

1917, which recognised Japan's claims in the north Pacific and the Shantung peninsula and Britain's in the south Pacific. Although the Commonwealth and New Zealand Governments were consulted and acquiesced, Hughes at first denied it, and Massey reiterated the need to keep Germany out of the south Pacific at the 1917 Imperial War Conference and at meetings of the Territorial Desiderata Committee. Smuts, similarly, expanded the arguments for retaining German South-West and East Africa.

Meanwhile Labour and left-wing agitation against British annexationist aims had been gathering strength. With the entry of the United States into the war and the Russian revolution, the cry became 'peace without annexations'. Lloyd George adopted Smut's idea of national determination, though he was careful to get evidence that New Guinea, Samoa and South-West Africa would self-determine in favour of the British.

At the Paris Peace Conference, Britain was caught on the horns of a dilemma between Wilsonian idealism and the annexationist aims of the southern dominions. Moreover, with Germany defeated, France victorious and Japan expanding, she needed American friendship to preserve her future power and world stability. The price she paid was the mandate system. When Wilson insisted that *all* Turkish territories and German colonies should come under the League of Nations, Smuts with Lord Robert Cecil suggested three classes. Lloyd George then cajoled and bullied Hughes and Massey into accepting C class mandates which could be administered as 'integral portions' of their own territory.

Despite this victory, Wilson could not prevent another 'scramble' when the mandates were apportioned. Nor could he prevent Japan eventually fortifying the north Pacific islands. In retrospect it seems that Hughes and Massey were well-justified in their lack of faith in League control, but not perhaps in their efforts to annex German New Guinea and Samoa at the cost of American friendship.

The international aspects of this inside story based on pioneering research into recently declassified public records and private papers are well-covered, but little is made of the way in which the southern dominions were growing into equal partnership with Britain. New Zealand attitudes and interests are treated very cursorily. Indeed Mr Louis is too ready to assume that New Zealanders thought like Australians and Massey partnered Hughes. Hopes and expectations that Samoa would be placed under the colonial office, criticism of Massey's atavistic imperialism, ambiguities in Massey's statements and rivalry with Australia over Nauru are ignored — and the 'Tonga islands' are erroneously said to 'form the larger part of the Solomon group'.

MARY BOYD

*Victoria University of Wellington*

*The Oxford History of South Africa.* Edited by Monica Wilson and Leonard Thompson. I. *South Africa to 1870.* Clarendon Press, 1969. U.K. price: 75s.

THIS VOLUME and a second which is foreshadowed are an attempt to reinterpret a history which has previously been written from an essentially European point of view. Professor Eric Walker's well-known scholarly history, though its standpoint is liberal, does not devote a single chapter to the non-European peoples. The South African volume of the *Cambridge*

*History of the British Empire* has one very good chapter of thirty-two pages by Professor Schapera on 'The Native Inhabitants' and another by Professor de Kiewiet on 'Social and Economic Developments in Native Tribal Life', in a work of 1000 pages. Professors Wilson and Thompson, as they explain in the preface, base their interpretation on the belief that 'the central theme of South African history is interaction between peoples of diverse origins, languages, technologies, ideologies and social systems, meeting on South African soil.'

On the whole the interpretation is extraordinary successful. The first chapter on 'The Archaeological Background' by Mr R. R. Inskip, densely packed with information, is rather heavy going. An archaeologist must have unusual literary gifts to bring his subject to life without slides or at least illustrations. On the other hand Professor Wilson, a first-rate anthropologist, reveals herself in Chapters II-IV and VII (which make up more than a third of the book) to be also a first-rate historian. On the early hunters and herders she holds that 'the most probable hypothesis is that the Khoikhoi (Hottentots) acquired cattle after they had sheep; that some of them had cattle well before 1488, but that cattle-men had not lived for many generations before that in the Western Cape.' On events farther east she shatters a well-worn South African myth: 'the absence of any detailed traditions or the name of any Moses who brought the people south supports the view that the Nguni have occupied the country south of the Drakensberg for many centuries'. She draws attention to an interesting distinction between the two main Bantu-speaking groups, Nguni and Sotho: 'the rituals point to an ancient Sotho economy dependent primarily on hunting, cultivation, and iron-smelting, to which herding was added; whereas the Nguni economy was based on cattle.' Dealing with the interactions of the South African peoples, she reflects 'The irony is that the descendants of settlers who taught the Khoikhoi and San (Bushmen) and Bantu-speakers to desire trade goods and learn their language and pressed them into their service as labourers, now demand that their descendants develop "separately."'

Mr M. F. Katzen begins his chapter on 'White Settlers and the Origin of a New Society, 1652-1778' with a well made point: 'the new Cape always remained a genuinely colonial society, which could not achieve the economy and self-sufficiency of the San and Khoikhoi societies which preceded it.' This does not of course mean that it was a step backwards: it is not self-sufficiency but interchange which is (and always has been) the forward path, a truth which nowadays is sometimes forgotten. And though the Dutch East India Company did not intend to colonize, it was not long before 'the adventurous frontier life, free from the petty exactions of Cape Town officials, attracted colonial-born children, who mostly could not afford to become traders or lodging house keepers in Cape Town or vegetable, wine or grain farmers in the western Cape and were too ill-educated to enter the limited ranks of the Civil Service or the professions and too proud to become farmers or artisans.' Much South African history is summed up in that sentence. Mrs Wilson's chapter on 'Co-operation and Conflict: the Eastern Cape Frontier' covers more familiar ground, but there are fresh details of some interest. A section on 'Civilization by Mingling' makes the point that mixed education was common in early mission schools. Christian missions produced, as a side effect, conflicting loyalties in times of frontier war: 'from this conflict of loyalties

