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Daniel Renfrew's Life Without Lead: Contamination, Crisis, and Hope in Uruguay (2018) is a masterful undertaking on the anthropology of disaster and its everydayness. An ethnographic portrayal that is prismatic in its attention, the book combines numerous elements--place, civic performance, history, political economy--to bear on the lead poisoning epidemic in Montevideo, Uruguay at the turn of the 21st century. The epidemic disproportionately affected
certain populations in Montevideo; namely, its socioeconomically poor neighborhoods, such as La Teja. By illustrating how place-based grassroots organization turn a hidden epidemic into the undeniably disastrous *Life Without Lead* captures the “interplay between the ordinary and the catastrophic, the normal and the critical (Das 2015: 26). For me the book raises a number of questions: How might we gain purchase on such interplays in context? How exactly do ordinary happenings turn into an event? At what point does an instant, an incident, morph into the crystallization of ensuing crisis? Focusing on community organization in *el barrio* of La Teja in Montevideo, Renfrew demonstrates the kind of assemblage-work that brings structurally produced myopias into full view.

Early on, we learn about Joaquín, an afflicted six-year-old who is now “the shadow of the formerly vibrant and playful kid from La Teja.” (1). After numerous hospital visits and screenings, Joaquín becomes the singular case, the “incident” that opens up inquiries into the conditions of the community, and, in turn, into lead poisoning as an event. Lead poisoning is mysterious—a slow violence that, like other chronic illnesses becomes an affliction of time. To make matters worse, the causes and pathways of lead poisoning are “multiple and cumulative” (3); an epistemological murk hovers over the scaffolding of stable facts while time goes to work. Meanwhile, the state and public health officials downplayed the critical nature of the lead poisoning crisis, by manipulating standards of toxicity as well as apportioning blame through culturalist tropes of lack of hygiene among the ‘urban poor.’ At the hands of the state, science then became mastery-through-trickery and as a result, community-based experts challenged public health official’s denials of the crisis through their own assertions of counter-expertise.

The body’s own opacity and its deferred symptoms often complicate how stakes on the disaster can be claimed (Fortun 2009; Petryna 2013), as “we may be sick without knowing why, or in what way or how seriously. We may be sick, even, without a sense of sickness.” (Kuriyama 2002: 17). Then, suddenly, symptoms are made legible—cognitive and learning disabilities in the barrio’s children are foregrounded as symptomatic of latent epidemics slowly turning in the soil, air, and water. Environmental violence, or crisis more broadly, works at the interplay between “the thick intensity of emergency and the deceptively natural flow of the everyday” (Meyers 2016: 357). It is then precisely this deceptive nature of time, of pathological life, that turns the disaster into “slow death” for La Teja’s inhabitants (Berlant 2011: 95).

Yet, even as the disaster shakes up of the temporal and social order, it can also paradoxically grant possibilities for world-making, for crafting features of the self, the social, and the political/personal nexus anew (Lovell 2013). *Life Without Lead* contributes enormously to our
understanding of the generative features of the disaster, what Renfrew speaks to as the “enabling” domains of *la crisis* (11). Environmental justice in Montevideo became the platform that sparked an array of demands on the conditions of life more broadly, and the impossibilities to sustain it for many. The disaster re-awakened and mobilized cultivated skills lying dormant from the dictatorship era (1973-1985), and provided the momentum and the vitality for charting out new horizons of political possibility.

This book forum welcomes four scholars that focus on environmental violence, lead poisoning, or Uruguay to think with *Life Without Lead* and its many offerings.
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Daniel Renfrew’s *Life Without Lead* is an exhaustively researched, imaginatively conceived, and empathetically written ethnographic study of lead poisoning and environmental justice activism in Montevideo, Uruguay. Renfrew argues that “lead poisoning took on the status of a publicly conscious, media-propelled event by linking up with larger stories affecting Uruguay and in this sense acted as a ‘prism’ and ‘social surrogate’ for broader social and political concerns” (4). The book’s six chapters substantiate this argument well. As Renfrew shows, the politics of lead poisoning in late 20th and early 21st-century Uruguay were never just about environmental health. They were inextricably linked to broader social struggles over neoliberalism, democracy in the aftermath of dictatorship, urban poverty, and the authority and legitimacy of scientific knowledge. There is insufficient space here to do full justice to the book’s complex arguments and richly detailed narrative. Instead, I will only focus on a few major aspects of *Life Without Lead*: anti-lead campaigns, red-green alliances, the politics of “conflicted place attachment,” and “spectral science.”

