

Dorf, interessiert sind, sei der Band wegen seiner kritischen Herangehensweise an die Entwicklungsprogramme und Vorgaben der praktischen Entwicklungsarbeit sehr empfohlen. Die Studie macht Mut zum Einnehmen einer kritischen Distanz und kann ggf. dazu animieren, anhand anderer Beispiele vergleichbar kritische Positionen einzunehmen. Vielleicht sind dazu in erster Linie ältere Geographinnen und Geographen prädestiniert, die erstens über die notwendige langjährige Erfahrung zur Beurteilung von Nachhaltigkeiten von Schlagworten der Entwicklungszusammenarbeitspraxis verfügen und für die zweitens die Rituale der Drittmittelwerbung und Projektakquirierung nicht mehr so relevant sind, dass sie sich in selbst auferlegten terminologischen Kniefällen beugen müssten.

Wie sehr die Menschen in Afghanistan von westlicher Entwicklungsideologie und den damit verbundenen, sich teilweise in verschachtelter Kompliziertheit gegenseitig übertreffenden Terminologien verwirrt worden sein müssen, lässt sich nur erahnen. Kritik daran wurde nur selten artikuliert. Insofern stellt die nun von WILSON vorgelegte Studie einen selbstbewussten und begründet kritischen Meilenstein dar. Einen guten Eindruck dazu liefert z. B. auch eine Auseinandersetzung mit den vielen internationalen Programmnamen und Projektakürzungen sowie den immer wieder neu erfundenen Kürzeln. Teilweise lassen sich wahrhaft orgiastische Abkürzungsexzesse identifizieren und es entsteht der Eindruck, dass vielfach Akronyme nur deshalb entwickelt worden sind, um damit ein künstliches Insider-Vokabular zu schaffen, das sich andere erst erarbeiten müssen, um als Eingeweihte gelten zu können. Dieses Erfinden von unnötigen Abkürzungen hat teilweise seltsame Blüten getragen. So steht NSP in Afghanistan sowohl für das sicherheitspolitische *National Security Programme* als auch für das entwicklungspolitische *National Solidarity Programme* und es gab mit PBUH tatsächlich ein offizielles Kürzel für das in Afghanistan in der Kommunikation allgegenwärtige „Peace be upon Him“ für „Frieden sei mit ihm“ (S. 477)!

Die Studie baut im Wesentlichen auf Haushaltsbefragungen in Sha Raheem in der Oaselandschaft von Khulm zwischen Balkh im Westen und Samangan im Osten auf. Gezeigt werden u. a. Beispiele von kleineren Dorfkartierungen in gelungener Umzeichnung und guter Detaillierung sowie die Analysen zur vergleichenden Lebenssituation der Bewohner während der vier Zeiträume der sowjetischen Besatzungszeit, der Mujaheddin-Herrschaft, der Taliban-Zeit und der Post-Taliban-Zeit. Es fließen Experten-Interviews ebenso ein wie Gespräche mit Ladenbesitzern in bestimmten Bazarabschnitten. Bei letzteren dürfte es sich um die seit CENTLIVRES mit „*Un Bazar d'Asie Centrale*“ (1970),

CHARPENTIER zum „Bazaar-e Tasqurghan“ (1972) sowie GRÖTZBACH über „Städte und Bazare in Afghanistan“ (1979) um die detailliertesten Bazaruntersuchungen in Nordost-Afghanistan überhaupt handeln. Materialreich präsentiert sich vor allem auch der Anhang der Monographie. Er zeigt die wichtigsten Fragebögen, eine Liste der Interviewpartner und weitere Dokumente, die es ermöglichen, die Wege der Ergebnisfindung unmittelbar nachzuvollziehen.

