

Peace, power, participation : Transboundary water cooperation through a gender lens

Routledge Handbook of Gender and Water Governance
ter Horst, Rozemarijn

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003100379-15>

This publication is made publicly available in the institutional repository of Wageningen University and Research, under the terms of article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, also known as the Amendment Taverne.

Article 25fa states that the author of a short scientific work funded either wholly or partially by Dutch public funds is entitled to make that work publicly available for no consideration following a reasonable period of time after the work was first published, provided that clear reference is made to the source of the first publication of the work.

This publication is distributed using the principles as determined in the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU) 'Article 25fa implementation' project. According to these principles research outputs of researchers employed by Dutch Universities that comply with the legal requirements of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act are distributed online and free of cost or other barriers in institutional repositories. Research outputs are distributed six months after their first online publication in the original published version and with proper attribution to the source of the original publication.

You are permitted to download and use the publication for personal purposes. All rights remain with the author(s) and / or copyright owner(s) of this work. Any use of the publication or parts of it other than authorised under article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright act is prohibited. Wageningen University & Research and the author(s) of this publication shall not be held responsible or liable for any damages resulting from your (re)use of this publication.

For questions regarding the public availability of this publication please contact openaccess.library@wur.nl

12

PEACE, POWER, PARTICIPATION

Transboundary water cooperation through a gender lens

Rozemarijn ter Horst

Introduction

The topic of water diplomacy has gained attention over the past years, as the transboundary impacts of environmental issues are increasingly acknowledged at the international level. This has also increased the role and visibility of diplomats in environmental discussions (Pohl et al., 2014; Sehring et al., 2022). The way diplomats work influences policies (Neumann, 2012), and thus practices of water diplomacy shape water governance and management at different levels. In addition, gender influences water diplomacy and related negotiations, determining who is selected and allowed at the negotiation table as well as who is heard.

There is a small, yet growing body of literature that discusses gender, diplomacy, international negotiations and water. In this chapter, I take the space to share a brief overview of the literature on the topic of gender and international negotiations in general, as it provides an understanding of how diplomacy is gendered. I then discuss the literature that is specific to water diplomacy and international negotiations over water. Based on previous research, I discuss this separately as it brings together the fields of diplomacy as well as engineering. These are two distinct yet equally masculinized fields in which norms, values and histories are mainly shaped by men and male experiences (Sehring et al., 2023). I end this chapter by reflecting on questions that have been left unexplored, specifically on the relation between gender and the securitization of water and its influence on participation.

Gender, diplomacy and international negotiation

Feminist studies are increasingly attending to the participation of women and the genderedness of diplomacy and international negotiations. Genderedness entails how the:

[A]dvantage and disadvantage, exploitation and control, action and emotion, meaning and identity, are patterned through and in terms of a distinction between male and female, masculine and feminine. Gender is not an addition to ongoing processes,

conceived as gender neutral. Rather, it is an integral part of those processes, which cannot be properly understood without an analysis of gender.

(Acker, 1990, p. 146)

The research shows that it is both valuable to “count heads” as well as to go deeper by unpacking the construction and influence of gendered dynamics on individuals, interactions and organizations. I will continue by summarizing insights provided by different researchers who made notable contributions to understanding power and participation of women in diplomacy.

Cynthia Enloe’s *Bananas, beaches and bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* (2014) brought the issue of women and international relations to the forefront. First published in 1990, the text asks, “where are the women?” and explores the meaning of masculinity and femininity in different international contexts and the ways in which these meanings shape power relations. The presence and experiences of women are often obscured from accounts on how international relations are or were practiced. While pointing out that feminist studies are centered around investigations of power, Enloe specifically asks: “Who gains what from wielding a particular form of gender-infused power? What do challenges to those wielding of that form of power look like? When do those challenges succeed? When are they stymied” (Ibid, p. 9)? She investigates these questions through stories of women affected by international tourism, wives living at army bases, domestic workers and wives of diplomats. While doing so, she makes those women and their experiences and struggles visible.