The heart of the book is a detailed study of Uruguay’s anti-lead movement, led by the Comisión Vivir sin Plomo (CVSP). Building on a historical analysis of 20th-century Uruguay’s “foundational myths,” Renfrew shows how the CVSP infused its anti-lead campaign with the discourse of Uruguayan exceptionalism. The cover of the book, based on a CVSP poster depicting lead figurines dressed as Uruguay’s national soccer team (alluding both to a 1950 World Cup victory over Brazil and to a lead poisoning epidemic associated with national decline and crisis), underscores the complexity of lead poisoning’s discursive resonance.

Renfrew also makes important connections between political economy and environmental politics. His account of the shift from Import-Substitution Industrialization to neoliberalism, and the relationship between FANCAP (the union representing state oil refinery workers) and the anti-lead movement is appropriately nuanced. The efforts by Julio López and other FANCAP officials to simultaneously protect jobs, prevent the privatization of the La Teja refinery, and build bridges with the anti-lead movement echo similar attempts to build “blue-green alliances” in Brazil, Italy, South Africa, South Korea, the U.S., and other countries (Räthzel and Uzell 2012, Barca 2014).
The most poignant sections of *Life Without Lead* describe the struggles of parents of lead-poisoned children, like Lucía and Victor in the Rodolfo Rincón squatter settlement. Renfrew’s sensitive but unsentimental descriptions of these families and their day-to-day challenges powerfully demonstrate the value of ethnographic research for environmental justice studies. His account of “conflicted place attachment” and the politics of relocation echoes similar case studies of toxic “fenceline” communities across the Global South and the Global North (Fortun 2001, Auyero and Swistun 2009, Perales 2010, Little 2014, Spears 2014, Voyles 2015, van Horssen 2016, Lora-Wainwright 2017, Hoover 2017, Pauli 2019). While the bulk of this literature has focused on the Global North (especially the United States), *Life Without Lead* adds to a small but growing literature by scholars such as Kim Fortun, Javier Auyero, and Anna Lora-Wainwright that begins to redress this imbalance. The book also makes an original analytical contribution by linking the granular empirical details of toxic contamination to the politics of national identity and histories of working-class struggle.

In Chapter 6, Renfrew introduces the concept of “spectral science,” which he defines as “science that has become spatially and temporally unmoored, disembodied from its source, fetishized, and translated selectively to fit locally disputed contexts” (189). As Renfrew makes clear, the international science of lead toxicology and epidemiology (including protocols from the World Health Organization and the U.S. Centers for Disease Control) played an ambiguous role in Uruguayan environmental politics. State actors selectively appropriated some aspects of international science, while ignoring a great deal of inconvenient evidence to minimize financial responsibility and legal liability for contamination. This enabled them to rationalize extremely high lead poisoning thresholds, concealing the reality of widespread contamination and confining the problem to the most contaminated squatter settlements (where they could blame it on the poor themselves). Dr. Elena Queirolo’s use of international scientific evidence to argue for lower thresholds, which Renfrew describes in Chapter 6, is a fascinating case study in the contestation of scientific knowledge. Dr. Queirolo’s battle with hospital and state bureaucracies is an apt illustration of the book’s central argument, as she explicitly connected Montevideo’s lead poisoning epidemic to the fate of the nation (212-213).

