1

Lisa Thompson

Not about knowledge, but numbers?

An examination of the notion of stakeholder participation and the governance of water as a 'scarce resource' in global and national policy discourses on development and security

Not about knowledge, but numbers?

An examination of the notion
of stakeholder participation
and the governance of water
as a 'scarce resource'
in global and national
policy discourses on
development and security

Lisa Thompson

Abstract

This paper continues research on citizenship, science and risk, examining the nexus between 'developmental expertise' on water management and technological innovation, and the recent developmental stress on local participation. It examines the ways in which water as a scarce resource has featured in global and national policy discourses, with particular attention to the question of the governance of water and stakeholder participation. Water as a scarce resource in international relations (IR) literature, it is argued, tends to conflate notions of community participation around regional and global resources with the management of natural resources by governments on behalf of the people. Where participation does take place it tends towards nominal representation, the principal goal seeming to be achieving parity of representation in terms of relevant 'stakeholder' criteria.

The paper draws on case study material collated on participatory water resources management in Zimbabwe, where catchments councils have ostensibly aimed at 'managing water' through participatory approaches that also recognise the transboundary nature of this resource, as well as the ways in which 'community' identity may be more ecologically than geographically determined. It is clear that while progress has been made with regard to policy formulation, there remain a number of problem areas that arise from – predominantly but not only – the rigidity of conceptual categories such as 'stakeholder', 'community', 'urban', 'rural' and indeed 'participation' itself. Relating this to the insertion of 'scientific' approaches to water management, as well as new technologies, shows that while there is

clearly an attempt on the part of both state and non-state actors (especially international NGOs) to ensure 'community participation', the actual dynamics of such participation are clearly negatively influenced by efforts on the part of policy-makers to define (and reify) 'stakeholders' and 'communities'.

The second part of the paper examines these observations against the backdrop of recent conceptual work on science, technology and risk, and will once again try to draw the connections between local, national and international global and environmental security.

Introduction

The management of water, the risks of severe water scarcity and the urgency of managing water as a natural resource, an economic good, a commodity and a human right, have become prominent governance issues over the last decade. The scope of the discourse on water ranges from academic attempts to outline the extent of risks of water scarcity, as well as possible global, national and local responses to this, to a much more policy-orientated attempt to bring science into the management of water as a natural resource on a national and international basis. A common feature of both aspects of the discourse is the stress placed on participation.

This paper examines ideas and policies on managing global water scarcity, as well as managing water as a national natural resource, through the specific lenses of participatory approaches. Examples from the southern African region, and particularly Zimbabwe, aim to highlight how, to a large extent, participation remains reified as a concept at global and local levels, particularly in terms of how 'community participation' is generally understood in the context of urban and rural settings, but also across state boundaries. In regard to this, one part of the problem is embedded in the ways in which communities are imagined, or understood. Another is the meaning, purpose and context of participation, especially in development policy discourses. Arguably, participants' understandings of their roles as stakeholders differ, but so too are these roles variously interpreted by those who determine the intellectual and policy parameters of the discourse on, in this instance, water, development and security. Which communities or community stakeholders should be represented, in what capacity and within which spaces and places, is routinely decided by those whose vested power tilts the ability to influence both the meaning and content of participatory spaces in favour of their particular vision of what community, or communities, should entail. Where 'science' or 'scientific approaches' to the management of natural resources feature, it seems reasonably safe to generalise that the power of stakeholders to influence the knowledge frame within which they must perforce function is limited by their ability to 'speak the right language'. Non-participation, once again in this instance, is also of rather limited strategic value, since it

is frequently seen to imply ignorance. Silent participation is understood to indicate consent, even where there is considerable research to prove otherwise (for example, women's attendance and silence at male dominated meetings). To expand on these points, the literature on citizenship, risk and science is useful, especially when located within broader national and global discourses on development and security.

This paper also focuses on the extent to which participation in scientific areas of development management, such as in the case of the use of technology to address scarce water resources, comes down to ensuring that there are sufficient 'bums on seats' to make sure that policy processes are considered legitimate and transparent, and community orientated. It would seem that in the case of the examples drawn from the southern African region that this depends in each case on the particular configuration of political and social consciousness of the stakeholders brought (or co-opted) in, as well as the degree to which the scientific content of the issue at hand is penetrable by lay knowledge, both in the meeting room as well as in the day-to-day lives of those who are part of the particular development dynamic in practice.

Water as a scarce resource in global and national developmental debates

As has been discussed at length elsewhere (Thompson & Swatuk, 2000; Thompson, 2000, Remove 2001), water as a scarce resource which could possibly evoke water crises, or water wars, is a theme that has gained popularity in realist IR literature over the past decade. Swatuk & Vale (2000), among others, have indicated that the possibilities of global wars over water are unlikely, and while this is accepted even among those who emphasis the risks of water scarcity (see Turton *et al*, 2000), it remains a popular theme in both the international and local press. The notion of water scarcity and water wars highlights water as an economic good, or a commodity that may be fought over at national, regional or even global levels. Even while there has been some healthy skepticism about this outcome in international development policy circles, there has also been a

surge of interest and involvement in water resources management by development agencies, not least in the southern African region.

