INTRODUCTION

The Crossing Boundaries (CB) project of the South Asian Consortium for Interdisciplinary Water Resources Studies (SaciWATERs) aims to bring in an interdisciplinary and gender-sensitive perspective, within the broad paradigm of Integrated Water Resources Management, on water resources research, education, and outreach. The project includes a number of components such as the introduction of social science courses in the curriculum of CB partner institutes and of interdisciplinary research in the realm of water resources management, and...
contributing to a more balanced gender composition among water professionals. Yet, it would be a mistake to assume that these are concepts whose meanings are uncontested or whose implementation can follow an easy, uniform blueprint for action. This paper brings out some of the complexities inherent in furthering the agenda of interdisciplinarity, by drawing on presentations and deliberations in SaciWATERs's International Conference on Interdisciplinarity in Water Education: Challenges, Perspective and Policy Implications held in Nepal in October 2010 (SaciWATERs conference henceforth) and also on a general understanding of the kind of water research, education, and activism that exists in the South Asian context. In doing so, it raises a number of larger questions on interdisciplinarity and the nature of research, and also offers some practical suggestions on taking a more nuanced agenda of interdisciplinarity forward in research and education, as well as linking this up with people's movements.

The structure of the paper is as follows. There are three sections – the first on interdisciplinary research, the second on interdisciplinary education, and the third on the links between research and activism; these are contributed by the first, second, and third authors respectively. The three sections are, in a sense, stand-alone ones, although they do speak to each other; further, they vary in the degree of scepticism/optimism about the potential of interdisciplinarity.

GAPS IN WATER RESEARCH IN SOUTH ASIA: QUESTIONS ABOUT INTERDISCIPLINARITY

As part of the CB project, interdisciplinary research was carried out by the South Asia Water Fellows on various issues related to Water Resource Management in the course of their degree programmes (Masters and PhD). Some of this research was presented in the SaciWATERs conference. Apart from the more conventional engineering issues, a wide range of issues usually associated with the social sciences were also taken up such as forms of urbanization, food and livelihood security, valuation of water, institutional aspects, governance, and so on. This is a far cry from the engineering-dominated discourses that one usually associates with water, and is therefore an important step. However, it is also important to not get too carried away at this juncture and reflect more critically on the implications of some of the ways in which interdisciplinarity between the social and natural sciences is being interpreted in the context of water research in South Asia. This is the broad theme of this section. Three sets of points are made – on the kinds of knowledge and hierarchies between them, interdisciplinarity, and the politics of research and knowledge – which reflect gaps in a lot of existing water research. We start, however, by dwelling on two terms that occur in the title of the theme itself – 'research' and 'water research'.

Some preliminary remarks

An interesting phenomenon that has occurred in recent times is the large number of sites in which 'research' is being undertaken (conventional academics, NGOs, government, communities). Whether and to what extent this represents a democratization of research is a difficult question which we do not attempt to answer in this paper. What we would like to highlight, however, is that the goal of research may also vary (bringing about better understanding, action, or policy change), although these goals are not necessarily mutually exclusive and there is no one-to-one correspondence between a particular research site and a particular goal. Hence instead of talking about research as if everyone knows what is meant by it, we need to be more specific about what kind of research we are talking about and what goal it has in any given context. For instance, in the case of research being done at the Masters level, it is rather unusual for these dissertations to be expected to come up with policy implications that would bring about change; as some of the presenters in the SaciWATERs conference were seeking to do. Further, irrespective of the kind of research, one could think of certain 'basic requirements' of any research:

1 For some of the outputs of this project, see papers in Sections 2 and 3 of this special issue of the South Asian Water Studies journal.
A well-defined research question that is situated within literatures (whether academic or the so-called grey literature) on relevant subjects as well as a concrete socio-political-cultural-economic-ecological context.

Greater reflexivity about methodology in terms of both methods or techniques used for data collection and analysis as well as the philosophical assumptions made about the nature of knowledge and reality.

Findings should be derived from the data and analysis with consistency, rigour and integrity; there are, of course, different understandings of these terms and the particular meaning used in a given research project would need to be clearly spelt out.

There are gaps with respect to the above in some of the research presented in the conference as well as the research that exists on water in South Asia. Greater attention to these issues would result in a better understanding of the phenomenon being studied as well as more careful action/policy recommendations; specific examples follow later in this section.

