

Renewable Energy and the Politics of Flow: Sovereignty, Ecology, and the Ethics of Water in the River Basin

Nuno Soares Domingues

Daiva Stanelyte

Abstract: This article develops the concept of ecological sovereignty to examine how states negotiate legitimacy, control, and ethical responsibility in the governance of renewable energy and riverine systems. Centred on Portugal's 2023-2025 proposals for hydric resilience in the Tagus River Basin, it interprets these initiatives as an event through which the boundaries between ecology, infrastructure, and politics are redrawn. Drawing from political theory, environmental humanities, and hydropolitics, the study shows how the dominant language of sustainability and resilience often reinforces infrastructural sovereignty—an ethos of control that subordinates ecological flows to economic and energy imperatives. In contrast, ecological sovereignty is proposed as a relational and ethical mode of authority grounded in the capacity to sustain the conditions of shared life across human and more-than-human communities. Through interpretive analysis of governmental documents, environmental NGOs, and civic memoranda, the paper traces how competing discourses of water and energy articulate divergent imaginaries of justice, responsibility, and belonging. It argues that recognising rivers as agents of political life transforms the conceptual terrain of sovereignty and environmental governance, suggesting that political legitimacy in the Anthropocene depends on sustaining, rather than mastering, ecological relations. The Tagus case thus illuminates a wider transformation in the politics of renewable energy, inviting a redefinition of sovereignty as care, reciprocity, and coexistence across planetary ecologies.

Keywords: Renewable Energy; Ecological Sovereignty; Political Theory; Environmental Humanities; Hydropolitics; Ecological Flows; Environmental Justice; European Water Framework Directive

INTRODUCTION

The politics of water has become a decisive site for rethinking sovereignty in the Anthropocene. Across continents, river basins have become laboratories of governance where the boundaries between nature, technology, and authority are continuously redrawn. In Portugal, recent proposals for new dams and weirs in the Tagus River Basin—framed as measures to secure renewable energy and agricultural resilience—have reignited long-standing disputes over transboundary flows, ecological degradation, and democratic legitimacy. These conflicts reveal how infrastructural power and technocratic valuation convert rivers into instruments of state sovereignty while eroding their ecological and communal functions.

The Tagus offers a particularly revealing case for examining these dynamics. As the Iberian Peninsula's longest river, shared by Spain and Portugal and governed through the Albufeira Convention and the European Union's Water Framework Directive, it encapsulates the tensions between national sovereignty, ecological interdependence, and supranational regulation. Its hydrological, political, and ethical complexities make it an exemplary site for exploring how questions of control, obligation, and ecological repair are negotiated under conditions of climate uncertainty. By situating the Tagus within broader hydropolitical transformations, this study illustrates patterns that resonate across transboundary and infrastructured river systems worldwide—from the Mekong to the Colorado—where competing claims over flow, energy, and life reshape the meaning of sovereignty itself.

This article argues that such conflicts demand a reconceptualisation of sovereignty. It develops the notion of ecological sovereignty: a framework that links political legitimacy to the capacity to maintain riverine life-conditions and interspecies justice. Rather than viewing sovereignty as the exclusive jurisdiction of states over bounded territory, ecological sovereignty understands the river basin as a relational and dynamic space of co-dependence among human and non-human actors. This concept re-situates authority within ecological interdependence, recognising that flows—of water, energy, sediments, and species—constitute both political and ethical relations.

Methodologically, the paper combines political ecology and new materialist theory with an interpretive case study of policy documents, governmental reports, and media interventions concerning the Tagus between 2023 and 2025. These materials show how infrastructural and economic narratives shape the politics of flow, and how civic movements and environmental NGOs articulate counter-claims grounded in ecological ethics and participatory justice. By tracing these competing imaginaries, the analysis demonstrates that the struggle over the Tagus is not merely environmental or technical but ontological: it contests what counts as life, value, and sovereignty in a warming and increasingly infrastructured world.

The argument proceeds in five parts. The first situates ecological sovereignty within debates in political theory and environmental humanities. The second outlines the methodological approach and sources. The third examines how hydrological planning and renewable-energy discourse in Portugal reassert infrastructural sovereignty. The fourth analyses civic and ecological responses that challenge this paradigm. The conclusion develops the ethical and institutional implications of ecological sovereignty for transboundary governance and environmental justice.

