



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL
ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of White Black Legal – The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of White Black Legal holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of White Black Legal. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, White Black Legal shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

WHITE BLACK
LEGAL

EDITORIAL TEAM

Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS) Indian Administrative Service officer



Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti-Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala. He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University. He also has an LLM (Pro) (with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru and

a professional diploma in Public Procurement from the World Bank.

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB, LLM degrees from Banaras Hindu University & PHD from university of Kota. He has successfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the Ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.



Senior Editor

Dr. Neha Mishra



Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; PH.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St. Louis, 2015.

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi,

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing PH.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.



Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Inter-country adoption laws from Uttarakhand University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.

Dr. Rinu Saraswat



Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur, M.A, LL.M, PH.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, PH.D, PGDSAPM

Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University. More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on CR.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.



Subhrajit Chanda



BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); PH.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

ABOUT US

WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal provide dedicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

SOCIO-LEGAL DIMENSIONS OF TRANSBOUNDARY WATER DISPUTES AND THE ROLE OF COOPERATIVE SOCIETIES IN PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE WATER GOVERNANCE

AUTHORED BY - MOHIT SATISH KUMAR RANINGA

Ph.D. Scholar,
Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat, India.

CO-AUTHOR - DR. KRATIKA GUPTA

Assistant Professor, United World School of Law,
Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat, India

Abstract

Transboundary water disputes have emerged as one of the most complex and sensitive challenges in contemporary international law and governance. Rivers, lakes, and aquifers that traverse political boundaries are indispensable for economic development, food security, and ecological sustainability, yet they increasingly become sources of legal conflict, political tension, and social vulnerability. While international water law has developed foundational principles such as equitable and reasonable utilization, the obligation not to cause significant harm, and the duty to cooperate, the implementation of these principles remains uneven and largely state-centric. This paper undertakes a socio-legal examination of transboundary water disputes by situating legal norms within their broader social, political, and environmental contexts. It argues that cooperative societies—democratically governed, community-based institutions—offer a crucial yet underexplored mechanism for enhancing participatory water governance. Drawing upon international treaties, International Court of Justice jurisprudence, regional water agreements, and socio-legal scholarship, the paper contends that integrating cooperative societies into transboundary water governance can promote equity, sustainability, and conflict prevention. The study concludes that effective management of shared water resources requires not only inter-state legal compliance but also grassroots participation, social accountability, and environmental stewardship.

Keywords - Transboundary Water Disputes; International Water Law; Cooperative Societies;

Introduction

Water is a fundamental natural resource essential for human survival, economic activity, and ecological balance. Despite its centrality to life, freshwater resources are finite, unevenly distributed, and increasingly under stress due to population growth, climate change, industrial pollution, and unsustainable patterns of consumption. A significant proportion of the world's freshwater flows through river basins and aquifers shared by two or more states. It is estimated that more than 260 international river basins cover nearly half of the Earth's land surface and support approximately forty percent of the global population.¹

The transboundary character of these watercourses transforms water governance into a legal and political challenge of global significance. Competing claims over water allocation, dam construction, irrigation expansion, and industrial use frequently lead to disputes between riparian states. These disputes are rarely limited to legal disagreements; they are deeply intertwined with historical grievances, power asymmetries, and socio-economic inequalities. In regions facing water scarcity, transboundary disputes often exacerbate poverty, threaten food security, and undermine social stability.

International water law has evolved to address these challenges through treaties, customary norms, and judicial decisions. However, these legal frameworks remain predominantly state-centric, focusing on sovereign rights and diplomatic negotiation. As a result, communities most directly affected by water disputes—farmers, fisherfolk, indigenous groups, and women—remain largely excluded from decision-making processes. This exclusion weakens the legitimacy and effectiveness of water governance regimes.

This paper argues that a purely doctrinal or state-centric legal approach is insufficient to address the complex realities of transboundary water disputes. Instead, a socio-legal approach is required—one that examines how legal norms operate within social, economic, and environmental contexts. Within this framework, cooperative societies emerge as important institutional actors capable of bridging the gap between international legal principles and

¹ UN Convention on the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses, 1997.

grassroots water governance.

Socio-Legal Framework for Analysing Transboundary Water Disputes

The socio-legal approach emphasizes that law is not autonomous but embedded within social structures and power relations. Legal rules governing water allocation and use directly shape livelihoods, public health, and ecological sustainability. Consequently, the effectiveness of water law depends not only on formal compliance but also on social acceptance, participation, and enforcement.²

Transboundary water disputes often reveal the limitations of formal legal compliance. For example, a state may adhere to treaty obligations while undertaking infrastructure projects that disproportionately harm downstream communities. From a socio-legal perspective, such actions raise questions of distributive justice, accountability, and democratic participation that cannot be resolved solely through treaty interpretation.

The socio-legal framework also highlights power asymmetries between upstream and downstream states and between central authorities and local communities. These asymmetries influence how legal norms are interpreted and implemented. Addressing them requires institutional mechanisms that promote transparency, participation, and social legitimacy—functions that cooperative societies are particularly well-suited to perform.

