

今日人类学民族学论丛

Anthropology and Ethnology Today Series

国际人类学民族学联合会第十六届大会文集

Book Series of the 16th World Congress of IUAES

黄忠彩 总编

Editor-in-Chief Huang Zhongcai

现代游牧民及其保留地： 老问题，新挑战

Modern Pastoralism and Conservation: Old Problems, New Challenges

[英] 当·查提 [美] 绰伊·斯特恩伯格◎主编

Edited by Dawn Chatty Troy Sternberg



知识产权出版社

全国百佳图书出版单位

今日人类学民族学论丛

Anthropology and Ethnology Today Series

国际人类学民族学联合会第十六届大会文集

Book Series of the 16th World Congress of IUAES

黄忠彩 总编

Editor-in-Chief Huang Zhongcai

现代游牧民及其保留地： 老问题，新挑战

Modern Pastoralism and Conservation: Old Problems, New Challenges

[英] 当·查提 [美] 绰伊·斯特恩伯格◎主编

Edited by Dawn Chatty Troy Sternberg

浙江工业大学
图书馆藏书



浙江工业大学图书馆



71918374



知识产权出版社

全国百佳图书出版单位

责任编辑: 石红华

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

现代游牧民及其保留地: 老问题, 新挑战 = Modern Pastoralism and Conservation: Old Problems, New Challenges: 英文/(英) 当·查提(Chatty, D.), (美) 绰伊·斯特恩伯格(Sternberg, T.) 主编. —北京: 知识产权出版社, 2012. 2

ISBN 978-7-5130-0881-5

I. ①现… II. ①查… ②斯… III. ①游牧民族-民族学-国际学术会议-文集-英文 IV. ①C95-53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2011)第 243818 号

现代游牧民及其保留地: 老问题, 新挑战/Modern Pastoralism and Conservation: Old Problems, New Challenges

XIANDAI YOU MUMIN JIQI BAOLIUDI: LAOWENTI, XINTIAOZHAN

[英] 当·查提 [美] 绰伊·斯特恩伯格 主编

出版发行: 知识产权出版社

社 址: 北京市海淀区马甸南村 1 号

网 址: <http://www.ipph.cn>

发行电话: 010-82000860 转 8101/8102

责编电话: 010-82000860-8130

印 刷: 北京中献拓方科技发展有限公司

开 本: 720mm×960mm 1/16

版 次: 2012 年 1 月第 1 版

字 数: 480 千字

邮 编: 100088

邮 箱: bjb@cnipr.com

传 真: 010-82000860-8240

责编邮箱: shihonghua@cnipr.com

经 销: 新华书店及相关销售网点

印 张: 15

印 次: 2012 年 1 月第 1 次印刷

定 价: 45.00 元

ISBN 978-7-5130-0881-5/C·126 (10359)

版权所有 侵权必究

如有印装质量问题, 本社负责调换。

Preface

China won the right to host the 16th IUAES World Congress in July, 2003. After six years of preparation, the Congress will be held in Kunming, China during July 27-31, 2009.

The International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) was established on August 23, 1948, when it merged, in fact, with the International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (ICAES), which was founded in 1934. The latter was the product of various Congresses of Anthropological Sciences, starting in 1865.

The IUAES is one of the member organizations of the International Social Science Council (ISSC) and also of the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies (ICPHS). The IUAES is also a member of the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU). Its aim is to enhance exchange and communication among scholars of all regions of the world, in a collective effort to expand human knowledge. In this way, it hopes to contribute to a better understanding of human society, and to a sustainable future based on harmony between nature and culture. The IUAES once noted a draft statement on the future of world anthropology in "*Current Anthropology*" (1979): "The scope of anthropology in terms of areas of human interest includes such critical issues of the contemporary world as problems of environmental management, pressure for the progressive reduction of disparities and the restructuring of the world order, the future of the nation-state, ethnic pluralism and the future of national society, and the harmonization of the roles and functions of institutions with the basic and derived biological and psychic drives of man". The IUAES itself consists of national and institutional organizations in more than 50 countries in all parts of the world, and also includes some hundreds of individual members. The research effort and involvement of the IUAES is principally arranged by its scientific commissions, of which, currently, there are twenty-seven, and each of which concentrates on some areas of anthropological interest. They included ethnic relations, aging and the aged, women, children, youth, migration, epidemiology and Aids, tourism, primatology, linguistics, and so on.