The other question that we want to flag, albeit briefly, is whether water research is only that which explicitly focuses on water. The problem with such a position is that it would exclude a lot of social science work which focuses on particular concepts and theories and uses water 'only' as a case study (e.g. anthropological work on the water bureaucracy), even though this literature can offer many interesting insights with respect to the various dimensions of water. This is, in turn, at least partly related to the recent trend of focusing not on disciplines or areas, but on particular sectors. One possible way to deal with this gap is to focus on a conceptual theme or a normative goal rather than a sector; if the sectoral focus cannot be given up, there should at least be a conscious effort to include these other kinds of work.

With these preliminary remarks, we move on to the three main points of this section.

Different kinds of knowledges and hierarchies between them

One of the points that emerges from the SaciWATERs conference is that greater attention is needed to different kinds of knowledge and hierarchies between them. For instance, terms such as 'scientific' knowledge are used as if its meaning is uncontroversial. However, there is now a long tradition of critique of both the hypothetico-deductive method of reasoning (which is the basis of a lot of 'scientific' research) as well as the privileging of 'hard' data over anecdotal evidence. Similarly, terms like 'unscientific urbanization' or 'more scientific transfer of water' were used without unpacking what precisely the terms mean and what they exclude.

To give another example, although the social, political, cultural, and economic dimensions of water are often added to technical knowledge, the construction of the 'technical' itself is not questioned (e.g. in discourses of sanitation and irrigation). Further, in the process of undoing the hierarchies that are already in place, care is needed to ensure that new hierarchies are not created. E.g. traditional knowledge is often posited as an alternative to modern or scientific knowledge. But apart from the fact that there are hierarchies within traditional knowledge also, such knowledge is often part of a 'lived experience' and any attempt to upscale it might itself result in it losing the characteristics that make it different from 'scientific' knowledge.

1 Intervention by Sumi Krishna in the SaciWATERs conference. Other examples of different kinds of research are also given in the fourth section of this paper.

2 This is a gap that was reflected in the SaciWATERs conference also.

3 For a brief account of some of these debates, see, for instance, Corbetta (2003).
Unpacking interdisciplinarity further

The term 'interdisciplinarity' has a range of meanings, and is often used interchangeably with 'multidisciplinarity' and 'transdisciplinarity', even though these are distinct concepts. Yet there is a prior question to be asked viz. what is a discipline? This is an important question because the word 'discipline' often seems to be used as an equivalent to a sector or an issue, so that interdisciplinarity is used to just mean that a variety of different social and political issues are considered. This is sometimes the sense in which Integrated Water Resource Management seems to be considered interdisciplinary. Even when the term 'discipline' is used in the more conventional sense of disciplines such as economics, physics etc., interdisciplinarity does not neatly translate into an inclusion of all relevant disciplines. Certain kinds of economics, political science, and sociology are privileged, and disciplines like history, anthropology and critical geography are neglected. This, in turn, is related to the point that the hierarchies and divisions between different social sciences are often greater than those between the natural sciences and social sciences, with deep-seated differences both in their understanding of knowledge and reality as well as in the methods used (see, for instance, Bardhan, 1989).

There is also the question of whether and how one can 'transfer' concepts and knowledges from one discipline to another and the dangers inherent in this. For instance, one often found uncritical reference to the 'population problem', 'merits of the green revolution' or 'participatory research' in the SaciWATERs conference, even though these are subjects that have been the subject of much debate within the social sciences. One does not want to take away the importance of bringing in social concerns to engineers. Yet doing this without consciousness about the political implications of too easy an interdisciplinarity could be dangerous. To put it in a different way, a good engineer who is aware that there are social/political/cultural consequences and who is willing to talk/listen to someone who has studied these (and vice versa) is probably better than an interdisciplinary engineer who claims to know a bit of the social and political, but then talks about population or desalinization or green revolution or migrants in an uncritical fashion. Taking social sciences to engineering colleges without having a reverse flow also feeds into the assumption that the knowledge of social sciences (be it on gender or governance) is more 'amenable' to such transfer and can be neatly packaged in a modular fashion, whereas it would be more difficult to do this with the more 'technical' engineering knowledge.

It may therefore be useful to start with a more modest aim of just being able to converse with other disciplines even as one is grounded well in one discipline, and to think about greater integration between disciplines much later.

