

CONTEMPORARY PASTORALISM: OLD PROBLEMS, NEW CHALLENGES

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 pastoral mobility in general that is characteristic of many various forms of stock-breeding as long as they utilize natural pastures (Khazanov 1994: 85 ff.)

In accordance with some not very precise estimates, there are still about 40 million 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. Besides, industrialized and commercialized ranch stock-breeding is practicing in the USA, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and few other countries. 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 thousand people are pastoralists, while a half of the population directly or indirectly depends on pastoralism (Fernandez-Gimenez 1999: 4). A remarkable resilience of mobile pastoralism, despite numerous gloomy predictions to the contrary, is not accidental; indeed

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 profitable. In many of these areas the situation remains basically the same. In Mongolia, pastures constitute 74.8 percent of the total area, while arable lands only 0.8 percent. In Kazakhstan, the ratio is 68.8 and 12.9 percent, in Turkmenistan 61.6 and 3.0 percent, in Kyrgyzstan 42.9 and 7.2 percent. In Sudan, only one third of the land is potentially arable. In sub-Saharan Africa in general, the arid zone accounts for 37 percent, and the semi-arid zone for 18 percent 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 non-Western 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

I would also add that, as the world practice has demonstrated time and again, short- and long-term modernization, especially in our age of the transnationalization of production and finance, is inseparably linked to the market economy and private property. All other ways of modernization eventually lead to the dead-end.

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

There are no general recipes applicable to all individual situations, which is not surprising considering a great variety of ecological, socio-political, and economic conditions of pastoralists in different countries and in different parts of the world. Still, it is worth to note that two major and radical solutions of modernization of traditional pastoralists that up to now have been suggested and experimented with, in many cases turned out to be inadequate.

The first solution was the communist one. It was based on nationalization and/or collectivization of the stock and pasturgland accompanied by forced sedentarization of the pastoralists. In its extreme form: collectivization plus sedentarization, this model was first used in the Soviet Union, in the late 1920s and in the 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; Ethiopia, in the 1970s; Eritrea, in the 1990s. Generally, this method was a failure.

It is true that in the communist countries pastoralist production process was somewhat modernized, but this was done in their characteristically inefficient and wasteful way. Livestock breeding had lost its traditional character, but it was never adjusted on the rational principles of modern economy. In the late communist period, the main goal was to increase the stock number by any means. This should not be surprising since even in Mongolia urban dwellers suffered chronic shortages of milk and meat products (Fernandez-Gimenez 1999: 19).

However, an increase in the stock numbers was achieved by large subsidies, a disregard of the production cost, and, especially, of rapidly deteriorating environment. Vast areas of fertile pastures in Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan have been turned into sand dunes, other pastures were 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 percent of pastures lost their 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 Xinjiang, salinization and desiccation affected about 4, 7 million hectares (Benson and Vanberg 1998: 141), while the average productivity of rangeland has fallen by 30 percent since the 1960s (Banks 1999: 298).

Besides, all pastoralist activities were put under everyday control and supervision by appointed managerial staff, which denied any initiative on the part of pastoralists themselves. The lack of personal responsibility and stimuli made the work of shepherds dull and uninspiring, while narrow specialization within appointed groups brought about



the loss of the whole complex of pastoralist skills. Those who are lamenting the dissolution of state and collective farms in the countries, like Mongolia or Kazakhstan, claim that this was done for political reasons. They prefer policies which are pursued by the most authoritarian countries, Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan, where the collectives were not disbanded but only "reformed" (Sneath 2002: 174, Kerven 2003: 14 ff). However, they fail to notice that this also was done for political reasons. Their other claim that the conditions for pastoral households in the latter countries are still better than in Kazakhstan and Mongolia, remain unsubstantiated and raises many doubts.

It is true, however, that post-communist period is marked everywhere by many negative developments in the pastoralist sector. One of the most striking characteristics of the current situation in the region is that in its main stock-raising countries, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, as well as in the Russian North, pastoralist specialization has 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 are a serious decrease in the stock number, which was somewhat stabilized only in the last few years, and the 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 beginning of the 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 are not 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 the majority of pastoralists. 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-oriented non-capitalist holders.

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 19th and in the first half of the 20th 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 of subsistence production. Ranchers might, and still may, enjoy their peculiar subculture, life-style and the 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

generator cars, in 1869, and refrigerated ships, in 1875. Stock owners were businessmen, not infrequently absentee cattle barons, who possessed 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 2000, Atherton 1961, Bennett 1985, Barsh, 1990, Jordan 1993, Starrs, 1998). But today even in the USA many family-owned ranches are facing growing difficulties and have but a slim profitability. It is hard for them to compete with the giant agro-industrial enterprises which use relatively cheap grain and agricultural by-products to feed cattle. Nowadays, it is still cheaper to ship animals to the feed by trucks, trains, ship, and even by planes, than to deliver feed to animals (Shields and Mathews 2003). 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 labor versus capital are unlikely to be consistent with large-scale, capital intensive operations. This is why many scholars are advocating now 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 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 had 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 implying 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: 166-167).

