

determining factor in native-European relations. In a period that has seen native peoples display considerable assertiveness within existing Canadian political and legal structures, it is important to understand the historical background of current struggles. In considering these historical struggles, however, Abel has left aside many of their darker elements.

**Nick Gardner**  
**Wilfrid Laurier University**

L. Anders Sandberg (ed.), *Trouble in the Woods: Forest Policy and Social Conflict in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick*, (Fredericton: Acadiensis Press 1992).

*Trouble in the Woods: Forest Policy and Social Conflict in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick* tackles head-on a "regional" topic (as all topics concerning Atlantic Canada are destined to be labelled) of national and global concern: the nature of economic solidarity between corporate capital and the state. "The intent of this book," editor L. Anders Sandberg writes in an introductory essay, "is to document the process of consolidation of power by the forest industry and the provincial government, and to recount the struggle of the men and women challenging the power structure." This may be the beatific Maritimes, but it is also the world of clear-cutting and transnational capital; this ain't the forest primeval.

A collection of ten essays with a remarkable theoretical cohesion, *Trouble in the Woods* hammers home in case after case evidence that the weaknesses of the Maritime pulp and paper industry — poor labour conditions and the lowest pulp prices in Canada — are less the result of inevitable market forces than of a century of short-sighted public policy. The governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick eagerly courted forestry investment that promised future prosperity, and thus presented votes. Sandberg relates how the "Big Lease" in Cape Breton offered American investors the chance to obtain cheap woodland, clear-cut it, and sell their leases

back at exorbitant rates the province was willing to pay to retain its "good name." In such a climate, the rights and wishes of the provinces' small woodlot owners have been bound to be antithetical to larger provincial policies. As Bill Parenteau shows, the New Brunswick government throughout the 1960s and 1970s hampered independent producers from forming marketing boards and enjoying collective bargaining with pulp and paper companies. The 1973 legislation that was finally to create marketing boards still permitted the corporations to bargain "in good faith." Nowhere in *Trouble in the Woods* is the state as neutral arbitrator to be seen.

In making its case against historical and contemporary forestry policy-making, *Trouble in the Woods* maintains a rigid political economy style and misses potentially rich sources of debate. For example, the woods are always "resources," and the environmental effects of forestry are largely ignored. Only Serge Cote perceptively notes that in the case he studied, the involvement of corporate foresters meant that small woodlot owners had no incentive to conserve their holdings, and acted as ferociously to clear their woodland as the larger interests did. The authors of the essays here are more concerned with the inequalities present in the forest industry, than with the nature of the industry itself.

Yet the book fails to show the reader these inequalities. The stories of "the men and women challenging the power structure" are missing. Individual pulp producers, organizers, and labourers are quite invisible, lost in a maze of submissions to commissions and appendices to reports (the authors cannot see the trees for the forest, as it were). It is unfortunate that such a tightly organized and well researched book has no narrative structure to tie it together; even an index would have helped the reader make sense of the interrelationships in overlapping essays. As it is, *Trouble in the Woods* is a dense book that will deserve the acclaim of academics and foresters whose attention it sustains.

**Alan Andrew MacEachern**  
**Queen's University**