

Cette contribution laissera cependant sur sa faim le lecteur qui souhaiterait comprendre l'évolution décrite. Il aurait été intéressant d'approfondir plus régulièrement dans l'ouvrage des cas de projets marquants ou certaines décisions afin de mieux comprendre de manière concrète l'expérience du BAPE. L'ouvrage, en deuxième partie, passe malheureusement du descriptif au normatif, en ne cherchant pas tant à expliquer qu'à dénoncer. Nous saluons son parti pris pour l'éveil écocitoyen, qui tire ses origines dans la lutte pour l'intégrité des chutes du Parc de la rivière Batiscan, et bien que nous épousions les positions de l'auteur, le martèlement de celles-ci donne un caractère pamphlétaire et répétitif à l'ouvrage. On y trouve peu de nouvelles idées, la plupart de celles-ci étant déjà présentes au milieu des années 1980 dans les divers bilans réalisés sur l'expérience encore jeune du BAPE.² En ce sens, l'ouvrage n'atteint qu'en partie son intention déclarée de «décortiquer les mécanismes en jeu pour aider à les comprendre, soupeser leur efficacité, en démontrer les limites et avancer des propositions à soumettre au débat public le plus large possible» (2). L'analyse pour expliquer cette évolution est absente. Si «le diable est dans les détails» comme le mentionne Louise Vandelac (XII), qui signe la préface de l'ouvrage, pourquoi s'être limité aux éléments les plus formels? En ce sens, si le titre de l'ouvrage nous semble peu justifié (où sont les citoyens? étude sur la perception du BAPE par ceux-ci? sondage, entrevues?), le sous-titre s'avère plus près du contenu. Une analyse plus politique mettant à jour les rapports de force au cœur de l'expérience du BAPE aurait davantage permis de répondre à l'objectif fixé et de mieux prendre appui pour sauter de la description à la prescription. Somme toute, il s'agit d'une contribution nécessaire et d'un point de départ intéressant pour rendre compte de l'expérience du BAPE, institution incontournable pour étudier l'évaluation environnementale et la participation du public au Québec.

Notes

- 1 Loi sur la qualité de l'environnement (L.R.Q., C. Q-2), chap. 1, Sect. II, art. 6.3.
- 2 Gariepy, Michel, B. Ouellet, G. Dumon et Y. Phaneuf, 1986. *Bilan et étude comparative de procédures d'évaluation et d'examen des impacts environnementaux*. Montréal: Bureau d'audiences publiques sur l'environnement, pagination multiple; Québec, 1988. *L'évaluation environnementale: une pratique à généraliser, une procédure d'examen à parfaire* (rapport Lacoste), Rapport du comité d'examen de la procédure d'évaluation environnementale, Québec, Gouvernement du Québec.

LOUIS SIMARD *Université d'Ottawa*

Equality

Stuart White

Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006, pp. 197

doi:10.1017/S0008423908080542

In this accessible and interesting book, Stuart White provides a useful evaluation of the most important contemporary approaches to theorizing about the idea of equality. It pretends to be an accessible and concise introduction for a wide audience. As the author points out "the aim of this book is to unpack the complexity of the demand for equality, to clarify what motivates it, and, in the process, to explore some of the anxieties about liberty and other values that this demand provokes" (3).

The book is organized in seven chapters through which different faces of the idea of equality are discussed. These multiple aspects are summarized in the first chapter which serves as an introduction and a framework for the remainder of the

book. White makes here two important distinctions. First, taking as a premise that demand for equality is not a demand for a concrete thing but a demand for many and controversial things, White distinguishes different forms of equality and the diverse ways in which one might think that these kinds of equality are valuable (4). Thus he differentiates among five categories of equality (legal, political, social, economic and moral equality) “all of which enter in more or less controversial ways into the demand for equality in modern politics” (4). Second, he examines the multiple values that may acquire these categories. Basically, the author argues that we might see a given type of equality as instrumentally valuable (when it serves to achieve another value), as intrinsically just (when that value is considered as substantively just) or as a supreme value (23).

The idea of political equality and the defensibility of the democratic ideal are discussed in the second chapter. Here White raises the question about how a society should distribute the power among the citizens to issue binding commands in the name of the state and to issue further commands to punish those who disobey; thus in this chapter the reader can find a discussion about the classical doctrines of natural aristocracy as well as the social theories of legitimate authority and their relationship with the democratic ideal. Equally important is the discussion about why and under what conditions political equality is a good idea, and how it can be achieved without compromising democracy in a fundamental way (26).

The third chapter is dedicated to examining the ideas of meritocracy and equality of opportunity. Among other things, in this chapter White elucidates those values usually used to support meritocracy (section 3.1); he distinguishes between weak and strong meritocracy (sections 3.2 and 3.3), analyzes to what extent our contemporary societies are meritocratic (section 3.4) and finally reviews the main criticism of the meritocratic ideal (sections 3.5 to 3.8).