Later, in the 1970s and in the early 1980s, an understanding came that it would be very difficult to introduce effective innovations without the general changes in social systems. The World Bank, the FAO, the European Union, the USAID, and other donors, increasingly influenced by the 'tragedy of commons' theory (Hardin 1968: 1243-1248, Hardin and Baden 1977, cf. Harden, 1988) began to promote individualized land tenure, assuming that it would be more efficient and productive than communal one (Fratkin 1997). This theory, which is still extremely influential in China (Banks 1999: 300), holds that if a resource belongs to everybody, nobody is interested in its preservation; therefore, situations where stock is privately owned but pastures are in 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



an open access to pastures and their communal tenure, sometimes with further regulations (McCay and Acheson 1987, Berkes et al 1989, Paine 1994: 187-188).

No wonder that the new trend in the 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 labor 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 connection 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 but 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 destitutes without help from the outside sources, which, at best, are 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 can not be taken in isolation from the broader political and developmental issues. There are two main obstacles that hinder successful modernization of traditional pastoralists. The first one is connected with their growing political weakness and subjugated positions in many post-colonial states. 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 are running away from the state, as the pastoralists of Madagascar have literally tried to do in the quite recent past (Kaufmann 1998), the state is running 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 the next one. It is true that they lost their political independence, that 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). 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 Bonate, 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, like "Yörük", in Turkey, or "Kuchi", in Afghanistan, have become derogatory labels. Pastoralists in China to this very day are often portrayed as ignorant, irrational, backward, lazy, uncooperative, destructive to the environment, and resisting modernization (Williams 1997: 334 ff.). The governments of some Central Asian countries are glorifying their "nomadic heritage", but are doing very little, if anything at all, to assist their pastoralist 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, 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, Syria, Israel, Turkey, Iran, India, China (especially in Inner Mongolia and Xinjiang) many pasturelands were appropriated by the state, or were simply seized by agriculturalists to be put under the plow (Lewis 1987, Galaty and Johnson 1990, Galaty and Bonte 1991, Koehler-Rolleison 1992, Smith 1992, Ma 1993: 173, Sheehy 1993: 17-30, Abu-Rabi'a 1994: 15, Galaty et al. 1994, Medzini 1998, Benson and Svanberg 1998: 141, Zaal 1999: 98-101).

In Nigeria, in 1957, 67 percent of the land was utilized as pastures; by 1986, the territory of pastureland decreased to 39 percent (Gefu and Gelles 1990: 39, 40). Even in Mongolia, according to some estimates, between 1957 and 1994, the total grazing area has been reduced from 140 to 125 million hectares for urbanization purposes, tilling, extension of roads and steppe tracks, etc. (Szynkiewicz 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: 136-137, Chatty 2001, Lenhart and Casimir, 2001: 10 ff., Rao, 2002). In addition, pastoralists face increasing dislocation brought about by droughts, famines, banditry, conflicts, and civil wars.

Many national governments and governmental agencies force the pastoralists to sedentarize. Actually, the allegedly permanent battle between the desert and the sown is an oversimplification of a great variety of real situations and is profoundly ahistorical. Nevertheless, already in 1979, the Fifteenth International African Seminar held at Ahmadu Bello University made a remarkable statement: "The conference notes that the nomadic



aspect of the life of pastoralists is no longer tenable in the face of ever greater pressure on land and that it is not in the interests of the pastoralists themselves to continue to lead a nomadic or semi-nomadic way of life" (Adamu and Kirk-Greene 1986 XVII, see also Khogali 1980, and Salih 1990 64 ff). The Chinese government is still pursuing a policy of settling down pastoralist peoples in Xinjiang (Benson and Svanberg 1998 80, 146 1986).

In principle, sedentarization and urbanization of at least a part of mobile pastoralists is inevitable and even desirable under contemporary conditions, if it channels the surplus labor in the pastoralist sector into other occupational activities. It may even facilitate an increase of economic efficiency of those who will remain involved in mobile pastoralism. However, at present, sedentarization of pastoralists confronts many difficulties, such as shortage of land suitable for cultivation, demographic pressure, etc. It is very difficult to turn to cultivation when arable land is already occupied by other people, who are numerically and politically stronger. As a result, the pastoralists often have to sedentarize in marginal areas, where cultivation is risky and unpredictable to the extent that the sedentaries themselves consider such lands of little use for cultivation.

Thus, at present, sedentarization can hardly be considered a general solution for the majority of pastoralists. As Salzman (1980 VII) aptly remarked "Sedentarization viewed as an inevitable and necessary step in furthering progress and advancing civilization, and pressed upon nomadic peoples by external forces, can have detrimental consequences not only for the nomadic peoples themselves but for the large societies of which they are part". Likewise, for a growing number of pastoralists who are moving into the cities and become urbanized, the problem of an employment is quite acute in many countries.

