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This chapter sets the context of a gendered political ecology of tourism and water by tracing the genealogy of political ecology from political economy, both in tourism and water as well as examining the gendered components to both. In doing so I provide an overview of a gendered political ecology of tourism and water. This overview is followed by two case studies which examine the gendered political ecology of tourism and water in Bali, Indonesia and Tamarindo, Costa Rica. In each case study I detail the diverse social and environmental contexts, before examining the salient aspects of a framework for a gendered political ecology of tourism and water.

Before examining the linkages between gender and political ecology, it is useful to map out the context by exploring its genealogy from political economy to political ecology and of political economy to gendered political economy. It is in this transition that the foundations for a gendered political ecology of tourism are located. Political economy is itself not a unified approach, but rather a range of approaches to study the relationship between the economy and the non-economic aspects of society; the common thread being that the political and the economic are irrevocably linked (Mosedale 2011). From its origins, and following the “cultural turn” over the past few decades social scientists increasingly began to move away from a positivist epistemology and recognize the neglect of cultural factors. Political economists started to take cultural meanings and discourses into consideration. Political ecology is a branch that considers the environment as critical to our understanding of the relationship between the social and environmental disparities that are experienced unequally. Thus, with a strong emphasis on understanding conflicts and power dynamics, it provides
new insights into how some actors are privileged, while others remain marginalized in their access to and control over natural resources.

The purpose of political ecology is to understand the complex relations between nature and society through a careful analysis of access and control over resources and their implications for the environment (Watts, 2000). There are a number of emerging disciplines with similar approaches and goals such as environmental justice and socio-ecological systems analysis (Ostrom, 2009). However political ecology and its related fields have been given relatively little attention by tourism studies scholars, which a few notable exceptions including Stonich (1998), Gossling (2003) and Cole (2012 and 2015). In relation to the political ecology of water, the work of Swyngedouw (2009) is most notable, he examines how the mobilization of water for different uses in different places is a conflict ridden process and the organization of the flow of water shows how social power is distributed in a given society. Thus, he illustrates how ‘‘the political ecology approach traces the fundamentally socially produced character of inequitable hydro-social configurations’’ (Swyngedouw, 2009, p. 58).

Adding gender to political economy studies has been particularly instructive, as so clearly articulated by Peterson:

feminists have exposed how men dominate the practice of and knowledge production about (what men define as) “economics”; how women’s domestic, reproductive and caring labour is deemed marginal to (male-defined) production and analyses of it; how orthodox models and methods presuppose male-dominated activities (paid work, the formal economy) and masculinised characteristics (autonomous, objective, rational, instrumental, competitive). As a corollary, “women’s work” and feminised qualities – in whatever sphere – are devalued: deemed ‘economically’ irrelevant, characterised as subjective, ‘natural’ and ‘unskilled’, and typically unpaid. For most economists, social reproduction through heterosexual families and non-confictual intra-household dynamics are simply taken for granted; alternative household forms and the rising percentage of female-headed and otherwise “unconventional” households are rendered deviant or invisible (Peterson, 2005, p.501).
Tourism development is part of the same development narrative. As Tribe et al (2015) argue, tourism research is undertaken within an overarching neoliberal paradigm, despite the obvious paradoxes. Neoliberal policies aimed at economic development in the world’s least developed countries have often promoted tourism growth at any cost, with little space for alternative discourses. Even alternative tourisms have been criticised for pursuing the dispersal of tourism to increase industry profitability rather than to empower host communities, improve their livelihoods and/or preserve environments (Blackstock, 2005, Harrison, 2008, Wheeller, 2003).

While tourism as part of economic growth, guided by neoliberal policies, has been an objective realised in some areas and by some sectors, this process has brought about increased inequalities, not least of all in gender distribution. For example, it is noted how “Men especially those who are economically, ethnically and racially privileged continue to dominate institutions of authority and power worldwide” (Peterson, 2005). If we look at the mission of the World Travel and Tourism Council, for example, whose mission is to promote freedom to travel, policies for growth and tourism for tomorrow, only two out of twenty of the board members are women.

