
Bibliography

“Hydro-hegemony”

Introduction

Following is a selection of major peer-reviewed contributions dealing with water governance issues. It gives a specific insight into the concept of hydro-hegemony. A brief comment introduces each reference to facilitate users' reading.

This selection is about the concept of hydro-hegemony developed in 2006 by Mark Zeitoun and Jeroen Warner. It is defined by **basin scale hegemony or control over transboundary waters, consolidated by one actor**.

The London Water Research Group has developed and put into practice this concept. This group gathers water professionals and scholars to facilitate the analysis of transboundary water management, policy and politics. We present here the main publications on hydro-hegemony from this group.

Cascão, A. E. 2009. Changing power relations in the Nile River Basin: Unilateralism vs. cooperation? *Water Alternatives*, 2(2), 245-268.

This article identifies how economic and political changes in the upstream states could affect Egyptian hydro-hegemony. It also sheds light on how these new dynamics might affect the ongoing regional cooperation. In the end, Cascão argues that over the last decade, as it might be possible in a near future, unilateralist and multilateral hydropolitical trends have co-existed in the basin.

Cascão, A. E. and Zeitoun, M. 2010. Power, hegemony and critical hydropolitics. In A. Earle, A. Jägerskog, & J. Ojendal (Eds.), *Transboundary water management: Principles and practice*. London: Earthscan, 27-42.

This book chapter attends to dress for the first time a critical hydropolitical theory for transboundary water management. It focuses on the role of power and hegemony and stands on critical debates with academics and practitioners of the field. The testing of the theory shows that conflict and cooperation co-exist and that not all forms of cooperation is good for all the parties. It also allows deepening the theory of hydro-hegemony.

Conker, A. 2014. An enhanced notion of power for inter-state and transnational hydropolitics: an analysis of Turkish-Syrian water relations and the Ilisu Dam conflict between the opponents and proponents of the Dam (Doctoral dissertation, University of East Anglia).

This study analyses Turkey's relations with states and non-state actors on transboundary water issues from Turkey's independence to 2011. It offers a theoretical framework that integrates the role of non-state actors enrolled in hydropolitical processes. Analysing the anti Ilisu dam activist networks, this study shows the relevance of including non-state actors in the analysis and draws the conclusion that such actors are able to use discursive power to meet their interests.

For more information, please contact

M. Stéphane Kluser, Geneva Water Hub

research@genevawaterhub.org



**UNIVERSITÉ
DE GENÈVE**

Daoudy, M. 2009. Asymmetric power: Negotiating water in the Euphrates and Tigris. *International Negotiation*, 14(2), 361-391.

This study analyses the role of power in upstream and downstream negotiations over the Euphrates and Tigris River Basins. It offers a framework for the analysis with traditional elements of power but it also integrates elements of bargaining power that favour downstream or more vulnerable riparian states. This study concludes that power asymmetries do not necessarily determine the issues of the negotiations.

Dinar, S. 2009. Power asymmetry and negotiations in international river basins. *International Negotiation*, 14(2), 329-360.

This article explores the role of power asymmetry between riparian states for negotiations and conflict resolution over shared water resources. By reviewing several international water agreements, this article argues that the realistic conception of power and hydro-hegemony is limited to explain cooperation among riparian states. This article rather demonstrates that weaker states may influence the hydro-political context and transboundary water agreements.

Kehl, J. R. 2011. *Hydropolitical Complexes and Asymmetrical Power: Conflict, Cooperation, and Governance of International River Systems*. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 17(1), 218-235.

This study examines the strategies weaker riparian states use in river basins with asymmetrical power and their success to achieve cooperation. Grounded in the theoretical framework of hydro-hegemony, this study demonstrates that weaker riparian states have recourse to external actors to increase their leverage. This study concludes that strategies to balance hard power are ineffective and rather exacerbate conflict. Strategies to balance economic and soft power are more effective in promoting cooperation among the riparian states.

Trottier, J. 2003. *Water Wars: The Rise of a Hegemonic Concept. Exploring the Making of the Water*.

This article investigates how the concept of water wars became a hegemonic concept over the last twenty years. Analysing how this concept has become predominant in the literature about hydro-politics in the Middle East, this article illustrates the mechanisms whereby water wars have been constructed and propagated in Israel and in the Palestinian Territories as a case study.

Sojamo, S., Keulertz, M., Warner, J. and Allan, J. A. 2012. *Virtual water hegemony: The role of agribusiness in global water governance*. *Water international*, 37(2), 169-182.

This paper tends to connect the Framework of Hydro-hegemony (Zeitoun & Warner, 2006) with virtual water concepts to illustrate the "virtual hegemony" of the Western agribusiness players over the virtual water embedded in international agro-food commodities in emerging Asian and African economies.

Warner, J. 2008. *Contested hydro-hegemony: Hydraulic control and security in Turkey*. *Water Alternatives*, 1(2), 271-288.

This article seeks to illustrate the emerging concept of hydro-hegemony with the examples of Turkey's strategy to control the Euphrates-Tigris River Basins. This article presents hydro-hegemony as a layered multi-level phenomenon – from global

For more information, please contact

M. Stéphane Kluser, Geneva Water Hub

research@genevawaterhub.org

hegemony to state-society relations – and shows that Turkey’s basin and regional hegemony is contested and constrained from different sides.

Warner, J., and Zawahri, N. 2012. Hegemony and asymmetry: multiple-chessboard games on transboundary rivers. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, 1-15.