One of the ways out of the water/scarcity/crisis dilemma, reads the popular view, is to ensure the participation of all states involved in shared watercourses in binding regional agreements on sharing water as a regional resource, and ensuring bilateral agreements between states that share catchment areas and rivers. Participation around water resource management is at this level presumed to be government-to-government, although the need for 'stakeholder participation' is also usually called for. Such participation would ensure that democratic decisions may be made on, for example, water offtake schemes and dams, as well as more day-to-day issues around managing water as a scarce resource *and a commodity to be paid for*, and would also recognise the now widely-held politically correct view of water as a human right.

At the national/local level, participation is conceptualised once again in terms of stakeholder participation, this time in terms of different communities' involvement on the committee structures that have been set up to manage water resources, most commonly catchment committees or councils. While it is recognised that such communities may in fact straddle national boundaries, there are few cases of regional representation on these bodies. As the following discussion makes clear, and taking the Zimbabwean example as a case in point, in terms of governance structures such as catchment committees infrequently become sites of meaningful participation as the power dynamics preclude anything more than nominal representation. Arguably, meaningful forms of influence in water resources management occur through other forms of participation or non-participation. It is also clear that the management of water at the local level has less to do with empowerment of local communities and rather a lot more to do with extending the reach and legitimacy of local government. Forms of participation between and within communities are thus often excluded from notions of participation in water management. It is also quite clear that the disjuncture between local/national and global is a conceptual as well as a policy problem. Nominal representation on national bodies precludes imagining communities any other way than within the national context. Until conceptual framings of governance structures become

more wide-angled, national and regional participation will remain boundaried by policy institutions at national level.

Gender and integrated natural resources management

Another important dimension to the discussion of water and governance surrounds the question of gender. It has become a politically correct cliché to say that 'women and water go together', in the same way the women are seen as vital to understanding food security. In rural areas women comprise the majority of *de facto* and *de jure* heads of households, and predominate as the 'stable' population, while men migrate back and forth between urban and rural environments. The inclusion of gender into the discourse of water and development is seen to be crucial to ensuring definitive and meaningful participation. However, Mbongwe (1997), Tapela (2001), Tapela & Mukheli (2003) and others have shown that the inclusion of gender into both national and global discourses on water has as yet to show real empowerment at the level of participation. This in spite of the fact that women are primary water users not only in agriculture, but also in and around the household.

As Tapela & Mukheli (2003: 2) put it in the context of Zimbabwe:

> *According Zimbabwe's Water Resources Management Strategy (WRMS), women play a central role in the provision, use and protection of water in the country. They provide water for the fulfillment of fundamental human needs, food preparation and family hygiene. Women are also managers of community and family water supplies. They are actively involved in monitoring water quality and devising strategies for conserving water during times of scarcity. Women are also actively involved in the production of food for both subsistence and marketing purposes. They are responsible for most of the agricultural production in the country. The agricultural activities of women include a long history of developing gardens in wetlands for supporting their families. Women are also responsible for collecting firewood, and the clearance of vegetation through fuel wood collection has been identified as a major cause for land degradation. Given that women constitute 51% of Zimbabwe's population, that approximately*

80% of women live in the rural communal and resettlement areas in Zimbabwe and that 60% of women in Zimbabwe are heads of households (Zimbabwe, 1995), the need for water management institutions to adopt gendered perspectives in the implementation of Zimbabwe's new water policy cannot therefore be overemphasized. However, despite that women play a pivotal and multi-faceted role in the use, provision and conservation of water resources in Zimbabwe, a significant proportion of women do not have the same access to water and land resources as men. Like the men, they have not been actively involved in the design and implementation of the past water policies. Unlike the men, they seem to have been sidelined from the design of the existing water policy during the pilot phase. Their involvement in the water sector has largely been at the basic, non-technical and unpaid levels rather than at the strategic levels.

This quotation alludes succinctly to most of the problems that prevent the inclusion of gender as a meaningful concept into discussions on water and governance. While women remain significant and important users, their silence in public fora has meant that their inclusion in them has been primarily motivated by the political objective to show 'gender representativeness', and it is very evident that the forms of inclusion are founded on a very specific notion of what 'gender participation' and 'power sharing' should be. Numerical representation in committees is seen as definitive, with the onus on the 'gender representative' to voice her opinion on behalf of all women in her community. Clearly this does not grasp the dynamics of gendered divisions of labour and the lack of overlap between gender interests, on one hand, and stakeholder interests, on the other.