In the past pastoralist economies were never deliberately profit-oriented or consistently aimed at meeting market demands, although they almost always had a barter exchange or even a market component. Nowadays, the pastoralists, whether they like it or not, are increasingly becoming involved in state, regional or international systems based on a monetary economy with a corresponding shift from use-value to exchange-value and commoditization of livestock and its products. At the same time, their engagement with the market is proceeding in unfavorable conditions of state intervention and expanding world markets.

Products of animal husbandry from the developed countries are dominant on the world markets, and it is very difficult for the pastoralist produce in the developing countries to compete with them. Moreover, export produce from the developed countries has seized a significant share of the markets in some developing countries, while the pastoralists there face many difficulties in selling their own produce. If one visited supermarkets in the major cities of Kazakhstan, in the 1990s, one would find a great variety of meat, sausage, cheese, and even butter produced in Australia, New Zealand, and the countries of the European Union, almost everywhere, except Kazakhstan. The local produce was sold mainly in bazaars. The situation began to change for better only in the last few years. Many milk products and other foodstuff in Mongolia are imported from other countries. In the second half of the 1980s and in the early 1990s, European Community dumping of low-grade industrial beef, pork and offal on coastal West African markets depressed demand for Sahelian fresh beef and small ruminant meat (Holtzman and Kulihaba 1996

202). Most milk products available in Cameroon are imported from European countries, regionally produced on the basis of imported products (Pelican 2002).

This situation contains an almost ironical side. While many international agencies, the World Bank, are arguing that in Third World countries agriculture, including pastoralism, should be self-sustainable in all developed countries they are enjoying direct and indirect subsidies and other support by the governments and/or consumers. However, they should take into account that in the developed countries only a small percentage of population is involved in agriculture, while in the developing countries the agriculturalists constitute more than a half of population.

In some countries, the price control and policies exercised by national governments are unfavorable to the pastoralists even with regard to the local markets. In China since the 1980s comparative price advantages have moved in favor of crop production relative to animal husbandry (Williams 1997: 346). In 1998, in Mongolia, meat was less than a third of its value in terms of flour, in 1990 (Sneath 2002: 172). Prices on wheat in Africa in general are artificially low (John Galaty, personal communication).

Besides, subsidies by themselves far from always change the situation for better and really assist the development. I can refer to the example of some Arab countries, especially the oil-producing ones. They support the Bedouin in the form of money payments, land allocations, job offers in the military and administration, and so on. As the result of this policy, many people moved into other sectors of national economies and cities.

One might expect that this would facilitate modernization of pastoralism and commoditization of its production. Nothing like this has happened, however. It seems that in these cases subsidies and subventions serve not as incentives for development but rather as compensation for a lack of development. There are but few ranch and commercial stock-raising enterprises in those countries which are unable to satisfy their needs. Nowadays, countries, like Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Oman, Libya, and even Jordan, have to rely upon imported meat and even dairy foodstuff (see, for example, Katakura 1977, Cole 1981, Fabiotti 1982, Lancaster and Lancaster 1986, Kosliner 1990: 244 ff. on Saudi Arabia, Scholz 1981, Jansen 1986 on Oman, Behnke 1980 on Libya, Abu Jaber and Al-Saraibeh 1981, Hiatt 1984 on Jordan).

One may complain about unfair competition and about limited export opportunities for the developing countries as much as one wants, but this is how the things are in practice, at the moment. To provide but one of many possible examples I can refer to the Mongolian case. As far as I know, cashmere is the only product of animal husbandry that the country successfully exports to the world markets. Moreover, while the developed countries build various barriers, like rigorous quality constraints, which prevent the import of animal products from the developing countries, the governments of the latter, not infrequently, encourage the import and control producer and consumer prices to keep them on the lower level for the growing urban population.

So far, I have talked about various schemes suggested and implemented by economists, experts on development and government officials. But what about social anthropologists especially anthropologists? In many cases we were sitting on the fence complaining about the decay of traditional pastoralism but having been unable to offer a viable and practical alternative. Perhaps, this attitude was the best expressed by Baxter

(1987: 1). "Almost all, indeed maybe all, the development interventions to date had not helped the impoverished pastoralists at all, nor had they added a cent to the wealth of any nation". This opinion is echoed by Scoones (1996: 3): "The last 30 years have seen the unremitting failure of livestock development projects across Africa. Millions of dollars have been spent with few obvious returns and not a little damage. Most commentators agree that the experience has been a disaster, so much so that many donors and other international agencies have effectively abandoned the dry zone in their development efforts".

It should not be surprising then that attempts at dialog between anthropologists and developers and governmental officials so far was not very fruitful. When administrators and planners began to advance and implement the schemes aimed at transformation of traditional pastoralists into commercial livestock producers, this brought them into direct conflicts with the majority in anthropological community. Thus, we pointed out time and again that our opponents did not realize that production is not only an economic activity, it is also a socially and culturally constructed activity.