Gendered diplomacy and the mainly masculinized norms and practices of diplomacy and international negotiations influence existing stereotypes about how one should behave as a man or as a woman. Ifat Maoz (2009) studies the effects of the “women and peace hypothesis,” which is a persistent idea that women are more cooperative. She researches this gendered evaluation effect in Palestinian-Israeli negotiations, finding that people expect women to look for joint solutions and thus value a compromise proposal offered by women as more realistic than such an offer made by men. She reaches a similar conclusion in a later study (David & Maoz, 2015). Sarai Aharoni (2017) confirms the influence strong stereotypes may have, including the power for women to use these stereotypes as strategic choice, as well as how it may limit them. She shows how women are not inherently more peaceful. It thus becomes much more interesting as to how these “incoherent” stereotypes come into existence, as well as what really influences practices. She points towards intersectionality to unpack how collective identity, class, unequal gender regimes, as well as patterns of political violence influence practices. By doing so, she shows the added value of feminist theorization in the discussion on the women and peace hypothesis.

Another notable contribution comes from Ann Towns and Birgita Niklasson (2017), who research the position of men and women in diplomacy through analyzing ambassador appointments. They study the positions of over 7000 ambassadors from the 50 highest ranked countries in terms of GDP in 2014. The research shows that there is an increase in the number of women who join as ambassadors, but that the number of women is still significantly less than the number of men; 85 percent are male. In addition, economic and military stations of posting seem to relate often with gender. In many cases, it appears that the higher the status of the postings in terms of military and economic power, the less women are appointed in these positions. The authors note that in many of the lower positions connected to these postings, the number of women is not higher than men. Women do

not gradually disappear once positions increase in status, but generally have less access to positions with higher economic and military status in the cases they studied. The authors warn against generalizations though, as policies and culture that influence appointments can differ greatly between countries. Moreover, they point out that policies and culture are not static, especially as the research shows that the number of women seems to be on the rise in diplomacy.

Karin Aggestam and Ann Towns (2018) also engage with the questions posed by Enloe, starting with “where are the women?” in contemporary diplomacy and international negotiation. During the nineteenth century, concurrent with the professionalization of diplomacy, women generally have been barred from official diplomatic positions (Ibid, pp. 279–280), limiting the oftentimes important formal roles played by women (see also Sluga & James, 2016). This is currently changing with more women entering the field, and through programs such as the special attention of the United Nations for participation of women in conflict resolution, peacebuilding, peacekeeping, humanitarian response and in post-conflict reconstruction through the UN Security Council Resolution 1325 in 2000. Yet, the authors importantly add that there is a difference between counting heads, or descriptive representation, and understanding how women have influence or subjective representation. Subjective representation is highly influenced by norms and practices in diplomacy and negotiations. They show that these masculinized norms and practices exclude women, as they make it “difficult to visualize women in leading diplomatic positions” (Aggestam & Towns, 2018, p. 278), and make the case that it is necessary to include power, position and gendered hierarchies in studies on women’s participation in diplomacy and negotiation.

In addition to counting heads and analyzing corresponding positions, Niklasson and Towns further unpacked gendered power dynamics in the edited special issue *Understanding the Gender of Ministries of Foreign Affairs* (Niklasson & Towns, 2022). This special issue in *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* shows that the topic has indeed gained more ground over the past years. Towns and Niklasson focus on Ministries of Foreign Affairs (MFAs) as these ministries hire and select ambassadors and can be seen as the connection between the local and the international level. The special issue analyzes these ministries in three ways: first, as gendered institutions, in which the institutional roles, rules, practices, and power relations influence who is selected for certain positions. Secondly, it invites people to rethink what Ministries of Foreign Affairs (MFAs) are and how they work, moving away from a solely Western understanding, as most research on gender and diplomacy is done by Western researchers based on Western case studies. In a comparison, authors note how similar diplomatic femininities and masculinities are in the cases of the Bulgarian, Czech and Turkish MFAs, pointing towards an international institution, or circuit, of diplomacy. Lastly, the special issue also confirms how a division based on gender, combined with a hierarchy that ranks men and masculinity higher than women and femininity, diminishes opportunities for women to advance in the organization (see McGlen & Sarkees, 1993 on gendered hierarchies).

The literature reviewed in this section points towards how institutions, norms and practices of diplomacy are gendered, as well as how this gendered nature cannot be understood without including questions related to power. By looking at power relations, the literature shows that the differentiation between men and women, combined with expectations and hierarchies based on masculinities and femininities, creates different and gendered possibilities for advancement. For this reason, identifying who is in what position, or counting

heads, is a good first step to see one of the ways the power of gendered diplomacy works. They show that there are globalized norms, values and stereotypes that shape the diplomatic circuit but also stress the importance of case studies that use an intersectional approach to avoid generalizations and recognize the interlocked workings of different forms of oppression based on gender, race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, caste, ability and other forms of discrimination (see Ojeda et al., 2022).