*Life Without Lead* should inspire further research on the discursive framing of environmental health disasters, the complexities of red-green alliances, conflicted place attachment, and the politics of knowledge production in environmental health science. While *Life Without Lead* makes many novel contributions to environmental justice studies, they are sometimes implicit rather than explicit in the narrative. In a footnote, the author observes that Auyero and Swistun’s *Flammable: Environmental Suffering in an Argentine Shantytown* (2009) is the only other “book-length social-scientific analysis of lead poisoning in a developing world context”
In addition to shifting focus from North to South, what new areas of inquiry should *Life Without Lead* inspire? This is less a criticism than an invitation for the author to elaborate further on the book’s contribution to environmental justice studies.

As a historian who has researched the politics of lead poisoning and urban environmental justice activism in Detroit, Michigan, I found many fascinating parallels to (and contrasts with) the North American context in this study of Montevideo. But this book also demonstrates the significance of local particularities (like *murga* culture) that global abstractions and generalizations cannot fully capture. This is why local studies based on painstaking archival and ethnographic research remain invaluable. Renfrew has succeeded in producing something much more than spectral social science: he has brought his subject to life.
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We All Have a Little Bit of Lead

ELIZABETH F.S. ROBERTS

University of Michigan

In Daniel Renfrew’s new book Life Without Lead, the statement “we all have a little lead” was deployed in millennial Uruguay to radically different effect. It was used by public health officials to quell parents’ anger and simmering political volatility in the face of widespread childhood lead contamination in many of Montevideo’s poorest neighborhoods. These officials diminished the children’s blood lead levels by saying “We all probably have a little bit of lead in us” (Renfrew 2018, 187). This rhetorical leveling device seems deeply connected to the fact that, until 2012, Uruguay’s definition of high blood lead was double international standards. Officially then, most of these children were fine. Simultaneously, activists and concerned doctors made a counterclaim using a similar statement: “We are all at risk for lead, only some populations experience more elevated risk” (Renfrew 2018, 210). This rhetoric marked difference instead of masking it.

In its first usage, “We all have a little bit of lead,” keeps the status quo intact by making us all the same. This leveling device reminded me of when Mexican officials give speeches about Mexico’s main known lead exposure pathway – lead glazed ceramic dishes (barro vidriado)---and joke about how much smarter they would now be if they had not eaten off these dishes throughout their childhood. These jokes mask difference, while also humble bragging. “Look at me! I ate off those dishes. I, too, had a little bit of lead and I’m still smart enough for this job”. It’s as if these dishes exist in a vacuum and everyone has the same life chances.

My long-term collaborators in Mexico City, both environmental health scientists and working-class people, have taught me though, that marking difference matters (Roberts 2017a; Roberts and Sanz 2017). Different conditions make for different effects. The working-class people I spend time with in Mexico City who use, or used to use, or secretly still use these dishes, note these different conditions. Their grandparents ate off these dishes all the time and were whip-smart and lived forever. But times and places have changed. The world was less contaminated then. Now with pesticides, air pollution, and increased chemical dumping these dishes can harm. This understanding is similar to the move in environmental health and toxicology towards focusing on non-linear exposure assessment where the interaction effects of “metal mixtures” is greater than the sum of each toxic part (Sánchez et al. 2012; Teushchler et al.)
2002). It’s similar to our deepening knowledge of how living in poverty exacerbates exposure to toxic chemicals through the cumulative effects of toxic layering (Agard-Jones In Press; Fortun 2001; Goldstein 2017; Roberts 2017b). There is no even playing field.

Mexican state institutions got the lead out of petroleum earlier than Uruguay (1997 vs 2004) but can’t seem to find the will to extirpate lead glazed ceramic dishes. It seems the relations are too complicated, the stakes not high enough. Petroleum permeated everyone with a “little bit of lead,” but the dishes don’t. It’s working-class and poor people who use them the most. I’ve spent the last few years tracing the relations that hold these dishes in place in working-class Mexican worlds. As I try to grasp their importance among the families who use them, I find myself sometimes wondering if maybe, a little bit of lead is not so bad. After all, the lead in these dishes literally makes food sweeter, intensified by the sweetness of family celebrations that include long-lived grandparents. What’s a little lead? But then I remind myself that that kind of leveling is fraught with peril. Even the families most attached to the dishes, as well as the Uruguayan activists described so vividly by Daniel Renfrew, know that the We... of, “We all have a little bit of lead in us” are not the same. Toxic burdens have never been equally shared.
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How do people routinely exposed to past and present hazards created by facilities such as an oil refinery, a fracking site, an incinerator, or a smelting plant, think and feel about the risks posed to their surroundings and their health? A now more than two decades-long “relational turn” in the social sciences has taught us that the true source of shared understandings—subjective, yes, but rarely individual—lies in the relationships between agents. Perceptions of toxic risk are not different, as Daniel Renfrew masterfully shows in this detailed and engaging ethnography—history of lead contamination in Uruguay; they are not locked inside individuals’ minds but located in specific social, political, and cultural universes.