I must confess that in the past I also was very critical of many development projects suggested by various international organizations and implemented by national governments in Third World countries (see, for example, Khazanov 1998: 12 ff.). I am still critical of many those projects. However, now I am coming to the conclusion that my general attitude to the principle goal of advocated development, which I shared with many other anthropologists, was, to some extent, unfair and unrealistic. Explicitly or implicitly, we the anthropologists resent most development projects because they undermine those types of social organization, culture, values, etc. that are connected with the traditional pastoralism. Essentially, our criticism has a certain anti-modernist touch, although we rarely admit this. Some recommendations made by anthropologists, e.g. that "room should be found on the rangelands for less fortunate people, if necessary at the expense of the more fortunate" or that "government should encourage and support traditional mechanisms for redistributing livestock" so that the rich provide the poor with basic needs" (Baxter 1987: 11) are well-intended indeed, but I wonder whether they are realistic. One may agree with Sanford (1996: 179) that "we social scientists have not yet structured our views rigorously enough to have any clear message for policy makers and practitioners except that everything is very complex, that Hardin (1968) was wrong and that livestock mobility is to be encouraged".

The opinion expressed by Raikes (1981: 250) more than twenty years ago that the most productive (or least destructive) way to incorporate mobile pastoralists into national economies is "through developing the production and productivity of existing herding systems rather than through their replacement by modern systems" remains unsubstantiated. The practice is teaching us the opposite. Traditional forms of social organization and of associated social behavior are often becoming counterproductive and inappropriate in the age of globalization.

It is true that so far mobile pastoralism in the developing countries has survived despite all kinds of development schemes, rather than because of them. Many development projects were ill-devised. Attempts at transforming mobile pastoralism from above, initiated, designed and implemented by the state through purely administrative measures in most of the cases have not brought the desired results. International and



International aid was sometimes directed at the wrong goals, misused and then was prematurely withdrawn. For example, in the 1990s, the assistance to African pastoralists by international agencies was much less than in the 1960s and in the 1970s. The Soviet aid amounted to more than a third of annual GDP in Mongolia. Its withdrawal was one of the main reasons of the economic crisis in the country.

The same can be said about national assistance to and investment in pastoralist sector of economies in rare cases, when it takes place at all. Thus, in China, only a relatively small portion of agricultural development resources goes into improving livestock production. Even when the arid lands along its northern frontier manage to attract large investment capital, local herders are bypassed in the development process (Williams 1997: 346-347). In Mongolia, the level of investment in pastoralism is low and was declining steadily in the 1990s. The percentage of all bank loans granted to borrowers outside the capital, Ulaanbaatar, has fallen each year throughout the nineties, from 46 percent in 1993, to 11 percent, in 1998 (Sneath 2002: 173).

In any case, excessive paternalism, even a benevolent one, will not help. The main problem is not what to do with the mobile pastoralists, but what the pastoralists have to do themselves in order to cope with challenges of globalization. The pastoralists must become full-fledged citizens of modernizing states and have a voice in decision-making. They should not only be listened to, they should directly be involved in the planning and implementation of development programs. At the same time, learning from the previous mistakes national governments and international agencies should do more by providing the pastoralists with various kinds of input, education, water service, veterinary care, transportation facilities, stock insurance, information, market infrastructure, credits, etc. Some protectionist measures can not be excluded as well.

Only the future will tell whether these recommendations, and many similar ones, remain wishful thinking, or not. Still, the general trend of transformation of mobile pastoralism in the 21st century seems to me quite clear and unavoidable. Let us face the truth. In many countries, mobile pastoralism in its current forms is not a viable economic option anymore. In East Africa, in the Middle East, in Central Asia and in the Russian North the inability of many pastoralists to subsist primarily on livestock-economy has become a common theme.

Modernization, which is highly beneficial in general, at the same time, was, is, and will remain a merciless selection process. It is uneven and differential. It has its winners, its losers and those whose awards are delayed. Those who fail to cope with it either perish, or, at best, are relegated to the margins of the developed world. They will be denied access to proper education, advanced medical service, the telecommunications revolution, a chance of improving their living standards, and many other benefits of modernity because directly or indirectly these benefits are intrinsically connected with the market-oriented economy.

Without modernization the mobile pastoralists face the risk of being further marginalized and alienated, or of becoming "zoo groups", an exotic attraction for urban romantics and tourists. Contrary to Krupnik (2000: 54), I am by no means sure that "fostering public spirit and herders' pride can be boosted via outreach and exhibit programmers' publication of elders' narratives, historical photographs, catalogues and classical ethnographies addressed primarily to local audiences". There is nothing wrong



with this and other similar suggestions. Besides, they help to keep anthropologists occupied. But it would be very naive to expect them to really change the situation for better.

In order to continue being pastoralists people should benefit from their capability of being pastoralists. It is indeed high time that anthropological concerns shift from a concern for a 'way of life' to a concern for the people who have to live it under dire circumstances. Likewise, episodic revivals of more or less traditional pastoralism, in one country or another, are more connected to temporary factors than with dominant trends in contemporary development. Thus, in Somalia this revival was connected with the disintegration of the state; in Mongolia, in the early 1990s, it was connected with the collapse of the communist command economy which resulted in a high unemployment rates. Modernization is an irresistible force, and there is no viable alternative to it. This is what the antiglobalists do not want to comprehend.