Ultimately, the Tagus Basin becomes a prism through which to explore a wider question: how might political theory evolve when the sovereignty of life itself—its flows, ecologies, and relations—becomes the terrain of contestation?

This work interweaves political theory, environmental humanities, and hydropolitics, situating the argument within debates on renewable energy transitions, water governance, and environmental justice. It draws from new materialism, political ecology, and rights-of-nature jurisprudence, combining normative theory with applied case analysis. The study adopts a qualitative, interpretive methodology grounded in political ecology and environmental humanities. Rather than seeking empirical generalisation or statistical verification, it treats governance texts, policy documents, NGO memoranda, and civic interventions as sites where the meaning of sovereignty is enacted and contested. This approach is guided by the premise that sovereignty, particularly in ecological contexts, is not a fixed institutional property but a relational practice that becomes visible through discourse, material infrastructures, and ethical claims.

By reading the 2023-2025 Tagus hydric resilience proposals as an event, the analysis interprets how technical artefacts, administrative language, and ecological imaginaries co-produce political authority. The interpretive lens allows for tracing how power circulates through texts and infrastructures, revealing the epistemic and moral assumptions embedded in hydrological planning. Rather than measuring hydrological data or policy outputs, the research reconstructs how competing actors—state agencies, environmental NGOs, and civic networks—articulate divergent visions of responsibility, justice, and life in common. This interpretive strategy situates the paper within a tradition of critical political ecology that values hermeneutic engagement over positivist empiricism. It aligns with methods used in the environmental humanities to analyse policy as discourse, and with posthumanist inquiry that recognises non-human agencies—such as rivers, infrastructures, and ecosystems—as active participants in the production of political meaning. In this sense, the methodology does not simply describe policy conflict but exposes how the very grammar of governance encodes assumptions about control, care, and legitimacy.

Renewable Energy and the Reconfiguration of Sovereignty in River Basins

The accelerating transition to renewable energy has reconfigured the spatial and conceptual dimensions of sovereignty across the world's river basins. Rivers have long served as infrastructures of political order, delineating territories, sustaining livelihoods, and materialising the state's capacity to provide life-supporting resources. Yet, as the demand for hydroelectricity, water storage, and irrigation intensifies, sovereignty is increasingly enacted through the management of flows rather than the control of territory. This shift marks the emergence of what may be called infrastructural sovereignty—a mode of rule expressed through the construction and legitimation of hydraulic systems that reorganise ecological and social relations.

A substantial body of scholarship in political ecology and critical geography has shown how dams, reservoirs, and inter-basin transfers translate natural processes into instruments of technocratic authority. From the Mekong to the Colorado, the dam has become both artefact and emblem of modern sovereignty, promising resilience while masking ecological degradation and social dislocation (Zeitoun & Warner 2006; Kuenzer et al. 2022; Owen 2021). The rhetoric of sustainability and energy security frequently reproduces an ethos of control in which life's circulations are subordinated to economic and infrastructural imperatives.

Running counter to this technocratic imaginary, a parallel body of work elaborates the notion of ecological sovereignty, which relocates legitimacy from domination to care. Drawing on posthumanist ethics, rights-of-nature jurisprudence, and relational ontologies, these scholars conceive sovereignty as the obligation to sustain the processes that enable life across human and more-than-human communities. Thinkers such as Haraway (2016), Bennett (2010), and Latour (2017) have challenged anthropocentric models of authority, while legal theorists including Borràs (2016) and Hutchison (2017) have advanced the recognition of rivers as legal persons. Together, they sketch a politics of interdependence that redefines sovereignty not as command over nature but as cohabitation within it.

A third strand of literature concerns riverine governance and renewable energy transitions, showing how climate adaptation, hydropower development, and supranational regulation reshape the politics of flow. Research on the European Water Framework Directive (European Commission 2016), transboundary arrangements such as the Albufeira Convention (Cruz & Correia 2020), and the findings of the World Commission on Dams (2000) reveals how competing imperatives of energy security and ecological restoration create enduring institutional tensions. Yet, as Connell (2022) and Duda et al. (2021) demonstrate, participatory and restorative practices—such as basin councils and dam removal initiatives—can reconfigure these tensions towards ecological justice and collective stewardship.