Gender in transboundary water governance

In the past section, I have shown how diplomacy and negotiations are gendered, both in terms of the number of men and women that participate, as well as the gendered norms and practices that influence who participates and how. In this section, I turn to gender and water diplomacy and international negotiations over water. In this chapter I define water diplomacy as:

[T]he deliberative political processes and practices of preventing, mitigating, and resolving disputes over transboundary water resources and developing joint water governance arrangements by applying foreign policy means, embedded in bi- and/or multilateral relations beyond the water sector and taking place at different tracks and levels.

(Sehring et al., 2022, p. 36)

Different tracks include a diplomatic track, a track that connects diplomacy with science, religion or civil society, and a track that connects people with people. Negotiations are an example of a deliberative process that is part of water diplomacy, through which two or more parties aim to come to a joint agreement on a certain issue. These negotiations can take place through ministries of foreign affairs, related to an ad hoc crisis including the construction of dams. Oftentimes they take place within the context of river basin organizations, platforms that are set-up to facilitate interactions of countries that share joint rivers and aquifers.

In the previous section I discussed how central the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is to diplomacy. When it comes to water, it is not only diplomats that take part in negotiations. Oftentimes it is a mix between professional diplomats or representatives of the ministry that is designated to manage water, such as a ministry of water or a ministry of the environment, as well as people with specific relevant experience related to water. Most probably, the gendered norms and practices of such a ministry or organization are very different from those of a ministry of foreign affairs. Essentially, water management remains a field that is dominated by engineering, and similarly to diplomacy, water management is also historically and currently a highly masculinized field. This influences who has access to certain education, positions, field work and rituals, and who is seen or envisioned as a “real” water manager (Liebrand & Udas, 2017; Rap & Oré, 2017; Shrestha et al., 2019; Zwartveen, 2008, 2017). As with diplomacy, these norms and practices are also subject to change over time.

When it comes to descriptive representation, a survey done between 2018 and 2019 showed that women represent less than one-fifth of the staff in the highest leadership positions. This shows similar gender disparities found in the studies done by Towns and Niklasson (2017; Niklasson & Towns, 2022). Despite these numbers, women in decision making

at the transboundary level, as well as representation in diplomacy and international negotiations is rarely researched. Anton Earle and Susan Bazilli (2013) are among the first to point out that gender is seemingly absent in discussions over, and analysis of, transboundary water management. They point towards the “hydraulic mission,” the idea that nature can be dominated and that thus every drop of water can be used for human development, mainly through dams and other infrastructural projects, as one potential reason for this absence (see also Molle et al., 2009). Furthermore, women are portrayed mainly as users of water at the household and village level in the context of this “hydraulic mission,” and not as agents that participate in its governance (De Silva et al., 2018). Natasha Carmi et al. (2019) showcase that women are part of water governance and make women and their agency in water diplomacy visible. They advocate for more involvement of women by pointing to obstacles women face to both access and participate in water diplomacy in Jordan, Lebanon and the State of Palestine.

The studies described above formed the main body of scientific literature on women, water diplomacy and international negotiations. While sparking interest and bringing important issues to the table, many questions are left open. These are similar to the questions that are brought up by Enloe (2014), Towns and Niklasson (2017) and Aharoni (2017) described in the section above. Where are the women? Why is their participation stymied? How are water diplomacy and international negotiations gendered, and how does this influence those who are involved in and impacted by international decision-making? The reason why such questions are asked is not value-free. They are meant to make imbalances visible with the aim of diminishing these imbalances. Thus, the final aim of asking these questions is to create more just water governance, based on an understanding that more equal representation is one of the main keys to achieving this.