In chapters 4 and 5 the author focuses on the ideal of “luck egalitarianism” which represents one of the dominant and most important developments of post-Rawlsian political philosophy. Introduced by Elizabeth Anderson some years ago, the term of “luck egalitarianism” has been used to characterize the theoretical approach of important egalitarians theorists such as Richard Arneson, Gerald Cohen, Ronald Dworkin, Thomas Nagel, John Roemer, Eric Rakowski and Philippe Van Parijs. Roughly speaking, according to these authors, those inequalities that reflect brute luck, over which people have no control, can be considered unjust and the community should act to correct or prevent such inequalities. However, those inequalities that reflect the different choices people make should be considered just and for this reason ought to be respected (78). In this chapter, White outlines Ronald Dworkin’s theory of equality of resources and the criticisms to this theory formulated by G.A. Cohen and Amartya Sen, then discusses two important objections made to luck egalitarianism approach. First, it constitutes a threat to individual freedom (because it demands a heavy taxation that is incompatible with respect for personal freedom) and second, luck egalitarianism “will give rise to objectionable inequalities in power and status, so undermining the goals of political and social equality” (79). In chapter 5, White addresses another popular argument against luck egalitarianism, that is, the idea that the application of luck egalitarianism would create unfavourable economic incentives that might undermine our economy and community. Basically, this chapter is devoted to the question about how much inequality we should permit. To examine this conflictive relationship between equality and incentives, White explores the John Rawls’s proposal (especially the difference principle) and discusses some of the most important objections to Rawls’s approach.

Chapter 6 is dedicated to the debate over group-differentiated citizenship. In this chapter the author essentially examines those theoretical postures that cast doubts on the link between equality and uniform citizenship. From these theoretical approaches,

a real and not formal equality requires a model of group-differentiated and not uniform citizenship, in which citizen's rights and duties vary according to the group that to which each citizen belongs (20). Here White evaluates arguments for and against gender-, culture- and religion-specific rights (section 6.1, 6.3) and discusses how the claim for a differentiated citizenship impacts our conception and understanding of democracy.

Finally, in chapter 7 White focuses on some issues concerned to the future of equality. Fundamentally, he evaluates (from a pessimist and optimist perspective) how the demands for equality can be applied at a global level. Among other things, he discusses to what extent citizens of rich societies are obligated to act to reduce the inequality between them and people in poor societies and how those principles to regulate equality discussed in the previous chapters can be introduced to a global level.

In conclusion, it is possible to say that the purpose and task of this book is successfully achieved. Even though, the book has a few omissions (as, for example, it does not offer a detailed distinction between the principles of equality, priority and sufficiency) these are minor and perhaps, unavoidable, taking into consideration the ground covered in such a brief volume. It reviews, presents and critically evaluates this complex topic in a succinct way.

CRISTIAN PÉREZ MUÑOZ *Universidad de la República*

Branching Out, Digging In: Environmental Advocacy and Agenda Setting

Sarah B. Pralle

Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2006, pp. xii, 279

doi:10.1017/S0008423908080554

Decisions about environmental and land-use management are highly controversial. In situations of conflict, how do advocacy groups succeed in imposing their views on a policy problem against competing views within the decision-making arena? Sarah Pralle addresses the issue of political controversies in the public policy process, claiming that advocacy group strategies matter (220). She suggests that success in the confrontation depends on the ability to shape the conflict's scope through strategic manoeuvring in the areas of defining issues, gaining support and shifting policy venues (220).

This constructivist approach of agenda setting was suggested by an initial empirical observation of two similar cases of forest management with very different outcomes, Clayoquot Sound on Vancouver Island, British Columbia, and the Quincy Library Group (QLG) in the Sierra Nevada Mountains of Northern California. The dilemma lies on the ability of environmentalists to prevent timber companies from logging in the old-growth forest. In the first case, Friends of Clayoquot Sound (FOCS), a coalition of environmental activists, succeeded in preventing logging as they brought the conflict to the international political and economic scene, organizing actions towards BC timber clients. In the second one, environmentalists failed against the timber industry, which developed a counterstrategy that relocalized the conflict and gained support for their logging plan, thanks to the consensual deliberative process used.

Why did environmentalists succeed in protecting the old-growth forest in one case and not the other? The author suggests that the former were more resourceful than the latter in developing their conflict management strategy: "By 'strategy', I mean the process of choosing and executing a plan of action to realize policy goals. Strategizing involves selecting targets for action, choosing specific tactics, and paying attention to timing" (6). She explains why advocacy groups opt for a particular strategy at a given time and how they succeed in framing the issue within the political arena.