Bringing these literatures into dialogue, this study argues that renewable energy transitions expose a structural contradiction between infrastructural and

ecological sovereignties. The theoretical claim advanced here is that sovereignty has entered a new phase: one enacted through the governance of circulation rather than the occupation of land. The dam and the reservoir have replaced the fortress and the frontier as icons of authority. This transformation carries both material and symbolic implications. Materially, hydraulic infrastructures fragment ecosystems, alter hydrological regimes, and redistribute ecological costs. Symbolically, they perform resilience—projecting an image of mastery that conceals dependence on fragile ecological systems.

The consequences of infrastructural sovereignty are widely documented. Over sixty per cent of the world's major rivers are now fragmented by dams (World Commission on Dams 2000), their sediment transport disrupted and their ecologies destabilised (Beaulieu et al. 2020). The Mekong's heavily dammed floodplain and the desiccated delta of the Colorado exemplify the paradox of control: infrastructures built to secure life end up generating new vulnerabilities. Pollution, industrialisation, and urbanisation intensify these pressures, turning rivers into conduits of what Nixon (2011) calls “slow violence”—gradual, dispersed harm that erodes ecological and social resilience. Climate change compounds these dynamics, exposing the fragility of technocratic control as glacial retreat, heatwaves, and drought destabilise established water regimes from the Nile to the Tagus (Immerzeel et al. 2020).

Against this backdrop, ecological sovereignty offers an alternative framework for understanding authority in the Anthropocene. It is not anti-statist but redefines the responsibilities of political entities within networks of interdependence. Sovereignty here entails the obligation to sustain flows, sediments, and migrations—the metabolisms that make life possible. Jurisprudential innovations recognising the Whanganui and Atrato rivers as legal persons (Borràs 2016; Hutchison 2017) exemplify a global movement towards relational governance, in which rivers are treated not as resources but as subjects of political life.

Ecological sovereignty also holds practical implications. It reframes legitimacy as a function of ecological continuity, equity, and transparency, which can be assessed through measurable commitments such as enforceable ecological flows, connectivity indices, and participatory governance mechanisms. This approach displaces the cost-benefit rationalities of infrastructural decision-making, situating the well-being of ecosystems and dependent communities at the centre of political legitimacy.

Empirical examples from the Elwha, Loire, and Emscher dam removals, alongside participatory management experiments in the Murray-Darling Basin, demonstrate how cooperation and accountability can restore both ecological and social vitality (Duda et al. 2021; Connell 2022). These cases illustrate that the shift from infrastructural to ecological sovereignty entails not only institutional reform but an epistemic transformation—from engineering mastery to relational care.

The synthesis proposed here bridges political theory, ecological science, and infrastructure studies to articulate sovereignty as *relational responsibility* rather than territorial command. In this redefinition, legitimate authority in the Anthropocene must be measured by a polity's capacity to sustain the metabolic and ecological processes that enable life. The global crises of scarcity, pollution, and climatic disruption reveal that infrastructural sovereignty alone can no longer secure legitimacy. The politics of flow demands a more reflexive and ethically literate understanding of power—one that situates sovereignty within, rather than above, the hydrological systems that sustain existence.

The Portuguese energy-hydrologic system and the Political-Ecological Problem

The preceding chapter traced how renewable-energy transitions have reconfigured sovereignty at a global scale, displacing the classical territorial logic of control with a politics of flows, infrastructures, and ecological interdependence. That analysis established the conceptual tension between infrastructural and ecological sovereignties as a defining feature of twenty-first-century hydropolitics. The Portuguese case now renders this tension concrete. In the Tagus and other national basins, the abstractions of energy policy, climate adaptation, and water governance converge within a specific socio-ecological landscape marked by historical dependence, transboundary asymmetry, and civic resistance. This therefore situates the general argument in a material and political field where sovereignty, ecology, and justice are not merely theoretical categories but lived relations mediated by the infrastructures of the river itself.

