leaves much to be desired in a book in which, particularly in the first section, the reader is taken all over these northern parts of B.C.

In Part One, Earl Pollon chronicles his life on the frontiers of settlement during the period 1930-65. In fourteen chapters he describes his experiences as trapper, carpenter, prospector, hauler, lime burner, and more in places as far afield as Germansen Landing to the west and the Sikanni Chief River to the north. Stylistically he has some difficulty in making a