Before exploring some of the issues raised, a more lucid understanding of different approaches to participatory development is useful for helping to sift through the dynamics of various forms of participation to help distinguish how various interests are represented. Without going into a long conceptual exploration, Cornwall's (2000: 9) adaption of White's (1996: 7–9) typology helps to provide a simple way of identifying forms of participation and the interests they serve (see overleaf).

Table 1: Typology of forms of participation and the interests they serve			
Form	What 'participation' means to the implementing agency	What 'participation' means for those on the receiving end	What 'participation' is for
Nominal	Legitimation – to show they are doing something	Inclusion – to retain some access to potential benefits	Display
Instrumental	Efficiency – to limit funders' input, draw on community contributions and make projects more cost effective	Cost – of time spent on project-related labour and other activities	As a means of achieving cost effectiveness and local facilities
Representative	Sustainability – to avoid creating dependency	Leverage – to influence the shape the project takes and its management	To give people a voice in determining their own development
Transformative	Empowerment – to strengthen people's capabilities to take decisions and act for themselves	Empowerment – to be able to decide and act for themselves	Both as a means and an end, a continuing dynamic

The typology briefly encapsulates both the exogenous and en-dogenous (indigenous) influences that can be brought to bear on participation dynamics. Even the presence of donor funding without specific conditionalities may be bring about a different form of participation.

What the typology does not adequately capture is ways in which non-participation may influence participatory dynamics both directly and indirectly. For example, in Zimbabwe it is clear that gender representation in catchment councils is poor, and it appears as if women may choose not to participate due to a number of factors. Nonetheless, they may still influence the process indirectly.

This, of course, may not necessarily change the power dynamics of the type of participation once it has been operationalised by the powers that be.

Water scarcity, technological innovation and 'stakeholder' consultation: The case of the Pungwe in Zimbabwe

Mehta (2000: 4–5) describes the different notions of water scarcity as follows:

> *One, unlike other environmental resources such as forests and coal, water is a renewable resource which means its availability is constantly subjected to variation depending on its state in the hydrological cycle…These are* biophysical and ecological *attributes determining water availability…Two, water has* temporal and cyclical *dimensions…The third dimension is the* distributional and relational *aspects of scarcity. There is tremendous inequality in access to and control over water resources. Scarcity is* not *felt universally by all… The fourth dimension concerns the* anthropogenic *dimensions of water scarcity. While water scarcity tends to be naturalized today, its anthropogenic dimensions are whitewashed.*

It is clear, however, that most international approaches to water scarcity tend to take a more crude atemporal and ahistorical approach to water scarcity, which assumes, despite considerable evidence to the contrary, that water scarcity leads to conflict rather than cooperation. It is also essential to note that other 'takes' on water, namely as a human right, an economic good or a commodity, are often tinted by international and national organisational and institutional interests. As Mehta (2000: 10–12) points out, from water as a human right to water as a commodity, there is a risk that arguments which are seemingly aimed at enhancing the rights and privileges of the poor may at the same time help to strengthen the power of governments and business concerns with seemingly altruistic motives. It should not therefore be assumed that policy pronouncements about water as a human right or as a common good are necessarily following through to empowerment of people to manage their local water resources.

As the case of shared water resource management in the southern African region seems to attest, at least in terms of preliminary studies, the degree to which there is 'institutional take-up' of local concerns and interests is quite limited, and mostly partial and

fragmented with regard to policy implementation. This is especially so on the more scientific aspects of water management such as dam building and water offtake schemes. The examples that follow are drawn from a study of the Pungwe river basin offtake scheme, undertaken on behalf of the Zimbabwean government between 1996 and 2000.

The Pungwe River supplies water to the city of Mutare and the Honde Valley in Zimbabwe. It is also the major source of water for the city of Beira in Mozambique. Because of officially pronounced water scarcity, the water offtake scheme was introduced on the Zimbabwean side to supply extra water to the city of Mutare, under the supervision of the Mutare local government. While Mozambique gave official sanction to the scheme, it is clear that it is a good example of the fungibility of concepts relating to water resources management, not least ones with an ostensibly developmental community-based approach as well as ones which purport to enhance regional cooperation, since it seems that the possible negative consequences of this scheme may have been underplayed in terms of the long-term effects on different upstream and downstream communities.