The Portuguese energy-hydrologic system embodies a long and intricate history of technopolitical modernisation. Over the past century, water has been simultaneously an infrastructural resource, a territorial project, and a symbol of national self-reliance. Successive regimes—from the Estado Novo's hydraulic nationalism to the Europeanised developmentalism of the democratic era—have positioned rivers as instruments for electrification, irrigation, and drought control. Hydropower, in particular, became the infrastructural expression of modernity and progress, its reservoirs naturalised as icons of productive sovereignty. Yet the intersection of climate change, ecological degradation, and energy transition has destabilised this narrative. What once appeared as a triumph of engineering now stands revealed as a political-ecological dilemma: a system of control that has produced both dependence and vulnerability.

Portugal's geography renders this dilemma acute. With most major rivers originating in Spain and crossing the border towards the Atlantic, hydrological sovereignty is inherently relational. The Tagus (Tejo) basin exemplifies this condition. Its headwaters and major reservoirs lie upstream in Spain, while Portuguese agriculture, urban supply, and ecosystems depend on cross-border flows, especially in the dry season. The 1998 Albufeira Convention, intended to manage this interdependence, codified minimum annual flow obligations—2,700

hm³ released to Portugal—alongside provisions for transboundary coordination. Yet critics argue that it institutionalised a volumetric logic divorced from ecological realities. The Convention’s “minimum flows” satisfy formal compliance but fail to guarantee continuous ecological flows as mandated by the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD). The absence of such regimes undermines aquatic biodiversity, estuarine salinity balances, and the seasonal rhythms that sustain riparian life (Cruz and Correia, 2020; European Commission, 2016).

Hydropolitics in the Tagus basin thus unfolds as a contest over sovereignty and ethics. The Portuguese state faces an upstream dependency that challenges its capacity to secure water for human and ecological needs. In response, political and technical elites have periodically turned to what may be termed infrastructural sovereignty: the assertion of national control through material interventions—dams, tunnels, weirs, and diversions—that promise to internalise flow management within the national territory. The recent revival of proposals for the Alvito dam, the Cabril-Belver tunnel, and a chain of new weirs along the final 127 kilometres of the Tagus represents precisely this impulse. Official justifications invoke climate adaptation, renewable-energy security, and drought resilience. Yet, as civil society movements and scientific critics note, these justifications often conceal the repetition of a failed hydraulic paradigm: the belief that ecological and political insecurity can be resolved by multiplying the very infrastructures that produced it.

Political ecology provides a vocabulary for analysing this impasse. It reveals that the Tagus controversy is not a dispute over technical optimisation but a struggle between valuation regimes. The economic-technocratic regime, embedded in governmental and corporate discourse, quantifies benefits in terms of installed capacity, storage volume, and irrigation potential, reducing water to a commodity of flow and kilowatts. The regulatory-legal regime frames the issue through compliance with the WFD, Natura 2000 directives, and the Albufeira Convention, privileging procedural obligations over ecological substance. A third regime—the socio-ecological and cultural—articulated by civic organisations such as proTEJO, asserts the river’s intrinsic value as a living system and a site of cultural attachment. Each regime entails a different conception of legitimacy: productivity, legality, or life. Their collision exposes the ethical and epistemic fault lines of Portuguese water governance.

At stake is not merely hydrological management but the definition of political responsibility. The official document “Solutions for Strengthening the Water Resilience of the Tagus,” released for public consultation in 2023-2024, exemplifies the opacity of the technocratic mode. Presented in a minimalist format devoid of empirical substantiation, it precluded informed analysis and excluded key regional stakeholders, including the Lisbon Metropolitan Area and the Intermunicipal Community of Alto Alentejo. The temporal proximity of this consultation to the third-cycle River Basin Management Plan further undermined transparency, leaving little scope for deliberative scrutiny. Such procedural deficiencies reinforce public distrust and confirm what political-ecology scholars

describe as epistemic injustice: the systematic marginalisation of local knowledge and civic agency in environmental decision-making (Whyte, 2020; Fricker, 2007).