The theme of the 16th IUAES World Congress in Kunming, China is "Humanity, Development, and Cultural Diversity". The Anthropologists and Ethnologists around the world will present over 4 000 papers, which covered 33 sub-disciplines or research fields as follows: Aging and the Aged Studies, Aids, Archaeological Anthropology, Children, Youth and

Childhood Studies, Communication Anthropology, Development and Economic Anthropology, Educational Anthropology, Enterprise Anthropology, Ecological/ Environmental Anthropology, Ethnic Culture Studies, Ethnic Relations and Ethnic Identities, Food and Nutrition Anthropology, Gender and Woman Studies, Globalization Anthropology, Historical Anthropology, Human Ecology, Human Rights Studies, Indigenous Knowledge and Sustainable Development Studies, Legal Anthropology and Legal Pluralism, Linguistic Anthropology, Medical Anthropology and Epidemiology, Migration Anthropology, Museum and Cultural Heritage, Nomadic Peoples Studies, Physical Anthropology and Molecular Anthropology, Psycho-anthropology, Religious Studies, Sport Anthropology, Theoretical Anthropology, Tourism Anthropology, Urban Anthropology, Urgent Anthropological Research, and Yunnan Studies.

As the organizer of the 16th IUAES World Congress, the Chinese Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (CUAES) decided to edit and publish "Anthropology and Ethnology Today Series", the paper collection series of the above sub-disciplines or research fields, for example, Physical Anthropology, Molecular Anthropology, Migration Anthropology, Museum and Cultural Heritage, Nomadic Peoples Studies, Linguistic Anthropology, Medical Anthropology, and Ethnic Culture Studies. We hope that the scholars from different parts of the world can share with all the achievements collected in the book series of this congress.

**Zhou Mingfu, Executive Vice-president
Chinese Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences**

**Huang Zhongcai, Secretary-general
Chinese Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences**

July 14, 2009

Foreword

The Commission on Nomadic Peoples (CNP) of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) took part in the 16th Congress between July 27-31, 2009 in Kunming, China. It organized three academic panels, bringing together researchers and specialists interested in nomadic pastoralism across the world. Over four days of talks, the key issues and critical concerns facing pastoralism today were presented and discussed by scholars and students. Led by Dawn Chatty, Chair of the Commission on Nomadic Peoples, and honouring Anatoly Khazanov's lifetime achievements, the sessions encapsulated the evolution, strengths and challenges of pastoralism in the 21st century. Two perspectives were stressed: the first highlighted pastoralism in an international context, drawing on research in Africa, the Middle East, South America and parts of Asia; The second focus was on pastoralism in the host nation, China, and identified both the impact of rapid development on nomadic practices and livelihoods and the country's growing integration into the global pastoral research community. The session provided the opportunity to compare findings, identify patterns and methodologies and expand academic networks for future engagement and expanded cooperation.

This book is a direct outcome of the CNP sessions at the IUAES Congress. Its purpose is to present a broad compilation of recent pastoral research covering different regions and approaches that were addressed at the Congress. Intended as part of a larger set of papers, the stand-alone nature of pastoralism as an area of study and the common political ecology approach of many of the papers gave it a distinctly coherent perspective. The volume includes papers that address key points raised at the conference. These include the nature and viability of pastoralism, its practice in different parts of the world and the challenges it faces from policy, population, the environment and socio-economic development. Issues of transformation and sustainability run throughout the chapters. The changing nature of pastoralism makes knowledge of today's pastoral world essential; the papers were selected to provide a broad context of pastoralism and enhance understanding of this unique livelihood and lifestyle.