A second crucial feminist addition to the understanding of political economy is the concept of intersectionality; that is, that gender and race are mutually constituted. This is credited to critical race theorist Kimberle Crenshaw who worked to understand race, gender, class, and ethnicity as interdependent and interlocking rather than disparate and exclusive social categories (Crenshaw, 1989). Not only have our understandings of economics, politics and development been shaped by men, but by white men. Indeed, as Mollett and Faria (2013) discuss, development thought and practice are deeply racialized.
Rocheleau et al (1996) produced the first feminist political ecology edited collection as a conceptual framework for critiquing international development practice, treating gender as “a critical variable in shaping resource access and control, interacting with class, caste, race, culture, and ethnicity to shape processes of ecological change,” (Rocheleau et al., 1996, p. 4). Gendered political ecology considers a range of environmental rights and responsibilities including property, resources, and use of space. People who are socially, economically, politically, culturally, institutionally or otherwise marginalised are highly vulnerable to the impacts of environmental change (Hanson and Buechler, 2015). Feminist political ecologists’ privilege knowledge of those most affected or marginalised by neoliberal, colonial or patriarchal systems in which tourism and water policy and practice are carried out. They consider gendered issues of resource access and control as well as gendered collective action or social movements.

As care givers, food providers, and health care suppliers in many societies, women are responsible for domestic water provision and management. These roles are often “naturalised”, unpaid, and unrecognised but mean that women live with issues of water scarcity and contamination on a daily basis. This is not about a view of women as more natural or closer to nature, but rather that women have different spaces in which they operate. These spaces vary across cultures, but frequently are in reproductive labour (and therefore un-counted by male economists) and are less visible, and the women’s voices less heard. A lack of water access is frequently linked to lack of land ownership and women are frequently excluded from water distribution policy and decision making.
Despite gender being a significant dimension of environmental sustainability and development, gendered analyses of socio-environmental issues are still niche, no more so than in tourism. Plenty has been written on the unequal gendered power relations embedded in the tourism sector (Gentry, 2007; Schellhorn, 2010; Vandegrift, 2008 Ferguson, 2011; Tucker and Boonabaana, 2012). As early as 1996, Kinnaird and Hall set out the highly gendered nature of the tourism industry, arguing that: “Unless we understand the gendered complexities of tourism, and the power relations they involve, then we fail to recognise the reinforcement and construction of new power relations that are emerging out of tourism processes” (1996, p. 100). There has been significant work on gendered aspects of tourism employment (Sinclair, 1997; Vandegrift, 2008), and recently Baum and Cheung’s (2015) study undertook to examine the barriers to women’s equality in employment, increase their positions in leadership and derive economic benefits from tourism development. Collectively, this work lies in the dominant discourse that increased tourism is good and fails to consider differential impacts or consequences of such developments on men and women. Further topic areas within the gender and tourism nexus have included gendered tourism imagery (Pritchard & Morgan, 2000; Marshment, 1997); sex tourism (Truong, 1990; Enloe, 1989; Sanchez Taylor, 2001, 2006 and 2010; Dahles and Bras, 1999) and female consumers (Frew and Shaw, 1999; Kim et al., 2007). A number of studies (Mason and Cheyne, 2008; Harrill and Potts, 2003; and Ritzdorf, 1995) have shown that women tend to view tourism development more negatively than men. However, these insights are not linked to inequalities of resource allocation but to increased noise, traffic and crime and decreased safety. Nunkoo and Ramkissoon (2010) postulate that women’s lack of support for tourism comes from their lack of control and power due to their reduced ownership of resources. More recent studies have considered the additional burdens tourism places on women (Ferguson, 2010), the feminisation of poverty through tourism (Moreno in Press) and the need to both “move
beyond simplistic and fixed thoughts of women’s economic empowerment” and to “consider more fully the cultural complexity and the shifting dynamics of how gender norms, roles and inequalities affect, and are affected by, development and poverty reduction outcomes” (Tucker and Boonabaana, 2012, p.438). Nevertheless, scholarly work on the environmental impacts of tourism have been gender blind, failing to acknowledge the differences between men and women and frequently reinforcing gender stereotypes. Inequalities in terms of access to resources, greater vulnerabilities and disproportionate negative impacts have not yet been subject to systematic gender analysis. This chapter is, in part, an attempt to rectify this lacuna in social scientific research on these issues.

A brief reflection on the contributions of political economy and political ecology to the study of gender and water provides further critical context for the development of a gendered political ecology of water and tourism. Scholars tend to agree that the social relations of water are poorly understood (Tortajada, 1998; Crow and Sultana, 2010; Truelove, 2011). Yet, it is also widely accepted that historically women have been fundamental in the provision and management of water at household and community levels and that when daily practice is closely examined, it becomes apparent how gender relations interact with class, material inequalities and other social power relations resulting in unequal water security and access. While adult women and young girls frequently take responsibility for providing water, men commonly own the productive assets, make decisions in government offices and communal institutions. The growing field of research on women and water has emerged illustrating how gender has become an important feature of water campaigning, with women taking centre stage in struggles over water management issues (Laurie, 2010). Yet, despite this expanding awareness of the role of women in water resource control, ‘most water sector decisions continue to be made based on the false assumption that they are gender neutral, that the
population is a homogenous whole, and that benefits reach everyone equally’ (Dávila-Poblete and Nieves Rico, 2005, p.49).