Insgesamt stellt die Studie nicht nur eine besonders gut gelungene Dissertation über ein nordafghanisches Dorf bei gleichzeitig wohlthuend kritischer Distanz zu kurzlebigen Entwicklungsmodethemen dar, sondern zeigt auf beeindruckende Weise auch, wie kompetente Regionalmonographien überhaupt aufgebaut sein sollten: Eingebettet in disziplinübergreifende Theoriegebäude, kritisch in der Auseinandersetzung mit Entwicklungsprogrammen und tief greifend in Dokumentation und Analyse regionalspezifischer Prägefaktoren. Vor diesem Hintergrund hat das Werk vor allem auch einen wissenschaftsdidaktischen Wert, der weit über die dargelegte Lokalexpertise hinausgeht. Auch für Nicht- oder Nochnicht-Afghanistan-Interessierte ist das Werk von MARY BETH WILSON daher uneingeschränkt zu empfehlen – PBUH!

ANDREAS DITTMANN

BENZ, ANDREAS: *Education for Development in Northern Pakistan. Opportunities and Constraints for Rural Households*. XXXII and 434 pp., 52 figs. and 44 tables. Oxford University Press, Karachi 2014, € 38,60

Pakistan ranks among the world's weakest countries in terms of literacy rates, gender disparities in school enrolment and other measures of educational performance. Within Pakistan, urban centres, wealthy regions and the densely-populated agricultural heartland enjoy much higher educational attainment than the country's mountain and desert-steppe peripheries where population densities are low. An important exception to this general pattern is Gilgit-Baltistan, a sparsely-populated and comparatively poor mountainous region in Pakistan's northern periphery, where literacy exceeds the national average, male enrolment rates are by far the highest in the country, and rates of female enrolment equal those of the densely-populated and highly-urbanised Punjabi heartland. This was not always the case. Until two or three generations ago Gilgit-Baltistan lagged far behind much of Pakistan; only a small minority of the region's children attended school, and literacy was

almost non-existent in the sub-districts that currently boast the highest rates of education. As ANDREAS BENZ states in the introduction to *Education for Development in Northern Pakistan*, “it is clear that parts of Gilgit-Baltistan today constitute one of the beacons of education in the predominantly gloomy educational landscape of Pakistan, and form an unprecedented exception of a successful and rapid educational expansion in the country” (p. 9). In attempting to explain this striking anomaly, account for variations in educational uptake within Gilgit-Baltistan, and analyse the impacts of educational achievement at the individual and household level, the book provides the most rigorous, comprehensive, and empirically-detailed examination of formal education in northern Pakistan currently available. It is a fascinating and informative work.

The book’s analysis is framed by two main premises, which are outlined in the opening chapters. The first addresses the relationship between education and development: that formal education may either enhance or constrain people’s problem-solving capacities (i.e., development) depending on the circumstances, and at the household or community level may have both enabling and inhibiting effects simultaneously. BENZ develops this theoretical proposition by tracing a pair of dominant conceptual threads through development theory, geographical approaches to development, and sociological and economic theories of education: an optimistic thread, which stresses education’s ability to enhance people’s problem-solving capacities, their opportunities for social and economic advancement, and their capacity for self-determination, as well as to nurture greater social equality and other aspects of progressive social change; and a pessimistic thread, which foregrounds formal education’s potential to reproduce existing social inequalities and hegemonic ideologies, thereby perpetuating relations of domination and limiting people’s self-determination. These opposing threads overlap individual theoretical perspectives in ways that allow BENZ to conceive them as dialectically-related. The book’s second foundational premise addresses the issue of what drives educational expansion. Drawing from conceptual work on sustainable livelihoods, BENZ posits that Gilgit-Baltistan’s rapid uptake in formal education results significantly from calculations by individual households operating within particular socio-cultural, economic, political and institutional contexts that investing in their members’ education is an effective household livelihood strategy (i.e., that education will have ‘optimistic’ rather than ‘pessimistic’ outcomes).