The volume commences with a paper by the Commission's 2009 Lifetime Achievement recipient, Anatoly Khazanov. Prof. Khazanov received his Ph. D from Moscow State University in 1966 where he worked on the archaeology of nomadic cultures. At the USSR Academy of Sciences, his focus shifted to social anthropology and the examination of

nomadic pastoralism and the development of complex societies. His extensive body of work is capped by the classic book—*Nomads and the Outside World* (1984). Since 1990, he has been at the University of Wisconsin-Madison where he continues to work and contribute to the international pastoral research and debate. His chapter analyzing nomadic pastoralism begins the volume; it is a fitting synthesis of the state of pastoralism today. The chapter, and book, benefits from Khazanov's long study and considered assessment on the topic. *Contemporary Pastoralism: Old Problems, New Challenges* highlights the integration of mobile pastoralism into the globalized world, identifies the difficulties of transition and modernization and notes the inevitable decline of traditional pastoralism, themes that are evident in the following chapters.

Framed by Khazanov's essay on the state of pastoralism in the world, the book follows nomadic peoples and their lives from West to East Africa, the Arabian Peninsula and the Inner Asian regions of western China and Mongolia. Saverio Kratli examines the complexities of cattle breeding amongst the Wodaabe herders of Niger. The matriarchal lineage of the cattle population maintains diversity and economic functionality; the systems stresses cattle reliability and performance over peak productivity and livestock numbers. The paper argues that among the Wodaabe cattle raising and mobility are part of a multifaceted understanding of herding that transforms natural unpredictability into a key resource. In the following chapter, Salem Mezhoud and Clare Oxby disentangle the "forced displacement" of herders from concepts of pastoral migration. Using examples from the Sahel, particularly Mali and Niger, and South Sudan the authors stress the vulnerability of herders to institutional displacement and government neglect while lacking access to international mechanisms and potential claims and redress under human rights law.

Stephen Moiko, an active herder, addresses the rapid transformation of Kenya's Maasai pastoral community. It highlights policies of land individuation vs. communal resource management. The Maasai are at a crossroads that contrasts the security of land tenure with the flexibility to adapt to fluctuating resources that customary communal tenure offers. His case study of the Olkiramatian Group Ranch stresses "property rights systems attuned to ecological conditions, indigenous knowledge and institutional structures". Also in Kenya, Angela Kronenburg Garcia investigates land appropriation strategies in Loita Masaailand. This encompasses processes of land demarcation, individualized appropriation of previously collective pasture, social approaches to possession and conditions of diminishing land availability. Appropriation strategies, grounding claims and living in the "grey zone" between access and property are now key features of Loita Maasai life and law.

Dawn Chatty, Chair of the Commission of Nomadic Peoples, writes on the Harasiis

mobile pastoralists of Central Oman. Efforts towards biodiversity conservation, such as through nature reserves, can be at odds with local pastoralists whose well-being depends on access to vegetation over vast areas. Difficulties faced with an Oryx Sanctuary in the Jiddat-il Harasiis exemplify how sustainable conservation depends on the goodwill of indigenous populations. In arid lands the drive for bio-conservation requires consideration of the rights and interests of mobile pastoral communities, such as the Harasiis, to develop sustainably.

Shifting to Asia, Troy Sternberg considers the factors that shape pastoralism in Mongolia. This stresses the local environment, long tradition and history, including 70 years as a Soviet satellite state, and the pressure of rapid adjustment to a market economy since 1990. Herding transformation reflects the declining (formerly positive) role of the state, collapsing infrastructure and a cultural shift toward modern lifestyles. A changing climate, access to water and market conditions will encourage or constrain future pastoralism on the steppe.

Two final chapters reflect on pastoralism in the Chinese context. Chinese herding is dominated by strong government control of policy and livelihood patterns that often contrast with the divergent interests of the pastoral minority communities. Emily Yeh examines China's environmental governance and ecological modernization through large-scale ecological construction projects. Such projects in western China have become a form of reterritorialization, with different citizens having different societal value dependent on a group's alignment with state interests. Thus environmental "greening" becomes a means of state power over marginal groups, such as the pastoral community, across the region. Foggins and Zhaxi's evaluation of ecological migration on the Tibetan plateau presents migration as way to meet conservation and human development goals. To assess the planned relocation of pastoralists the authors draw on Canada's experience resettling indigenous populations. These papers question the efficacy of ecological migration and theorizes that a more socially stable and sustainable approach would include community engagement and the ability to maintain pastoral livelihoods.