International Legal Principles Governing Transboundary Watercourses

1. Equitable and Reasonable Utilization

The principle of equitable and reasonable utilization constitutes the cornerstone of international water law. It recognizes that all riparian states have a right to use shared water resources in a manner that is fair, sustainable, and considerate of the needs of other states. Factors such as geography, hydrology, population dependence, existing uses, and environmental requirements inform the assessment of equity.³

This principle rejects doctrines of absolute territorial sovereignty and emphasizes shared rights and responsibilities. However, its flexibility also allows states to advance competing interpretations, often leading to disputes over what constitutes “equitable” use.

² Stephen C. McCaffrey, *The Law of International Watercourses* (2d ed. 2007).

³ Salman M.A. Salman, *Perspectives on International Water Law*, 23 *Water Res. Dev.* 625 (2007).

2. Obligation Not to Cause Significant Harm

Closely linked to equitable utilization is the obligation not to cause significant harm to other riparian states. This obligation requires states to prevent activities that result in substantial adverse effects, including pollution, reduced water flows, or ecological degradation. The relationship between utilization and harm prevention remains a central tension in international water law.

3. Duty to Cooperate

International water law increasingly emphasizes cooperation, prior notification, consultation, and information exchange. These procedural obligations aim to prevent disputes by fostering trust and transparency. The **UN Convention on the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses, 1997**, codifies these duties and reflects emerging customary norms.

Contribution of the International Court of Justice

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) has played a pivotal role in clarifying and developing international water law through its jurisprudence.

In the **Gabčíkovo–Nagymaros Project (Hungary v. Slovakia)** case, the Court emphasized that unilateral actions undermine cooperative water governance and recognized sustainable development as a guiding concept reconciling economic development with environmental protection.⁴ The judgment underscored that shared watercourses impose shared responsibilities.

In **Pulp Mills on the River Uruguay (Argentina v. Uruguay)**, the ICJ elaborated procedural obligations, holding that prior notification and consultation are essential components of cooperation.⁵ The Court also recognized environmental impact assessment as a requirement under customary international law.

Similarly, in **Certain Activities Carried Out by Nicaragua in the Border Area (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)**, the Court reinforced the integration of environmental protection into watercourse management and awarded compensation for ecological damage.⁶ These decisions

⁴ *Gabčíkovo–Nagymaros Project (Hungary v. Slovakia)*, 1997 I.C.J. Rep. 7.

⁵ *Pulp Mills on the River Uruguay (Argentina v. Uruguay)*, 2010 I.C.J. Rep. 14.

⁶ *Certain Activities Carried Out by Nicaragua (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, 2015 I.C.J. Rep. 665.

demonstrate the Court's increasing sensitivity to environmental and social considerations.

Regional and Bilateral Water Agreements

Bilateral treaties remain the primary instruments for managing transboundary water disputes. The **Indus Waters Treaty, 1960**, between India and Pakistan is frequently cited as a successful example of sustained cooperation despite political hostility. The treaty established a detailed allocation mechanism and a multi-tier dispute resolution process involving neutral experts and arbitration.⁷

However, the treaty reflects the limitations of mid-twentieth-century water governance. It does not adequately address climate change, groundwater depletion, or participatory governance. Its rigid allocation framework and state-centric structure limit its adaptability to contemporary challenges.⁸

Similarly, the **Ganges Water Sharing Treaty, 1996**, between India and Bangladesh illustrates the difficulties of balancing legal certainty with ecological sustainability and social equity.⁹ These agreements underscore the need for governance models that extend beyond formal state-to-state arrangements.

Socio-Political and Human Impacts of Water Disputes

Transboundary water disputes have profound socio-political consequences. Reduced water availability directly affects agricultural productivity, food security, and public health. Rural and indigenous communities dependent on river systems are particularly vulnerable to changes in water flows caused by upstream interventions.¹⁰

Gender dimensions are especially significant. Women bear primary responsibility for water collection and household management, yet they remain underrepresented in water governance institutions. This exclusion exacerbates gender inequality and undermines effective resource management.¹¹

⁷ Indus Waters Treaty, India–Pakistan, 1960.

⁸ Salman & Uprety, *Conflict and Cooperation on South Asia's International Rivers* (2002).

⁹ Ganges Water Sharing Treaty, India–Bangladesh, 1996.

¹⁰ Ramaswamy Iyer, *Water: Perspectives, Issues, Concerns* (2003).

¹¹ Bina Agarwal, *Gender and Green Governance* (2010).

Moreover, the securitization of water—where water resources are framed as matters of national security—often marginalizes social and environmental concerns and hinders cooperative approaches to water governance.

Cooperative Societies: Concept and Legal Recognition

Cooperative societies are voluntary associations formed to meet common economic, social, and cultural needs through collective action. They are based on principles of democratic member control, mutual assistance, and equitable distribution of benefits. Most legal systems recognize cooperatives as distinct legal entities.