Together, these initial premises allow BENZ to formulate research questions relating to the kinds of educational strategies rural households develop and why;

the outcomes of these strategies at the individual and household level; the influence of ethnicity, religious denomination, gender and other socio-economic variables on educational strategies and outcomes; and the influence of the education system’s structural characteristics on the character and efficacy of household decisions regarding schooling. The overall objective in framing these questions is to understand “the [anticipated and realised] contributions of formal education to the well-being of rural people, securing of livelihoods and improvement of living conditions” (p. 51).

In order to tackle this ambitious set of research questions, BENZ undertakes systematic analysis of existing literature and secondary data on education and socio-economic change in Gilgit-Baltistan, and develops three detailed village-level case studies. Utilizing existing scholarship on socio-economic organization and change in Gilgit-Baltistan, Chapter Three delineates the region’s ethno-linguistic and denominational diversity, and traces its rapid but uneven transition from subsistence agro-pastoralism to a more diversified set of market-oriented livelihood strategies, which occurred in tandem with the development of a road network, fuller (but still incomplete) socio-political and cultural incorporation into the Pakistani nation, and agency-led rural development initiatives. The chapter stresses that an important feature of this relatively recent context of off-farm employment and income diversification is that schooling has become much more important as a long-term strategy for household reproduction. This process of socio-economic change is described in greater detail for each of the three study villages, serving both to contextualise the specific cases and to give readers a sense of regional variation. Chapters Four and Five consolidate the existing bewilderingly-scattered, unreliable, and often incomparable statistical and interpretive material on education in northern Pakistan into a coherent regional and sub-regional picture of spatially-variable educational growth over time. In addition to contextualizing the book’s ethnographic material, these chapters constitute a valuable stand-alone contribution to scholarship on education in northern Pakistan.

BENZ notes that existing literature on education in the region focuses predominantly on supply-side issues (i.e., the spatio-temporal development of different sorts of schooling opportunities, institutional factors shaping supply, and statistics regarding numbers of teachers, schools, enrolments, etc.) and neglects the individual and household considerations that influence demand for education and its uptake among a population. The village-level case studies are designed to overcome this neglect. The three study villages are located in different sub-districts of Gilgit-Baltistan, and were selected

in order to access the three main religious denominations in northern Pakistan – Sunni, Twelver Shia and Ismailia – as well to represent different phases in the process of educational expansion, while also being comparable in terms of functional importance, population, road accessibility and existence of educational facilities for both sexes from primary to college level. BENZ spent several months in each village conducting an intensive program of ethnographic research, including in-depth interviews, surveys, observations, and gathering documents. The resulting data, which are voluminous and remarkably rich, are analysed in the book's sixth and seventh chapters, which focus on household-level educational strategies and outcomes, respectively.

Chapter Six presents empirical material to support the argument that educational expansion in rural Gilgit-Baltistan results from households' decisions to incorporate members' education into their long-term livelihood strategies. The chapter analyses how these decisions and the rationales that justify them vary from village to village, and among households within villages, depending on underlying 'framework conditions' and household circumstances. Empirically-detailed discussions are devoted to households' motives for pursuing members' education; people's expectations in terms of the outcomes of education; the gendered aspects of these motives and anticipated outcomes; parents' considerations regarding the best type of education for their children and their evaluation of the relative merits of government, private and religious educational institutions; the influence of parents' education level on the schooling choices they make for their children; considerations regarding the migration of individuals or households in pursuit of higher education; and the place of distance education, home learning and coaching classes in some households' educational strategies. BENZ compares his participants' explanations with a variety of survey and statistical data on schooling in each village and across the region, to establish a connection between household-level livelihood strategizing and broader spatio-temporal patterns of educational expansion. He makes a strong case that rising enrolments and other aspects of educational growth in Gilgit-Baltistan have resulted from households' increasing tendency to use schooling as a strategic response to the region's changing economic and socio-political context.