While there is substantive research on women and water, on the whole gender issues remain ‘under-theorized and marginal’ (Laurie, 2010, p.172) contributing to a number of key pitfalls. Through a narrow focus on the involvement of women – as opposed to a larger-scale, more holistic look at gendered power relations – such work tends to obscure the broader power dynamics at work in processes of the neoliberalization of water (Harris, 2009, p.391). There are some exceptions, however. Ahlers and Zweeten’s work on gender and water demonstrates ‘the power dynamics underlying resource allocation with gender inequality being a critical structuring force’ (Ahlers and Zweeten, 2009, p.411) as well as how feminist strategies in water politics should not just seek to ‘equalize’, but rather to construct possibilities for seeing beyond ‘women’ (Ahlers and Zweeten, 2009, p.417). A recent collection of specifically political ecology studies of women and water edited by Buechler and Hanson (2015) highlights a number of important considerations: Firstly, they reiterate women’s proactive roles and the politics of emerging social movements and collective action. Secondly, they draw links between different places and different scales, problematizing the urban-rural divides and emphasizing the relationship between the two and the importance of the watershed scale of analysis. Thirdly, they examine how climate change impacts on water resource-related market dynamics, adding to the body of knowledge that demonstrates how privatisation of water creates deeper gender and other inequalities (Swyngedouw, 2009; Bakker, 2003; Truelove, 2011). Finally, the chapters stress the integration of multiple scales of analysis from the intimate to the international and remind us of the importance of intersectionality and how other forms of social difference interact with gender to determine
responsibilities, vulnerabilities, and governance of water resources. They point out that age has largely been ignored from water resource accounts and analysis.

Before examining the case studies I will briefly reflect on literature that has considered the links between water and tourism. As this has been done in detail elsewhere (Cole, 2012 and 2014) a summary here will suffice. Most research on the direct consumptive use of water for tourism that has taken place in the dry land regions of Australia (Crase, O’Keefe, and Horwitz, 2010; Lehmann, 2009; Pigram, 2001) or in relation of the Mediterranean (De Stefano, 2004; Essex et al., 2004; Garcia and Servera, 2003; Kent, Newnham, and Essex, 2002; Rico-Amoros et al., 2009; Stefano, 2004; Tortella and Tirado, 2011). Elsewhere, I note how “despite access to water being a key indicator of progress towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals, the intensification of global concerns over water access and availability and the increasing importance of tourism in developing countries there has been remarkably little academic research into the link between tourism and the impact of water scarcity on destination populations” (Cole, 2012, p.1223). The exceptions include work by Stonich (1998) in Honduras; and by Gossling (2001) in Zanzibar. Studies have shown that the per capita use of water by tourists far exceeds that of locals (Crase, 2010; De Stefano, 2004). Overall, high-end and luxury tourism establishments tend to consume greater volumes of water than smaller guesthouses (Deng and Burnett, 2002; Gössling, 2001; Gössling et al., 2012). While Gössling et al.’s (2015) recent publication highlights the importance of embedded or virtual water, it is the disproportionate water consumption by tourism establishments as compared to local households that has directly impacted on destination communities – both environmentally and socio-economically. Pressure on water resources is ‘directly contributing to water scarcity and inequity’ (Tourism Concern, 2012, p. 4), posing a direct threat to people’s right to health while exacerbating existing poverty and generating
conflict and societal instability (King, 2005; OECD/UNEP, 2011; Cole, 2012, Cole 2014) and affecting gender relations. Given the central importance of water to the tourism industry and to women’s daily lives, and the climate induced environmental changes taking place in coastal destinations; this paper fills a space by unpicking some of the critical aspects where these topics coalesce.