In all probability, spatial mobility will remain an important characteristic of stock breeding in many arid environments. The complete transformation of mobile pastoralists into sedentary cultivators or town-dwellers would mean that vast desert and semi-desert territories unsuitable for cultivation would cease to be used for food production and would be left to lie as waste land. Besides, it is worth to remember that crop cultivation is more environmentally degrading than pasturing. Apparently, the general trend in pastoralists' development will be connected with the growing commercialization and monetarising of production, introduction of modern livestock technology, and other innovations. Probably, one will witness the better definition of property rights, and, in some countries, even the introduction of individual land tenure. One may only hope that the appropriate land tenure arrangements will be flexible enough to adjust to environments, especially to non-equilibrium ones, which are characterized by high climatic variability. There is also a danger of the substitution of long-term optimization for short-term maximization of production.

Modernization brings not only technological and economic changes, but social and cultural changes as well. Some pastoralists will benefit from these developments, but I am afraid, that many will find themselves at the losing end. These changes may increase further the tension within pastoralist groups, which is already evident in many countries. They may result in the erosion of many traditional social institutions, bonds, statuses, values, loyalties, and authenticities, as well as in a growing economic inequality.

Actually, these processes are already quite conspicuous in Africa (see, for example, Bovin and Manger 1990) and other parts of the world. They may have other disruptive consequences, since the mere destruction of the traditional forms of social organization will hardly bring a vital new system, on the contrary, this may result in social disorganization and dislocation. In any case, more people will have to leave pastoralism and to move into other sectors of economy. In the worst scenario more pastoralists may become destitutes, whose physical survival will depend on the international relief organizations.

It is impossible to predict in detail what exact forms the integration of mobile pastoralism in the developing countries into the globalized market will take. Apparently, there will be various forms, including transitional ones, which may be quite different from each other in terms of land tenure, degree of specialization, and many other parameters.

In all, this process will continue to be very painful, and will bring a lot of resentment. Perhaps, it is possible to somewhat alleviate its negative collateral effects, but hardly to avoid them completely. However, hopefully, eventually mobile pastoralism will become more competitive and more productive along the lines of capitalist economic effectiveness. Meanwhile, anthropologists and other social scientists will be able to write many more books and articles critical of this development and blaming everybody and everything, of course, except themselves, for the decay of traditional pastoralism.

References

- Abu Jaber, K.S. and Gharabeh, F.A. 1981. Bedouin Settlement: Organizational, Legal and Administrative Structure in Jordan. In: D. Aronson, J. D. Galaty, and P. C. Salzman (eds.) *The Future of Pastoral Peoples*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre: 294-300.
- Abu-Rabi'a, A. 1994. *The Negev Beduin and Livestock Rearing: Social, Economic and Political Aspects*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Adamu, M. and Kirk-Greene, A.H.M. (eds). 1986. *Pastoralists of the West African Savanna*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Anderson, D. and Grove, R. (eds). 1987. *Conservation in Africa: People, Policies and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arhem, K. 1985. *Pastoral Man in the Garden of Eden. The Maasai of the Ngorongoro Conservation Area*. Uppsala: Uppsala Research Reports on Cultural Anthropology.
- Aripov, U. 1997. Karakulevodstvo i aridnoe kormoproizvodstvo v Uzbekistane, sostoianni i problemy razvitiia. In: A. Khazanov, V. Naumkin, and K. Shapiro (eds.). *Pastoralism in Central Asia*. Moscow: University of Wisconsin-Madison and Russian Center for Strategic Research and International Studies: 134-141.
- Atherton, L. 1961. *The Cattle Kings*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.
- Awogbade, M. D. 1987. Grazing Reserves in Nigeria. *Nomadic Peoples* (NS) 23: 19-30.
- Azarya, V. 1996. *Nomads and the State in Africa: The Political Roots of Marginality*. Leiden: African Studies Centre.
- Banks, T. 1999. State, Community and Common Property in Xinjiang: Synergy or Strife? *Development Policy Review* 17: 293-313.