Bringing together scientific insights on gender and water diplomacy

For the past three years, I was part of a research team that worked towards contributing to knowledge creation and drawing attention to the genderedness of water diplomacy. We conducted a workshop in 2021 on “(En)Gendering Transboundary Water Governance: Feminist Perspectives on Water Conflict and Cooperation” (Offutt, 2020) that brought together scientists and practitioners working on gender and transboundary waters. Based on the workshop, Jenniver Sehring, Margreet Zwarteveen and I worked on an edited volume, *Gender Dynamics in Transboundary Water Governance: Feminist Perspectives on Water Conflict and Cooperation* that aimed to bring together research on gender, water, diplomacy and negotiations and to create a starting point for conversations and research on the topic. We decided to collect contributions on this topic as there is still very little written on how gender plays out in negotiations and interactions over transboundary waters. With contributions of 20 authors, the book includes case studies from the Brahmaputra, the Chu-Talas, the Danube, the Indus, the Jordan, the Nile, the Rhine and the Zambezi basins. Jointly, they show that gender influences who has access to the negotiation table. I will briefly share the main insights of the book, as the chapters contribute to an understanding as to how water diplomacy and international negotiations are deeply gendered.

First, the framing of gender’s role in transboundary water governance shapes our understanding. Is the focus merely on states, and state relations? Or do we acknowledge the entanglement of the personal and the professional to play a role as well? Ritu Priya and Tania Debnath (2023) show that these boundaries and frames influence literature on international

relations and theoretical choices. “Seeing” gender requires critically re-thinking ontological categories and definitions. In practice, this is oftentimes challenging, as people working on water diplomacy and international negotiations often do not acknowledge the deep genderedness of their work and working environment. Those who work for the adoption of gender policies and gender mainstreaming may not be taken seriously, as they bring in ideas that counter the general norms, ideas that may even be resisted (Kunz et al., 2019).

Further research on gender dynamics in negotiations show that there are strong perceptions as to how women and men should behave, with aggressive and confrontational behavior accepted and expected of men, and cooperative behavior, including attentively listening, accepted and expected of women. These expectations influence self-governance as well as interactions between individuals. For instance, studies have shown how women’s participation leads to more cooperative behavior in mixed negotiation teams in the Nile, Chu-Talas and Rhine basins (Mattur & ter Horst, 2023; Said, 2023; Sehring, 2023). However, gender is not a stand-alone issue, as it intersects with other determinants that influence power in a certain context, including caste, class, ethnicity and income. People navigate these dynamics in very different ways, from adhering to gendered norms to adopting hegemonic norms of the other gender, or by disengaging and protesting.

Many of the insights are similar to what is found in the research on diplomacy and international negotiations. Insights from the volume also show that context matters in order to understand the impact of how water diplomacy finds itself at the intersection of both the masculinized norms of water engineering and diplomacy. Context is also critical in order to acknowledge the diversity in cases and experiences of individuals, all based on different interactions between collective identity, class and unequal gender regimes (Aharoni, 2017). In this sense, the edited volume also confirms the point made by Ann Towns and Birgita Niklasson (2017) who warn against generalizations. Many of the interviewees in the case studies on the Chu Talas and Rhine basis indicated that they had not thought about gender often and were curious to learn why we brought up the topic, a situation echoed in research on diplomacy. Others indicated that gender was not the most important issue, or that being a woman benefited rather than limited them. Towns and Niklasson shared a similar experience when they conducted interviews with diplomats in Stockholm in 2014. They were told that “women face few limits *as women* in diplomacy” (Towns & Niklasson, 2017, p. 522). However, theirs and our data tell that oftentimes the story is different. In most cases, once the interviews progressed, examples were given of situations in which gender, gendered stereotypes and norms and values have influenced access and participation. Interestingly, for several interviewees this meant that contradictions could be found in their narratives: some expressed that gender did not play a (big) role while sharing experiences and practices in which it did matter.

Reflection: water securitization, participation and gender

There are many questions left open on how water diplomacy and international negotiations are gendered, how these dynamics change over time and how they shape water governance. One element that has come up based on the presentation of the book *Gender Dynamics in Transboundary Water Governance* is the impact of water securitization. Securitization of water is the idea that states ensure water availability and are tasked to protect and secure these resources. This happens through discourse and infrastructure, or institutionally through exclusion of certain groups from decision making processes.

Water securitization is oftentimes triggered by sudden events, including droughts or infrastructure development (Fischendler, 2015). Outside of the water sector, and based on the case of Israel, Aharoni (2018) shows that securitization restricts women's access to diplomacy. She bases her analysis on the secret meetings of Golda Meir and King Abdullah in 1947–48, the Oslo peace process 1993–2000 and the 2007 Annapolis Peace Summit. Her analysis shows how the extreme conditions of militarization, secrecy and structurelessness work to create an environment of exclusion, and that based on gendered hierarchies, mostly women are excluded.