The substantive objections raised by civil society reveal the depth of the political-ecological problem. ProTEJO and allied NGOs contest the technical rationale of the Alvito dam, noting that its proposed summer contribution of approximately 20 m³/s would add only six cubic metres per second to existing flows, while costing over €500 million in public expenditure. By contrast, full enforcement of the Albufeira Convention's annual quota, distributed as continuous ecological flows of roughly 45 m³/s in the summer quarter, would achieve superior ecological and social outcomes at negligible cost. The argument thus reframes the issue from one of hydraulic scarcity to one of governance failure: the state's unwillingness to exercise diplomatic and regulatory authority to demand compliance from its upstream counterpart. In this view, the new infrastructures signify not resilience but capitulation—a compensatory assertion of sovereignty that reproduces dependency on capital-intensive engineering.

Ecologically, the proposed projects risk amplifying existing degradation. The cumulative fragmentation of the Tagus threatens the last free-flowing stretches of river in central Portugal, impeding fish migration, degrading riparian forests, and reducing sediment delivery to the estuary. Reservoir creation submerges terrestrial habitats, accelerates organic decay, and emits methane—a potent greenhouse gas that undermines hydropower's purported climate neutrality (Beaulieu et al., 2020). These outcomes contravene the objectives of the European Biodiversity Strategy for 2030, which calls for restoring at least 25,000 kilometres of rivers by removing obsolete barriers, and of the Birds and Habitats Directives protecting the Tagus Estuary and Paul do Boquilobo reserves, both designated as Natura 2000 sites and Ramsar wetlands. The Tagus Project's promise of resilience thus conceals an ecological regression: a multiplication of barriers where EU policy mandates their removal.

At the ethical level, the controversy exposes the disjunction between infrastructural and ecological sovereignties. Infrastructural sovereignty measures authority by the state's capacity to build, control, and allocate; ecological sovereignty evaluates legitimacy by the ability to maintain the conditions for life. Civil society's counter-proposals exemplify this alternative ethos. They call for enforceable ecological-flow regimes from Spain, continuous and seasonally adjusted, as required under the WFD; for the restoration of riparian ecosystems and native forests to enhance natural water retention and carbon sequestration; for decentralised water-capture stations—such as the proposed €10-million Lezíria do Tejo facility modelled on EPAL's Valada installation—that utilise gravity and renewable energy to reduce costs; and for the redirection of public funds from large dams toward water-efficient, biodiversity-preserving agriculture. These measures articulate ecological sovereignty as a practical and moral programme: a politics of care grounded in intergenerational justice.

The proTEJO memorandum “For a Free Tagus” situates these proposals within a broader vision of cultural and economic renewal. It emphasises the role of ecological and nature-based tourism in revitalising riverside communities, fostering environmental education, and restoring ways of life historically intertwined with the river. This vision rejects the false dichotomy between development and conservation. Instead, it imagines prosperity through ecological integrity—regional economies sustained by clean water, biodiversity, and cultural continuity rather than by extractive infrastructures. In this sense, the movement’s discourse resonates with new materialist and posthumanist philosophies that recognise rivers, sediments, and fish as active agents in political life (Bennett, 2010; Latour, 2017). To care for the Tagus is to acknowledge its agency, its capacity to shape social and ecological futures beyond human design.

The confrontation between government proposals and civic resistance reveals a deeper crisis of governance. Portugal’s water policy, though formally Europeanised, remains structurally beholden to an outdated hydraulic imaginary: that control equals security. The state’s reluctance to challenge Spanish hydroelectric management practices—driven by profit maximisation and flexible reservoir operations—reflects the entanglement of sovereignty with market logic. The consequence is a double abdication: of ecological responsibility and of democratic legitimacy. When environmental decisions are justified through opaque technocracy rather than participatory deliberation, sovereignty becomes performative rather than substantive. It asserts control over infrastructure while relinquishing control over life.

Reclaiming ecological sovereignty thus entails a reorientation of governance at multiple scales. Domestically, it requires the institutionalisation of participatory river-basin councils with binding authority, integration of greenhouse-gas accounting into hydropower assessments, and the alignment of national climate and biodiversity policies. Transboundary, it demands the renegotiation of the Albufeira Convention to incorporate dynamic ecological-flow obligations and transparent monitoring mechanisms. Culturally, it requires nurturing public attachment to rivers as living commons rather than state property. The ethical imperative is clear: sovereignty must be exercised not against the river but with it.