This book, made up of a selection of the academic presentations at the CNP sessions at the 2009 IUAES Congress, develops a global perspective on the wide-ranging approaches and challenges in the pastoral world. The volume includes original papers and articles previously published in peer-reviewed journals. Together the chapters provide a snapshot of nomadic pastoralism in 2009; the Commission looks forward new research and pastoral scholarship at the next IUAES conference in Manchester, England in 2013.

Co-editors: D. Chatty, T. Sternberg
Oxford, 2011

Table of Contents

1. Contemporary Pastoralism: Old Problems, New Challenges	Anatoly M.Khazanov	1
2. Cattle Breeding, Complexity and Mobility in a Structurally Unpredictable Environment: the WoDaaBe Herders of Niger	Saverio Kratli	24
3. Disentangling "Forced Displacement" from Pastoral Mobility: Recovery and Reconstruction in the Sahel and in South Sudan	Salem Mezhoud and Clare Oxby	59
4. Pastoralists at Crossroads: Community Resource Governance in the Context of a Transitioning Rangelands Tenure System	Stephen S. Moiko	83
5. Booking and Grabbing Land: Strategies of Appropriation in Loita Maasailand, Kenya	Angela Kronenburg Garcia	102
6. Adapting to Biodiversity Conservation: The Mobile Pastoral Harasiis Tribe of Oman	Dawn Chatty	133
7. Pastoral Determinants in Mongolia's Steppe Environment	Troy Sternberg	154
8. Theorizing Ecological Migration	Emily T. Yeh	176
9. Can Ecological Migration Policy in the Tibetan Plateau Region Achieve both Conservation Goals and Human Development Goals? A Review of the Canadian Experience of Relocation and Settlement	J. Marc Foggin and Gongbu Zhaxi	207
Author Biographies		224

Contemporary Pastoralism: Old Problems, New Challenges^①

Anatoly M. Khazanov

University of Wisconsin-Madison

I will start with terminology because it is sometimes confusing and misleading, and results in the wrong conclusions. One should discriminate between the pure pastoral nomadism, which, as some scholars claim, is coming to its end (Humphrey and Sneath 1999), other forms of traditional, subsistence-oriented mobile pastoralism, and pastoralist mobility in general that is characteristic of many various forms of stock-breeding as long as they utilize natural pastures (Khazanov 1994, 15 ff.).

While commercialized and somewhat industrialized ranch-stock breeding is practiced in the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and few other countries, there are still many millions of people in the world for whom mobile pastoralism remains the main economic activity. They are living mainly in Africa, in the extended Middle East, in Central and Inner Asia, in South Asia, and in the Far North. In Africa, the pastoralist population is estimated at 268 million, over a quarter of the total population (African Union 2010). In some countries, such as Niger, Djibouti or Somalia, mobile pastoralists still constitute the majority of population; in many others they constitute a significant minority. Thus, in Mongolia, a country with a population of 2.5 million people, about 400 000 thousands are pastoralists, while half the population directly or indirectly depends on pastoralism (Fernandez-Gimenez 1999, 4). The remarkable resilience of mobile pastoralism, despite numerous gloomy predictions to the contrary, is indeed not accidental.

① This is a revised and augmented version of a paper originally published in Mongolia. See Anatoly M. Khazanov. Pastoralists in the "Age of Globalization: Challenges of the 21st Century". "In: Jörg Janzen and Batboldyn Enkhtuvshin (eds). *Dialog between Cultures and Civilizations: Present State and Perspectives of Nomadism in a Globalizing World*. Proceedings of the International Conference, Ulaanbaatar, August 9-14 2004. Ulaanbaatar 2008: xiii-xxviii.