Consciousness about Politics of Research/Knowledge

One of the interesting features of the deliberations in the conference has been the relative absence/neglect of terms such as capitalism, neoliberalism, commodification, privatization etc., even though there are many strands of water research which are seriously concerned with them. This is partly a result of the problems with the kind of interdisciplinarity that is usually put in place (a point that was discussed in the previous sub-section). But given that there is no such thing as an apolitical position, it is important that the politics of one's position (whether about climate change, migrants, or desalinization) is at least explicitly articulated if not actively debated. There is also a need for greater attention to the politics of the research/knowledge creation process itself. Exclusions of certain aspects from a particular research project could be just a matter of what is deemed to be important by a particular researcher, but is also more often than not related to her/his social and political position.

Having struck a cautionary note about interdisciplinary research, the paper now moves onto the question of interdisciplinary education and how to take it further, even while keeping some of the concerns in mind which are raised in this section.
There was a consensus in the SaciWATERs conference on the need for interdisciplinary water resources education. This consensus echoed itself in some of the narratives heard during the conference as well as the discourses surrounding water management that were repeatedly cited by many of the speakers. It is possible to distil three such distinct – though closely related – narratives: a focus on the limitation of traditional, supply augmentation approaches to water resource development, an emphasis on the need for students to learn across disciplines to appreciate the various facets of water management, and questioning of the dominant paradigms in water management. At the same time, prevailing discourses such as those around IWRM lend credibility and justification to the need for interdisciplinarity in water resources education. Changes and processes underway in South Asia such as increasing urbanization and climate change that were widely discussed and debated in the conference also have wide ranging implications for both water availability and access and further necessitate analyses of an interdisciplinary nature.

The CB project has made a dent in reorienting the dominant paradigm in water resources education in the region. Gender mainstreaming – an otherwise relatively difficult task in water management – has been relatively more successful in terms of water education, as seen in terms of the fruition of SaciWATERs's efforts in getting female participants in the programmes of the CB institutes. It is interesting to note that the more interdisciplinary we get, the more the gender mix turns in favour of female students. This is not just in the case of the CB partner institutes wherein the CB programme has made a conscious effort to invite and enrol female participants, but is also a trend visible outside the CB partner institutes. A good example is TERI University's interdisciplinary programmes, wherein 80-85% of students are girls, as against the preponderance of boys in conventional, engineering programs.5

However, sensitization on the need for a paradigm shift among policy-makers and potential employers – especially in the government – is still required in order to get them to appreciate the value of interdisciplinarity both in terms of the approach to water management as well as in terms of the skill sets needed by water professionals. In the rest of this section, the focus will be on how to take interdisciplinarity in the education system further.

What is the education system? Who or what are we trying to change?

When we talk of changes needed in the education system, it helps to start by thinking about what comprises the education system. Clearly, the education system consists of the faculty, the students as well as the administration that sets the rules and procedures within which they function. Then, of course, there are other actors that play an important role, such as employers and the parents or families of students. Changes can thus be made at two levels; first, in the formal education system, and second, in the daily interaction between students and faculty. Although the former is necessary, it requires lobbying and advocacy and tends to produce results slowly. There is a greater potential to bring about change in a relatively shorter period of time by the second route viz. changes in the classroom and in the field, and it this that will form the focus of this section of the paper.

Interdisciplinarity as a social construction

In this context, it is worth emphasizing that an interdisciplinary approach is constructed in the modes of interaction and communication between students and faculty. Interdisciplinarity should be seen as a socially constructed phenomenon, shaped by the interactions among them. Therefore an understanding of faculty and

5 See, for instance, Narain (2008). However, no easy, neat relationship can be drawn between gender mainstreaming and interdisciplinarity; also what exactly this trend means, particularly in terms of gender stereotypes, would need further study.
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student attitudes and relationships is key.

Particularly important is the role of faculty. Having a group of committed faculty members with interdisciplinary interests in any department or group within a university is essential. Further, course design and curriculum often reflect the balance of power among faculty. In moving further, therefore, changes in faculty attitudes are important. Faculty members need to be truly internally convinced about interdisciplinary education so that students see it as more than 'lip-service'. Faculty members remit certain signals to students about what they think is important or worthwhile. This becomes implicit, for instance, in how they talk about certain kinds of research, e.g. 'solid work' or 'soft sciences' (a point that is also linked to the hierarchies between different knowledges discussed in the previous section). There is a strong imperative to come out of our disciplinary ivory towers and lessen attachment to our own disciplines and past training. There is a need to cultivate a greater openness to other disciplines, even when they belong to our academic rivals or competitors.