In what follows I provide outline sketches of the two distinct case studies before going on to the comparative gendered political ecology analysis of their tourism and water. Both case studies are outlined here as detailed examinations have been covered elsewhere (Cole, 2012, 2014, 2015 and in press) Research in Bali was conducted in 2010 and in Costa Rica in 2012. In both cases the research conducted made use of a range of ethnographic methods including participant-observation, structured and semi-structured interviews and focus groups. In both destinations a local research assistant was engaged. In Costa Rica forty-four women and men took part; in Bali thirty-nine participants were involved. Informants were located by a combination of serendipitous meetings, strategic place-based conversations and snowball sampling. The data was analysed through discussions in the field, saturation, triangulation and the identification of themes for the process of conveying my findings.

**Case Study 1: Bali, Indonesia**

Bali is a small, rugged, tropical island in the centre of the Indonesian archipelago. Measuring 140km by 90km the island has an area of 5,632km². As a tropical island it has a warm, humid climate with two seasons: the wet season from October to March and the dry season from April to September. Mean annual rainfall ranges from less than 500mm to as much as 3500mm in the mountains, which reach 3142m (McTaggart, 1988). There are three categories
of water resources in Bali: crater lakes (which make an important contribution to underground reserves), rivers and groundwater.

The population of Bali is over four million. About 15 percent of the population are non-Balinese, the majority of these from the neighboring islands of Java and Madura and Lombok. While tourism has lured people from across the archipelago, there are additionally around 30,000 foreign migrants living in Bali (Cohen, 2008). The island is a single Indonesian Province, but is divided into nine Regencies (kabupaten), each with a Regent (Bupati), or area head. In 1999, following 30 years of highly centralised dictatorship, Indonesia gave considerable autonomy to each of the Regencies; new laws invited intense competition over local resources and political power. As Usman (2001), Benda-Beckmann and Benda-Beckmann (2001), and Antlov (2001) have all noted; with Regency autonomy comes the power, obligation and responsibility to raise local revenues.

At the local level Bali is divided into banjars. These traditional neighbourhoods are territorial, social and cultural units (Hussey, 1989). Banjars have a significant impact on local level decision-making. The head of a Banjar is democratically elected and decisions are made democratically, but only by male heads of households. Balinese fall into one of four castes, the first three castes, collectively referred to as gentry or nobility, make up about 10 percent of the population and disproportionately fill high political office and own large tracts of land (Howe, 2005). The Subak, headed by a pekaseh, is a third dimension of social organisation, of particular importance to water management. These are self-governing, democratic associations of farmers who have managed sharing Bali’s water for centuries (Lansing 2007). While neither homogenous nor harmonious, with internal workings which are complex and contested (MacRae and Arthawiguna, 2011), the subak is a religious as well as administrative
community. The subak carries out the necessary rituals and ceremonies related to the capture and use of water, itself a sacred substance in Balinese society (McTaggart, 1988; Hauser-Schäublin, 2011). The water temples of Bali are still actively used and maintained by local populations, but the subak system is endangered (Lorenzen and Lorenzen, 2011).

Balinese women people live in a highly patriarchal society where land is handed down through male lines. Women play triple roles in society, responsible for not only the domestic but also the economic and customary/ritual/spiritual spheres in life. This three-sided role has led to commentators calling them “wonder women” (Nakatani, 2004). Women leave their father’s home to join their husbands; in the case of divorce children remain part of the husband’s family, making divorce rare. Regional autonomy since the fall of the New Order has been linked with a rise in concern about regional cultural identities. The re-conservatism and the reinforcement of patriarchal values that stem from this new focus on regional issues have already had considerable repercussions for women in Bali where issues of gender intersect closely with calls to regional identity (Creese, 2004). Ritual is an important aspect of Balinese life, and while “constant ritual performance might sometimes be felt as a burden, it appears to be a necessary one” (Howe, 2005, p.63). Some people are concerned about the effect that lengthy ritual procedures have on their jobs and some employers have become explicit about their irritation of many requests for time off for ceremonial matters, and thus hire migrant labour considered to be more ‘reliable’. According to Howe (2005), this exacerbates already hostile ethnic relations between Balinese and migrant workers.