Climate and environment are not subject even to our post-industrial civilization. It is worth keeping in mind that pastoralism was originally developed as an alternative to cultivation in the regions where the latter was impossible, or economically less feasible (Khazanov 1994, 85 ff.). In many of these areas the situation remains basically the same. In Mongolia, pastures constitute 74.8 per cent of the total area, arable lands only 0.8 per cent. In Kazakhstan, the ratio is 68.8 and 12.9 per cent; in Turkmenistan, 61.6 and 3 per cent; in Kyrgyzstan, 42.9 and 7.2 per cent. In Sudan, only one third of the land is potentially arable. In sub-Saharan Africa in general, the arid zone accounts for 37 per cent, and the semi-arid zone for another 18 per cent of its land area (Jahnke 1982). Thus, mobile stock-breeding may retain some advantages in comparison with other forms of economic activity and remain a rational and sustainable system for utilizing natural resources in the arid and semi-arid zones. Moreover, new ecological thinking holds that in many dry zones pastoralism is more environmentally benign than cultivation.

Still, one must admit that at present, traditional, subsistence-oriented pastoralism is experiencing many difficulties and has to adjust to the new realities. Our times are often called the "age of globalization", but globalization is just a new stage in the on-going modernization process. To avoid any misunderstanding I would like to make one clarification. When I write about modernization I do not imply simplistic views which hold that the developing countries should copy the Western models and repeat the Western stages of development. I perceive modernization as economic growth based on technological innovations with corresponding changes of socio-political and cultural institutions. I would also add that, as world practice has demonstrated time and again, successful and long-term modernization, especially in our age of the transnationalization of information, production and finance, is inseparably linked to the market economy. All other ways of modernization eventually lead to a dead end.

However, it is difficult for traditional economies not only to compete with, but even to adapt to the modern economies. Therefore, it is difficult, in principle, to maintain traditional mobile pastoralism within the contemporary, increasingly globalized economic climate. It is evident that traditional pastoralism should somehow be modernized. The unsolved problem, however, is how to do this in the least painful way for pastoralists themselves.

Considering the great variety of ecological, socio-political, and economic conditions of pastoralists in different countries and in different parts of the world, it is not surprising there are no general recipes applicable to every situation. Still, it is worth noting that two major and radical approaches to modernization of traditional pastoralists that have been

suggested and experimented with, in many cases proved to be inadequate.

The first solution was the communist one. It was based on nationalization and/or collectivization of the stock and pastureland, not infrequently accompanied by forced sedentarization of the pastoralists. In its extreme form: collectivization plus sedentarization, this model was first applied in the Soviet Union, in the late 1920s and early 1930s. Later, some other countries adopted the whole model, or more often, either its collectivization or sedentarization parts: Iran, in the 1930s; Mongolia, in the 1950s; China, in the 1960s; Somalia, in the 1970s; Eritrea, in the 1990s. Generally, this method was a failure.

It is true that in the Soviet Union the pastoralist process of production was eventually somewhat modernized, but this was done in inefficient and misguided way. Livestock breeding had lost its traditional character, but was never organized on rational economic principles. In the Soviet Union and Mongolia, in the late communist period, the prime goal was to increase numbers of stock by any means. This should not be surprising indeed, since even in Mongolia urban dwellers suffered chronic shortages of milk and meat products (Fernandez-Gimenez 1999, 19).

However, an increase in stock numbers was achieved by large subsidies and disregard of the production cost, and especially of the rapidly deteriorating environment. Vast areas of fertile pastures in Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan have been turned into sand deserts; other pastures are rapidly degrading. In Kyrgyzstan, overgrazing resulted in degradation of 1.7 million hectares of pastureland (according to some data, even 3.5 million hectares), while another 30 per cent of pastures lost productivity (Dzoldoshev 1997, 168; Kliashtornyi 1999, 61). In Uzbekistan, more than 30 percent of pastures in the desert and semi-desert zones are in various stages of degradation (Aripov 1997, 139). In China, nearly 90 percent of usable grassland is considered "degraded" because of species change and productivity loss (Li and Huntsinger 2011). In its Xinjiang province, salinization and desiccation affected about 4.7 million hectares (Benson and Svanberg 1998, 141), while the average productivity of rangeland has fallen by 30 per cent since the 1960s (Banks 1999, 298).

