

much more sophisticated, and determined by politico-administrative factors, than planning models suggest. For those of us who work with such models it is healthy to be reminded of this fact.

Heinz Ahrens

Winfried von Urff, Heinz Ahrens, Peter Lutz, Bernhard May, Wolfgang-Peter Zingel, Die wirtschaftliche Situation Pakistans nach der Sezession Bangladeshs. (Beiträge zur Südasienforschung, Südasien-Institut, Universität Heidelberg, Bd 6). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1974. 453 pages, DM 48,—.

This study is the first publication of a research-project sponsored by the Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development, Federal Republic of Germany. In April 1971 the Department of Rural Sociology of South-Asia Institute, Heidelberg, was asked to analyze the economic planning and development of Pakistan with special reference to the agricultural sector. After the secession of Bangladesh, however, work was concentrated purely on the remaining Pakistan.

In Part I of the study (116 pages) an overview of the economic situation of Pakistan, the economic background of the secession, the main problems of Pakistan's economy and its development targets are given. Part II analyzes in five steps the sectors (1) agriculture, fishery and forests (76 pages); (2) mining and mineral resources (12 pages); (3) industry and building economy (115 pages); (4) economic infrastructure, i. e. energy, communication and urban development (45 pages); (5) social infrastructure, i. e. education, health and family planning (35 pages).

The authors admit that their study has one real disadvantage, namely that they had to rely solely on official documents and statistics which they were unable to check on the spot. Nevertheless, most of the data included lead up to the middle of 1973, i. e. Pakistan's economic performance in 1972/73 was taken into account.

The authors also concede that their study might not be detailed enough for all those interested in the special problems of one sector only. This may be the case, yet it cannot be avoided in a project centred on practical problems, i. e. recommendations for the German development administration. The fact that we are not provided with any information on that second part of the project or the frame of reference selected to arrive at practical conclusions is understandable as it conforms to an almost world-wide pattern in the relationship of politics and social research; nevertheless, it is regrettable.

D. Kantowsky

Oskar Weggel (ed.), Die Alternative China. Politik, Gesellschaft, Wirtschaft der Volksrepublik China. Hamburg: Verlag Hoffmann und Campe, 1973, 468 pages, DM 32.—.

Oskar Weggel, senior research fellow at the Institute of Asian Affairs in Hamburg has published numerous articles and books on Chinese politics. In this new volume he has focused his attention on the domestic scene and what is called by the Chinese the "struggle between two lines", which the author names an "autochthonic blueprint".

After the preface and a short "invitation to discuss methods" Weggel presents what he calls the twelve decisive sectors of Chinese domestics as seen from the perspective of the „Two-Line-Principle". These sectors are: party, organisation and cadres, mass-organisations, army, militia, industry (and economy in general), agriculture, trade, education, literature and art, medicine and health service, science.

The closing chapter is dedicated to what the author describes as the "algebra of revolution" also presented in the "Two-Line-Principle."

Each chapter has a list of selected relevant literature. The book is also equipped with charts, tables, sketches and a lengthy index which are generally very helpful in reading this book.

What makes this volume somewhat peculiar is its typographical setting. After a short introduction the two "lines" confront each other in separate columns on the same page. Weggel used this technique in 1970 in an article on the ideological conflict between Peking and Moscow, where the Chinese and the Soviet positions were facing each other on one page.

Harry Harding used this method in 1969 in his article on "Maoist Theories of Policy-Making and Organization — Lessons from the Cultural Revolution." There Harding examined the