How does securitization of water influence gender and participation? In case there is little conflict over the shared resources, is there more space for women to be included in its governance? And in case conflict flares up and water becomes an issue of high politics, will the men move (back) in, for instance because other ministries with other gendered norms and practices become involved? Securitization and conflict are part of the entanglement between cooperation and conflict, yet in research on transboundary water and gender, interactions between water, gender, conflict and securitization and participation have not been made explicit (Offutt, 2020).

Interestingly, Ann Towns (2020) shows that diplomacy is oftentimes associated with a feminine approach to transboundary interactions, as opposed to military power and violence. Listening and negotiating is seen as a feminine activity and as an art. This is also often mentioned in case studies on the Chu-Talas, Nile and Rhine basin. Collaborative skills, including listening and creatively identifying joint solution is seen as related to being a woman, and antagonistic behavior, including shouting and non-cooperation is associated with being a man (Sehring et al., forthcoming). Yet, as shown before, seeing diplomacy as a feminine approach does not translate into a larger number of women involved. We have shown that this relates to many factors, including education, hiring practices, job structures, as well as ideas of what a water expert looks like. Another factor may be the level of securitization of water.

Aharoni also brings up the issue of *tokenism*, that is, how the participation of one or few women can be used to show a symbolic effort, but not a real and transformative change. She expresses the expectation and hope that with participation of non-elites in negotiation, there will be space for “transformative politics that involves re-allocation of resources and a deeper commitment to non-violent ways of conflict resolution” (Aharoni, 2018, p. 209). This hope is shared by Eric Blanchard (2003) who writes that participation of women in masculine high politics will lead to a more comprehensive security, as with a feminist critique, new approaches and questions are being introduced. This includes questioning war and its influence on civilians and the focus on borders and securing them.

Based on a case of environmental security in Colombia, Keina Yoshida and Lina Céspedes-Báez (2021) also confirm that securitization works to promote exclusion. They criticize the Women, Peace and Security agenda of the United Nations, based on the UN Security Council Resolution 1325 in 2000, which treats women mainly as victims of war and conflict. This is similar to the dynamics of the water sector, as described in the previous section on “Gender in transboundary water governance.” They argue that to “add women and stir” is not enough. This superficial approach can easily disregard gendered identities and power dynamics, as well as the high diversity amongst individual experiences. They point out that an intersectional approach can help to both make women visible, as well as draw attention to the differences in experiences and power. Yet, as shown in the cases of Israel and Colombia, a securitization agenda limits the space to do so.

Diplomacy and international negotiation are changing, both with the participation of women, and the participation of broader sectors of civil society, press, religious groups and science (Sending et al., 2011). But adding different groups “and stirring,” as Yoshida and Céspedes-Báez (2021) point out, may not be enough to lead to structural changes, which are changes that may last when securitization comes into play. For this to happen, it is necessary for the norms and practices, or “the rules of the game” to fundamentally transform.

The relation between gender, participation and securitization in water diplomacy and international negotiation has not been deeply explored. I will broadly reflect on this issue based on two different case studies. The first case study is on the International Commission for the Protection of the Rhine (ICPR), composed of France, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Switzerland and the European Union. The Commission was set up directly after the Second World War to facilitate international exchanges and agreements on the management of the waters of the Rhine. Initially, the activities were limited to monitoring and data exchange (Dieperink, 2000; Ruchay, 1995). Cooperation remained limited until the 1986 chemical spill in Sandoz, Switzerland, which greatly affected the Rhine, killing most salmon in the river. This led to civil society campaigns and joint political support in the basin to develop activities to bring back the salmon and protect water quality. The common policy project facilitated cooperation in the basin, which is currently increasingly supported through European cooperation, for instance through the EU Water Framework Directive. The ICPR sees itself as an example of cooperation, receiving visitors from all over the world to share their experiences. The ICPR history shows a story of decreasing securitization. Although water quantity is becoming a sensitive issue, the ICPR continues to provide a framework in which its members can explore options to engage.