- Barsh, R.L. 1990. The Substitution of Cattle for Bison on the Great Plains. In: P.A. Olson (ed.) *The Struggle for the Land: Indigenous Insight and Industrial Empire in the Semi-arid World*. Lincoln and London: The University of Nebraska Press. 103-126.
- Bates, D.G. 1980. Yörük Settlement in Southeast Turkey. In: P.C. Salzman (ed.) *When Nomads Settle. Processes of Sedentarization as Adaptation and Response*. New York: Praeger. 124-139.
- Baxter, P.T.W. 1987. Introduction. In: P. T. W. Baxter (ed.) *Property, Poverty and People: Changing Rights in Property and Problems of Pastoral Development*. Manchester: University of Manchester. 1-VII.
- Beck, L. 1980. Herd Owners and Hired Shepherds: The Qashqa'i of Iran. *Ethnology* 19, 3: 327-352.
- Behnke, R. 1980. *The Herders of Cyrenaica: Ecology, Economy and Kinship among the Bedouin of Eastern Libya*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Bennet, J.W. 1985. Range Culture and Society in the North American West. *Folklore Annual* 88-104.
- Benson, L. and Svanberg, I. 1998. *China's Last Nomads. The History and Culture of China's Kazakhs*. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Berkes, F., Feeny, D., McCay, B. J., and Acheson, J.M. 1989. The Benefits of the Commons. *Nature* 340: 91-93.
- Bernus, E. 1990. Dates, Dromedaries, and Drought: Diversification in Tuareg Pastoral Systems. In: J.G. Galaty and D.L. Johnson (eds.). *The World of Pastoralism: Herding Systems in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Bovin, M. and Manger, L. (eds.) 1990. *Adaptive Strategies in African And Lands*. Uppsala: The Nordic Africa Institute.
- Bradburd, D.A. 1980. Never Give a Shepherd an Even Break: Class and Labor among the Komachi. *American Ethnologist* 7, 4: 603-620.
- Chatty, D. 2001. Pastoral Tribes in the Middle East and Wildlife Conservation Schemes: The Endangered Species? *Nomadic Peoples* (NS) 5. 104-122.
- Cole, D. 1981. Bedouin and Social Change in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 16, 1-2: 128-149.



Dale, E.E. 1960 *The Range Cattle Industry: Ranching on the Great Plains from 1865 to 1925*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press

Dzoldoshev, K. 1997. Sostoiianie pastbishch i problemy proizvodstva i zagotovki Kyrgyzstane. In A. Khazanov, V. Naumkin, and K. Shapiro (eds). *Pastoralism in Central Asia*. Moscow: University of Wisconsin-Madison and Russian Center for Strategic Research and International Studies. 168-177

Ellwood, W. 1995. Nomads at the Crossroads. *New Internationalist* 266 (April): 7-10

Fabietti, U. 1982. Sedentarization as a Means of Detribalization: Some Policies of the Saudi Arabian Government towards the Nomads. In T. Niblock (ed.). *State, Society and Economy in Saudi Arabia*. London: Croom Helm

Fernandez-Gimenez, M.E. 1999. Reconsidering the Role of Absentee Herd Owners: View from Mongolia. *Human Ecology* 27, 1: 1-27

Fratkin, E. 1997. Pastoralism, Governance and Development Issues. *Annual Review Anthropology* 26: 235-261.

Galaty, J. 1992. "The Land is Yours": Social and Economic Factors in the Privatization, Subdivision and Sale of Maasai Ranches. *Nomadic Peoples* 30: 26-40

Galaty, J. and Bonte, P. (eds) 1991. *Herders, Warriors, and Traders: Pastoralism in Africa*. Boulder: Westview Press

Galaty, J. G. and Johnson, D.L. (eds). 1990. *The World of Pastoralism: Herd Systems in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Guilford Press

Galaty, J. G., Hjort af Ornas, A., Lane, Ch., and Ndagala, D. (eds). 1994. The Pastoral Land Crisis: Tenure and Dispossession in East Africa. *Nomadic Peoples* 34/35 (special issue).

Gefu, J.O. and Gelles, J.L. 1990. Pastoralists, Ranchers and the State in Nigeria and North America: A Comparative Analysis. *Nomadic Peoples* 25-27: 34-50.

Goldshmidt, W. 1981. The Failure of Pastoral Economic Development Programs in Africa. In J.G. Galaty, D. Aronson, and P.C. Salzman (eds). *The Future of Pastoral Peoples*. Ottawa: International Developmental Research Centre: 101-118

Gorse, J.E. and Steeds, D.R. 1987. *Desertification in the Sahelian and Sudanian Zones of West Africa*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Handule, A. and Gay, C.W. 1987. Development and Transitional Pastoralism in Somalia. *Nomadic Peoples* 24: 36-43