In a previous paper on this subject (Thompson, 2001) I have highlighted the regional consequences of the Zimbabwean scheme by pointing to the potentially unforeseeable consequences for users both upstream and downstream in terms of the total amount of water available to small- and large-scale farmers, as well as to the city of Beira, and also in terms of salt intrusion at the river mouth in Beira. There are other factors which may not have been adequately accounted for in the downstream impact assessment criteria, such as a new free export processing zone near Beira and more intensive agricultural farming to be undertaken on the Mozambican side (interviews, ARA Centro, Beira, September 2000). These possible negative consequences will only be measurable in the medium- to long-term, and as such may not emerge for some time to come. Also it is clear that the motivation for the scheme was not only water scarcity *per se*, but also the perceived gains of the offtake scheme to the Mutare local government in terms of increased revenue. Thus the benefit of this particular alternative above other alternatives was

quite obviously influenced by the major power holder in the decision-making process in terms of the conception of maximising water as an economic good, and a commodity. Even though consultation was virtually non-existent, it is unlikely that grassroots resistance would have stopped the scheme going ahead even had it been more widespread. As other more radical examples attest, for example the Narmada dam project in India, grassroots protests may be countered by the weight of 'scientific facts' attesting to the need for the technological innovation. Against this background resistance may be dismissed as 'uninformed', or 'not moving with the developmental pace of the times'. Non-participation, as an alternative strategy, is also unlikely to be at all effective in the above case as it may be interpreted as acquiescence, indifference, or indeed, ignorance.

The area of particular interest here is the ways in which local participation has featured in the legitimisation of the Pungwe scheme. It is interesting that the problem of water scarcity was identified by the Mutare City Council, and that the finance and expertise for the water offtake scheme was provided for largely by SIDA. At this stage of the process, participation took the form of minimalist sanction – the Mozambican authorities had to give permission, but no other stakeholders were consulted. The reality of water *scarcity* was taken as a given. There are two first-hand anecdotes to this picture of water scarcity which were supplied to the research team by one of the city's engineers: the high density suburb of Sakubva has a water loss of up to 50% due to damaged, leaking and faulty pipes and taps; and since the inception of the offtake scheme, the city council now has extra water to sell. This would seem to further corroborate Mehta's (2000) point that scarcity is not an absolutely accurate concept, even while it may be quite easy to determine a baseline amount of water necessary for individual survival and health. A further interesting aspect to this latter point is that, as will be pointed out below, although the low-income, high-density suburb of Sakubva has plenty of water, sanitation (and consequently healthy living conditions) leave a great deal to be desired.

'Participation' has been ensured in a post-hoc fashion through the establishment of the Pungwe sub-catchment council. On the Mozambican side, participation is purportedly ensured by ARA-

Centro, a regional body that forms part of the Mozambican water department (Van der Zaag, 2000; interviews, Mutare and Beira, 2000). On the Zimbabwean side, the sub-catchment council has only recently become functional. Tapela & Mukheli (2003) in their research on the council state that:

> Despite the range of water users, the stakeholders represented in the Pungwe SCC [Sub-Catchment Council] almost exclusively included women and men involved in commercial agricultural production. The exception was the representation of people in the Hauna Business Centre by an elected councilor, and in the Mutasa Communal Area by a headman representing Chief Mutasa. The stakeholder farmers represented in the Pungwe SCC included members of farmers' associations such as the Coffee Growers' and the Banana Growers' Associations, members of agricultural unions such as the Zimbabwe Farmers' Union (ZFU) and the Commercial Farmers' Union (CFU), and members of various irrigation schemes including Makunike, Mandeya, Gatsi, Ruda and Murara.
>
> Much of the debates within the Save CC and the Pungwe SCC revolved around the issue of payment for the use of water. Although the councilors in the two structures recognised, in principle, the need for users to pay for water, many of the constituencies that they represented apparently did not. Communal and small-scale irrigation farmers put forward various arguments against payment for water. These included that water is God-given, and had been used by those farmers for centuries without the need to pay for it. They also included that it was unfair for those already in possession of water rights that were accorded under the previous water law to pay the same additional amount of money for water permits as those who had never held any water rights. What was interesting was that the arguments were gender-neutral and they largely failed to give a nuanced grasp of the problems of paying for water in rural communal areas. To some extent, this seemed to owe to the nature of gender representation in the council meetings.
>
> Despite that women have been identified by Zimbabwe's Water Resources Management Strategy as playing a central and multi-faceted role in the provision, use and safeguarding of water, their involvement in the water-related decision-making structures was very low. The Save CC was wholly com-

> *posed of men. Within the entire Save Catchment Area, women councilors constituted 3.5% of the total number of SCC councillors. Of the seven SCCs, the Pungwe SCC had made the greatest effort to actively involve women in decision making and planning, with women occupying 20% of the SCC seats out of the council's gender representation target of 60%* (Tapela & Mukheli, 2003: 11).

The quote above brings to the fore two important issues I have highlighted elsewhere: the way in which local 'participation' has evolved may well be the result of discrepancies between notions of water as a human right, on one hand, and as an economic good, on the other. Local groups may become involved because of a wrongly perceived notion of being able to influence the fundamental rules of the game. However, certain taken-for-granted immutables (on the part of the local authorities), such as the 'fact' that water is an economic good according to the SCC, may quickly bring about non-compliance and non-participation on the part of rural communities who wish to reaffirm their conception of what is being discussed within the committee, and who then consistently fail to do so. Furthermore, the Pungwe sub-catchment council dynamic also shows clearly that those with the greatest economic or political power dominate the debates, and that for all the lip service on the importance of gender representation in Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) there seems to be poor carry-through to the actual dynamics of institutional participation (Mukheli *et al*, 2001; Tapela 2001; Tapela & Mukheli 2003; Dube & Swatuk, 2001).