Bali has been promoted as a tourism destination since Dutch colonial times in the early 1900s. By the end of the 1930s tourists were arriving in the thousands (Picard, 1997). This escalated to tens of thousands in the 1960s and hundreds of thousands by the 1980s. Bali was
opened to mass tourism during Indonesia’s New Order era (1966–1998), with growth coming at any cost (Warren, 1998; Lewis and Lewis, 2009). From 5,000 rooms across the island in 1987, there were 13,000 in 1992, over 50,000 in 2010, and some 77,500 in 2014 (PHRI, 2015). Despite disquiet among islanders over the exploitation of their island, outside investors and powerful government officials with links to Regents have continued to gain concessions. Tourism has become an integral part of Balinese culture (Picard, 1997) and economy providing 481,000 direct jobs, equating to 25 percent of the work force and supporting a further 55 percent thereby contributing 30 percent of Bali’s GDP (BPS, 2010). While many Balinese have certainly benefited from tourism, it is estimated that 85 percent of the tourism economy is in the hands of non-Balinese (MacRae, 2010), while tourism accounts for 65 percent of the island’s water consumption (Merit, 2010). However, all is not well in this tourist paradise. The tourism industry has reached saturation, and may even be in decline (Kuntjoro, 2009), with income from tourism having continually dropped since 2000 despite continuing development and a steady increase in hotel rooms (Kuntjoro, 2009).

The rapid and unchecked development of tourism has led to extensive mismanagement of water resources and negative consequences for the local communities, infringing on their right to water. As discussed elsewhere (Cole, 2012) Bali’s water crisis is due to a complex of interrelated factors including: inadequate regulation, social and cultural factors (discussed below), deforestation and a lack of awareness. However, ground water has been overused by the tourism industry and as a consequence there has been a dramatic fall in the water table, salt water has intruded up to 4km in South Bali (Pdam, 2015) underground supplies have been polluted, and are “unfit for human consumption” (Sundra, 2007). Hand-dug wells have run dry, there is an increased use of bore wells—for those who can afford them—and there
has been increasing privatisation of drinking water, much of which is unregulated and of dubious quality.

Case Study 2: Tamarindo, Costa Rica

Tamarindo is a beach destination on the North Pacific Guanacaste Coast of Costa Rica, which receives approximately 1,700mm of rain per year. The district of Tamarindo covers 123km and includes the neighbouring settlements of Villa Real and Santa Rosa. It has a population of 6,375, a quarter of which comprises people born outside Costa Rica. Nearly 26 percent have no national insurance, approximately 5 percent because they are unemployed and just over 20 percent because they are illegally employed (INEC, 2012), however these figures obscure the presence of unemployed illegal migrants from Nicaragua and other countries. Costa Rica has the highest levels of migration of any Central American country, 75 percent of migrants arrive from Nicaragua (OECD, 2009). Most of Tamarindo’s original population, and those who work in Tamarindo, live in the neighbouring villages of Villa Real and Santa Rosa. Before the late 1970s, Tamarindo was a remote village, only accessible on foot or by horse. In the 1980s a road was built and development began, reaching a frenzy between 2005 and 2008. A great deal of the later development was in real estate and residential tourism, resulting in a large number of condominiums (van Noorloos, 2011). There are now 64 registered hotels with a total of over 1,600 rooms, including three large hotels with 200+ rooms each, eight medium sized establishments with between 30 and 100 rooms, and the rest comprising small lodges (Cole and Ferguson, in Press).

In the 1970s, water for the area’s sparse agricultural population came from artesian wells. The Costa Rican state owns all the country’s underground water resources and grants access and withdrawal rights. The autonomous state institution for water and sanitation (AYA)
supplies water to half of Tamarindo. A voluntary, community-based drinking water organization (ASADA) provides the other half. Both AYA and ASADA obtain their water from the same aquifer, which is limited in capacity and is starting to show signs of salt water intrusion.

Tourism in Tamarindo has followed a similar unmanaged pattern, involving unsustainable resource use and unsustainable tourism and lack of regulation (Duffy, 2002 and Honey, 2008). It was described by an official at the Costa Rican Tourism Board as ‘out of control’, ‘exactly how tourism shouldn’t be’. There are no locally-owned hotels and only three establishments are owned and managed by Costa Ricans. Tamarindo experiences extreme water stress during the dry season. At such times the state water department, AYA, “cannot deal with peak demand, the supply can be interrupted for 6-7 or 10-11 hours per day, we use trucks to deliver water to hotels,” but residents are left no choice but to wait until their water flows again. There are over a hundred illegal wells and a backlog queue of over 1,000 requests for wells and reports about illegal wells according to Department of the Environment (MINEA). Poor water pressure was a common complaint from women residents of Tamarindo, as was the unpleasant taste resulting from high mineral or chlorine content. For those able to afford it, the privatized solution of bottled or filtered water was the answer.