In his dissection of the “the profound devastation wrought and illuminated by the crisis of lead contamination,” (114) Renfrew tells a story that is uniquely Uruguayan (in that the author goes deep into the country’s cultural and political specificities) but also, and herein lies in my view, the book’s greatest strength, almost universal in its analytic and theoretical intervention. The book documents the suffering of low-income communities exposed to lead contamination and their individual and collective efforts to “endure and thrive” (215). In the study of environmental suffering, documentation is still imperative—Renfrew does this very well. But so are analysis and critique—and here, he excels. Renfrew mobilizes a wide range of perspectives (mainly from sociology and anthropology but also from other fields) to understand and explain not only the reasons why folks think and feel about widespread contamination the way they do, but also their actions to contest what dominant discourse (by officials, scientists, and doctors) sometimes minimizes and other times denies. His particular attention to the diverse forms of grassroots mobilization—and the hopes they convey—provides a glimmer of hope in an otherwise quite gloomy reality.

_Life without Lead_ shows and tells readers the story of contamination and mobilization. If we are to truly comprehend the experience of pollution, the book reveals, we need to pay close and simultaneous attention to history, to daily life, to dominant discourse and practice, and to individual and collective actions. Along the way, Renfrew demonstrates that shared experiences of pollution are not only ways of viewing the surrounding world but also, and as importantly, ways of acting in it. And without pontificating the value of ethnography, Renfrew proves that in order to reconstruct and analyze the views, sentiments, and practices of those
living and suffering in contaminated communities, embedded participant-observation that is sensitive to local history still is (with the mandatory reflexivity) a useful tool and perspective to both understand and intervene in the world. Ethnography is also a way, our way, of expressing recognition of (and solidarity with) those who are, as the main protagonists of this book certainly are, enduring (suffering and fighting) the devastations produced by unequal socio-political orders.

*Javier Auyero* is professor of sociology at the University of Texas-Austin where he directs the Urban Ethnography Lab. Together with Katherine Sobering, he recently published *The Ambivalent State: Police-Criminal Collusion at the Urban Margins* (Oxford Press 2019).
The case of the lead epidemic in La Teja, a working-class neighborhood, and surrounding areas of Montevideo in the early 2000s, was one of the first warning calls that alerted Uruguayan society about the externalities of a socio-economic model based on the exploitation of people and nature. What made it possible for this case to become emblematic and allow this level of social and environmental awareness? This is the question that Daniel Renfrew’s book *Life Without Lead* tries to answer.

*Life Without Lead* shows us how through the social organization of neighbors an awareness of socioenvironmental impacts emerged in Uruguay. Renfrew follows the trail of toxic lead to document the difficulties and creativity of people constructing an environmental justice movement. The Comisión Vivir sin Plomo (Living Without Lead Committee) was created by neighbors demanding action, and accountability allowed the situation to become visible to the general public and produced responses on the part of the government. The social organization’s struggle and plan of action revealed the lack of inspection, regulation, or prevention by industries and businesses while detailing the environmental and human health impacts. The book also shows the limits governmental interventions have at the level of policy and legislation because their effects are dedicated to mitigating contamination as much as to hiding institutional responsibilities.