Besides this, all pastoralist activities were put under the day-to-day control and supervision of appointed managerial staff, which denied any initiative on the part of pastoralists themselves. The lack of personal responsibility and stimuli made the work of herders dull and uninspiring, while narrow specialization within appointed groups brought about the loss of the whole complex of pastoralist skills.

It is true, however, that the post-communist period was also marked everywhere by many negative developments in the pastoralist sector. In the 1990s, one of the most striking

characteristics of the situation in the region was that in its main stock-raising countries, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, as well as in the Russian North, pastoralist specialization had become unprofitable to the majority of households and farms due to the high input prices, undeveloped market channels, and low prices for animal production. Other conspicuous characteristics had been a serious decrease in stock numbers, which was somewhat stabilized only in the last few years, and a decrease in pastoralist mobility. These negative developments were mainly the result of the state's premature retreat from its former role as a provider of subsidies, credits, and input-supply systems, which was accompanied by widespread corruption and embezzlement (Khazanov et al. 1997; Khazanov et al. 1999; Khazanov and Shapiro 2005; Kerven 2003).

In the early 1990s, some scholars from Central Asia and other countries predicted the revival of traditional forms of mobile pastoralism in the region. So far, nothing like this has happened. Communal forms of land tenure and pasture utilization destroyed in the Soviet period have not been restored, and the role of kinship-based ties in the organization of pastoralist production remains insignificant. At the same time, the transition to market-oriented forms of pastoralism and animal husbandry is also blocked for many pastoralists. In some post-communist countries, there is the danger of re-peasantization and even pauperization of the majority of those who remain in the pastoralist sector. Instead of becoming small-scale but efficient market-oriented producers, these people may be locked into the role of subsistence farmers with no capital.

Another solution advocated mainly by some experts from Western countries is transformation of traditional pastoralists into commercial stock producers (Ingold 1978, 121), or even into capitalist ranch-owners. However, their recommendations did not take into account the environmental and social conditions in many Third World countries. The ranch system that emerged in the United States and in some other countries during the second half of the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth centuries was by no means a result of the development of the traditional pastoralist economies. Rather, it was created and introduced anew.

From the outset, the ranch system was aimed at production of livestock exclusively for sale and was operating within profit-oriented market economies. There was no introductory period. In the western United States, commercial ranching rapidly replaced subsistence-based herding with communal grazing lands after the USA took over the Mexican territories. On the Plains and in the Prairies an opportunity for expanding ranching emerged after the extirpation of bison. Ranchers might, and still may, enjoy their peculiar subculture, social

status, life-style, and quality of life, which for them were more than money, but they could not survive without having been market oriented and producing for profit. In the beginning, the rapid growth of the East Coast and European beef markets guaranteed cattlemen high prices and profits, especially after the introduction of refrigerator cars, in 1869, and refrigerated ships, in 1875. Livestock owners were businessmen, not infrequently absentee cattle barons, who possessed the capital, technological know-how, and means to develop the intensive system of fenced ranching with irrigated pastures, machinery, motorized transport, tame-seed forage plants, selective breeding and artificial insemination, shelters for animals in the winter, and so on (Dale 1960; Atherton 1961; Bennett 1985; Barsh 1990; Jordan 1993; Starrs 1998; Huntsinger and Starrs 2006). Still, it is remarkable that in the United States and Canada most rangelands belong not to individual ranchers but to various government agencies, and the ranchers have to lease them or to get grazing permits. Today even in the USA many family-owned ranches are monospecialized. They are relying on cattle alone and are facing growing difficulties connected to their limited profitability. It is hard for them to compete with the agro-industrial enterprises, which are using relatively cheap grain and agricultural by-products to feed cattle. Besides, contemporary ranchers are sedentary people, and often their cattle are for the most part stationary.

In the short run, it would be unrealistic to expect similar developments in many Third World countries, where the relative costs of labour versus capital are unlikely to be consistent with large-scale, capital intensive operations. This is why many scholars are now advocating much more gradual transformation of traditional pastoralism. In fact, one may already single out three stages in its attempted development. In the beginning, the main attention had been paid to the technological improvements in stock-breeding within the framework of traditional pastoralist social organization and land tenure. In other words, livestock development had taken priority over pastoralists' development.