Traditionally, men in Guanacaste have migrated to find seasonal work. Coupled with a culture of multiple partners and alcohol consumption, the concept of the family in Guanacaste “has always been a rather fragile entity and a source of struggle for women and children” (Chant, 2000, p.204). Despite being a Catholic country, the region has a high number of births “out of wedlock” (approximately 60 percent) and serial consensual unions and female-headed households are the norm. Females are the head of 31 percent of households. While
tourism has brought employment and autonomy for many women, much of the work in the region is seasonal and informal (approx. 50 percent), and women’s mean earnings in hotels and restaurants make up only 64 percent of male earnings in the sector (Chant, 2008). As Chant has argued, the “feminisation of poverty” in the region “is about increased unevenness of inputs to household survival between men and women” (2008, p.81). Since construction halted in Tamarindo in 2008, job opportunities for men have shrunk; the only fields of work that remain are security, gardening and taxi driving. Many front-line service and management jobs in tourism are held by women from North America and Western Europe. In contrast, the lower paid and menial tasks such as cleaning and other domestic work are performed by Nicaraguan migrant women, who make up the bulk of the Tamarindo tourism workforce. Local Costa Rican women tend to work in more professional or clerical positions in the public and community sector.

**Salient issues in a gendered political ecology of tourism and water**

As discussed earlier, political ecology scholars attempt “to understand how environmental and political forces interact to affect social and environmental changes through the actions of various social actors at different scales” (Stonich, 1998, p.28). A gendered political ecology ensures that the voices of women and other marginalized sections of the community are heard, their issues of access and control are considered, and their conflicts and activism understood. While it is accepted that the complex interactions between changing environment and society lead to culturally and historically contextualized conclusions (Derman and Ferguson 2000), by making a comparison between these two destinations I aim to show that while there are differences, there are far more similarities. These will be considered from the perspectives of unsustainable development; access and control over water resources; intersectionality; conflict and activism; and issues of scale from intimate to international. In
the sections that follow, I will attempt to draw on relevant aspects of both cases in order to demonstrate the common themes and most salient aspects of a gendered political ecology of tourism and water.

**Unsustainable development**

Both Bali and Tamarindo are destinations suffering from unsustainable over-development. In both cases there has been rapid and unchecked growth of tourism at the expense of the environment. A lack of governance resulting from a lack of law enforcement, overlapping mandates between government departments, and the deliberate misuse of terms to get around water laws was evident in both destinations. In Tamarindo the “Hacienda Panilla” was just one of a number of properties masquerading as a farm in order to drill wells without permits. The 4,500-acre property, which has 25 luxury villas, a golf course, beach club, five restaurants and a 316-room Marriott hotel, possesses only household well permits. By calling themselves a “Hacienda” or farm, they were enabled to bore with impunity. In Bali, where the term ‘Villa’ is (mis)used, the situation was similar, since “a villa originally assumed as a private house that is sometimes rented out, pays a lower premium for water than a star rated hotel or even a non-star rated hotel” (Cole, 2012, p.1231). But “anything can be a villa,” as the head of the Bali Villa Association stated, meaning that “villa” could denote a tourism accommodation structure with 70 rooms, each having its own swimming pool, for which up to US$750 per room per night could be charged (ibid).

In both destinations there has been a rapid change from rural to urban development and as a consequence the infrastructure has been unable to keep up. While in Tamarindo over 95 percent of residents are connected to a piped water supply, the case is only 64 percent in Bali. However, sewage systems had not been developed in either area, although now living in
urban areas they were still reliant on septic tanks. This, combined with an over-reliance on additional (and illegal) wells, is a cause of concern. A combination of saline intrusion and proximity to septic tanks means that ground water in southern Bali is unpotable. In Tamarindo septic tanks are very small and the ground rock hard such that they need to be emptied regularly (at least every 6 months). This led to conflict; trucks that were used to empty the septic tanks emptied the contents into the river or onto waste land. Reportedly, the same trucks were used to distribute water to hotels during the dry season.