The ICPR is also an example of a river basin organization that strives for a gender balance, or a gender imbalance in the favor of women. Interestingly, women are in large majority at the level of minister. At the level in the secretariat, more space for women was only created after the implicit rule was abandoned that a Dutch representative, as a downstream country, was to be selected as secretary. Before this, the pool of people to select from consisted mainly of Dutch male engineers. According to interviewees, women’s participation at the country level started to increase 15 years ago, first in the Netherlands, then Germany, then France, yet in Switzerland little has changed over the years (Mattur & ter Horst, 2023). Differences between countries delegations thus do exist, highly influenced by the organizational cultures of the ministries and organizations that select delegates. There are also differences in gender representation in various working groups, in which interviewees could identify topics that attracted more men, such as dikes, and those that attracted women, such as ecology, in which ideas about what are suitable studies for men and women play a large role.

Through interviews on the interactions in negotiations, it was noted that these changed from being cold, distant, sometimes aggressive and focused on maintaining a country’s position, to warm, familiar, explorative and cooperative. Interviewees at the ICPR indicated that they thought the change came as the major transboundary issues were addressed and issues related to the Rhine are not securitized. Many also indicated that this change happened due to the participation of women in negotiations, and perceived norms of how to behave appropriately towards “the other gender” (Sehring et al., forthcoming). Interestingly, the interviews also showed that there is indeed a hegemonic masculine norm. One example is how an interviewee learned how to negotiate as a man, which entailed her taking more space, talking louder and compromising less, as she felt that this approach would

lead to better results (Mattur & ter Horst, 2023). Although more research is needed to explore the link between securitization and gender participation in the case of the Rhine, the absence of securitization allowed for an open and cooperative atmosphere, in which participants could challenge the hegemonic status quo.

The second case study is on the work of Nadia Gefoun, a diplomat with an impressive track record in foreign service. She was a former Ambassador of Sudan to Norway and Denmark, Deputy Head of Mission of Sudan to Sweden, Chargé D’Affaires of Sudan to Malaysia, member of the Sudanese Mission to the United Nations in Geneva and Press Attaché for the Sudanese Embassy in Cairo. She shares that “traditionally, women were not part of the top leadership in anything related to natural resources, for example roads, mining, oil, and also water” (ter Horst et al., 2023, p. 188). She shared that she thought that the main reason why women were not present in negotiations was due to education, as few women trained as engineers.

A link with securitization and her position comes through the announcement of the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam. The announcement and construction of the dam in Ethiopia securitized the waters of the Nile, including the participation of army officials in interactions between Egypt, Sudan and Ethiopia. Although she has worked on water in terms of reviewing agreements and being part of bilateral committees, she was not part of the negotiations that happened after the announcement of the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam. While no conclusions can be drawn based on this limited information, it is interesting to look further at what happened to Sudan in the past years. Nadia Gefoun shared that she had hoped that the Sudanese revolution, and the prominent role women had played in this revolution, could lead to more equality in representation (Ibid). The Minister of Water who was part of the government that took over after the revolution in 2019 explicitly chose to include young people and women in the team that helped to prepare negotiations. The military coup in 2021 had a negative effect on the participation of women and young people. Two years is too short to change underlying norms, practices and policies, but they show the influence of civilian movements and determination of powerful and visionary individuals.

Conclusion

In this chapter I summarized insights on gendered participation in diplomacy and international negotiation in general, and for the water sector specifically, noting that dynamics present in diplomacy and international negotiation hold true for the water sector. In terms of descriptive representation, or counting heads, women are generally underrepresented, especially in positions with high economic and political status. Research shows that it is critical to look beyond descriptive representation and to understand how women and men have agency, what space they have to contribute to content, decisions and what power they have to ultimately shape water governance. When it comes to this subjective representation, we have discussed several elements related to both agency and structure.

Specifically, when it concerns diplomacy and international negotiation related to water, two different fields come together, each with its own norms and values. Both are historically shaped by male experiences. One of the ways that this shapes water diplomacy and negotiations is through education. Some topics are considered more for men, including engineering. Anton Earle and Susan Bazilli (2013) show how water management at the international level is largely dictated by the “hydraulic mission,” which relies on engineers, while including less input from lawyers, geographers or biologists.

Different case studies show how securitization can limit the space for the true participation of women or those who do not adhere to the status quo, leading to tokenism and symbolic participation. On the other hand, two case studies show that increased cooperation over the course of decades creates space for the increased participation of women, both through different policies of sending institutions and through changing norms. The case study on the ICPR shows that hegemonic masculinized norms remain pervasive, and that learning how to behave according to those norms can help someone in her and his job. The case study on the work of Nadia Gefoun in Sudan shows that sudden change can happen, through large supported civil society demands as well through visionary and powerful individuals.