Bridging the disciplinary divides

The previous section raised some larger concerns about interdisciplinarity, including differences between disciplines. However, one alternative view is that we need to look at points of convergence across approaches and concepts rather than emphasize on paradigmatic differences; in fact, platforms for dialogue need to be built not just between the social and natural sciences (as discussed in the SaciWATERs conference), but also within the social sciences. For this, we need open conversations across disciplines, such as debates on issues of measurement, e.g. on quality of life and poverty.  

We should try to build a common ground to foster dialogue across researchers that use interdisciplinary approaches to study the complex relationships across ecology, society, and technology. Further, there is a need to 'de-jargonize', to communicate simply, and to appeal to a wider audience and not just to peers in our own discipline.

Getting and keeping students interested

This brings us then to the important challenge of generating and maintaining interest among students. Here, a few points are crucial. First, it helps to break away from the rhetoric of a 'holistic approach' – a term often used to build a case for interdisciplinarity - and focus instead on concrete discussion of relationships between technology and institutions, ecology and society, technology and policy, or agro-ecology and governance. The value of interdisciplinarity is well demonstrated when we understand how different types of irrigation systems make different demands on governance, how ecology shapes institutions, and how technologies not in fit with institutions will fail to make a dent. Many examples illustrate what happens when there is a misfit between technology and institutions. For instance, the case of improved chulhas, that failed to make a dent because they did not reflect the cooking habits, perceptions, and priorities of women who used them; likewise, the automation of office systems that fails in the absence of supportive human capacity, skills, and training is a good example of the (mis) fit between technology and institutions. It helps further to relate simple examples from familiar settings. For instance, explaining the social construction of technology to an engineer can be made easy when we talk about the difference between a round table in a canteen and a rectangular or oval one in the board room – both are artefacts catering to different social settings and domains of social interaction.

Secondly, there is a need to demystify the social sciences. Students trained in engineering and the positivist sciences tend to shy away from complex social science jargon and can get confused on issues of rigour and
methodology employed across these fields of study. There is therefore a need to move incrementally, by first explaining the difference between positivist and interpretive sciences and their methodological ramifications. Sharing our own interdisciplinary research with students as examples and cases gets them motivated more quickly.

Thirdly, since students in interdisciplinary programmes travel a road relatively less taken, they tend to compare their worth and career prospects with those of established, conventional, engineering programmes. Therefore, faculty members have an important role in demonstrating the value of interdisciplinary approaches and building students' self-esteem. Promoting interaction of students with inter-disciplinary alumni and seniors with similar career paths has immense value. Faculty members also need to network and lobby with potential employers and demonstrate the value of interdisciplinary approaches to them.

**Reorienting the curriculum**

In developing curriculum for interdisciplinary programmes, it is important to begin by recognizing that it is better to see 'interdisciplinary' as an orientation, rather than a fixed body of knowledge, tools, and concepts. Therefore, the thrust has to be on inculcating an orientation in students to walk out of the confines of their respective disciplines and incorporate tools, concepts, and ideas from disciplines that may not necessarily be the ones in which they are originally trained; further, inter-disciplinarity is incremental and requires internal drive.

In the CB project, the interdisciplinary orientation has come in through introducing social science courses in curricula dominated by natural science or engineering courses. In further reorienting the curriculum perhaps therefore the next step is to move from 'social science' and 'natural science' courses to new courses that demonstrate the relationships across them. In devising the curriculum and developing the course material, it is important that there be less 'material' but more time and space for students to engage with it and internalize the wide range of subjects that they are exposed to. Needless to say, there also needs to be sufficient exposure to field settings to study the working of the complex relationships between technology, ecology, and society.

**Links between interdisciplinary research and education: scaling up interdisciplinarity**

In terms of scaling up interdisciplinary education, tapping links between interdisciplinary research and education is crucial. Having more inter-disciplinary PhD programs results in a cascading effect. They snowball the interdisciplinarity – a candidate trained in an interdisciplinary programme goes on to train further another group of candidates and so on. Another useful strategy is to have large interdisciplinary projects of long duration, with a potential to employ/engage many researchers and students. Such projects have the possibility of engaging a large number of researchers, scholars, and students and provide resources needed to get an interdisciplinary grounding for a team of professionals interested in a particular subject.

