

British"; and that they showed little tendency to identify with the masses, except on occasional broad political issues." This treatment makes the elite appear to be bourgeois *gentils hommes* within the structure of a non-colonial society. The Nigerian elite could not replace the British, could not fall heir to British power, and could not be alienated from Nigerian society primarily because they could never have become British colonizers. The British, it must be remembered, dominated Nigerian society but were alien to it; the new elite are organic, if prestigious, members of the colonial society. The prestige of the elite came from their usurpation of political power from the British — a usurpation which excluded the British. It is significant that the British in Nigeria became expatriates when they began to lose political power. The tendency of the elite or rather their ability to identify with the masses only on broad political issues, must be seen in terms of the colonial nature of Nigerian society. British rule in Nigeria came under attack because the British were alien to the masses. The new Nigerian elite gained prestige because their "alienation" from the masses better abled them to serve the interests of Nigerian society in general.

These comments no way detract from the usefulness of this book for students of Africa. It is valuable for an understanding of those new social groups arising in African countries. It is my hope, however, that future studies of Africa elites pay more attention to the important methodological problems which arise in studying problems in this area.

Elliott P. SKINNER
New York University

*
* *

From Tribal Rule to Modern Government. Raymond APTHORPE (Editor), Rhodes-Livingstone Institute, Lusaka, 1959, xix, 216 pp. 10s Od.

This publication is the result of a conference on political change sponsored by the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute. The conference was attended by civil servants, professional anthropologists and the Institute's research staff and the format of the book reflects this diversity of participation. Following a theoretical introduction by the editor which sketches some of the major problems of political change, there is a fifty page discussion of colonial policy, nine case studies of political change and a review of the papers. As can be expected from a symposium, the articles and sections vary in theoretical sophistication, depth and quality and quantity of material. The introduction and some of the articles are heavily influenced by methods and concepts not traditionally employed by British anthropologists, but which are derived from the Parsonian school. The degree of political adaptation, the vulnerability of the political systems and a critique of typologies are topics of research. Other articles are the traditional ethnographic studies.

The first section reviews those policies which provided a rough and ready guide to the British colonial administrators in Africa. Much of the writing is hindsight guessing and ruminations laced with nostalgia, but despite the meandering, a few points arise. One administrator unconsciously reflects a basic bias when he recounts the ease and culture fit of the British administrators when dealing with centralized kingdoms and well-defined political roles, the ease of maintaining control and imposing new regulations, and conversely, the difficulties which arise when dealing with a decentralized political system. Fosbrooke, a colonial officer and anthropologist, treats the inherent difficulties an administrator encounters when attempting to anchor a bureaucracy, modified as it was, in Tanganyika, around the typical diffused role of a magico-religious leader. While there is no systematizing on features of a political system which impedes political transference, it is evident that in many decentralized political systems, the political processes were not continuous, but operated intermittently, usually in crisis situations, dealt with a narrow area of the political functions and rarely encompassed the duties envisaged by local government — all features hardly compatible with modern governments. These points open an area which might be fruitfully explored: the oft-stated fact of the ease in adding new functions and another level in superior-subordinate relations in a pre-existing system, and the apparent resistance to the creation of new political roles. It is unfortunate, but for one or two new minor points, this section is the weakest. A large number of studies of indigenous political systems exist and there are a smaller number of studies describing change, but very few studies focus on the administrators as the nexus between the two. Any formulation of political change in colonial territories would benefit from detailed information on the innovators, the administrators who are the locus of power and who are able to enforce changes.

The second section, nine case studies of political change drawn from Central, East and West Africa, is the core of the work. Although it is too much to expect a conference to produce an integrated group of papers attacking a similar problem with a consistent methodology, one focus does emerge: the papers attempt to organize their material around the problems of adaptation. However, adaptation as presented in these case studies is an abbreviated version of the total concept of adaptation, and represents to a striking degree, political stability with remarkably little concern about change. A note of surprise permeates the papers as instances of the continuation of the traditional system is recorded; one paper documents a revival of the previous political patterns when the colonial pressure is withdrawn. The political systems in their broadest sense are not analysed. In the study of change, the emphasis is upon leadership roles and decision-making, the basis of leadership, sanctions and external relationships are referred to only in passing. For example, Aphorpe links the major unit of Nsenga society, the clan, to political processes of recruitment of leadership, and stresses a political aspect of kinship societies and a relationship between political roles and social units, thus showing that political authority in this situation depends

upon membership in a clan. Leadership among the Nsenga is representative and egalitarian. As such, a factor in the lack of adaptation is the rejection and conflict engendered by the lack of representation of certain clans within the Native Authority, resulting from the removal of some clan chiefs and the hierarchical concept of the Native Authority. These actions make it impossible for some members of the Nsenga tribe to be affiliated with modern government. Argyle, treating another Central African tribe, the Soli, emphasizes another facet of political change. Even though some of the traditional leaders are anxious and willing to implement political change, the more aggressive chief who adheres to the proscriptions of European officialdom loses favour with his own followers and becomes linked with European officials, and emerges as a leader without followers. Maquet shows the tenacity of superior-subordinate relationships among the Tutsi in Ruanda-Urundi. The political dimension of a caste relationship is retained even though elections were introduced, and the Tutsi still fill the traditional political roles. White continues his publications on the Luvale and stresses the retention of the jural function of lineages. St. John describes the traditional acephalous system of the Ibo who featured the village unit as the focus of political loyalty, a council as the major political instrument, slow consensus decision-making and reliance upon informal pressure or supernatural sanctions, and how these features re-emerged in 1955.

While other papers deal with the tenacity of the political system, Lewis' article on the Somalia presents a different but similar facet of political change, how the political system re-interprets and adapts incoming changes to its own culture and needs. In this case, traditional interest groups, competing lineages and tribes, are represented in the adherence to different nationalistic movements, a pattern which has been repeated throughout Africa and Asia. but as yet has not received the attention it deserves.

An evaluation of the work as a contribution to the systematic study of political systems finds it wanting. A note of caution to any potential reader: the publication as it stands was not proof-read and there are missing pages, and inserts of typographical errors, both of which cause slow reading and irritation. The hasty publication also led to the inclusion of some appallingly poor material and a discussion section which sounds like garbled tapes. All this could have been prevented with careful editing and time for rewriting. As a preliminary step toward a theoretical and substantive contribution, the publication moves in the right direction. It is now time for another work to break new ground, tying together studies of changing political systems and searching for trends in political change. If this is not forthcoming, anthropologists who have initiated studies of political change in non-Western areas will soon find their concepts out-moded and their area pre-empted by other social scientists.

Arthur TUDEN
University of Pittsburgh