However, the real world is often quite a different place from the one assumed by those development experts who had supposed that appropriate technological inputs would automatically yield desirable economic and social outputs. As Gorse and Steeds (1987, 10) noted: "Planners have often misunderstood the logic of traditional production systems, and have thereby overestimated the ease with which improvements could be introduced and underestimated the negative consequences of intended improvements."

Many early developmental projects in Africa failed or resulted in unforeseen repercussions because administrators and planners ignored the peculiarities of the social organization and land tenure of pastoralists. Thus, attempts at intensifying traditional

pastoralism by applying modern technologies not infrequently gave rise to overstocking, overgrazing, degradation of vegetation, soil, and water, and even to desertification (see for example Reining 1978; Goldschmidt 1981, 104 ff.; Handule and Gay 1987; Bernus 1990, 166-7).

Later, in the 1970s and in the early 1980s, an understanding came that it would be very difficult to introduce effective innovations without general changes in social systems. The World Bank, the FAO, the European Union, USA ID and other donors, apparently influenced by the "tragedy of commons" theory (Hardin 1968, 1243-8; Hardin and Baden 1977; cf. Hardin 1988) began to promote individualized land tenure, assuming that it would be more efficient and productive than the communal one (Fratkin 1997). This theory, which is still very influential in China (Banks 1999, 300; Taylor 2006), holds that if a resource belongs to everybody, nobody is interested in its preservation; therefore, situations where stock is privately owned but pastures are common property inevitably result in overgrazing. In fact, this theory is wrong because it has failed to take into account a plethora of ethnographic data on pastoralists and does not distinguish between open access to pastures and their communal tenure, sometimes with further regulations (McCay and Acheson 1987; Berkes et al. 1989; Paine 1994, 187-8).

No wonder that the new trend in development policy has brought, at best, ambiguous results. The traditional pastoralists usually lack both the experience and the necessary capital to start market-oriented ranch enterprises. It is not surprising that the development of capital-intensive livestock production, and sometimes speculative investments, usually led to a concentration of benefits in only a few hands (Waters- Bayer and Bayer 1992, 4).

Commodification of livestock and labour resulted in the emergence of absentee herd owners and hired herders. Thus, in Turkey, Iran, Kenya, Tanzania, Botswana, some West African countries, and several others, it is not pastoralists but sedentary businessmen with managerial experience and people with good connections in the governments who have established commercial enterprises (see for example Bates 1980, 125 ff. on Turkey; Beck 1980 and Bradbury 1980 on Iran; Pelican 2002 on Cameroon; Little 1985; Galaty 1992; Ellwood 1995, 9 on Kenya; Arhem 1985 on Tanzania; Hinderink and Sterkenburg 1987 on Botswana; Maliki 1986 on Niger; Salih 1990a on Sudan; and Waters-Bayer 1988 on Nigeria). Even the advocates of ranch schemes admit that concentration of large tracts of land in the hands of a few individuals creates a new set of social and political problems (see for example Awogbade 1987, 25-6).

This inevitably leads to an increasing number of displaced and unemployed persons

who, in the currently prevailing conditions in many developing countries, are often denied viable possibilities for adjustment and alternative employment. At the same time, at present, the pastoralist systems in Africa, as well as in some other parts of the world, are no longer capable of reabsorbing these people without help from outside sources which are at best insufficient and often inefficient, and at worst are non-existent.

Only recently are some scholars and experts coming to the conclusion that modernization of traditional pastoralists cannot be carried out in isolation from the broader political and developmental issues. There are two main obstacles that hinder successful modernization of traditional pastoralists. The first is connected with their growing political weakness and subjugated positions in many post-colonial states. Not infrequently, these states remain alien to the pastoralists. The latter cannot escape them, as they were sometimes capable of doing in the past, but they do not benefit from the state either. When they run away from the state, as the pastoralists of Madagascar have literally tried to do in the quite recent past (Kaufmann 1998), the state runs after them; and the state is much stronger.