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACADEMIC RESEARCH AND PEOPLE’S STRUGGLES IN THE WATER SECTOR**

The previous two sections discuss some issues with respect to the interdisciplinarity of research and education. This section seeks to explore what interdisciplinarity, and in particular interdisciplinary research, has to contribute to social movements in water.

But first, a caveat. Talking about the relationship between academic research (interdisciplinary or otherwise) and social movements or between the academic and the activist, is a binary and mutually exclusive characterization. Though by and large this is true, we should also acknowledge the overlapping space between the two; further, as Ujwal Pradhan indicated in his intervention in the SaciWATERs conference, there is also the category called “scholar-activist” or “activist-researcher”. A binary characterization also assumes that there is a “tension”
between the academic and the activist and that there is a need to resolve it. The discussion in this section is premised on the assumption that a positive relationship between the two can be beneficial especially to re-shape the water sector discourse along more sustainable, equitable, and democratic lines.

This is done keeping in mind that both the nature of people's struggles and academic research has been changing over time. For instance, people's movements have gone beyond the typical class issues and engage with issues like environment, caste, ethnicity, patriarchy and so on; they are also using innovative forms of organization including bringing scientists, technologists, and activists together to develop and ground an alternative approach. The nature of academic research has been changing over the last couple of decades. Many academics work as consultants of donor agencies and very often consultancy reports are passed on as academic outputs. Also, with the decline of state funding, donor agency funded and led research is on the increase and very often this comes with its own “agendas”.

The rest of this section is divided into two broad parts: the first part tries to capture the main insights from the deliberations in the SaciWATERs conference about the academic-activist engagement, and in the second part, the effort would be to step out of the deliberations of the conference and flag a few issues that are important to make the engagement between the academic and the activist more productive and meaningful.

Engagement between academic research and people's struggles: Insights from the SaciWATERs conference

With the above background, let us look at the deliberations of the conference to see what insights it brought on to the table about the relationship between academic research and people's struggles. The assessment is based on three sessions: consolidation of the research programmes in four CB partner universities; cross-regional comparisons in innovations around water resources studies (which included one network each from CB Project [South Asia], WATER Net [Africa] and Concentracion [Latin America]); and the panel discussion on the topic 'Social movements for democratising water resources: Relevance of academic research'.

Perhaps one of the most interesting points that emerged is that in the CB project and WATER NET, there does not seem to be any engagement with people's struggles or social movements; the closest they get to this is by way of stakeholders' consultations in the course of the research. However, in the case of Concentracion, there is a very explicit and conscious engagement with people's struggles. Research in this case is clearly seen as an instrument to articulate demands and political advocacy; in turn, there is a broader normative framework guiding research and its interventions.

In line with the experience of Concentracion, the panel discussion was not a polarized debate and both the speakers – Quratulain Bakhteari and Kuntala Lahiri-Dutt– talked about the overlapping spaces of research and activism, albeit in different ways.

Quratulain talked about her efforts in de-mystifying research through her “University without Walls” linking it up with social action and movements. Not only was there an emphasis on local knowledge, but the research findings were used in education and action and helped people in their daily struggles. This was brought out by a number of examples: rehabilitation of Mirami dam oustees, about 10,000 families returning to land, and involvement of youth in community development.

Kuntala in her presentation – King Canute Riding the Wave: Socially Engaged Academic Research for Democratising Water Resources – pointed out that according to her, the academic and the activist are not always

---

8 Mukti Sangharsh Movement in South Maharashtra is a good example of such a movement that tried to bring together pro-people scientists and activists in its anti-drought movement.
at loggerheads with each other. The difference is that the academic researcher claims to be evidence based and the activist works more from a particular standpoint. Further, interdisciplinarity can arise out of two types of collaboration – one, amongst the practitioners of different disciplines, and two, amongst the academics and activists. For her, it is important that the identity and location of the academic be made more explicit; there is also a need for the academic to get out of comfort zones and ask new questions. To ask the right questions or to decide what type of questions to ask, the academic needs to work more closely with the activist.

