

come to the foreground in the article, perhaps because it appears in a journal directed at an anthropological readership; where it does appear, Brosius is often concerned that our writings will be co-opted and used against the people with whom we study and work. He warns us, for example, of the dangers of showing that indigenous identities are contingent and historical. However, there are ways in which our writings can influence broader debates in many social contexts. Indeed, our recording of lives of the poor and the marginalized offers an important balance to other dominant views, as Scheper-Hughes argues for her research in the shantytowns and slums of Northeast Brazil (1992). We have the option of writing for different audiences, in different voices, and even in different languages. Our teaching as well is not directed exclusively to undergraduate majors and graduate students who form part of anthropological communities but often to many others as well. There are opportunities for team teaching, for offering courses outside anthropology departments and programs. Though our analyses may be framed in conventional academic forms of professional writings and of teaching, they can reach broader audiences and thus constitute a kind of wider engagement.

The second theme stems from the first. The colleges, universities, professional societies, journals, and books in which we present academic interventions are only one of the many sites in which we become involved with environmentalism. This second theme of the sites of our interventions also is not treated as directly as some others in the article, in part because of limitations of length. In his respect and admiration for grassroots politics, Brosius may exclude other forms of political action in which anthropologists may intervene more directly. We may serve as advocates, as advisers, as intermediaries, as liaisons; we may work with NGOs, with environmental scientists, with agencies (Orlove and Brush 1996). Another broad contribution of environmentalism, as Brosius notes, is to contribute to debates over the constitution of public space and public discourse; there are many portions of public space in which anthropologists can participate.

This concern for sites led me to note Brosius's treatment of the question of what counts as politics. He suggests that "national elites and transnational capital interests—at times working in concert with mainstream environmental organizations—are engaged in attempts to displace the moral/political imperatives that galvanize grassroots movements with a conspicuously depoliticized apparatus that is by turns legal, financial, bureaucratic, and technoscientific" and echoes this point elsewhere in his discussion of the "green spectrum" that runs from "mainstream" to "direct action" groups. If the line between analysis and intervention seems insufficiently clear to me, this separation of politics and depoliticization strikes me as excessively firm, this single axis of forms of politics too simple. Climate issues offer examples in this regard. I share the concern over claims such as that global warming is a purely technical problem and that once the kinks are worked out of the

details of greenhouse gasses, we can develop markets for carbon emission permits and eliminate the problem as efficiently as possible. But I also recognize that in the case of ozone depletion, complex interactions of activist groups with conventional government agencies and scientific experts have led to international accords that have greatly reduced threats to the integrity of the atmosphere and the biosphere (Benedick 1991). In this case, it is difficult to draw these lines so neatly.

It is a sign of the strength rather than the weakness of the article that it can raise these issues of audience and site in environmental anthropology. Its synthetic overview highlights the importance of future work. I eagerly await Brosius's further writings on the Penan and on environmental anthropology.

DIANNE E. ROCHELEAU AND CLAUDIA RADEL
Graduate School of Geography, Clark University,
Worcester, Mass. 01610, U.S.A. (drocky@ma.
ultranet.com). 2 II 99

Brosius raises a series of questions that emanate from recent encounters between critical anthropology and environmental discourses and movements. Drawing upon insights from feminist theory, we propose to expand and enrich these questions as they relate to intersections of identity and environmental movements, policy, and positionality. Brosius's analysis of research on environmental social movements, discourse, and images repeatedly touches on the complex processes of identity and representation. Perhaps most striking is his implicit dichotomization of essential and strategic identities. Our comments first focus on the issue of environmental essentialisms, their deployment by various actors, and their potential unmasking by researchers. We then raise the issue of researcher positionality in terms of purpose, policy engagement, and relationship to the researched.

The dilemma of the article—to unmask or not—is based on a relatively fixed and essential notion of identities, both environmental and cultural. Brosius is concerned with fallout from training our critical gaze on the very people and organizations whose struggles we wish to support. The fear is that if we expose the political and intentional nature of environmental social movements' claims of "Green" identity we will undermine their effectiveness. This is premised on understanding identity and its representation as either essential or strategic and equating the former with authenticity, the latter with sham. In contrast, Mouffe (1992, 1995), Harding (1998), Haraway (1991), and Fraser (1997) theorize identities as contingent and relational, discarding essentialisms both politically and analytically. Mouffe understands identities as partial fixations to "nodal points," one of which, we suggest, embodies environmental stewardship. A group's identity may be temporarily and partially fixed to this node within a particular context and a particular set of extragroup social relations. If we approach Green identities as shift-

ing, contingent, and relational, we can understand them as both strategic and authentic. The dichotomy between essential and strategic Green identity is false.

