

Cleveland State University
EngagedScholarship@CSU



Political Science Faculty Publications

Political Science Department

8-2005

Earthly Politics: Local and Global in Environmental Politics, edited by Sheila Jassanoff and Marybeth Long Martello

Neda A. Zawahri
Cleveland State University, n.zawahri@csuohio.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/clpolsci_facpub

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Publisher's Statement

Copyright 2005 Cambridge University Press. Available on publisher's site at

http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0022381600002784.

Original Citation

Zawahri, Neda A. 2005. "Earthly Politics: Local and Global in Environmental Politics, edited by Sheila Jassanoff and Marybeth Long Martello." *Journal of Politics* 67:941-943.

Repository Citation

Zawahri, Neda A., "Earthly Politics: Local and Global in Environmental Politics, edited by Sheila Jassanoff and Marybeth Long Martello" (2005).

Political Science Faculty Publications. 9.

https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/clpolsci_facpub/9

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Political Science Department at EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Political Science Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.

volume's contribution to the literature and to its relevance to those interested in environmental policy reform.

In summary, the editors of the volume set out to achieve an ambitious objective and succeed masterfully. Incorporating perspectives from a number of disciplines, and presenting a number of topics too often seen as competing, the volume offers a well-integrated collection of essays of interest to those concerned with environmental politics.

Debra Holzhauer, *Southeast Missouri State University*

Earthly Politics: Local and Global in Environmental Politics. Edited by Sheila Jassanoff and Marybeth Long Martello. (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2004. Pp. 376. \$27.00.)

The objective of this edited volume is to demonstrate the need for combining indigenous and scientific knowledge in order to improve our ability to manage global environmental problems. This combination is needed because indigenous and scientific perspectives so clearly diverge. Indigenous or local communities acquire their knowledge from hundreds of years of experience, trials, and errors. They are therefore bequeathed distinct and valuable perspectives upon global or regional problems such as deforestation, global warming, desertification, and evaluating the ecological impact of multipurpose dams. By contrast to indigenous communities, international environmental or developmental institutions acquire their knowledge from scientific or epistemic communities, which leads to a different understanding of the origin and solution to problems.

Coming from a constructivist perspective and a multidisciplinary approach—combining science and technology, anthropology, sociology, political ecology, and political science—the book's 12 empirical chapters are divided into three sections. The first section demonstrates how international institutions often ignore local knowledge. The second section brings into the argument the role of national actors—such as local scientists and environmental movements—to document the discrepancies they confront as they navigate between global and national politics. The last section covers cases in which local knowledge was mobilized in response to global environmental institutions.

The fusion of local and scientific knowledge is essential, according to the authors who write for this volume, because international institutions tend to not only ignore local knowledge but even to deny its existence. For example, Cathleen Fogel's chapter on the Kyoto Protocol demonstrates how Western scientists and policymakers assume that forests are not only uninhabited and empty spaces, but also malleable and capable of accommodating any policy prescriptions. This unawareness of local communities is unfortunate because as indigenous leaders have noted, "Our traditional knowledge on sustainable use, conservation and protection of our territories has allowed us to maintain our ecosystems in equilibrium" (117).

The authors collectively challenge the assumption that scientific knowledge is superior to local knowledge, because science is assumed to be objective, apolitical, and universal. The empirical chapters persuasively demonstrate that scientific knowledge is political, local, and biased, which diminishes its ability to respond effectively to global or regional environmental problems. Consider for example World Bank documents and reports, which provide the data for scholars throughout the world. Michael Goldman's chapter demonstrates that the consultants hired to prepare these reports and evaluate development projects are often selected to corroborate, instead of challenge, the Bank's existing policy.

The case studies also challenge the assumption that epistemic communities produce scientific solutions that are benign and effective in managing problems. Using the International Research Institute for Climate Prediction as an example, Clark Miller demonstrates that climate forecasting by these scientists—which was intended to improve states' response to droughts and floods in order to alleviate famine or hunger—actually had malignant consequences. These negative consequences arose because the scientists did not understand the cause of famine and hunger—which is not simply a byproduct of crop failures that result from floods and droughts. According to Miller, scientists also failed to appreciate the distributive consequences of their forecasts, which were used to favor one group and harm another. The authors, therefore, argue against privileging scientific studies over indigenous knowledge. Instead, they call for placing both local and scientific knowledge on equal footing.