In India, the **Multi-State Cooperative Societies Act, 2002**, provides a statutory framework for cooperatives operating across state boundaries, including those involved in resource management.¹² Internationally, cooperative principles are promoted by organizations such as the International Cooperative Alliance.

Role of Cooperative Societies in Water Governance

Cooperative societies play a crucial role in water governance at the grassroots level. They manage irrigation systems, maintain infrastructure, allocate water equitably, and resolve local disputes. Their localized knowledge and social legitimacy enable them to respond effectively to environmental and social challenges.¹³

Elinor Ostrom's work on common-pool resource management demonstrates that community-based institutions can sustainably manage shared resources when supported by appropriate legal and institutional frameworks.¹⁴ Cooperative societies exemplify these principles in practice.

Integrating Cooperative Societies into Transboundary Water Governance

Integrating cooperative societies into transboundary water governance can bridge the gap between international legal norms and local realities. Cooperatives can facilitate cross-border community cooperation, fostering trust and mutual understanding even where interstate

¹² Multi-State Cooperative Societies Act, 2002 (India).

¹³ Tushaar Shah, *Governing the Commons* (2009).

¹⁴ Elinor Ostrom, *Governing the Commons* (1990).

relations are strained.¹⁵

Formal recognition of cooperatives as stakeholders in treaty mechanisms would enhance transparency, legitimacy, and compliance. Mandatory stakeholder consultations, including cooperative representation, could significantly improve treaty implementation and dispute prevention.

Environmental Sustainability and Cooperative-Led Governance

Environmental degradation poses a serious threat to transboundary water systems. River pollution, declining groundwater levels, and ecosystem collapse illustrate the consequences of unsustainable water use.¹⁶ Cooperative societies can promote conservation practices, monitor pollution, and support ecosystem restoration through community engagement.

Judicial recognition of environmental obligations, as reflected in ICJ jurisprudence, supports the integration of ecological considerations into cooperative governance models.¹⁷

Challenges and the Way Forward

Despite their potential, cooperative societies face challenges such as limited financial resources, lack of technical expertise, and insufficient legal empowerment. Political resistance from centralized authorities and power asymmetries among riparian states further complicate integration.¹⁸

Addressing these challenges requires legal reforms, capacity-building initiatives, and international support mechanisms. Regional platforms facilitating cross-border cooperative collaboration can enhance resilience and sustainability.

Conclusion

Transboundary water disputes represent a convergence of legal complexity, social vulnerability, and environmental urgency. While international water law provides essential normative frameworks, its effectiveness depends on inclusive and participatory governance.

¹⁵ Rahaman, *Ganges Treaties Analysis*, 16 Int'l J. Water Res. Dev. 537 (2009).

¹⁶ Owen McIntyre, *Environmental Protection of International Watercourses* (2015).

¹⁷ Philippe Sands et al., *Principles of International Environmental Law* (2018).

¹⁸ Ashok Swain, *Managing Water Conflict* (2004).

Cooperative societies, rooted in democratic principles and social solidarity, offer a viable pathway to bridge the gap between law and society.

Integrating cooperative societies into transboundary water governance can promote equity, sustainability, and conflict prevention. The future of shared water resources depends not only on treaties and courts but also on empowered communities capable of translating legal norms into lived realities.

References

1. UN Convention on the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses, 1997.
2. Stephen C. McCaffrey, *The Law of International Watercourses* (2d ed. 2007).
3. Salman M.A. Salman, *Perspectives on International Water Law*, 23 *Water Res. Dev.* 625 (2007).
4. *Gabčíkovo–Nagymaros Project (Hungary v. Slovakia)*, 1997 I.C.J. Rep. 7.
5. *Pulp Mills on the River Uruguay (Argentina v. Uruguay)*, 2010 I.C.J. Rep. 14.
6. *Certain Activities Carried Out by Nicaragua (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, 2015 I.C.J. Rep. 665.
7. Indus Waters Treaty, India–Pakistan, 1960.
8. Salman & Uprety, *Conflict and Cooperation on South Asia's International Rivers* (2002).
9. Ganges Water Sharing Treaty, India–Bangladesh, 1996.
10. Ramaswamy Iyer, *Water: Perspectives, Issues, Concerns* (2003).
11. Bina Agarwal, *Gender and Green Governance* (2010).
12. Multi-State Cooperative Societies Act, 2002 (India).
13. Tushaar Shah, *Governing the Commons* (2009).
14. Elinor Ostrom, *Governing the Commons* (1990).
15. Rahaman, *Ganges Treaties Analysis*, 16 *Int'l J. Water Res. Dev.* 537 (2009).
16. Owen McIntyre, *Environmental Protection of International Watercourses* (2015).
17. Philippe Sands et al., *Principles of International Environmental Law* (2018).
18. Ashok Swain, *Managing Water Conflict* (2004).