In addition, the concept of strategic identity bears closer examination. We argue that strategic Green claims arise from various and multiple sources. They may be principled, contingent, and/or instrumental, reflecting (1) Green values intrinsic to the group sense of identity or way of living (principled), (2) honestly held beliefs or interests that intersect with environmentalist agendas but are subject to change depending on context (contingent), and (3) coincidental or invented Green interests intended to maintain the group and its place in the world (instrumental). The source of identity claims does not, however, obviate the need for their careful analysis. Social scientists can help to clarify a given group's strategy and to predict its consequences for the group and others. For example, as Brosius notes, "blood-and-soil" arguments are especially vulnerable to the unmasking of some of the group as not "native," "naïve," or "natural" enough to justify absolutist claims. Claims need to be considered in less absolutist and more variable and ambiguous terms. Yet Lohmann (1998) notes that retreat to uncritical pluralism can be equally damaging. He warns of the creation of new publics through "stakeholder" analyses, participatory processes, and conflict resolution protocols that construct all "actors" and all stakes—from ancestral claims, cultural continuity, and local livelihoods to national security and corporate profits—as equal.

The question of whether to unmask or not vanishes, but important methodological issues of the social scientist's relation to the researched group remain. Feminist ethnographers grapple with many of these issues. For example, Ong (1996) and Spivak (1988) address the appropriateness and feasibility of subaltern identity and interest representation. Behar (1993) and Warren (1993) explore political and ethical dimensions of life histories and testimonials. Others discuss reconciling distinct professional, political, and personal ethical positions, confronting issues of trust and betrayal, and co-constructing knowledge (Visweswaran 1994, Nagar 1997, Tsing 1993).

We must also consider the self-positioning of the researcher. Policy analysis, among critical social scientists, is likely to be of one of three kinds. Applied research directly informs policy formulation by nation-states and international organizations. Many of us engage in this activity, often in a reformist capacity. The second, critical academic work on environment, culture, and social justice, aims to influence national or international policy indirectly or to hold policy-makers accountable for their actions' consequences. The third, rarely acknowledged as policy analysis, tries to inform the groups about which we write or to influence NGOs and social movements acting in solidarity with them. We seek to shape their strategies and actions—in a word, their policy. Often we are unclear about our self-positioning and potential conflicts between distinct policy perspectives. Roe (1994, 1998) uses applied narra-

tive analysis and complexity theory to trace a viable path between the theoretical domain of scholarship, the ethics of planning, the practical realm of applied work, and the political terrain of policy consequences. We also need to clarify what kind of policy analysis we propose to conduct, to determine for whom, with whom, and about whom we conduct such analysis, and to examine our reasons for doing so.

This brings us full circle to the question of identity, that of the researcher. We must consider who we are when we engage in research (despite Brosius's reticence on this point). We refer specifically to the way in which researchers and social movements position themselves relative to each other. Are we writing with, for, or about environmental social movements? On what basis do the movements participate in our analyses through their (non)cooperation with our efforts? What are the political affinities between us? We propose that we, as researchers, explicitly address the entanglement of our analyses and our politics and accept at least partial responsibility for our works' political and practical consequences. This carries with it a cost—the loss of the universal ethnographic mask. The consequence of such transparency is nothing less than the revelation of ourselves, our purposes, and our personal, professional, and political relationships to the place, people, and issues we address in our work. The major unmasking may be our own.

SUSAN C. STONICH

Department of Anthropology, Environmental Studies Program, University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif. 93106, U.S.A. (stonich@sscf.ucsb.edu). 29 x 98

Reading Brosius's timely and thoughtful article brought to mind an incident that occurred during a recent international meeting on conservation and development in which I participated. During the conference, a leader of a network of grassroots nongovernmental organizations from a nation-state in the South candidly revealed the political agenda underlying the coalition she represented. She explained that the network members identified themselves as "environmentalists" to obfuscate their true character as a resistance movement determined to raze the current regime and replace it with a form of governance that reflected their own values and visions of the future. She went on to state that if they openly proclaimed this agenda the government and its allies would squelch them immediately. Being identified nationally and internationally as "environmentalists" they had created a political space in which to mitigate the abuses of the state while also garnering essential support from Northern environmentalists and others. The leader's statements concretely demonstrated the potential for integrating environmental concerns into broader movements promoting livelihoods and social justice, linking local ecologies and transnational environmental agendas, and articulating civil society and global environmental governance. While mar-