To combine local and scientific knowledge, according to these authors, the design of international institutions needs to change in order to accommodate indigenous actors in the negotiation process. These institutions should also actively seek out and incorporate local communities by reaching into states in search of indigenous leaders. The only shortcoming of the foregoing argument, which can be remedied in future research, is that it does not address the conditions under which a state would permit an international institution to enter its sovereign territory and incorporate the knowledge of indigenous groups, especially when this knowledge contradicts the state's national interest.

Despite this shortcoming, the book remains valuable for several important reasons. First, it is rich in empirical data, which was collected from field research by several authors (Goldman, Lahsen, Forsyth, and Lachmund). Another author (Gupta) actually participated in the negotiations within environmental institutions. Second, the cases studied in the empirical chapters represent many different regions of the world. They come, for example, from Brazil, India, Thailand, Germany, United States, and Laos. The issues discussed also vary—they include deforestation, construction of multipurpose dams, global warming, biotechnology, and whaling. This depth and breadth is quite impressive.

Finally, the book is valuable because it points to an important and missing ingredient, the need to draw on indigenous knowledge and combine it with scientific knowledge. This combination will undoubtedly improve our ability to manage global environmental and developmental problems. As a result, the book will have a wide appeal among scholars—in international, environmental, and

developmental politics—and its empirical data will be of value for both undergraduate and graduate courses on environmental politics, international organizations, international relations, and developmental politics.

Neda A. Zawahri, *Cleveland State University*

Imprisoning America: The Social Effects of Mass Incarceration. Edited by Mary Pattillo, David Weiman and Bruce Western. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2004. Pp. 277. \$39.95.)

Over the past 30 years, incarceration rates in the United States have exploded. A growing body of literature details the impact of this change. *Imprisoning America* adds an important volume to that collection by drawing together a diverse set of essays that treat incarceration as a social institution that has an impact on stratification, family relations, the labor market and even electoral processes. The book succeeds in its goal of being “empirically based, interdisciplinary and multi-method” (11) and as such provides a series of provocative assessments of incarceration’s impact. Like many edited volumes, it covers a lot of ground and in doing so, it leaves the reader with as many questions as it answers. But the approach is novel and the research fresh, which should grab the attention of a variety of scholars interested in crime, communities, public policy, and fragile families.

The book is organized into two sections, families and communities (including two chapters on the impact of felony convictions on employment chances and voting rights), with an introductory chapter by Western, Pattillo, and Weiman and a concluding chapter by Jeremy Travis. Consistent with the book’s multimethod theme, the section on families has two large-N studies with statistical analysis, one medium-sized qualitative study using in-depth interviews, and one study that combines survey data with a smaller set of interviews. The chapters cover the impact of incarceration on bonds between parents and children, the potential for incarceration to serve as a desist point in the criminal careers of fathers, the challenges facing juvenile offenders who are fathers, and the risks to children of incarcerated parents. All the chapters are worthy of attention, though Western, Leonard M. Lopoo and Sara McLanahan do a particularly nice job of trying to isolate the effects of incarceration on cohabitation and marriage. “In the high-crime-low-marriage equilibrium,” they conclude, “incarceration poses a threat to public safety by undermining the crime-prevention effects of marriage” (42). Given sociological research on the positive effects of marriage on men, it is at least plausible that incarcerating men who do not pose a safety threat to their families or others, might reduce their chances of serving as productive fathers for their children and contributing members of their families.

Anne M. Nurse’s chapter on paroled juvenile offenders who are fathers also suggests that incarceration may have irreversible and damaging effects on the parent-child relationship. Nurse’s interviews reveal a complex web of relations that parolees must navigate in order to maintain contact with their children. The usual tensions between unmarried parents, grandparents, and new boyfriends are