The Tagus controversy epitomises the broader predicament of the Portuguese energy-hydrologic system: a collision of modernity’s infrastructures with the ecological limits of the Anthropocene. Dams once promised mastery over scarcity; they now symbolise its perpetuation. The real test of political imagination lies not in building more walls of concrete but in cultivating new forms of relational governance—where the legitimacy of the state is measured by the flourishing of the rivers that sustain it. The political-ecological problem, in Portugal as elsewhere, is ultimately ontological: it concerns what kind of sovereignty can coexist with life.

CONCLUSION

The politics of the Tagus River reveals that sovereignty is not a fixed attribute of the state but an evolving relation that unfolds within a hydrological, ecological, and ethical field. The 2023-2025 proposals for hydric resilience are therefore not mere technical plans but events through which the political imagination of sovereignty is re-enacted and contested. As this study has shown, the Tagus Basin becomes a site where infrastructures, data regimes, and ecological discourses converge to determine who—or what—possesses the right to define the conditions of life in common.

Adopting a qualitative and interpretive approach, the analysis draws on governmental documents, NGO statements, and civic memoranda concerning the recent Tagus proposals, offering a synthesis that aligns with interpretive political ecology rather than empirical quantification. Through this lens, the paper advances the concept of *ecological sovereignty* as an emergent mode of political legitimacy, one that reframes authority as the capacity to sustain and regenerate the conditions of shared existence among human and more-than-human communities. Sovereignty, in this sense, should be evaluated not through the state's capacity for command and control, but through its responsiveness to ecological interdependence and temporal continuity. In the Tagus case, this requires recognising the river's flows as expressions of collective life rather than as resources to be measured, extracted, or contained.

The Tagus event exposes a critical tension between *infrastructural sovereignty*—anchored in control, quantification, and resilience rhetoric—and *ecological sovereignty*, which affirms vulnerability, reciprocity, and care as political virtues. This contrast transforms sovereignty from a boundary-bound condition into a relational process and suggests that ethical governance in the Anthropocene must move beyond extraction and securitisation towards a politics of restoration and repair.

This reconceptualisation carries broader implications for political theory and environmental governance. Ecological sovereignty offers a framework through which legitimacy can be ethically measured, linking renewable energy governance to hydrological ethics and planetary interdependence. It connects the practice of sovereignty to justice across species and scales, advocating participatory governance and transboundary ecological accountability as conditions for legitimate authority. By integrating insights from rights-of-nature jurisprudence, hydropolitical justice, and posthumanist ethics, the concept invites a renewed vocabulary of political obligation—one in which rivers are understood not as legal objects or development infrastructures but as co-constitutive members of the political community.

The Tagus case thus serves not as an anomaly but as a prefiguration of how sovereignty might be re-imagined in a warming, drying, and interdependent world. Future research should extend this framework across other transboundary

basins to explore how ecological sovereignty might inform cross-border governance and ecological diplomacy. As the planetary hydrosphere becomes a theatre for political reinvention, the enduring challenge will be to craft institutions capable of honouring both human and riverine rights to flow—to live, to persist, and to transform together.

