promised later will provide for a look at African writing, and a chance for genuine comparative studies. They will, it is hoped, be much more firmly based on a methodology.

Having voiced all these doubts, I must make it clear that Jahn has done a useful job in pointing to problems that have been either ignored or too little discussed. The whole problem of describing and evaluating African writing still remains. There has been, by this time enough "appreciation" but criteria for judgement or analysis as literature are lacking, together with any sufficiency of knowledge about the influences of oral tradition and narrative method.

He has also gathered together a great deal of useful information. He points out continuously — and not as a way of ducking for cover — that much more has to be found out, and he indicates a number of lines of enquiry. I tentatively offer a verdict of "not proven" as far as the neo-African literature thesis is concerned, and look forward with genuine interest and some trepidation to his discussions of modern African writing.

**The politics of modernization**

PETER C. W. GUTKIND

*McGill University, Montreal, Canada*

There is nothing new about modernization — it is part of the human condition. But it is useful to draw a distinction between it and the concept of change. I view change as a continuous process whereby a total social and cultural configuration is gradually transformed — a sort of kalaidoscopic process leading to the constant rearrangements of the parts which comprise the whole. Modernization, on the other hand, is "The Will To Be Modern", to deliberately and actively plan change, to be scientific and to apply rationality to a comprehensive change process. Modernization means the effort to achieve progress through new and dynamic ideas and actions all of which are designed to transform the ancien regime. Thus, in part, the past is transformed by a shift of power held by more or less traditional groups to modern groups with new functions — a process which can usually not be achieved without transforming the political model.

The "Will To Be Modern", and the consequences of change, have taken different forms around the world. No doubt, we all seem to be more captivated by events in the low income countries than by, let us say, the social revolutions which have gripped western Europe since the end of the second world war. In virtually every new nation particular institutions have been radically transformed. But the old has not yielded without a struggle and most modernization is still an amalgam of the old and the still to be institutionalized new. Perhaps the transformation of the political order has been the most obvious to the outsider. Yet I would like to suggest that the most important transformation seems to be taking place in the re-alignment and the re-structuring of the social position of individuals and groups, and in occupational and social mobility. Moderniza-
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tion, as David Apter points out, has resulted in a vastly increased range of new choices confronting individuals - the chance to sever old relations and to forge new ones.

How are we to comprehend modernization? In the first case we must recognize that this concept is dangerously inclusive of everything ranging from the analysis of new leadership to the structure and function of modern social security systems. Although every aspect of national life is touched by forced transformation, the “analysis”, David Apter writes, “begins with moral content”. To back him up Apter returns to Durkheim’s well known view that society is to be understood as a moral phenomenon. It is important that we are always concerned (in the social sciences more so, perhaps) with the meaning of social and moral acts. But this pitches our context for analysis at a meaningful yet too abstract level. An even more serious problem confronting the scholar is that essentially our observations on modernization of the new nations must deal with contemporary history. Thus we can, hopefully, isolate facts, but what are we to do about their meaning when a temporal dimension is simply not there?

As a first step to deal with this problem, David Apter in his 'The Politics of Modernization', has elected, like others, to build models which he feels can aid us in our understanding – to bring order out of chaos. But this new love for models propels us to a level of orderliness of sequential events and characteristics of modernization the existence of which can only rarely be tested empirically and confirmed. It is indeed one of the weaknesses of this intellectual exercise that Apter has not really offered in depth (in this volume) any country or case studies of institutional transformation. This is a theoretical model-building work but it is too early to tell whether it will be the pace-setter for the social scientist interested in the new nations.

Apter has a theory of modernization (a concept which he defines as “a special kind of hope”) which he bases broadly on his very wide grasp of modern social sciences. Modernization is seen not merely in terms of political theory but also of sociological and anthropological perspectives. His concern with the reality of national and international economic forces is less pronounced. In political terms, modernization is concerned with the structure of authority and its flow through the national fabric. On the broader sociological plane, Apter views modernization in non-industrial societies as “the transposition of certain roles ... and the transposition of institutions supporting these roles”. Because “social organizations are more chaotic and confused”, he writes, “politics become the mechanism of integration, and authority is the critical problem confronting the leaders.” Thus different roads to modernization lead to different patterns of authority. This can be seen by building normative models which give the ideological content and structure to the political system. Apter singles out two general models: the secular-libertarian model “which essentially accepts society as it is and suggests a framework that will allow modest change over time”; and the sacred-collectivity model “which is opposed to conditions as they are” and copes with modernization “through a system of authority that enforces selective communication between people about certain key political problems”. Clearly, we now know that most African states, and other new nations, have selected the latter model as the road to modernization and the good life. Where radical regimes have been overthrown, they have been replaced by military regimes, for the time being, which have not basically altered the authoritarian structure. Apter carefully steers