

at the 2010 and 2011 International Conference on Urban Health.

PUKAR clearly produces important knowledge and research on people's lives and conditions in Mumbai while fulfilling its goal of democratizing and deparochializing the "right to research." At the heart of this project is the idea that "taking part in democratic society requires one to be informed" (Appadurai 2006), and to be informed requires the ability to conduct research. This, then, is fundamentally a project of empowerment: to empower people, and in particular youth, in Mumbai to research the conditions of their lives and the lives of those that they know.

As a research institution that aims to include both skilled and unskilled researchers, PUKAR seems to be effective. However, questions about exactly who the research benefits, what is done with it, and whether it changes the material conditions of people's lives seem less clear. In its self-description, PUKAR's website seems to explicitly avoid using language that frames it as having activist or social justice goals beyond shifting the terrain of who are considered legitimate "researchers."

Given its current successes, one wonders what PUKAR would look like if, in addition to its focus on individual empowerment, it were explicitly working with a social-justice movement in Mumbai or working to start one. To put this another way, How could the important work of empowering people to research their own lives around issues of health, gender, and their neighborhoods also serve to have a material impact on these very same people by building community power? Perhaps individual empowerment through research is only a starting point for the kinds of collective struggles necessary to fully realize Appadurai's goal of "the human right to research" (2006).

Manissa McCleave Maharawal *Department of Anthropology, CUNY Graduate Center, New York, NY 10016*

REFERENCE CITED

- Appadurai, Arjun
2006 The Right to Research. *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 4(2):167–177.

Living among "Things of Value": Stephan Schwartzman, Indigenous Restitution, and Forest (Carbon) Conservation

Sian Sullivan

To review the career of Stephan Schwartzman—anthropologist and current director of Tropical Forest Policy for the Environment Defense Fund (EDF; <http://www.edf.org/>)—is to step into the vortex of heated debates that have raged in conservation since the 1980s. From passionate affirmations of the ways in which forest dwellers can live relatively benignly in and with forests, to equally passionate advocacy for enrolling the "carbonated" and monetized "value" of tropical forests into controversial global carbon markets, Schwartzman has been close to the eye of the storm.

Schwartzman received his Ph.D. in anthropology from the University of Chicago in 1988 for work entitled *The Panará of the Xingú Indigenous Park: The Transformation of a Society*. His research involved the period's anthropological holy grail of learning to speak an unwritten indigenous language (namely, Panará–Southern Kayapo), and it documented the process whereby the Panará of northern Mato Grosso and southern Pará in the Brazilian Amazon reconstituted themselves as an independent and semiautonomous society after the trauma of contact. Diminished by incursions into and reductions of their territory, the pernicious effects of new disease epidemics, and conflict with Kayapo neighbors, a greatly reduced population of Panará had been relocated to Xingú Indigenous Park (Schwartzman 1998). During the

1980s, Schwartzman also represented Brazil's Institute for Socio-Economic Studies (INESC), served as coordinator of the U.S.–Brazil Tropical Forest Action Network, and consulted for the Anthropology Resource Center and other indigenous rights organizations.

Schwartzman joined the EDF in the mid-1980s to work for "environmental reform of multilateral development banks" (Schwartzman 1998:82). This campaign succeeded in strengthening the language in U.S. legislation toward curbing megadevelopment projects funded by the World Bank. He also played a key role in developing the concept of "extractive reserves" as conservation alternatives in the Brazilian Amazon, working with the Amazonian National Council of Rubber Tappers, and twice bringing the latter's iconic (and later murdered) leader, Chico Mendes, to the United States (Schwartzman 1989). In 1990, he was part of an American Anthropological Association's investigation to determine whether or not the Brazilian government's policies to develop the Brazilian Amazon were "genocidal" for indigenous peoples (Turner et al. 1990). The 1990s saw intensified work with the Panará and a coalition of NGOs as they mobilized to reoccupy their territories.

Throughout, Schwartzman has celebrated the positive roles of indigenous and traditional peoples in defending large areas of tropical forest from deforestation because of commercial interest. This position counters protagonists of "people-free parks," who, according to Schwartzman

and colleagues, frame “forest residents and other rural people as the enemies of nature” and significantly undermine conservation agendas by alienating an important environmental constituency (Schwartzman et al. 2000:1351–1352). Schwartzman instead emphasizes that forests (such as those in Brazilian indigenous and extractive reserves) are enriched by those who dwell in them, thus embodying both “tremendous conservation value” and “sustainable development” (e.g., Schwartzman et al. 2000:1352–1353, 1355; Schwartzman 2010:320). In doing so, Schwartzman affirms that control by forest-dwelling people is critical for the future conservation of the Amazon’s biomass and biodiversity and that social movements also assist conservation by mobilizing “forest-friendly,” small-scale farmers and indigenous peoples amid the complex, and sometimes violent, Amazon frontier (Schwartzman 1998, 2010:315; Schwartzman et al. 2010).

