

Interactive comment on “Socio-environmental cooperation and conflict? A discursive understanding and its application to the case of Israel/Palestine” by T. Ide and C. Fröhlich

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 30 June 2015

The article is well written and provides for new avenues of thinking about environmental conflict and peacebuilding opportunities. It links these often separate debates on these topics in a very productive way.

The methodological part would benefit from more details on the approaches, not every reader is familiar with the terms/methods mentioned.

The choice of the level of analysis is not always clear: national discourses are compared to the discourses in a transnational but finally communal project; would the results have been different for a comparison between the FOEME initiative and two local level assessments, i.e. in communities on both sides that are not involved in the

C402

FOEME project? In both cases, discourses are crucial for the understanding of the conflict but the different orientation of the discourses is a striking case in point and it is not so clear which role the level of analysis may play in this context. A national discourse may always be different from a local one. Please explain how far this is the case or why not and why the comparison then makes sense.

In the conclusion, it would be interesting to link the findings to the debates on peacebuilding: how far can a change in discourse help designing and implementing peacebuilding activities, is this more relevant/realistic at local than at national levels etc. The question of the relevance of these findings for other world regions, as mentioned in the conclusion, would also benefit from a clearer statement on the level of analysis and actors concerned. The citation on pastoralist conflict seems to refer to the local level and the mobilisation of group identities at this level, but the citation right after this points to national level policies.

Overall a very good article that need minor revisions with respect to the methodological introduction and the level of analysis (stronger argument for the choice of these levels; explicit reference to this in the conclusion).

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., 6, 1001, 2015.

C403