The second obstacle consists in double marginalization of the pastoralists. They are becoming increasingly marginalized within national systems of Third World countries, which, in turn, are marginalized within regional and global economic systems. These countries are often euphemistically called the "developing" ones; however, in fact, many of them, especially in Africa and in some parts of the Middle East, are not developing but stagnating. In all, the pastoralists have to adjust to external forces of great magnitude which are beyond their control.

In some respects, the colonial period was easier for pastoralists than what followed. It is true that they lost their political independence, that the colonial power confiscated some of their lands, regulated their migratory routes, and forced them to pay taxes. However, some exceptions notwithstanding, in general, those powers were often satisfied with the maintenance of order and did not intentionally try to undermine the traditional way of life and social organization of the pastoralists.

In the post-colonial period, many national governments and ruling elites demonstrate much stronger anti-pastoralist bias (Azarya 1996, 69 ff.; Manger 2001, 29; Claudot-Hawad 2006, 655 ff.; Keenan 2006, 918 ff.). They consider the pastoralists as not sufficiently productive, and, at the same time, as a disruptive and unruly element that has to be pacified and domesticated. In 1973, when the Sahel was affected by a severe drought and many pastoralists lost their stock, Ebrahim Konate, at that time the Secretary of the Permanent African Interstate Committee for Drought Control, expressed his satisfaction with the

situation with remarkably cynical frankness. He stated: "We have to discipline these people, and to control their grazing and their movements. Their liberty is too expensive for us. Their disaster is our opportunity" (Marnham 1979, 9).

Terms for nomads, like "Yörük" in Turkey, or "Kuchi" in Afghanistan, have become derogatory labels. (Actually, nowadays, only about 200 families of the SarikaciliYörükpractise seasonal migrations-AysaHilalTuztas, personal communication). In Kenya and Uganda, negative images of pastoralists as backward and unproductive people, locked into a way of life that belongs to the past, are a commonplace in the mainstream political and popular discourses (Krätli 2006, 124-7). In Saudi Arabia the Bedouin stand not only for ancestors but also for "backward people", "primitive", or even "savage" (Fabietti 2006, 573). The governments of some Central Asian countries are glorifying their "nomadic heritage", but are doing very little, if anything at all, to assist their pastoralists in practice. No wonder that in many countries, pastoralists are currently facing more threats to their way of life than ever before in their long history.

Population growth, mining, industrial development, and urbanization result in the encroachment of sedentary populations into territories occupied by the pastoralists. This is often encouraged by the national governments. Not only in Central Asia, but in such countries as Nigeria, Mali, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Sudan, Kenya, Algeria, Syria, Israel, Turkey, Iran, India, and some others, many pasturelands were appropriated by the state, or were simply seized by agriculturalists to be put under the plough (Lewis 1987; Galaty and Johnson 1990; Galaty and Bonte 1991; Koehler-Rollefson 1992; Smith 1992; Ma 1993, 173; Sheehy 1993, 17-30; Abu-Rabi'a 1994, 15; Galaty et al. 1994; Medzini 1998; Benson andSvanberg, 1998, 141; Claudot-Hawad 2006, 672).

In Nigeria, in 1957, 67 per cent of the land was utilized as pastures; by 1986, the area of pastureland had decreased to 39 per cent (Gefu and Gelles 1990, 39, 40). Even in Mongolia, according to some estimates, between 1957 and 1994, the total grazing area was reduced from 140 to 125 million hectares for urbanization purposes, tilling, extension of roads and steppe tracks, etc. (Szykiewicz 1998, 208). In the Scandinavian and Russian Arctic, many pasturelands utilized by reindeer were lost to hydroelectric development, extractive industries, and other projects (Morris 1990; Vakhtin 1992; Paine 1994; Krupnik 1998). Not infrequently, herding lands are also lost to game parks and urban areas (Anderson and Grove 1987; Kaufmann 1998, 136-7; Chatty 2001; Lenhart and Casimir 2001, 10 ff.; Rao 2002; Chatty and Colchester 2002). In addition, pastoralists face increasing dislocation brought about by droughts, famines, banditry, military conflicts, and