Renfrew’s ethnography focuses on the dynamics and disputes of socio-environmental conflicts at the epistemological and symbolic level. During that period in the public sphere, and at the institutional level, the lead crisis was framed as a consequence of poverty and attributed to the cultural characteristics of the poor. But social organizations foregrounded issues pertaining to the environmental crisis as created by a neoliberal economic model. Renfrew unveils how the social movement work focused on making sense of the experience through an environmental justice perspective. The construction of this new narrative highlights the responsibilities of industries and the state in the contamination of the people’s living spaces, thus revealing how the community’s health was affected by this. The social movement started by neighbors morphed into an eclectic group that included doctors, journalists, and intellectuals who helped
to question the established understanding of the lead crisis and frame it as an epidemic that affected the whole city, not only particular neighborhoods. A combination of citizen science and socially committed professional practice produced new knowledge about the phenomenon and a new way of understanding what was happening.

The role of the researcher and the ethnography is also part of this reflexive process that had epistemological and symbolic effects in the community. The outsider perspective of the researcher served to inform the movements’ representations of the socio-environmental issue and gave legitimacy to the neighbors’ interpretations by supporting them with international data and other authorized voices. This enabled the group to use international regulations and experiences as comparison and contrast in terms of what level of lead to consider acceptable in children. Renfrew’s approach to ethnography from a political ecology perspective transforms the construction of knowledge into a political act. How does the researcher-activist stance affect the understanding and unfolding of environmental conflicts? What are the advantages and problems of this stance?

This book makes an important contribution to the history of the environmental movement in Uruguay and also documents the social strategies that have been successful in making visible socio-environmental violence. There are today other “sleeping” environmental problems in Uruguay, which are invisible in the public sphere (i.e. residue disposal “megabasureros,” the monoculture industrial agriculture and tree plantation models based on the use of toxic fertilizers and pesticides). How can this type of engaged and committed ethnography help inform the environmental social movement’s struggles today?

Mariana Achugar, PhD (UC, Davis 2002), is an associate professor in the Universidad de la República in Uruguay. Her work focuses on understanding cultural reproduction and change from a critical discourse analysis and linguistic anthropology perspective. She is an active militant in environmental groups in Uruguay.
Response to comments on *Life without Lead*

DANIEL RENFREW
West Virginia University

It is both a vexing challenge and a special privilege to write and publish a book. To have first-rate scholars and scholar-activists carefully read, digest, and reflect upon it makes me humbled and deeply grateful. So my first comment is one of gratitude to my four colleagues who took the time and effort to engage so thoughtfully and generously with my book. I offer a special thanks to Andrés Romero, my dear former student and eminently creative, first-rate scholar himself, for the invitation to engage with me and us in this forum.

The rest of my commentary is focused on Josiah Rector’s invitation to think more explicitly and deeply about what I see as my book’s contributions to environmental justice (EJ) scholarship, coupled with Mariana Achugar’s questions on the politics, potentials and pitfalls of scholarship-activism. On a first level, as Rector notes, my book contributes a case study of environmental justice in the urban global South, still a perplexingly neglected arena of English language scholarship. A perhaps counterintuitive angle that I highlight in the book is the Uruguayan case’s frustrating redundancy, so to speak, in relation to the global history of lead. Rector identifies parallels with Detroit, Roberts with Mexico City, Auyero with Buenos Aires. The sources and pathways of exposure, including paints, plumbing and industrial emissions in Detroit, lead-glazed cookware in Mexico, petrochemical pollution in Buenos Aires, are all layered on top of other formal and informal, legacy and emergent industrial sources, hazardous dumping in myriad forms, and the toxic blanketing of leaded gasoline combustion. Industry, infrastructure, consumption, and waste: the toxic trail of lead, “mother of all industrial poisons” (Markowitz and Rosner 2002), rings and engulfs us all.