**Access and Control**

In both destinations women were responsible for water for domestic purposes. It was the poor women who suffered when hand dug wells ran dry and it was women who worried about collecting drips all day or filling pails to ensure they was back up when sources ran dry. The patriarchal nature of Balinese society places women below men. The effect of this is that while women from lower ranks are the most likely to be impacted by water scarcity—since they must feed, wash and prepare food for their families—these women will have the least opportunity to voice their concerns for fear of bringing disrepute or not showing respect. Whereas in Guanacaste “it is the woman who is at home on a daily basis, we are the ones that know, we have to wash, to cook,” one Costa Rican respondent explained. “We always have that culture that we use water all the time; and also the woman is feeling it more, because at the moment they have no water, if the man goes to work, only the woman knows, the pressure is on women, because we spent more time stuck at home.” By contrast, in both destinations we conducted interviews in all the relevant department offices connected to water and its supply; the environment; or tourism, In every case a man was in charge, and, apart from in the health department in Tamarindo and administrators, women were absent from the offices visited. In each case it was a man who gave the reasons, and justifications,
who chose the narratives, and who steered the debate. It was men who discussed the pricing of water, who planned supplies, who made decisions to supply the tourism sector over the community and who had control. Notably, in Costa Rica the rural water supply is organized by community associations (or ASADA), the boards of which are made up of a 50-50 ratio of men and women. In Tamarindo the people supplied by the ASADA made far fewer complaints than those supplied by the semi-autonomous state supplier (AYA).

**Intersectionality**

Struggles with water supply were not felt equally by all women in both destinations. The worst impacts affect the poorest and most marginalized members of society first. In Bali it is those from the commoners’ caste or migrants from other islands whose hand dug wells have run dry and could not afford to be connected to state water supplies as the standard fees are unaffordable to many households (Straus, 2011). Additionally, this same population cannot afford to buy sealed and treated bottle water (Aqua) by the gallon. The price of this relatively new but increasingly dominant supply of drinking water for the middle classes had increased by 25 percent between 2007 and 2010. They have to make do with unregulated “refill” drinking water, increasing their risk of disease. The villagers who buy refill gallons for drinking purposes spoke of increased cases of diarrhea. One respondent explained how, “sometimes there was mud or worms/larvae in the water”. A similar privatization of drinking water has taken place in Tamarindo, where middle-class Costa Ricans and migrants from the Global North tended to drink bottled or filtered water. As one guesthouse owner from the capital told me “I don’t drink the water… a lot of people have kidney problems in old age… I do not trust it... we filter water for ourselves and even our dogs.” Low-income Nicaraguan migrants were unable to afford this privatised solution.
In both destinations tourism work was divided along both gender and ethnic lines. As mentioned above, Tamarindo most of the cleaning was done by Nicaraguan women. Gender stereotypes depict women as suitable for hospitality work and these women were frequently desperate enough to access income for their families, that they took whatever work was available. Undemanding and unorganised because of their frequently illegal status (despite decades living in Costa Rica) they provide the perfect flexible labour force that characterises so much of tourism employment. Juana’s experience was typical: she cleaned houses, condos and offices in Tamarindo between 7am and 5pm every weekday. None of her employers have given her a contract, so if she gets sick, she explained how: “there's no way...no one pays me insurance...nobody, nobody”. Relatives look after her children while she is at work. As Ferguson discusses, Nicaraguan migrants represent a “new ‘tier’ of workers, who tend to sleep in the lowest quality accommodation and work in hyper-flexibilised tourism activities” (2010b, p.869).

In Bali the starkest intersectionality exists between the rural and urban populations and between the island’s southern and north-eastern regions. Despite the USD $3-5 billion generated in Bali from tourism, many rural people can neither live from their land nor afford the increased prices of essential goods. In the resort towns, rural migrant workers still earn very little: the minimum wage (which in 2015 was raised to just USD $160 per month) is far below the living wage. Bali's Governor, I Made Mangku Pastika, previously condemned tourism, calling it ‘a disaster for the poor’ (Auskar Surbakti, 2012).