The discussions in Chapter Six are inflected with a strong sensitivity to households' constitution "as an arena of cooperative conflict between its members, characterised by hierarchical internal power structures, gender disparities, as well as unequal distribution of labour, responsibilities, resources and opportunities" (p. 234). Although decision-making hierarchies vary some-

what among households and villages and along denominational lines, BENZ demonstrates that it is usually the case that senior members of a household make educational decisions on behalf of others, some individuals are more likely to be sent to school (especially higher levels) than others, household seniors are willing to devote more resources to the education of some children than others (e.g., by sending them to private schools or schools outside the village), and some household members (typically females) disproportionately bear the added financial and labour burden of other members' schooling. These intra-household disparities result largely from senior members' calculations regarding the best way to use education to further their own and their households' long-term material and status interests, as well as in some cases from religious prerogatives. For example, arguments against devoting scarce resources to girls' education relate primarily to the expectation that girls will marry outside the household and therefore take the strategic advantages of their education with them; arguments in favour of girls' schooling stem from the perception that educated girls do better in the marriage market, as well as from religious admonitions to educate both sexes.

Having devoted the sixth chapter to validating empirically the proposition that Gilgit-Baltistan's rapid educational growth is driven by strategic choices made at the household level, BENZ then focuses in Chapter Seven on the actual outcomes of the educational strategies households have enacted. The chapter shows that on average and with considerable variation men with higher levels of education also have greater rates of formal sector employment, higher levels of participation in non-agricultural business activities, and enjoy higher incomes. Educated men are also more likely to seek careers beyond commuting distance from their home villages; this often benefits households in terms of substantial income remittances, but also shifts more of the burden of household reproduction onto the shoulders of women, children and elderly family members remaining in the village. Unfortunately, many young men have not been able to translate educational attainment into these material benefits, resulting in frustration and discontent for parents and children alike.

Educated women are somewhat more likely to work in the formal labour market than their uneducated counterparts, but women's formal labour market participation is extremely low at all levels of education, and higher levels of education seem not to yield higher incomes for women. It appears that education does substantially benefit girls and their households in two other ways. First, the chapter presents evidence that education makes girls more appealing as marriage partners

and daughters-in-law, and well-educated girls are more likely to attract well-educated husbands; second, there is a strong feeling in all three villages that female (and male) education has enabled women to take a more autonomous and agential role in household and community life. In the three study villages, if not in all corners of Gilgit-Baltistan, women's freedom of movement, involvement in civic affairs, and decision-making voice within households have all increased with rising education levels. Strong evidence is presented that socio-political participation among women and men increases in tandem with education, as measured by such things as proficiency in Urdu and English, interest in the news and world affairs, participation in political events, and membership in political and civil society organisations.

The material presented in Chapter Seven goes some way toward addressing the book's second overarching premise: that focusing on education as a livelihood strategy has the potential to both enable and constrain 'development' at the individual, household and societal scales. It seems that in terms of improving livelihood options and prospects, contributing to women's autonomy and decision-making voice, and enhancing individuals' participation in political and civil society, schooling does achieve some of the emancipatory potential identified by 'education optimistic' strands of theory. In these ways education does enhance development, defined in terms of people's problem-solving capacities. On the other hand, the benefits and burdens of education are not equally distributed either within or among households, or across the region, meaning that some groups are relatively disadvantaged in a social context that attaches ever-more value to high levels of education. This propensity for formal education to have inequitable and therefore socially stratifying effects is one of the concerns of 'education-pessimistic' strands of theory, and is taken up in greater detail in the book's eighth and concluding chapter. BENZ argues here that when Gilgit-Baltistan's educational expansion began communities were characterised by a high degree of social and economic equality, and therefore participation in education was not significantly influenced by class factors. Unlike many other contexts, educational expansion in Gilgit-Baltistan did not serve to reproduce existing class or status hierarchies. Rather, education itself "became the single-most stratifying driving force in the region" (p. 355), as early adopters gained an initial advantage in the region's changing economy, and have been able to reproduce that advantage through subsequent generations. With each phase of expansion the level of education required to achieve a socio-economic advantage increased, and the newly-required higher levels of education were most available to children in households

that had already realised a social advantage from education in an earlier phase of expansion. In this way, "the social disparities generated in the early stage of the expansion were not only reproduced, but even deepened and intensified" (p. 359). True to his dialectical theory of education for development, BENZ offers the overall conclusion that although there is no doubt that educational expansion created new opportunities and socio-economic benefits for much of the region's population, these came at the cost of greater social stratification and have left poorer households behind, thereby variably enhancing and inhibiting the region's development.