Key to Schwartzman’s advocacy is his understanding of Panará conceptions of “things of value” (Schwartzman 2010). A life lived well and beautifully is one located where there is a wealth of such things, being entities considered both useful and beautiful. For the Panará, the forest is such a thing, further categorized and graded into fine-tuned combinations of soil type, plants, animals, and spirits that denote historical circumstance, affirm Panará identity, and indicate appropriate work-ritual (the two being indistinguishable). In this schema, money, the conventional economic denoter of “value,” is not a thing of value. Indeed, it is a desire for money that produces the “ugly and reprehensible” landscapes of forests decimated by the production of the things associated with its accumulation, including timber, gold, beef, and electricity (from hydroelectric turbines at dams on the Xingú River; Schwartzman 2010:310). Schwartzman’s work on the part of varied forest dwellers, including indigenous Panará, rubber tappers, and traditional riverine smallholders, is redolent with appreciation of these alternative value priorities, and particularly of their positive implications for democratic sustenance of both ecological and cultural diversity.

At the same time, however, Schwartzman advocates market mechanisms for forest conservation (e.g., see Bellassen et al. 2008; Bonnie et al. 2000:1763; Nepstad et al. 2009:1350). In a telephone interview with me on May 16, 2012, he spoke of the need “for market prices to reflect the value of living forests” so as to deflect their conversion into products that currently command greater short-term profits through market exchange. This position echoes a revised emphasis for the EDF, which, since the 1980s, has put its weight behind market incentives and technoscience (incl. geoenvironment and nanotechnology) for the resolution of “ecochallenges.” For Schwartzman, it is in direct lineage with assertions by Chico Mendes in the 1980s that “rubber tappers should be compensated for their work to maintain globally valued forests in their extractive reserves.” It also reflects a current international position in the Kyoto Protocol of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate

Change (UNFCCC) that standing-forest biomass be counted as carbon units. In turn, priced units of carbon can enter the global carbon market and incentivize the maintenance of forest biomass (as saleable carbon). Such schemes form the basis of the UN REDD+ (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries) initiative to monetize the carbon stored in forests and create income streams for local people that are linked with this “value.”

This is a powerful and pragmatic response to the current “value invisibility” of living forests in a global capitalist economy that filters out the nonmarket values of living forests. But it also seems to be in tension with the different conceptions of “things of value” known and practiced by the forest peoples of Schwartzman’s anthropological work. Iterating the gestalt of Schwartzman’s career, this again crystallizes current controversy over conservation solutions that further enfold forests and forest peoples into the very system that has engendered their devaluing, displacement, and degradation. As such, it might be paradoxical to construct conserved forests as monetized products whose trade will hopefully incentivize their conservation in a context where the desire for money, as documented in Schwartzman’s ethnographic work with Panará, is considered instead to be the destroyer of (forest) value.

Controversies aside, Schwartzman’s integrity and persistence in service both to forests and to the subtle forest knowledge of Amazonian peoples is admirable and instructive. His work has contributed to a sea change in conservation thinking that is leading staunch opponents of the inclusion of social-science analysis in conservation projects to favor collaboration. Given his literacy with Panará conceptions of value, combined with an outward-looking pragmatism regarding the discourses and pressures of the time, it is to be hoped that he will long continue as a mediator in these varied understandings of forest significance. This work is itself a “thing of value,” constituting a trail-blazing example of public and engaged anthropology.

Sian Sullivan *Department of Geography, Environment and Development Studies, Birkbeck College, University of London, London WC1H 9EZ, U.K.*

REFERENCES CITED

- Bellassen, Vanessa, Renaud Crassous, Laura Dietzsch, and Stephan Schwartzman
2008 Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation: What Contribution from Carbon Markets? Climate Report 14. http://www.cdclimat.com/IMG/pdf/14_Etude_Climat_EN_Deforestation_and_carbon_markets.pdf, accessed May 8, 2012.
- Bonnie, Robert, Stephan Schwartzman, Michael Oppenheimer, and Janine Bloomfield
2000 Counting the Cost of Deforestation. *Science* 288(5472): 1763–1764.

- Nepstad, Daniel, et al. (incl. Stephan Schwartzman)
2009 The End of Deforestation in the Amazon. *Science* 326:1350–1351.
- Schwartzman, Stephan
1989 Extractive Reserves: The Rubber Tapper's Strategy for Sustainable Use of the Amazon Rain Forest. *In* *Fragile Lands in Latin America: Strategies for Sustainable Development*. J. Browder, ed. Pp. 150–155. Boulder: Westview Press.
- 1998 The Panará: Indigenous Territory and Environmental Protection in the Amazon. *Yale F&ES Bulletin* 98:66–85. <http://environment.research.yale.edu/documents/downloads/0–9/98schwartzman.pdf>, accessed May 8, 2012.
- 2010a Nature and Culture in Central Brazil: Panará Natural Resource Concepts and Tropical Forest Conservation. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry* 29(2):302–327.
- Schwartzman, Stephan, Adriana Moreira, and Daniel Nepstad
2000 Rethinking Tropical Forest Conservation: Perils in Parks. *Conservation Biology* 14(5):1351–1357.
- Schwartzman, Stephan, Ane Alencar, Hilary Zarin, and Ana Paula Santos
2010 Social Movements and Large-Scale Tropical Forest Protection on the Amazon Frontier: Conservation from Chaos. *The Journal of Environment and Development* 19:274–299.
- Turner, Terence, Bruce Albert, Jason Clay, Alcida Ramos, Stephan Schwartzman, Anthony Seeger, Claudia Andujar, Manuela Carneiro da Cunha, and Davi Kopenawa
1990 Report of the Special Commission to Investigate the Situation of the Brazilian Yanomami. <http://www.aaanet.org/committees/cfhr/rptyano2.htm>, accessed May 10, 2012.