- Hardin, G. 1968 The Tragedy of the Commons. *Science* 162. 1243-1248.
- Hardin G. 1988 Commons failing. *New Scientist*, 22 (October)
- Hardin G. and Baden J. 1977 *Managing the Commons*. San Francisco: W H Freeman
- Hiatt, J.M. 1984. State Formation and the Encapsulation of Nomads: Local Change and Continuity among Recently Sedentarized Bedouin in Jordan. *Nomadic Peoples*, 15: 1-11.
- Hinderink, J. and Sterkenburg, J.J. 1987. *Agricultural Commercialization and Government Policy in Africa*. London and New York: KPI
- Holtzman, J.S. and Kulibaba, N.P. 1996. Livestock Marketing in Pastoral Africa: Policies to Increase Competitiveness, Efficiency and Flexibility. In I Scoones (ed.) *Living with Uncertainty. New Directions in Pastoral Development in Africa*. London. Intermediate Technology Publications. 79-94
- Ingold T. 1978 The Rationalization of Reindeer Management among Finnish Lapps. *Development and Change*, 1: 103-122
- Jahnke, H. 1982. *Livestock Production Systems and Livestock Development in Tropical Africa*. Kiel. Kieler Wissenschaftsverlag Vauk.
- Jansen, J. 1986. *Nomads in the Sultanate of Oman: Tradition and Development in Dhofar*. Boulder: Westview Press
- Jordan, T.G. 1993. *North American Cattle-Ranching Frontiers: Origins, Diffusion and Differentiation*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New-Mexico
- Katakura, M. 1977. *Bedouin Village: A Study of a Saudi Arabian People in Transition*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Kaufmann, J. C. 1998. The Cactus Was Our Kin: Pastoralism in the Spiny Desert of Southern Madagascar. In: J Ginat and A.M. Khazanov. *Changing Nomads in a Changing World*. Brighton, Sussex Academic Press. 124-142.
- Kerven, C. (ed.). 2003. *Prospects for Pastoralism in Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan: From State Farms to Private Flocks*. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon
- Kerven, C. 2003. Agrarian Reform and Privatization in the Wider Asian Region. In: C. Kerven (ed.) *Prospects for Pastoralism in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. From State Farms to Private Flocks*. London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon
- Khazanov, A.M. 1994. *Nomads and the Outside World*. 2nd ed. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press



Khazanov, A.M. 1998 Pastoralists in the Contemporary World: The problem of Survival In J. Ginat and A.M. Khazanov (eds) *Changing Nomads in a Changing World*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press: 7-23

Khazanov, A., Naumkin, V., and Shapiro, K. (eds). 1997 *Pastoralism in Central Asia*. Moscow: University of Wisconsin – Madison and Russian Center for Strategic Research and International Studies

Khazanov, A., Naumkin, V., Shapiro K., and Tomas, D. (eds). 1999 *The Kazakhstan Livestock Sector in Transition to a Free Economy*. Moscow: University of Wisconsin Madison and Russian Center for Strategic Research and International Studies.

Khazanov, A. and Shapiro, K. 2005. Contemporary Pastoralism in Central Asia. In: Amitai and M. Biran (eds). *Mongols, Turks and Others: Eurasian Nomads and the Sedentary World*. Leiden: Brill: 503-534

Khogali, M.M. 1981 Sedentarization of the Nomads: Sudan. In: D.Aronson, J.G. Gale, P.C. Salzman, and A. Chouinard (eds). *The Future of Pastoral Peoples*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre: 302-313.

Kliashtorny, S. 1999 "Sel'skokhoziaistvennaia revoliutsiia" v Kyrgyzstane predpolagaemye tendentsii dal'nieshego razvitiia. In: A. Khazanov, V. Naumkin, Shapiro, and D. Thomas (eds). *The Kazakhstan Livestock Sector in Transition to Market Economy*. Moscow: University of Wisconsin-Madison and Russian Center for Strategic Research and International Studies: 60-70.

Koehler-Rollefson, L. The Raika Dromedar Breeders in Rajasthan: A Pastoral System in Crisis. *Nomadic Peoples* 30: 74-83.

Kostiner, J. 1980 Transforming Dualities: Tribe and State Formation in Saudi Arabia. In: P.S. Khoury and J. Kostiner (eds). *Tribes and State Formation in the Middle East*. Berkeley: University of California Press: 226-251.

Krupnik, I. 1998 Understanding Reindeer Pastoralism in Modern Siberia: Ecology, Continuity versus State Engineering. In: J. Ginat and A.M. Khazanov (eds) *Changing Nomads in a Changing World*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press: 223-242

Krupnik, I. 2000 Reindeer Pastoralism in Modern Siberia: Research and Survival at the Time of Crash. *Polar Research* 19, 1. 49-56.

Lancaster, W. and Lancaster, F. 1986 The Concept of Territory among the Bedouin. *Nomadic Peoples* 20: 41-48