*Education for Development in Northern Pakistan* is a *tour-de-force* that merits a diverse and attentive readership. It makes significant contributions to scholarship on education in Pakistan and in the rural global South more generally, as well as to the sociology of education and critical development studies. Beyond that, it should be essential reading for those interested in any aspect of social organization and change in northern Pakistan, as well as for students and scholars interested in comparative case study methodology. It is a remarkably thorough, erudite, and thought-provoking study, that successfully draws general conclusions without sacrificing attention to detail, diversity and specificity, which are highlighted by careful analysis of three cases and comparison among them. The book's consistent sensitivity to gender, religious denomination, spatial diversity, and the internal dynamics of households are especially noteworthy strengths. Another significant strength of the work is its sustained commitment to understanding Gilgit-Baltistan's educational expansion in terms of the aspirations and experiences of its inhabitants. At the same time, however, the study's strong focus on education as a *livelihood* strategy aimed at improving *households'* living conditions impedes its ability fully to analyse the ways in which education may be reproducing or undermining hegemonic ideologies, promoting or inhibiting reflexive or critical thinking conducive to progressive social change, or achieving some of the other emancipatory or oppressive effects of institutionalised education identified in the critical education literature. As BENZ acknowledges briefly in Chapter Seven, whether education is emancipatory or oppressive depends not only on its effects in terms of social advancement, political and civic participation, or social stratification, but also on the extent to which it inspires critical self-analysis, awareness of the ideological nature of naturalised truths, and sensitivity to structured relations of domination and oppression. Drawing conclusions about these aspects of Gilgit-Baltistan's educational expansion would involve assessing schools' methodology of instruction and substantive curriculum, neither of which the study does. I

hesitate to identify this as a weakness, as it is beyond the study's remit, but is a noteworthy limitation. My only other criticism of this excellent book is that at 400 plus pages, 44 tables, 52 figures and 13 appendices it is longer than it needs to be. Greater attention to reworking the book from its original shape as a dissertation would have yielded a shorter, more readable, and equally valuable piece of scholarship.

DAVID BUTZ

DÖRRE, ANDREI: *Naturressourcennutzung im Kontext struktureller Unsicherheiten. Eine Politische Ökologie der Weideländer Kirgisistans in Zeiten gesellschaftlicher Umbrüche*. 416 S., 29 s/w und 35 farb. Abb. und 14 Tab. *Erdkundliches Wissen* 154. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 2014, € 64,- [D] / 65,80 [A]

Am Schluss scheiterten sie alle. Ob Agrarexperten der Weltbank, Kollektivierungspioniere der jungen Sowjetunion, lokale Statthalter des Zaren oder des Khans von Kokand – rückblickend misslang ihnen allen der Versuch, mobile Landnutzer und -nutzung im heutigen Kirgisistan gesetzlich zu kontrollieren und wirtschaftlich effizienter zu gestalten. Zu dieser Einsicht gelangt, wer sich durch die knapp 400 Seiten umfassende Studie von ANDREI DÖRRE zur Weidenutzung in Kirgisistan gearbeitet hat.

Am Beispiel einer Gebietskörperschaft im Süden des Landes untersucht der Autor Strukturen und Nutzungsmuster der kirgisischen Weidewirtschaft im Kontext postsowjetischer Transformation. Aus der analytischen Warte der politischen Ökologie erklärt er die gegenwärtigen Verhältnisse unter anderem mittels einer fundierten historischen Analyse der lokalen Landnutzung seit der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Dabei behält er jedoch auch die Handlungsebene von Haushalt und Individuum im Blickfeld.