Managing water and stakeholder participation: Urban vs rural, examples from Sakubva

This section draws on research on community natural resource management in the low-income high-density suburb of Sakubva, Mutare. Conditions with regard health and sanitation have been, and remain, extremely poor. Historically a dormitory suburb, Sakubva still relies on communal ablution blocks and due to a severe housing shortage, these are completely overstretched. Thus despite the technological innovation of the Pungwe offtake scheme, Sakubva is,

and remains, a suburb characterised by poor water supply, poor drainage, unsanitary conditions and being susceptible to disease caused by inadequate water related services.

Tapela & Mukheli (2003: 21) outline the situation as follows:

> The City Council of Mutare, which is responsible for provision of water and sanitation services, recognizes that access to sanitation facilities (www.unicef.org/sanitation) is a fundamental human right that safeguards health and human dignity. Safe drinking water and adequate sanitation are basic needs essential to health and development generally (Fair, 1995). However, differences in water accessibility in Sakubva is resulting in the stealing of water in common blocks and standpipes. Reconnection of water supplies illegally after being disconnected for non-payment of accounts in Sakubva is common. Although the penalties can be heavy, the chances of criminals being caught are slim. The fact that Sakubva is also a 'dormitory suburb' for migrant labour also makes it very difficult to instill a sense of 'responsibility' and 'best practice' among 'residents'. Moreover, leaseholders in these areas were rarely residents themselves. It is a common situation to find the leaseholder returning to his/her rural area and simply earning money from the illegal 'sub-letting' of his/her property. The condition of communal ablution blocks, for example, is therefore of no concern to the leaseholders… Given that the City Council lacks capacity to effectively implement proactive demand management strategies, the only readily available option is to shut off water. This type of demand management through punishment only exacerbates the difficult relations that exist between residents and the City Council. It also means that women have to walk for long distances searching for communal blocks with running water.

What is particularly interesting about the above description is the evident blurring of the concepts 'urban' and 'rural'. Sakubva, with its long history as a temporary community, shows that the ways in which community is constituted as a concept in public policy is not adequately cognizant of the differences between feelings of belonging in a 'temporary' community, and in more permanent ones (which may of course also overlap socio-spatially). Common understandings of community generally assume a common sense of responsibility

that may not necessarily be the case in practice. A further extremely thought provoking aspect of Mukheli's empirical work is the split notion of community in Sakubva: communities consider themselves both urban *and* rural, although their loyalties and responsibilities may be in more ways than one towards the rural context. Provision of public goods, and the sense of public duty which is supposed to ensue, is thus not necessarily created, not due to any lack of public responsibility but because of a sense of 'not really belonging'.

Notions of 'urban', 'rural', 'stakeholder' and 'participation'

Anderson (1983) traces the ways in which the sense of community is captured both as a form of imagining but also in the spread of knowledge as a written discourse. It seems that popular policy perceptions of 'urban', 'rural', 'stakeholder' and 'participation' have a tendency to try to fit the concepts to a specific setting, or policy area, rather than the other way round. In this sense there is quite a large gap between the policy context and dynamics, as one would find them represented in official documentation, and the perceived as well as actual overlapping dynamics of participation, non-participation and cooptation on the ground. Tapela & Mukheli (2003) and Dube & Swatuk (2001) have also made mention of the ways in which gender fails to be integrated into discussions and dynamics of participation in any meaningful kind of way. For example, in rural areas women are often not able or willing to leave their daily responsibilities to attend meetings where they do not, in any case, feel able to exercise much influence. Anecdotal evidence seems to suggest that rural women do nonetheless exercise indirect power through male representatives and have many varied and sometimes unorthodox methods of censure for not having their interests represented by those whom they delegate as their 'representative' voice. Other aspects that factor into the participation dynamic (or the lack thereof) are long distances and too frequent meetings, as well as the language in which meetings are conducted (usually English).

The governance gap: Imagined communities and notional participation

It would seem that an essential feature of what could be called the governance gap is the lack of conceptual fit between the stakeholders involved in participation, by virtue of the fact that the community to which they are assumed to belong in terms of the public terrain is not how they themselves envisage the space where their predominant interests could be represented. At the level of research and policy formulation there is a naturalised assumption that urban and rural communities are out there to be found, captured by public discourse which concerns their interests and then inserted into these 'for their own good'. The question of agenda setting aside, participation based on this trajectory is bound to be minimal. As a result, there is evidently good reason to view the word 'empowerment' with caution, or even skepticism. For example, as Cornwall (2002: 3) reminds us, the use of 'empowerment' in World Bank policy has become the chief instrument for managed intervention.