sprang a cleavage between the pagan or "red" people, who continued to anoint themselves with red clay, and the Christian converts, who attended school and wore a European pattern of clothes. This point is worth the attention of critics of South African education policies even today. As Mrs Wilson remarks in her conclusion 'the cleavage between white and black was not monolithic. There was diversity and contradiction within each group.' Indeed Dr T. R. H. Davenport in the next chapter, 'The Consolidation of a New Society' shows how the policy of English-medium education was ultimately defeated by the survival and spread of rural primary schools, the nurseries of Afrikaner nationalism. This chapter ends with self-government in the Cape. It had arrived, says Dr Davenport, 'without the *éclat* which accompanied its arrival in some other parts of the British Empire. It had come before the emergence of stable political parties, before there was any effective rural Afrikaner, let alone Coloured or African, participation in the higher levels of political life, to a community whose political leaders were divided as to its merits.'

The two final chapters, on co-operation and conflict in the Zulu kingdom and Natal and on the high veld respectively, are in the hands of the co-editor, Professor L. M. Thompson. More than half of the first is concerned with the rise of the Zulu kingdom as the outcome of the impact of two remarkable personalities, Dingiswayo and Shaka, upon the smaller chiefdoms and with the defeat of Dingane, Shaka's half-brother and successor, by the Voortrekkers. The history of Natal, a white island in a black sea, a plural society held together chiefly by the influence of Theophilus Shepstone, is more briefly discussed. Mr Thompson sees a 'gradual ossification' of Shepstone's policy. 'On the defensive against persistent criticisms from the white community, he could do no more than maintain what he had already accomplished'. The last chapter begins by unravelling the complex story of the *Difaqane*, the time of trouble which followed Shaka's wars. The Great Trek which followed is all too familiar to South Africans, though Mr. Thompson finds one or two fresh things to say. He notes the concentration of the *trekboers* as distinct from Voortrekkers proper in the Orange River Territory — a fact which explains the hesitations of 1854. He also notes the difficulty of generalising about conditions in the South African Republic (the Transvaal): 'if the Africans were quiescent and the white were stable, the Africans had security of life and limb and the opportunity to produce their own food in return for the obligation to perform intermittent compulsory labour for the white farmers. If the Africans resisted the imposition or the whites were disorderly, the result was anarchy.'

The book is one of the finest products of the University of Capetown, but two criticisms may be ventured. 'Bushman' and 'Hottentot' are sanctioned by long English usage, though the definition of Bushman in the O.E.D. needs revision. 'Khoikhoi' and 'San' may merely mystify. So will numbers of tribal names unpronounceable without a short course in Hottentot (or Khoikhoi) clicks. The object is surely to enlighten the non-South African as well as the South African reader. Is this purism worthwhile? The other criticism is more substantial. Many of the crucial decisions in South African history were taken in Great Britain: they are only lightly touched on here. The reversal of D'Urban's annexation of the 'Province of Queen Adelaide' is mentioned, but not explained. With reference to the annexations of British Kaffraria and the Orange River

Sovereignty, Lord Grey is said to have 'accepted these *faits accomplis* with varying degrees of reluctance'; in fact he initiated the first and pointed that previous measures tended towards the second, so that it might 'fairly be inferred that this sovereignty should be openly and avowedly assumed.' Other instances might be cited. This book is rightly centred in South Africa; but at times it is too exclusively centred in South Africa.

W. P. MORRELL

*University of Otago*

*The Origins of Malay Nationalism.* By W. R. Roff. Yale University Press, New Haven, 1967. xviii, 297 pp. U.K. price: 63s.

IT HAS INDEED been a pleasant task to review this book. It gives the reviewer ample scope to make a fair and genuinely critical review. Before we offer some critical comments it is best to present its favourable aspects. For those unfamiliar with the twentieth century history of the Malays in Malaya, the book is a good source of information. An attempt is made to go beyond the official points of view on different issues and in this the author has succeeded. It is written without a trace of naive and innocent prejudice or distortion of facts which have hitherto characterised works on the Malays. It has made use of a good number of Malay sources and cited a good number of references to Malay authors unlike many other works on the subject. It will remain useful for a long time as reference material.

Without hesitation we may welcome this book as a useful addition to the collection on the Malays. The criticisms to follow are more on methodology and conceptualisation rather than on the utility of the work. To begin with it is wrong to characterise the work as 'the first sociological history of modern Malay society' (H. J. Benda, p. xi). The fact that an author writes on society does not make his writing sociological. Roff has nowhere in his book undertaken any sociological analysis or even used a concept in the sociological sense. He did not clarify nationalism or its Malay version. He did not use the concepts 'intelligentsia' and 'elites' in the way sociologists do. The analytic and theoretical parts of the book did not go beyond general statements whereas a work on historical sociology would go to deeper levels of differentiation using clear cut analytic case illustrations. The following are some instances:

- (1) 'The fires of dispute between reformists and traditionalists tended to die as improved Islamic and secular education removed many of the coals of contention.' (p. 255)
- (2) 'The attempts of the reformists to posit a purified and revived Islam as the necessary dynamic of progress had, in making too direct a challenge to customary religious (and by implication secular) authority, fundered on the rock of traditionalism. In the long run, it was the metamorphosed traditional elite itself which alone was to prove capable of organising large-scale support for a "Malay rights" program, which however did little more than exaggerate existing British Malay policy.' (p. 127)
- (3) 'Throughout the period under review, therefore, there is evidenced among the Malays a strong persistence of traditional patterns of social and economic relationships in a context of rapid and far-reaching socioeconomic change affecting principally Malaya's non-Malay inhabitants.' (p. 253)