Lastly, we discussed the centrality of contextualization and situatedness in feminist scientific literature. The experience of one is not the same as the experience of another; acknowledging and embracing difference is critical to better understand how water diplomacy and international negotiation are gendered, and with what effect. We highlighted intersectionality as a concept to unpack and understand these differences, and how elements such as class, caste and education impact representation and participation. Our work showed how intersectionality can help to understand changing practices in diplomacy and international negotiations. We also call for more case studies to acknowledge situatedness, contribute to the small body of literature on gender and water diplomacy and international negotiation, as well as to keep track of potentially transformational changes through increased participation of the non-elite.

References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, 4(2), 139–158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124390004002002>
- Aggestam, K., & Towns, A. (Eds.). (2018). *Gendering diplomacy and international negotiation*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Aharoni, S. B. (2017). Who needs the women and peace hypothesis? Rethinking modes of inquiry on gender and conflict in Israel/Palestine. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 19(3), 311–326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2016.1237457>
- Aharoni, S. B. (2018). Diplomacy as crisis: An institutional analysis of gender and the failure to negotiate peace in Israel. In K. Aggestam & A. Towns (Eds.), *Gendering diplomacy and international negotiation* (pp. 193–211). Palgrave MacMillan.
- Blanchard, E. M. (2003). Gender, international relations, and the development of feminist security theory. *Signs*, 28(4), 1289–1312. <https://doi.org/10.1086/368328>
- Carmi, N., Alsayegh, M., & Zoubi, M. (2019). Empowering women in water diplomacy: A basic mapping of the challenges in Palestine, Lebanon and Jordan. *Journal of Hydrology*, 569, 330–346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.12.011>
- David, Y., & Maoz, I. (2015). Gender perceptions and support for compromise in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 21(2), 295–298. <http://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000092>
- De Silva, L., Veilleux, J. C., & Neal, M. J. (2018). The role of women in transboundary water dispute resolution. In C. Fröhlich, G. Gioli, R. Cremades & H. Myrntinen (Eds.), *Water security across the gender divide. Water security in a new world* (pp. 211–230). Springer.
- Dieperink, C. (2000). Successful international cooperation in the Rhine catchment area. *Water International*, 25(3), 347–355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508060008686842>
- Earle, A., & Bazilli, S. (2013). A gendered critique of transboundary water management. *Feminist Review*, 103, 99–119.
- Enloe, C. (2014). *Bananas, beaches and bases: Making feminist sense of international politics* (2nd ed.). University of California Press.