As Anderson's (1983) work on imagined communities further suggests, the common features of publicly defining communities does, in a sense, include them in a historical process of 'imagining themselves'. However for this reinvention to take place successfully the benefits of belonging must also outweigh the costs, even if this is simply in terms of perception (education and literacy are part of this process). Inasmuch as the Zimbabwean example attests, and as most of us working in the field of international development are sometimes uncomfortably aware, the benefits of development are often not easily apparent to the lay public, irrespective of the form of community identity. It seems for these reasons that institutional uptake of community concerns, in terms of the transformative type of participation mentioned above, is so particularly poor. Much of what is decided in the community interest is perforce based on a public management understanding of what that interest is, or what it is supposed to be, whether or not the dynamics which follow measure up.

Risk, security and the environment: Thinking glocal?

Nominal participation does not necessarily imply resistance to co-operation *per se*. It may simply indicate a resistance to formal up-take in government institutions that do not seem to serve the purpose of meaningful and empowering political engagement. This certainly seems to be the case in the example of the Pungwe SCC.

Another aspect to the above is that, (as I have mentioned elsewhere and as Cleaver (1997), Mehta & Leach *et al* (1999), Moyo & Tevera (1999) and others have pointed out), conflict avoidance seems to be a very marked feature of water sharing in localised, often transboundary, contexts. *Anticipating* conflict, on the other hand, is a result of often poorly theorised notions of scarcity, which feature strongly in the global and national water policy discourse. It seems that part of this anticipation is provoked by governments and international institutions which tend to assume state-centric and reified notions of community and participation. It may be that conceptualising communities in less geographically deterministic ways may help to nuance the ways in they may overlap, take on different forms, imagine and re-imagine themselves. Ecosystemic communities, for example, embrace the notion of the flexibility of community according to environmental and not statist criteria.

Baumann (2001: 61) also reminds us that, in spite of these persistent patterns of behaviour by states at the international level, the growth of a new cosmopolitanism renders notions of community obsolete for many influential global elites, many of who help shape discourses on global security. Old fashioned notions of community, where ideas of obligation are intrinsic, are distasteful to those who have the money and power to assert their individuality *de jure* as well as *de facto*. Yet this global elite is very much involved in the replication of notions of community along the two axes in which they themselves still have faith. When it comes to the validation of notions of community (and the security which is implicit in belonging to one):

> *...two authorities and two authorities only are left that are able to endow with a reassuring power, the judgements they pronounce or make manifest through their actions: the authority of experts, people who 'know better' (whose area of competence is too vast to be explored or tested by lay people), and the authority of numbers (on the assumption that the larger the numbers, the less likely they are to be wrong)* (Baumann: 2001: 63).

This 'double imagining', on one hand on the part of dominant discourse shapers, and on the other, individuals in layered community spaces (from the local up as well as the other way around) and places (from the geographical to the ecosystemic), implies that the concept of community in our current global context holds only the promise of the particular, rather than the familiar. Certainly as a 'warm space' within which create a sense of cohesion, shared vision and the ability to mobilise against socio-economic forces which may impose risks of modernisation and development, there is a persistent popular view in development policy literature that 'community' is always out there waiting to be found by the happily funded researcher with lots of notepaper and a cassette recorder, or by the policy-maker at local government level who needs to show (for donor funding purposes) that all stakeholders were consulted and/or participated. Thus 'community' as a political, socio-economic and/or policy construct, at different levels, is possibly as important a focus as notions of community generated at grassroots level. In short, who, or what, defines community, in what context, and for what purpose? Relatedly, Cornwall (2002: 29) points out that there is a need to examine participation "as situated practice" rather than trying the "down the rabbit hole" examination of participation as naturally linked to a reasonably static and definable notion of community both within *or* between states. Locating community participation not as an idealised notion of democratic practice but as potentially malleable space or place for everyday resistances, may also, at an intellectual level, help to overcome some of the facile platitudes of community empowerment (in natural resource management policy discourses, for example).

Bauman's points notwithstanding, there is a concomitant inherent tension of missing the integrated nature of community in a global ecosystemic sense. Fragmented and insecure as Beck's vision of

the Risikogesellschaft may be, there is certainly a sense in which the 'glocal' now pervades both academic and popular notions of both security and risk. The safe and secure community ideal is gradually being replaced by shared understandings of global insecurity at the level of the individual, in a world where notions of the nation (and its communities) as bounded and secure are commonly understood as more fiction than fact. The concept of 'glocal citizenship' may come to represent the ideal of citizenship and community which are forged globally through overlapping forms of participation, community and identity at different intra- and interstate, as well as international levels, where security, like post-Fordist production, is founded on the constantly shifting, endlessly reforming terrain of 'just in time' coalitions, rather than 'just in case'. These coalitions may embody any variety of global and local actors, concerns and issue areas.