Conflict and Activism

An understanding of power dynamics and conflicts lies at the centre of political ecology. Threats to water security bring struggles, conflict and also activism as a form of resistance to
the inequity and injustice people feel. The differences between the two case studies in how women are able or not to express the injustice they experience, depends on the cultural context. In Costa Rica women’s participation in activism appears to be increasing. Of the six people we interviewed who took on strong activist roles, five were women. The groups that have protested about water shortages due to tourism have been largely shaped by women. Women’s perceived responsibility for water has led them to organise around resistances to tourism development. For example, this resistance is illustrated by the Nimboyores project which constituted one of the most high-profile conflicts over water in tourism development in Costa Rica. This case, recounted through a Youtube video (Nimboyores 2002), highlights how women’s activism prevented a multinational hotel chain from over-using a local water supply. It indicates how women used their labour on a local level to upset the international political economy and disrupt the power structures of international finance over local resources. When the Meliá hotel group tried to pipe water from the village of Lorena to a coastal tourism development, María Rosa organised the protest and stopped the project, calling it illegal and fearing the village would be left with insufficient water. For eight years she fought institutions at the local, provincial and national level and then “by protests, blocking the streets, and we sat on the Meliá’s pipes for a month, so they could not begin construction”. The parties eventually accepted the allocation of a smaller quantity of water for the pipeline and agreeing that the water would be distributed to the broader coastal community rather than solely tourism development (Kusdaz, 2012). This example reflects the power struggles between corporations and communities over water distribution as it was the focus of women’s activism over water allocation in the region. Women are the driving force for change coalescing around the unequal power relations between multinational enterprises and communities over water allocation (Cole and Ferguson in Press).
Unfortunately, the same level of proactive local participation and collective community action needed to ensure fair governance is lacking in Bali. Despite the widespread recognition of government disorganization and inefficiencies, relative immunity is granted by the cultural norm of collectivism, whereby authority is revered and uncontested (Erb, 2000; Kling, 1997; Raka, 2000). There is a small but growing civil society movement in Bali that has coalesced against mega developments, most recently against a massive reclamation project (Tolak Reclaimasi), but the political authoritarianism of the New Order Government stifled democratic mobilization (Suasta and Connor, 1999). There is no equivalent women’s collective activism as seen in Costa Rica and elsewhere (Mexico: Hanson, 2015; Bolivia: Laurie, 2010). My Balinese informants offer two possible reasons: “Balinese women will is more attracted to economic activity, so the movement issues are considered ‘too much talk’” or “They are busy with the daily ritual habits which are very time consuming. Most women are also not very aware of the ‘rights’ as they usually do not have ‘a say’ in the community, they are considered ‘domestic’”.

**From Intimate to International**

Many of the stories women wanted to share were about their domestic daily lives: the struggles they had “collecting drips”, “filling jars” of caring for sick children and tending to the needs of elderly parents. They did not talk about the international economic system that, in just one generation, had changed their village to an urban sprawling resort. One of the remaining elderly original inhabitants of Tamarindo told us “almost all the people have sold their land, spent their money and are finished, without ground and without money they turn into a slave”. “Foreigners make up 90 percent of the population and none of them care,” said another. Yet another local explained “Investors who arrived in Tamarindo, are all foreigners: Europeans and Americans, … they were investors who came, bought and left.” This
transience of investors – the easy come, easy go, means that they do not put roots down in the community, they have no allegiance to the land and its ecology and little concern for the future of the destination. In Bali as well, most of the water is consumed by tourists and tourism investors and developers, but they are not affected by water shortages. This transience of water users was considered critical to the unsustainability of Bali’s tourism-water socio-ecological system (Cole and Browne 2015).

It is increasingly clear that the world’s water resources will come under increasing stress and water security is now recognised as a systemic global risk factor. Water is a critical cross-sectorial resource (Gossling et al., 2015). With global warming and increasing urbanisation and population pressure, governments will have to make critical choices about their water resources. In neither of these case studies did the Indonesian or Costa Rican governments sufficiently fulfil their duty to protect the residents’ right to water and the tourism industry continues not to respect destination communities’ rights to water.

**Conclusions**

In both Bali and Tamarindo, environmental and political factors articulate with different social actors in different ways. Yet, in both cases they result in the distribution of water being diverted away from the quotidian needs of women towards the tourism industry and tourists. The mobilization of water in Bali, Tamarindo, and beyond is indeed a conflict ridden process. Women who are often primarily responsible for providing their families with water for domestic purposes usually bear the brunt. Yet, in some places, women are also those who are mobilizing against international powers. As this chapter illustrates, women can indeed be a force for change in the political ecology of tourism, taking on the might of multi-nationals and shifting the power status quo. International and local businesses are able to bore to ever
greater depths to access underground water supplies and pay for private supplies while the most marginalized populations find their hand dug wells have run dry and are unable to afford (often unreliable or unclean) piped/bottled supplies. As previous studies have shown (Robbins, 2004), those worst affected are the marginal communities at the fringes of social power, with little bargaining strength at the market, and little force in the political process.

This gendered political ecology analysis has highlighted how global economic interests are impacting local level lived emotional and material realities. We are reminded that the hegemony of the dominant capitalist discourse of economic growth stands in sharp contrast to women’s experiences of hardship and struggles for environmental justice. Minorities by gender, race, class and ethnicity are already unfairly disadvantaged in the face global political economy as well as increasingly those hardest hit by climate change. An alternative discourse to the neoliberal growth of tourism is required if justice for women who so readily shared their stories with me and the millions of others in coastal destination communities around the world who will increasingly suffer from competition over their water resources.
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