Warner and Zawahri grasp the question of whether power asymmetry is needed to get anything done, as hegemonic theory claims, or is it hindrance for a fair deal between the riparian states. To answer, the authors focus on the existing literature on water conflict and cooperation. They conclude that the literature has to move beyond a state-centric approach and has to consider the tools for non-state actors because such actors are capable of encouraging the hydro-hegemon state to alter its behaviour that is counter-productive to cooperation.

Warner, J. and Zeitoun, M. 2008. International relations theory and water do mix: A response to Furlong’s troubled waters, hydro-hegemony and international water relations. *Political Geography*, 27(7), 802-810.

Warner and Zeitoun start from the statement that there are few number of serious studies applying International Relations (IR) frameworks to transboundary water issues. In this article, they discuss and criticize the relations between IR theories and water literature, such as the hydro-hegemony approach. They conclude that critical and Realist IR theories are necessary to the water community, specifically to develop the nascent field of hydro-hegemony in a way to avoid mainstream discourse about ‘water wars’ and ‘water peace’.

Zeitoun, M. and Warner, J. 2006. Hydro-hegemony – A framework for analysis of trans-boundary water conflicts. *Water Policy*, 8(5), 435-460.

This is the seminal article about hydro-hegemony, as it presented for the first time a Framework of Hydro-hegemony (hegemony at the river basin) to analyse transboundary water conflicts based on previous contributions in this field. This Framework attends to explain how control over water resources is not achieved through water wars but through power-related strategies. In this Framework, the authors include the variation of conflict intensities and power relations between competing riparians, which were under-considered in the literature of water conflicts. Applying it in the Nile, Jordan, and Tigris and Euphrates river basins, the authors conclude that hydro-hegemony is present with asymmetrical power relations that influence an inequitable outcome at the expense of low-intensity conflicts.

Water Policy 2008, special issue on Hydro-hegemony, 10 Supplement 2

Cascão, A. E. 2008. Ethiopia - Challenges to Egyptian hegemony in the Nile Basin. *Water Policy*, 10(S2), 13-28.

Questioning the approach defined in the Framework of Hydro-hegemony (Zeitoun & Warner, 2006) that asymmetric power relations between the riparian states are the corner stone of the hydro-political relations, this study tends to show that hydro-hegemony is not incontestable. It attempts to provide a model for counter-hegemonic processes, namely the available options for non-hegemonic states to contest hegemonic situations, through examination of Ethiopia’s contest and consent of Egyptian hydro-hegemony in the Nile River Basin.



**UNIVERSITÉ
DE GENÈVE**

Daoudy . M. 2008. Hydro-hegemony and international water law: Laying claims to water rights. *Water Policy*, 10(S2), 89-102.

In the context of an emerging theoretical framework on Hydro-Hegemony (Zeitoun & Warner, 2006) that focuses mainly on hydro-politics, this paper is an attempt to address hydro-hegemony from an International Water Law (IWL) perspective with the understanding that IWL constitutes an element of power relations. As a source of structural and bargaining power, this article concludes that IWL's principles tend to increase legitimacy of the downstream states in the negotiations.

Turton, A. and Funke, N. 2008, Hydro-hegemony in the context of the Orange River Basin. *Water Policy*, 10(S2), 51-69.

This paper intends to offer a counter-theory in the form of a Hydropolitical Complex to the Framework of Hydro-hegemony where power is mainly expressed as a problem (Zeitoun & Warner, 2006). Addressing the case of a positive hydro-hegemon, South Africa that resolves conflict with the other riparian states in the Orange River Basin, this article tries to show that in such basin as in other international river basins, power is more nuanced and could create a stable basin-wide regime associated with benefits for all the riparian states.

Wegerich, K. 2008. Hydro-hegemony in the Amu Darya basin. *Water Policy*, 10 (S2), 71-88.

This article analyses how hydro-hegemony in the Amu Darya Basin is shaped by History with Soviet Union's legacy that defined how water resources were used and integrated into a large framework. It then shows that the post-Soviet basin may not have a hydro-hegemon, contrary to the perception that Uzbekistan controls the flow, and that the riparian states are acting unilaterally to increase water resource capture without negotiating agreements.

Woodhouse, M., and Zeitoun, M. (2008). Hydro-hegemony and international water law: grappling with the gaps of power and law. *Water Policy*, 10(2), 103-119.

This paper explores how the Framework of Hydro-Hegemony could contribute to the knowledge of legal norms in International Water Law (IWL) for state behaviour in transboundary water. The authors argue that this Framework shows the covert use of power used by a State to perpetuate inequitable water sharing arrangements. They conclude that IWL must include in its principles these covert hegemonic practices.

Zeitoun, M., Allan, J. A. 2008. Applying hegemony and power theory to transboundary water analysis. *Water Policy*, 10(S2), 3-12.

On the basis of the Framework of Hydro-hegemony (Zeitoun & Warner, 2006), this article develops the concepts of hegemony, power and political-economy processes and shows their roles in shaping transboundary water relations. Based on the Gramscian notions of hegemony and on Luke's three dimensions of power (force, deals and ideas) (see S. Lukes, *Power: A Radical View*, 2005), this paper shows how these social theories may be useful for interpreting complex transboundary water relations.

For more information, please contact

M. Stéphane Kluser, Geneva Water Hub

research@genevawaterhub.org