References

Adams, W.M. 1995. Green development theory: Environmentalism and sustainable development, in J. Crush (ed), *The power of development*. London: Routledge.

Anderson, B. 1983. *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.

Ashton, P. 2000. Southern African water conflicts: Are they inevitable or preventable?, in H. Solomon & A. Turton (eds), *Water wars: Enduring myth or impending reality*? Africa Monograph Series, No. 2. Durban: ACCORD.

Baumann, Z. 2001. *Community: Seeking safety in an insecure world*. London: Blackwell.

Chenje, M. & Johnson, P. (eds). 1996. *Water in Southern Africa.* Maseru/Harare: SADC/IUCN/SARDC.

Cleaver, F. 1997. *Gendered incentives and informal institutions: Women, men and the management of water*. Development and Project Planning Centre Discussion Paper series 2, No. 3. Bradford: University of Bradford.

Connelly, J. & Smith, G. 1999. *Politics and the environment: From theory to practice*. London: Routledge.

Cornwall, A. 2000. *Making a difference? Gender and participatory development*. Institute for Development Studies (IDS) Discussion Paper. Sussex: IDS, University of Sussex.

Cornwall, C. 2002. *Making spaces, changing places: Situating participation in development*. IDS Working Paper, No. 170. Sussex: IDS, University of Sussex.

Crush, J. (ed). 1995. *The power of development.* London: Routledge.

Dalby, S. 1998. Ecological metaphors of security: World politics in the biosphere. *Alternatives*, 23.

Davies, M. & Niemann, M. 2000. 'Henri Lefebvre and global politics: Social spaces and everyday struggles', paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Studies Association, Los Angeles, California, USA, March 14–18.

Derman, B. 2000. Democratising environmental use? Land and water in Southern Africa at the end of the century. *Land reform and agrarian change in Southern Africa*, PLAAS Occasional Paper Series, No. 13. Cape Town: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS).

Du Plessis, A. 2000. Charting the course of the water discourse through the fog of international relations theory, in H. Solomon & A. Turton (eds), *Water wars: Enduring myth or impending reality*? Africa Monograph Series, No. 2. Durban: ACCORD.

Dube, D. & Swatuk, L. 2001. 'Stakeholder participation in the water management approach: A case study of the Save Catchment, Zimbabwe', paper presented at the Second WARFSA/Waternet Symposium on Integrated Water Resources Management Theory, Practice, Cases, Cape Town, 30–31 October.

Eckersley, Robyn. 1990. *Environmentalism and political theory: Towards an ecocentric approach*. Berkeley: University of California.

Holmes, T. & Scoones, I. 1999. *Participatory environmnetal policy processes: Experiences from North and South*. IDS Working Paper Series, No. 113. Sussex: IDS, University of Sussex.

Homer Dixon, T. & Blitt, J. (eds). 1998. *Ecoviolence: Links among population, environment and security*. Boston: Rowman and Littlefield.

Johnson, Stephanie, H. 1999. 'An ecofeminist critique of the International Economic Structure', in Meyer, M. K. & Prugl. E. (eds). *Gender politics in global governance*, Boulder: Rowman and Littlefield.

Kabeer, N. 1999. *The conditions and consequences of choice: Reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment*. United

Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) Discussion Paper, No. 108. Geneva: UNRISD.

Kabeer, N. 2002. *Citizenship and the boundaries of the acknowledged community: Identity, affiliation and exclusion*. IDS Working Paper Series, No. 171. Sussex: IDS, University of Sussex.

Keeley, J. & Scoones, I. 1999. *Understanding environmental policy processes: A review.* IDS Working Paper Series, No. 89. Sussex: IDS, University of Sussex.

Keeley, J. & Scoones, I. 2000. *Global science, global policy: Local to global policy processes for soils management in Africa*. IDS Working Paper Series, No. 115. Sussex: IDS, University of Sussex.

Lash, S. Szerszynski, B. & Wynne, B. (eds) 1996. *Risk, environment and modernity: Towards a new ecology*. London: Sage.

Magara, L. & Tapfuma, V. 2000. *Pungwe-Mutare Water Supply Project: Pungwe River hydrology impacts of water transfer*. Harare: Interconsult.

Maguire, J. 1996. The tears inside the stone: Reflections on the ecology of fear, in S. Lash, B. Szerszynski & B. Wynne (eds), *Risk, environment and modernity: Towards a new ecology*. London: Sage.

Marchand, M.H. & Parpart, J. (eds). 1995. *Feminism, postmodernism, development*. Routledge: London.

Mbongwe, T. 1997. 'Women and water: A global perspective', paper presented at the first national conference on gender and the environment, Gabarone, Botswana, March.

Mehta, L. 2000. *Water for the twenty-first century: Challenges and misconceptions*. IDS Working Paper Series, No. 111. Sussex: IDS, University of Sussex.