Zum Auftakt definiert DÖRRE den Begriff struktureller Unsicherheit und beschreibt ihn anhand gesellschaftlicher und politischer Entwicklungen seit dem Ende der UdSSR als zentralen Faktor gesellschaftlichen Handelns im postsowjetischen Kirgisistan. Das zweite Kapitel umfasst eine allgemeine Beschreibung der kirgisischen Weidewirtschaft, ihrer Produktionsmittel, Akteure und aktuellen Konflikte. Kapitel drei widmet sich der Transformation als analytischem Begriff der Sozialwissenschaften, führt in die Grundlagen der politischen Ökologie ein und erläutert und reflektiert den methodischen Zugang der Studie. Der Beschreibung des eigentlichen Untersuchungsgebiets, dem Bezirk

*Bazar Korgon* am Rande des Ferganabeckens, widmet sich Kapitel vier. Es klassifiziert und beschreibt die verschiedenen Weidetypen und deren vielfältige Nutzungsformen, umreißt rechtliche, wirtschaftliche und administrative Problemfelder und identifiziert unterschiedliche Faktoren der Weidedegradation. Schon hier wird deutlich, dass aktuelle Probleme der Weide- und Waldnutzung nicht allein den lokalen Nutzern angelastet werden können, sondern weitreichende strukturelle Ursachen haben. Kapitel fünf untermauert dies mittels einer historischen Analyse über mehr als sieben Seiten. Dabei werden die Weidelandverhältnisse von der Zeit des Kokander Khanats über dessen Kolonisierung durch das zaristische Russland bis in die sozialistische Epoche untersucht. Basierend auf umfangreichen Archivrecherchen und akribischer Quellenarbeit zeichnet DÖRRE im Detail nach, wie einander ablösende staatliche Autoritäten auf unterschiedliche Art und Weise versucht haben, mobile Landnutzung zu kontrollieren und für den Staat finanziell einträglich zu gestalten. Überzeugend legt er dar, weshalb insbesondere die radikalen Eingriffe während der sozialistischen Epoche essentielle Vorbedingungen für die weitere Entwicklung nach 1991 darstellen. Diesen jüngsten Entwicklungen schliesslich spürt Kapitel sechs nach. Am Beispiel dreier Weidegebiete wird illustriert, wie sich eine stetig wechselnde Gesetzeslage, mangelhafte Koordination sowie die eklatante Unterausstattung lokaler Verwaltungsstrukturen auf verschiedene Weidenutzer auswirkt, und wie diese ihre Strategien zur Nutzung der Weiden entsprechend anzupassen versuchen. Durch die Beschreibung einzelner Akteure und ihrer subjektiven Wahrnehmung gelingt es dem Autor, die konkreten Auswirkungen struktureller Probleme – Zugangsrivalitäten, Unregelmässigkeiten in der Zuteilung und Verwaltung, ökologische Schädigung – greifbar und verständlich zu machen. Das abschliessende Kapitel zeichnet dann nochmals die grossen Linien vom 19. Jahrhundert bis in die Gegenwart nach. Es legt schlüssig dar, weshalb Pastoralisten trotz zahlreichen externen Interventionen als handlungsmächtige Akteure verstanden werden müssen.

Wohl ist das Buch nicht der erste sozialwissenschaftliche Beitrag zur Weidewirtschaft Kirgisistans. Mit seiner analytischen Tiefe und der umfangreichen historischen Einbettung stellt das sorgfältig editierte Werk aber eine bedeutende Erweiterung des Erkenntnisstandes dar. Dazu trägt insbesondere auch die starke Gewichtung russischsprachiger Quellen bei, welche von der bisherigen Forschung allzu oft vernachlässigt wurden. Methodisch bedient sich der Autor einer Kombination quantitativer und qualitativer Ansätze und bringt deren Resultate überzeugend in Einklang,