In the United States, recent developments in Flint, Michigan and Newark, New Jersey remind us of lead’s stubborn and criminal redundancy as a toxic pollutant. Children are particularly vulnerable, and the poor (oftentimes of color) find themselves in greater harm’s way, with heightened difficulty in combating and mitigating the effects of toxic exposure. So people (sometimes) mobilize, forging alliances with outside groups and experts, waging struggle on discursive, symbolic, medical and institutional-political grounds. This is the universal story of lead as an environmental justice issue across the global North and South. The Uruguayan case
demonstrates the need to think through particular environmental justice cases globally and historically, and in the analytical terms of connection rather than difference.

But of course the specificities also matter. In the face of most environmental health crises like lead poisoning, people do not systematically and collectively rise up. They may remain oblivious to the sources of their suffering. Perhaps medical professionals do not run the appropriate tests, or public health officials and environmental regulators do not make recognition and mitigation of environmental contamination a priority. Or people do not collectively organize because “getting by” and enduring “structural ferocity” (Wilkinson and Kleinman 2016) is hard enough. Or maybe they cannot find meaningful political allies and advocates. The “slow violence” (Nixon 2011) of environmental suffering then becomes routinized and normalized, another hardship and consequence of being poor. Collective movements towards environmental justice are the exception rather than the rule. As scholars and activists it is essential then to try to understand the processes, mechanisms and conditions by which routinized toxic contamination is made publicly visible, turned into a collective “toxic event.”

In my book, I highlight an urban working-class vision of environmental justice led by squatters, working-class people, and old anarchists and labor organizers united with journalists, doctors, scientists, and other professionals. As the legacies of civil rights activism fueled African American and Latino involvement in the U.S. EJ movement, I argue that radical labor struggles and the anti-dictatorship resistance movement served as the foundational legacies of Uruguay’s nascent EJ movement. In the industrial working class neighborhood of La Teja, long a radical stronghold and mirror to Montevideo’s dominant middle class ethos of measured compromise, radical politics mixed with community-building in athletic and social clubs, soup kitchens, grassroots community media centers, and the rich traditions of Carnival. I use the Carnival genre of murgaas a prefigurative model and poetic surrogate for the political, symbolic and performative dimensions of environmental justice struggle in La Teja. Lead poisoning became a toxic event, I argue, because activists were able to tap into the already-existing dense networks of social and political organization in La Teja, and because of the ways it linked up symbolically and metaphorically with fundamental social, economic and political issues confronting Uruguayan society at the turn of the millennium.

As other scholars of environmental justice have argued, these movements serve as a means and a platform from which to stake broader moral claims about the world. More than just reacting against toxic exposures, they can be movements of possibility. As an ethnographer of environmental justice struggle, I see my role as an echoer and ally of this movement.
Approaching environmental justice research as a form of accompaniment is both a political choice and a methodological strategy. As I highlight in the book, my access “to” the CVSP activists was conditioned by my participation “with” the movement. Acting as a scholar-activist opened doors that would have otherwise remained impenetrable. It may also have closed other doors, but ultimately it was the ethical choice I found both necessary and urgent.

As EJ movements powerfully and morally frame the environment in relation to life, labor, place, and home, they should be recognized as an effective and prefigurative political model for how to recognize and combat all kinds of other social problems, including the “sleeping” environmental issues highlighted by Achugar in Uruguay. I see environmental justice as a broadly “undisciplined” arena of political strategy and academic scholarship. It breaks down disciplinary confines and the conventional borders between scholarship and activism, global and local, North and South, body and environment, history and present. An undisciplined environmental justice activism pushes the need for an open, holistic, creative, and undisciplined approach to EJ scholarship as well.[i] The first intention of my ethnography was to grasp the richness and depth of local worlds. But I also wanted to show how local dialects of environmental justice struggle resonate with a more universal language that moves back and forth from slow violence and structural ferocity, to cultural creativity, resilience, and hope.
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Note

[1]See the recent declaration from the Undisciplined Environments political ecology collective for a similar argument: http://undisciplinedenvironments.org/2019/10/01/undisciplining-political-ecology-a-minifesto/. I also take inspiration from John Comaroff’s call (2010, 532) to embrace anthropology as an “immanently undisciplined discipline... an indiscipline whose conceptual foundations and techniques of knowledge production have almost infinite potential to open up new horizons.”