Mehta, L. & Leach, M. et al. 1999. *Exploring understandings of institutions and uncertainty: New directions in natural resource management.* IDS Discussion Paper Series, No. 372. Sussex: IDS, University of Sussex.

Meissner, R. 2000. Hydropolitical hotspots in Southern Africa: Will there be a water war? The case of the Kunene River, in Solomon, H. & A. Turton (eds). *Water wars: Enduring myth or impending reality*? Africa Monograph Series, No. 2. Durban: ACCORD.

Mitchell, T. 1995. The object of development: America's Egypt, in Crush, J. (ed), *The power of development*. London: Routledge.

Moyo, S. & Tevera, D. 1999. 'Environmental trends and security in Southern Africa', paper presented at the Southern African Regional Institute for Policy Studies' Annual Colloquium on Peace and Security in Southern Africa, 26–30 September 1999, Harare Sheraton, Harare.

Mukheli, A. Mosupye, G. & Swatuk, L. 2001. 'Is the Pungwe Water Supply Project a solution to water accessibility and sanitation problems for the households of Sakubva (Zimbabwe)?', paper presented at the Second WARFSA/Waternet Symposium on Integrated Water Resources Management Theory, Practice, Cases, Cape Town, 30–31 October.

Nilsson, A. & Osborne, S. 1998. *Report on the drafting of terms of reference for the Pungue (Pungwe) River Basin Joint Integrated Water Resources Management Plan*, Harare: SIDA.

Ohlsson, L. 1995. *Water and security in Southern Africa.* Publications on Water Resources, No. 1. Stockholm: Department for Natural Resources and the Environment.

Parpart, J.L. 1995. 'Post-modernism, gender and development' in Crush, J. (ed). *The power of development*. London: Routledge.

Parpart, J. 2001. Rethinking participatory empowerment, gender and development: The PRA Approach, in J. Parpart, S. Rai, & K. Staidt (eds), *Rethinking empowerment*. London: Routledge (forthcoming).

Peterson, V. 1992. *Gendered states: Feminist (re)visions of international relations theory.* Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Peterson, S.V. & Runyan, A.S. 1999. 'The politics of resistance: Women as nonstate, antistate and transtate actors', in S.V. Peterson & A.S. Runyan (eds), *Global gender issues.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Peterson, V. & Runyan, A.S. 1999. 'Gendered divisions of violence, labour and resources', in S.V. Peterson & A.S. Runyan (eds), *Global gender issues.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Philips, A.(ed). 1998. *Feminism in politics.* London: Oxford University Press.

Swatuk, L & Vale, P. 2000. Swimming upstream: Water and discourses of security, in *Security, ecology and community*, Working Paper Series, No. 2. Bellville: Centre for Southern African Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Szerzynski, B. 1996. On knowing what to do: Environmentalism and the modern problematic, in S. Lash, B. Szerszynski, B. & B. Wynne (eds), *Risk, environment and modernity: Towards a new ecology*. London: Sage.

Tapela, B. 2001. 'Gender and integrated water resources management in the Save Catchment Area in Zimbabwe', June/July, unpublished draft report.

Tapela, B & Mukheli, A. 2003 (forthcoming), Gender perspectives on integrated water resources management in the Save catchment area of Zimbabwe, in *Security, ecology and community*, Working Paper Series, Bellville: Centre for Southern African Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Thompson, L. & Swatuk, L. 2000. Gender and ecosystems: Reframing Southern African 'security'. *Security, ecology and community*, Working Paper Series, No. 1. Bellville: Centre for Southern African Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Thompson, L. & Tapscott, C. 2000. Thinking beyond the discourse: Towards alternative approaches to development in Southern Africa, in Thompson, L. (ed). *Development, democracy and aid,* CSAS Monograph Series, No. 1. Bellville: Centre for Southern African Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Thompson, L. 2001. *Conference report on African decentralisation and local government*. Bellville: School of Government, University of the Western Cape.

Tickner, A. 1992. *Gender in international relations: Feminist perspectives on achieving global security*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Tickner, J. A. 1997. 'You just don't understand': Troubled engagements between feminists and IR theorists. *International Studies Quarterly*, 41(4) 611–632.

Turton, A. 2000. Water wars: Enduring myth or impending reality?, in H. Solomon & A. Turton (eds), *Water wars: Enduring myth or impending reality*? Africa Monograph Series, No. 2. Durban: ACCORD.

Van der Zaag, P. 2000. 'Some basic information on the Pungwe Basin', unpublished report prepared for the South African Water Research Commission-sponsored project on contesting the water wars hypothesis.

White, S. 1996, Depoliticising development: the uses and abuses of participation, *Development in Practice,* 6(1).

Zanting, H. A. Macueve, C. & Novela, B. 1994. *Salt intrusion in the Pungue estuary*. Beira: Department of Hydrology.