- Fischendler, I. (2015). The securitization of water discourse: Theoretical foundations, research gaps and objectives of the special issue. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, 15, 245–255. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-015-9277-6>
- Kunz, R., Prügl, E., & Thompson, H. (2019). Gender expertise in global governance: Contesting the boundaries of a field. *European Journal of Politics and Gender*, 2(1), 23–40. <https://doi.org/10.1332/251510819X15471289106112>
- Liebrand, J., & Udas, P. B. (2017). Becoming an engineer or a lady engineer: Exploring professional performance and masculinity in Nepal's Department of Irrigation. *Engineering Studies*, 9(2), 120–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19378629.2017.1345915>
- Maoz, I. (2009). The women and peace hypothesis? The effect of opponent negotiators' gender on the evaluation of compromise solutions in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. *International Negotiation*, 14(3), 519–536. <http://doi.org/10.1163/138234009X12481782336267>
- Mattur, R., & ter Horst, R. (2023). Governance in the Rhine basin through a Gender Lens: The international commission for the protection of the Rhine. In J. Sehring, R. ter Horst & M. Zwartveen (Eds.), *Gender dynamics in transboundary water governance* (pp. 146–162). Routledge.
- McGlen, N. E., & Sarkees, M. R. (1993). *Women in foreign policy: The insiders*. Routledge.
- Molle, F., Mollinga, P. P., & Wester, P. (2009). Hydraulic bureaucracies and the hydraulic mission: Flows of water, flows of power. *Water Alternatives*, 2(3), 328–349.
- Neumann, I. B. (2012). *At home with the diplomats: Inside a European foreign ministry*. Cornell University Press.
- Niklasson, B., & Towns, A. E. (2022). Introduction: Approaching gender and Ministries of Foreign Affairs. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 17(3), 339–369. <http://doi.org/10.1163/1871191x-bja10123>
- Offutt, A. (2020). Making gender visible in transboundary waters. *FLOWs: The Water Governance Blog at IHE Delft Institute for Water Education*. <https://flows.hypotheses.org/5728>.
- Ojeda, D., Nirmal, P., Rocheleau, D., & Emel, J. (2022). Feminist Ecologies. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 47, 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-112320-092246>
- Pohl, B., Carius, A., Conca, K., Dabelko, G., Kramer, A., Michel, D., Schmeier, S., Swain, A., & Wolf, A. (2014). The rise of hydro-diplomacy: Strengthening foreign policy for transboundary waters. *Adelphi*. www.adelphi.de/en/publication/rise-hydro-diplomacy
- Priya, R., & Debnath, T. (2023). Is academic knowledge production on transboundary waters in South Asia gender neutral? In J. Sehring, R. ter Horst & M. Zwartveen (Eds.), *Gender dynamics in transboundary water governance* (pp. 39–57). Routledge.
- Rap, E., & Oré, M. T. (2017). Engineering masculinities: How higher education genders the water profession in Peru. *Engineering Studies*, 9(2), 95–119. <http://doi.org/10.1080/19378629.2017.1342255>
- Ruchay, D. (1995). Living with water: Rhine River basin management. *Water Science & Technology*, 31, 27–32. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-1223\(95\)00353-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-1223(95)00353-O)
- Said, A. (2023). The role of gender in transboundary water governance of the Nile Basin. In J. Sehring, R. ter Horst & M. Zwartveen (Eds.), *Gender dynamics in transboundary water governance* (pp. 163–178). Routledge.
- Sehring, J. (2023). Gendered river basin institutions: The Chu-Talas commission in Central Asia. In J. Sehring, R. ter Horst & M. Zwartveen (Eds.), *Gender dynamics in transboundary water governance* (pp. 129–145). Routledge.
- Sehring, J., Schmeier, S., ter Horst, R., Offutt, A., & Sharipova, B. (2022). Diving into Water diplomacy – Exploring the emergence of a concept. *Diplomatica*, 4(2), 200–221. <https://doi.org/10.1163/25891774-bja10082>
- Sehring, J., ter Horst, R., & Said, A. (forthcoming). Gender perceptions and women's participation in transboundary water governance. Insights from the Nile, Chu-Talas, and Rhine basins. *Political Geography*.
- Sehring, J., ter Horst, R., & Zwartveen, M. (2023). *Gender dynamics in transboundary water governance*. Routledge.
- Sending, O. J., Pouliot, V., & Neumann, I. B. (2011). The future of diplomacy: Changing practices, evolving relationships. *International Journal*, 66(3), 527–542.
- Shrestha, G., Joshi, D., & Clement, F. (2019). Masculinities and hydropower in India: A feminist political ecology perspective. *International Journal of the Commons*, 13(1), 130–152. <https://doi.org/10.18352/ijc.920>

- Sluga, G., & James, C. (Eds.). (2016). *Women, diplomacy and international politics since 1500*. Routledge.
- ter Horst, R., Amakali, M., Barua, A., Gefoun, N., Jekel, H., & Villar, P. C. (2023). Negotiating water: Lived experiences of female practitioner. In J. Sehring, R. ter Horst & M. Zwartveen (Eds.), *Gender dynamics in transboundary water governance* (pp. 179–192). Routledge.
- Towns, A. E. (2020). ‘Diplomacy is a feminine art’: Feminised figurations of the diplomat. *Review of International Studies*, 46(5), 573–593. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210520000315>
- Towns, A. E., & Niklasson, B. (2017). Gender, international status, and ambassador appointments. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 13(3), 521–540. <https://doi.org/10.1093/fpa/orw039>
- Yoshida, K., & Céspedes-Báez, L. M. (2021). The nature of women, peace and security: A Colombian perspective. *International Affairs*, 97(1), 17–34. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iaa173>
- Zwartveen, M. (2008). Men, masculinities and water powers in irrigation. *Water Alternatives*, 1(1), 111–130.
- Zwartveen, M. (2017). Hydrocracies, engineers and power: Questioning masculinities in water. *Engineering Studies*, 9(2), 78–94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19378629.2017.1358730>