It is recognized that it is largely beyond the intended scope of this work to provide a more in-depth examination of the political, economic and social conditions that work to place certain communities at greater risk while simultaneously constraining their abilities to effectively adapt to rapidly changing environmental circumstances. In their introductory chapter, the Collectif Argos writers do allude to the fact that it is often the world's poorest populations, whose lives are already marked by a fair amount of insecurity, that are generally the most affected by the impacts of climate change. They also make mention of issues of social justice in the context of the unequal burden that many less developed nations are forced to bear as they contend with the problems created by greenhouse-gas emissions that they themselves did very little to produce. However, with the stories that follow this introduction, it feels as if there is almost a missed opportunity to further explore the material ramifications of these essential arguments.

As a case in point, there are the two examples highlighted from the United States. These each feature communities whose vulnerability to the effects of climate change are quite likely linked to the historical marginalization they have experienced as a result of either their ethnic or racial status. Here we find an Alaskan Native village that will be forced to relocate in the very near future because of the severity of local coastal erosion. This is a move that many community members recognize as a direct threat to the cultural cohesion of their people. Yet, these villagers must try and induce the federal government to spend the extra money necessary to relocate them to the alternate area they deem most amenable to the retention of their current way of life. The second case from the US explores the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. This recent disaster has certainly led many to call for a more thorough deliberation of how certain social justice issues like the state of contemporary race relations in this country can magnify the vulnerability of minority residents to these environmental catastrophes. However, the brevity of the pieces featured in this work clearly does not allow for a deeper consideration of these elements of each story. Thus it can only be hoped that the reader becomes at least subtly aware of these critical issues with which we must contend if we are ever to effectively engage with the full suite of problems associated with global warming.

As a whole, the climate change stories presented in *Climate Refugees* ideally serve to represent a global issue whose impacts should also be understood as uniquely local. Therefore, while we must tackle this issue at the international level as the Collectif Argos suggests, careful attention should also be paid to the particularities of each place. *Climate Refugees* is the type of emotionally charged exposé that seeks to motivate its readers to want to know and do more about the challenges raised by climate change and the refugees it will likely create in the not so distant future. *Climate Refugees* therefore represents the best efforts of the Collectif Argos to instill a sense of caring and concern for those already being impacted by the effects of climate change. In this way, it is hoped that we all will be compelled to seriously reckon with the issues raised by the notion of 'climate justice' before it is too late.

Alana Shaw

Conservation Refugees: The Hundred-Year Conflict between Global Conservation and Native Peoples.

Mark Dowie
MIT, ISBN: 9780262012614, pp. 376, 2009

The parks vs. people debate continues to garner attention in scholarly, policy, and activist circles. *Conservation Refugees* is Mark Dowie's welcome addition to this forum. From international conferences and the boardrooms of the largest conservation NGOs, to the patch of grazing land on the Serengeti, *Conservation Refugees* provides an accessible and informative overview of the displacement of indigenous peoples (both in terms of forced eviction and indirect forms) around the world for the purposes of biodiversity conservation. Not only does Dowie outline the history of this debate from the establishment of Yosemite and Yellowstone up until today, but he also argues for a new conservation paradigm whereby indigenous peoples and powerful conservation interests work together to balance the protection of nature and culture. This paradigm is one where indigenous peoples participate fully in conservation and the management of protected areas not as stakeholders, "but as rights-holders and equal players."[1]

© Author(s), 2014. This open-access work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Cette oeuvre en libre accès fait l'object d'une licence Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International.

Dowie organizes the book by alternating chapters focused on case studies of specific indigenous groups—from North and South America, Asia, Australia, Sub-Saharan Africa—and their experience with biodiversity conservation, with thematic chapters concerned with the social construction of "nature" and "wilderness", the political economy of conservation, scientific vs. traditional ecological knowledge, among others. This provides an assortment of empirical examples in addition to an overview of many topics that one would find in an introduction to the political ecology of conservation. With the wide range of case studies based largely on his own investigative journalism and supported by the work of others, Dowie does sacrifice depth for breadth. As a result he may miss some nuance in certain places. However, the vast amount of ground that is covered allows Dowie to highlight the scale of conservation-induced displacement, the myriad of forms that it takes, and the similarities that connect them all. People may also rightly point out that the book lacks theoretical rigor. However, as a journalist, not an academic, and in conjunction with his ability to outline the issues in an accessible way that has the potential to bring the issues at hand to new audiences, Dowie may be forgiven.

