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Where is the “anthropogenic disturbance” in the hydrological cycle?
Jordan River Basin

- Lebanon
- Syria
- Jordan
- Palestine
- Israel
Transboundary Water Management

* Various quantitative and qualitative methods for conflict resolution in water cooperation
* Focus on rational choice, managerialism and a zero-sum neoliberal game theoretical approach
* Ignoring the importance of identity, cognitive and emotive dimensions of violence and water cooperation
Structured Hegemony

* Protracted military conflict and occupation
* Persistent asymmetrical hegemonic communication
* Sub-alternating of the oppressed other
* Cognitive dissonance and dis-recognition of pain
* Framing of historical narratives and colonial-logics
* Focus on economic profit and benefits
* No opportunity for reconciliation, transformative justice or processing of past traumas for conflict transformation
The Jordan River Basin Boardgame Exercise (JRBBE)

“This game is real. It is so close to what we all experience here in the Basin”

Player from Jordan
The Jordan River Basin Boardgame Exercise (JRBBE)

- A: Sweden (Lund University)
- B: Golan Heights (Syrians)
- C: Sweden (CMES)
- D: Bir Zeit University (Palestinians)
- E: Tel Aviv (Israelis)
- F: Ramallah (Palestinians)
- G: Amman (Jordanians)
Optimal Allocation or Hegemony?
Identities in the hydrosocial cycle
Conclusions

* On-going dilemma of playing to win individually (*national interests, selfishness, unilateralism*) or to win together (*transboundary water management, altruism, joint or collective action*).
* Identity, trust, empathy, cognition and perception of “the other” play an essential role in decision-making on water cooperation.
* Peace cannot emerge in a solely technocratic domain with a managerial focus on rational choice and maximum profit without taking into account the emotive and recognising human rights violations for transformative justice.
* An equitable just hydropeace in the Jordan River Basin within the neoliberal paradigm is highly unlikely.
* In the metaphorical paradigm of the boardgame (*human ecosystem and not zero-sum but cooperative management*) a durable hydropeace is however possible (positive outcome of the game).
Can structural hegemony be challenged and countered by emphasizing the role and importance of empathy for sustainable transboundary water management, recognition and altruism in water cooperation and if so, how can this be reflected in effective policies for a fair and just peace between riparian states locked in a protracted military conflict?