

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

JR Romero (Referee)

janine.romero_valenzuela@uni-erfurt.de

Received and published: 31 July 2015

The article is convincing, clearly structured and well written. It provides an interesting take on the water dimension of the Israel-Palestine conflict by comparing water discourse both on the national and local level. It can thereby contribute as a case study to constructivist research and support the theoretical environmental peace and conflict discussions.

I do not have any substantial criticism on your already very far developed paper. What I however noted in your analysis section was that you did not quantify the weight of your outlined three dimensions of the water discourse. What is most important for the

C453

people you interviewed? Which aspects were mentioned more frequently? Particularly to the “developed-underdeveloped” discourse, was this present in all or most of your interviews or did it enter only occasionally? Moreover, certain aspects of your paper need more explication, which could potentially be given through footnotes. I agree with the first referee that the methodological section is in need of more specification since the concepts referred to are not always familiar to the reader. You also fail to outline sufficiently why the methods chosen fit your case better than others would. The quotations you included from your interviews demonstrate that they were conducted in English, which is not the native language of your interview partners. Though this is comprehensible from the point of effort and cost, an analysis of discourse that is not held in the mother tongue could be methodologically challenged on this account. I would thus recommend to explain your position on this issue in a footnote. I also suggest to extend your concluding section. You have provided a very valuable analysis of discourse and a better comprehension of this dimension can support peace-building initiatives. I would thus urge you not to give away the opportunity to formulate policy recommendations to open your paper to a larger readership.

Concretely I have the following remarks: *Page 1003: “We are optimistic that our findings on the relevance of discourses for socio-environmental conflict and cooperation are valid in other contexts (. . .)” Your optimism is not sufficiently underpinned by fact. You should provide more substantial arguments for why you believe your findings are transferable to other regions. *Page 1013: You repeatedly refer to the myth of the fellah (which I would put in italics). You only briefly introduce this myth on page 1013. Yet, for readers that do not engage regularly with the region, the story is not known and should be more substantially explained since it is important to your analysis. *Page 1020: While all your interviews are cited with a concrete location, the interview location on page 1020 is only specified as “Israel”.

All in all this is a very good paper that I enjoyed to read and that with some minor corrections is ready for publication.

C454

C455