- Lenhart, L. and Casimir, M.J. 2001. Environment, Property Resources and the State: An Introduction. *Nomadic Peoples* (NS) 5, 3: 6-20.
- Lewis, N. N. 1987. *Nomads and Settlers in Syria and Jordan, 1800-1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Little, P. 1985. Absentee Herd Owners and Part-Time Pastoralists: The Political Economy of Resource Use in Northern Kenya. *Human Ecology* 13, 2: 131-151.
- Ma, R. 1993. Migrant and Ethnic Integration in the Process of Socio-Economic Change in Inner Mongolia: A Village Study. *Nomadic Peoples* 33: 173-191.
- McCay, B. M. and Acheson, J.M. (eds). 1987. *The Question of the Commons: The Culture and Ecology of Communal Resources*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Maliki, B. 1986. The Changing Structures of Livestock Ownership among Pastoralists in Niger. *Bulletin of the Institute for Development Anthropology*, 4.1: 3-5.
- Manger, L. 2001. Pastoralist-State Relationships among the Hadendowa Beja of Eastern Sudan. *Nomadic Peoples* (NS) 5, 2: 21-48.
- Marnham, P. 1979. *Nomads of the Sahel*. London: Minority Rights Group Report 33.
- Medzini, A. 1998. Bedouin Settlement Policy in Israel, 1964-1996. In J. Ginat and A.M. Khazanov (eds) *Changing Nomads in a Changing World*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press. 58-67.
- Morris, C.P. 1990. Hydroelectric Development and the Human Rights of Indigenous People. In: P.A. Olson (ed). *The Struggle for Land: Indigenous Insight and Industrial Empire in the Semiarid World*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press: 193-209.
- Paine, R. 1994. *Herds of the Tundra: A Portrait of Saami Reindeer Pastoralism*. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1994.
- Pelican, M. 2002. From Cultural Property to Market Goods: Changes in Economic Strategies and Herd Management Rationales of Agro-Pastoral Fulbe in North West Cameroon. A paper submitted to the workshop "Collective and Multiple Forms of Property in Animals" held at the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle/Saale.
- Raikes, P.L. 1981. *Livestock Development and Policy in East Africa*. Uppsala: The Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.
- Rao, A. 2002. Pastoral Nomads, the State and a National Park: the Case of Dachigam, Kashmir. *Nomadic Peoples* (NS) 6,2: 72-98.



- Reining, P (ed) 1978 *Handbook on Desertification Indicators* Washington, American Association for the Advancement of Science
- Salih, M 1990. Agro-Pastoralists Response to Agricultural Policies: The Predicament of the Baggara, Western Sudan. In M. Bovin and L. Manger (eds). *Adaptive Strategies African And Lands*. Uppsala: The Scandinavian Institute of African Studies: 59-75.
- Salih, M 1990a. Government Policy and Options in Pastoral Development in the Sudan. *Nomadic Peoples* 25-27: 65-78.
- Salzman, P C. 1980. Preface. In P.S. Salzman (ed). *When Nomads Settle: Process of Sedentarization as Adaptation and Response*. New York: Praeger: VII-VIII
- Sandford, S 1996. Improving the Efficiency of Opportunism: New Directions for Pastoral Development. In: I. Scoones (ed). *Living with Uncertainty. New Directions in Pastoral Development in Africa*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications: 174-182.
- Scholz, F (ed). 1981. *Beduinen im Zeichen des Erdöls: Studien zur Entwicklung des Beduinischen Lebensraum Südost-Arabiens*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag
- Scoones, I. 1996. New Directions in Pastoral Development in Africa. In I. Scoones. *Living with Uncertainty: New Directions in Pastoral Development in Africa*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications: 1-36
- Sheehy, D.P. 1993. Grazing Management Strategies as a Factor Influencing Ecological Stability of Mongolian Grasslands. *Nomadic Peoples* 33: 17-30.
- Shields, D.A. and Mathews, K.H. 2003. Interstate Livestock Movements. Eco-Research Service Report. USDA-LDP-M-108-01. Available 06/06/05 <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Data/InterstateLivestockMovements>.
- Smith, A.B. 1992. *Pastoralism in Africa: Origins and Development Ecology*. London: Athens: Christopher Hurst and Ohio University Press
- Sneath, D. 2002. Producer Groups and the Decollectivization of the Mongolian Pastoral Economy. In J. Heyer, F. Stewart, and R. Thorp (eds). *Group Behaviour and Development: Is the Market Destroying Cooperation?* Oxford: Oxford University Press: 161-184
- Starrs, P.F. 1998. *Let the Cowboy Ride: Cattle Ranching in the American West and the North American Landscape*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Szykiewicz, S. 1998. Contemporary Mongol Concepts on Being a Pastoralist: Institutional Continuity, Change and Substitutes. In: J. Ginat and A.M. Khazanov (eds). *Changing Pastoralists in a Changing World*. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press: 202-218.

Vakhtin, N. 1992. *Native Peoples of the Russian Far North*. London: Minority Rights Group

Waters-Bayer, A. 1988. *Dairying by Settled Fulani Agropastoralists in Central Nigeria*. Kiel. Wissenschaftsverlag Vauk.

Waters-Bayer, A. and Bayer, W. 1992. The Role of Livestock in the Rural Economy. *Nomadic Peoples* 31 3-18

Williams, M. 1997. The Desert Discourse of Modern China. *Modern China* 23. 3 328-355

Abstract

In all probability in the foreseeable future, spatial mobility will remain an important characteristic of stock breeding in many arid environments. The general trend in pastoralists' development will be connected with the growing commercialization of production, introduction of modern livestock technology, the better definition of property rights, and, in some cases, even the introduction of private land tenure. Some pastoralists will benefit from. This process will continue to be very painful, and will bring a lot of resentment. Perhaps, it is possible to somewhat alleviate its negative collateral effects, but hardly to avoid them completely. However, eventually mobile pastoralism should become more efficient and more productive along the lines of the capitalist economic efficiency.

