

## REVIEWS

finding the one hope, given the political domination of populous Ontario and Quebec, sitting securely on the sanctified heritage of George Brown, of rep. by pop., that the West and the Maritimes might hold a balance of votes in the ruling party, or even in Parliament by means of a third party (the Progressives), turned to political alienation in voting consistently for the perpetual opposition, the Conservative party. Only a fundamental revision of the constitution, with a powerful Upper House representing provincial, or regional rights, could alter this. And that is not possible, given the fact that central Canada would not likely agree, and more important, the fundamental "populist", or rep. by pop. nature of the Canadian political mentality.

So Colin Howell is quite right to seek for a "meaningful federalism", one which allows expression of legitimate local interests and concerns. He does not, alas, elaborate, but the book has led us to the door.

Such is its purpose and its value. Its larger meaning is that Canada is now in 1864, the year of decision for Confederation. Either Canada by a supreme effort — a coalition government — finds means to reconcile Québec and liberate the Maritimes and the West, or we are all in serious trouble. The means to do so begins to emerge, but the crunch will have to harden to break up the old convictions and release the new possibilities.

W.L. Morton  
History  
University of Manitoba

William Ophuls, *Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity*, San Francisco, W.H. Freeman and Company, 1977, cloth \$12.95, paper \$6.95, pp. 303.

The book consists of two parts. The essential message of Part I is that the ecosystems constituting our biosphere have natural limits which insure their ability to continue performing naturally designed functions. Interventions in these complex systems by man for purposes of production must be such that they "strike a balance between production and protection". This can only be done by maintaining an attitude of respect toward the natural biospheric laws of *limitation*, an attitude which has not of late characterized man's use of the environment. Hence, like all other living populations, we must level off and attempt to achieve a steady state in recognition of our rapidly approaching "limits to growth". However, any reasonable palliatives to ecological scarcity, such as the author's plea for an immediate transition to a steady state society,

## RECENSIONS

must face the vexing need to alter radically current social, economic, and political values. Part II addresses itself to this need. The author argues that the classical liberal values, based as they were on political and economic assumptions of unlimited abundance, are no longer viable. What is called for is a "new paradigm" of politics.

My criticisms of the book have mainly to do with this second part in which the author attempts a political and economic analysis of the present ecological crisis documented in Part I. The essential problem in this regard is that the author never squarely faces the international and national *structures* within which the problem of ecological scarcity will or will not be worked out. Instead, he has a tendency to personify nations and then to engage in a psychological reductionism which obliterates awareness of the present problems as involving entrenched political, economic and social patterns whose historical and present reality must be fully understood and confronted. On an international level, for example, the dominant contemporary structure of the trans-national corporation and its complicity in ecological destruction is barely addressed. As well, the whole discussion of the state and its relationship to and intimidation by such structures is entirely omitted. Instead, the author vilifies individual nations and falls, for instance, to blaming participants in the 1972 Stockholm Conference because the "quarrelsome and self-seeking nations" fail to "put aside stale old grudges, recognize their common predicament and act in concert to improve the human condition . . ." (p. 217).

Similarly, the performance of Third World countries at such international conferences is criticized because of their tendency to turn the discussion (as well they might) toward issues of international economic justice, a tendency which for the author "enormously complicates the process of negotiation" (p. 218).

At the national level, the discussion of ecological destruction and pollution and any potential remedies to them is badly in need of a sustained class analysis showing the differential involvement of the various socioeconomic levels in the general problem. The "implicated" and the implications of ecological scarcity and environmental violation are very different depending upon where one looks in the class structure. Proposed solutions must show a recognition of this.

In the place of this structural awareness, the author offers a kind of Jeffersonian republicanism which calls us back to the classical American virtues contained in that paradigm — to a communal, decentralized, locally autonomous, aristocratically ruled, planned, and conserving society. The dynamic by which present *structures* will give way to the implementation of these *values* is, unfortunately, not seriously addressed.

To conclude, any author who attempts to address the pressing ecological problems in our time must immediately confront the fractured nature of the contemporary approach to knowledge. Although one would like to see an

## REVIEWS

explicit and sustained treatment of the implicit survival threat in the very organization of the sciences, the author does not provide it. He can, however, be commended for his lucid and largely successful effort in Part I to summarize the main and varied components of the present ecological crisis. The political, economic and sociological analysis contained in Part II I found to lean heavily in the direction of an idealist and cultural critique at the expense of structural considerations and, for this reason, I found it less satisfying.

Bernard Hammond  
Social Sciences  
King's College  
University of Western Ontario

Kent S. Miller. *Managing Madness: The Case Against Civil Commitment*. New York: The Free Press, 1976, pp. 185.

Concern about the incarceration of the mentally ill has reached the proportion of a broad public debate. Since the 1960s when in various parts of the industrial world mental patients were given increased rights through legislation and constitutional adjudication, the perspectives held by progressive thinkers have altered considerably. Many of the assumptions with which benign observers operated a decade ago have either been thrown into serious disrepute or, at the very least, have become the subject of investigation and discovery.

It was not long ago that Thomas Szasz, who questioned the existence of mental illness, gained a reputation of infamy among reasonable-minded mental health professionals. Although some were prepared to acknowledge that our understanding of mental illness was not a precise science, nonetheless, in the interest of protecting the community and at the same time providing medical benefits, it was generally held that involuntary commitment was on occasion justifiable. Legislative revisions were mounted to provide criteria in order to assure that when involuntary commitment occurred it was done under due process of law. It was not expected, after these legislative reforms were enacted, for example, in England and Scotland in 1959 and 1960, and in Canada at various points in the late 1960s, that difficulties would emerge with respect to liberties.

From the perspective of commonwealth jurisdictions the American jurisprudence thus took on the appearance of an alien community of interests and polarizations which did not meaningfully reflect the tranquillity of professional and governmental relations outside the United States. This contentment, unfortunately, was short-lived as it has rapidly become apparent that the