**Redefining the engagement**

Stepping out of the deliberations of the conference, one can flag a few issues which would redefine or strengthen the engagement of the academic and the activist. In his Theses of Feuerbach (1845), Karl Marx famously said in his eleventh thesis that “the philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it”. This sentence could provide some sort of a benchmark for the engagement between the activist and the academic. In fact, maybe we need to go beyond this polarization between philosophers (read academics) and the professional revolutionaries (activists), and ask the question as to whether what we do merely critiques the world around us or whether it contributes to changing it.

The first issue is whether academics and movements together have contributed to going beyond the polarized discourse around water. There has been a fairly close relationship between academics and activists in the case of feminist movements and dalit movements. Similarly, a few decades ago, in the movement against the Silent Valley project in Kerala led by the Kerala Shastra Sahitya Parishad (KSSP), intellectuals played a crucial role in forcing the government to scrap the project. But in the area of water, apart from certain isolated cases, we do not find this type of a close collaboration. In fact, there are also cases when a research intervention is made in the context of an existing social movement, but does not work out in the manner expected at least partly because of the lack of an interdisciplinary understanding of water (that combines the bio-physical and socio-cultural dimensions of water) on the part of at least some of the actors involved in the movement. ⁹

The second set of issues relates to the nature of research. Here one can think of a number of different ways in which a more positive interaction between research and activism can take place. The first point is that it is important for researchers to make their normative framework/concerns more explicit, so that some of the suspicions/scepticism that movements have about academia can be reduced. For instance, there is often worry among activists that a neoliberal framework seems to be underpinning a lot of research and influencing the issues taken up, the way the research questions are framed, the methods of enquiry, and the solutions proposed. The second point is about theory-building and how academics can contribute to this. In general, there seems to be (what one might call) a postmodern disdain for grand theories of any kind, along with a move towards quick-fix solutions. However, now more than ever, we need new conceptualizations as earlier ones do not seem to be sufficient to explain the new realities unfolding around us (for instance, the changing nature of capitalism). Though there are articulations and practices around certain elements of an alternative, there is also a need to bring them together into an integrated theory and practice, and this is an area where academics and activists have to work together.

The third point is about the way we do research and the kind of honesty and integrity we bring to the process. Although all knowledge production is to some extent conditioned by the character of the state, we should realize that it also has certain relative autonomy. The issue is how we have been able to use this relative autonomy and not merely reproduce what the state (and also the donor agencies) want. The way environment impact assessments (EIAs) are done in India, mostly by mainstream academic institutions, is a case in point. There does
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⁹ One such example is alternative proposal (in Paranajpe and Joy, 1995) that aimed to go beyond the polarized debate around large dams and open up a different pathway to utilize large sources without the destructive content often associated with large dams.
not seem to be a single case where the EIA report has gone against a particular project. As against this, in the case of Three Gorges dam in China, when the case was referred to the Chinese Academy of Sciences, apparently it did give an objective report pointing out the multi-faced destruction such a project can cause. If the Chinese Academy of Sciences which functions under much more state and party control could give such a report, why is it that the same does not take place in India? The answer lies in the fact that some of the researchers who work in our research institutions consider themselves more as “government servants” and not as academics. This mindset needs to change.

Finally we also need to re-think the way in which we do movements, especially in the present context of imperialist capitalism and “accumulation through dispossession” as the main means of capital accumulation and exploitation. New issues have come up and there are wide sweeping changes taking place in the water sector. To engage with these developments, movements need new skills and new articulations and innovative forms of organisations and struggles. There is a need to evolve new people’s alternatives and organise struggles around these alternatives. Here interdisciplinarity can bring in new insights. Interdisciplinarity is not only for the academics, it is very much needed for the activists as well. This would help to understand the bio-physical and socio-cultural peculiarities of water and would help movements to rise above polarized, sectarian discourses, interests, and programmes.

CONCLUSION

This paper has sought to assess the state of interdisciplinary water research and education in South Asia, along with how these contribute to social movements in water, using as a starting point the efforts made in the CB project of SaciWATERs. Attempts to do away with boundaries of any kind are laudable. However, this paper has called for a healthy dose of scepticism about too easy a dissolving of boundaries because this might involve simplifications that could have serious political consequences. At the same time, there is also a case made for a more nuanced interdisciplinarity in research, education and outreach.
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