REFERENCES

1. Aas, Ø., Lamberg, A., & Johnsen, B. O. (2018). Balancing hydropower and salmon: The Norwegian experience. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 28(6), 1305-1318. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aqc.2955>
2. Agência Portuguesa do Ambiente (APA). (2022). Relatório do estado do ambiente 2022. APA.
3. Beaulieu, J. J., Waldo, S., Balz, D. A., Barnett, W., Hall, A., Platz, M. C., & White, K. M. (2020). Methane and carbon dioxide emissions from reservoirs: Controls and upscaling. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 125(12), e2019JG005474. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JG005474>
4. Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Duke University Press.
5. Borràs, S. (2016). New transitions from human rights to the environment to the rights of nature. *Transnational Environmental Law*, 5(1), 113-143. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S204710251500028X>
6. Cho, M. (2019). Urban stream restoration and ecological resilience: The case of Cheonggyecheon, Seoul. *Cities*, 85, 132-141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2018.09.019>
7. Connell, D. (2022). *Water politics in the Murray-Darling Basin*. ANU Press.
8. Connell, D. (2022). Collaborative water governance in the Murray-Darling Basin: Challenges and prospects. *Australasian Journal of Water Resources*, 26(2), 115-130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13241583.2022.2030468>
9. Convention on Cooperation for the Protection and Sustainable Use of the River Basin of the River Tagus (Albufeira Convention), Spain-Portugal, 1998.
10. Cruz, J. V., & Correia, F. N. (2020). Transboundary water governance in the Iberian Peninsula: The limits of the Albufeira Convention. *Water International*, 45(4), 373-389. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508060.2020.1764462>
11. Domingues, N. S. (2025). The politics of flow: Sovereignty, ecology, and the ethics of water in the Tagus River Basin. Instituto Politécnico de Lisboa.
12. Duda, J. J., Warrick, J. A., Magirl, C. S., & Torgersen, C. E. (2021). The Elwha River dam removals: Lessons learned for river restoration. *BioScience*, 71(5), 465-477. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biaa163>
13. European Commission. (2016). *Ecological flows in the implementation of the Water Framework Directive (Guidance Document No. 31)*. Publications Office of the European Union.
14. Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press.
15. Haraway, D. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press.

16. Hutchison, A. (2017). The Whanganui River as a legal person. *Environmental Law Review*, 19(3), 179-193. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461452917729964>
17. Immerzeel, W. W., Lutz, A. F., Andrade, M., Bahl, A., Biemans, H., Bolch, T., ... & Wester, P. (2020). Importance and vulnerability of the world's water towers. *Nature*, 577(7790), 364-369. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1822-y>
18. Kuenzer, C., Campbell, I., & Ismail, M. H. (2022). *The Mekong River in the Anthropocene: Dams, development, and decline*. Earthscan (Routledge).
19. Latour, B. (2017). *Facing Gaia: Eight lectures on the new climatic regime*. Polity Press.
20. Movement for the Tagus (proTEJO). (2023). Public statements and memoranda. proTEJO.
21. Nixon, R. (2011). *Slow violence and the environmentalism of the poor*. Harvard University Press.
22. Owen, D. (2021). The Colorado River crisis: Water rights, drought, and adaptation. *Environmental Law Review*, 23(2), 101-125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614529211025932>
23. Portuguese Government & Agência Portuguesa do Ambiente. (2024). *Propostas de resiliência hídrica do Tejo*. Government of Portugal.
24. Santos, M., Baptista, A., & Moreira, F. (2021). Integrating renewable energy sources in Portugal's energy mix: Hydropower modernisation and pumped storage. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 138, 110563. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110563>
25. Schwarz, A. E., Ligthart, T. N., Boukris, E., & van Harmelen, T. (2019). Sources, transport, and accumulation of different types of plastic litter in aquatic environments: A review study. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 143, 92-100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2019.04.029>
26. Trigo, R. M., Santos, J. A., & García-Herrera, R. (2016). Decline of winter precipitation in the western Mediterranean and its connection to atmospheric circulation. *Journal of Climate*, 29(18), 6595-6612. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0639.1>
27. UNESCO. (2023). *United Nations world water development report 2023: Partnerships and cooperation for water*. UNESCO.
28. Whyte, K. (2020). Indigenous environmental justice: Anti-colonial action through kinship and solidarity. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 3(1), 207-224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848619867591>
29. World Health Organization (WHO) & United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). (2021). *Progress on household drinking water, sanitation and hygiene 2000-2020: Five years into the SDGs*. World Health Organization.
30. World Commission on Dams. (2000). *Dams and development: A new framework for decision-making*. Earthscan.
31. ZERO — Associação Sistema Terrestre Sustentável. (2023). *Soluções de resiliência hídrica para o Tejo sem fundamentação técnica*. ZERO.

32. Zeitoun, M., & Warner, J. (2006). Hydro-hegemony: A framework for analysis of transboundary water conflicts. *Water Policy*, 8(5), 435-460. <https://doi.org/10.2166/wp.2006.054>