In the first line, Dowie sets the book up as a "good guy vs. good guy story" with international conservation pitted against indigenous peoples.[2] His reason for not labeling international conservation as the bad guy is because the big conservation actors "should not be assigned the same 'bad guy' status as 'extractive corporados' and others who push native people around and compromise ecosystems in their avaricious quest for resources and profits." [3] He adds to this by pointing out that big conservation is also doing some good by protecting biodiversity. It is a noble goal to move away from a narrow good guy vs. bad guy or David vs. Goliath narrative, but the 270 pages that follow the first line of the book tend to fall into it nonetheless. At times it is actually difficult to see how international conservation and the extractive bad guys are wholly separate because Dowie himself details how the two have partnered in many instances. This often makes extractive activities possible in some of the most ecologically sensitive areas while indigenous peoples are excluded from the same spaces. Furthermore, his arguments concerning the political economy of conservation highlight how the separation of "nature" and people is in part tied to the quest for money on the part of conservation NGOs as well. Perhaps most damaging to the "good guy" status of big conservation are the words of indigenous groups themselves to make the point that conservation, not the extractive industry, "has become the number one threat to indigenous territories."[4]

It is difficult to critique Dowie for portraying big conservation as the bad guy, even though he said he would not. Indeed the actions of organizations like the IUCN and Conservation International that the book details largely speak for themselves. It is conceivable, however, that he refrains from wanting to call international conservation the bad guy because a new conservation paradigm that takes the rights and conservation capacity of indigenous peoples seriously depends "very much on the compassion and understanding of global conservationists."[5] He does point to several areas of progress in this regard and has hope for the future, a hope that depends on international conservation—as well as governments—coming to its senses and doing the right thing.

Where Dowie might be most vulnerable is in his glorification of community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) and its status compared to fortress conservation. Indeed, he is rather quick to the conclude, "There can be no question that the Mataven [CBNRM] model of conservation is gradually displacing the Yosemite/Yellowstone model."[6] While he does admit that this is occurring "perhaps too slowly",[7] I wonder how we can reconcile this with the expansion of traditional forms of fortress conservation such as new national parks, but also with different manifestations such as private reserves and examples of green grabbing, all of which continue to exclude and even expel indigenous and local communities. Furthermore, Dowie seems somewhat reluctant to admit the failures and problematic aspects of CBNRM itself. Referring to his hope that CBNRM will take hold over fortress conservation in Gabon, Dowie argues "previous chapters attest that community-based conservation is a tried and proven method."[8] Yes, he does give examples of CBNRM successes, but he also leaves out the numerous critiques of CBNRM—including those put forward by scholars he routinely references[9]—and the many initiatives that have failed on both ecological and socio-economic and cultural terms. While I am on Dowie's side that community-based conservation is where we should be headed, it still does deserve to be critically analyzed. A chapter dedicated to this would be a welcome addition. With that said, we, and especially the conservationists among us, should heed his argument that "people who will help you most in conservation are those who depend on the environment for their livelihood."[10]

Dowie provides an excellent introductory foray into the people vs. parks debate and the political ecology of conservation more generally. For anyone looking for an in-depth analysis of particular cases, you would probably be better served by going to many of the outstanding sources that Dowie references including works by Dan Brockington, Rod Neumann, and Jim Igoe, among others. With that said, *Conservation Refugees* is a welcome addition to any bookshelf and is especially useful for the uninitiated, but not

© Author(s), 2014. This open-access work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Cette oeuvre en libre accès fait l'object d'une licence Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International.

only. To be sure, one of the most important contributions of the book is simply in its framing of those being displaced for the purposes of conservation as "refugees". While elaborating on what is meant by the term refugee could have strengthened this framing—for example, why is it not in the chapter "A Word about Terms"?—it is a bold step to use the concept of conservation refugee. I would also argue that it is a step in the right direction of bringing the issue of conservation-induced displacement into broader conversations concerning forced-displacement and refugee studies. Indeed, the figure of the conservation refugee should not only be of interest to political ecologists or those of us interested in conservation, but should also be the purview of those interested in displacement and "refugeeism" more broadly.

Notes

1. Mark Dowie, *Conservation Refugees: The Hundred-Year Conflict between Global Conservation and Native Peoples* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2009), 250.
2. Ibid., ix.
3. Ibid., x.
4. Ibid., xviii.
5. Ibid., 254.
6. Ibid., 239.
7. Ibid., 239.
8. Ibid., 260.
9. See, for example, Daniel Brockington, *Fortress Conservation: The Preservation of the Mkomazi Game Reserve, Tanzania.* Indiana University Press, 2002 and Wolfram Dressler, and Bram Büscher. "Market Triumphalism and the CBNRM 'Crises' at the South African Section of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park," *Geoforum* 39, no. 1 (2008): 452–65.
10. Dowie, *Conservation Refugees,* 221.

Francis Massé

© Author(s), 2014. This open-access work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Cette oeuvre en libre accès fait l'object d'une licence Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International.