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This is the dramatic story of the colonial encounter and the construction of empire in southern Africa in the nineteenth century. What did the British make of the Xhosa and how did they make sense of their politics and culture? How did the British establish and then explain their dominion, especially when it ran counter to the cultural values they believed themselves to represent? Richard Price answers these questions by looking at the ways in which individual missionaries, officials and politicians interacted with the Xhosa. He describes how those encounters changed and shaped the culture of imperial rule in southern Africa. He charts how an imperial regime developed both in the minds of the colonizers and in the everyday practice of power and how the British imperial presence was entangled in and shaped by the encounter with the Xhosa from the very moment of their first meeting.
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Preface: Intentions and purposes

In early January 2000 I found myself standing in the small, old-fashioned catalogue room of the Cape Archives in Cape Town, South Africa, leafing through the binders that contain the depository's finding lists. I had come to Cape Town on a scholarly whim. It was a luxury that I had given myself during a sabbatical year – an alternative to a scholarly lifetime of making the trek across the north Atlantic to the comfortable familiarity of the British Library. After many years working in British social history, I was searching for a new research project. I had spent the previous ten years working on a book that was a synthesis of pre-existing scholarship and I knew that I wanted to get back into historical archives again after a long absence. Cape Town was not, perhaps, an obvious place to satisfy this need, although it would certainly be warmer and more beautiful than anywhere I knew in Britain. But, of course, this trip was not entirely an indulgent caprice. My interest in South Africa had longer and more complicated roots.

I grew up in Britain in the 1950s. It was a childhood that I remember as being dominated by two major political themes. There was the question of empire and there was the question of class. Both were a constant presence in the culture and politics and both were inextricably bound up with what it meant to be British. It was impossible to escape the issues of class and empire. The seeming propensity of the male British worker to go on strike and the growing nationalist movements in the empire were seldom out of the public eye. It is no surprise that my own scholarly career has been dominated by those two themes.

My early interest in history was kindled by an old four-volume set of Cassell's History of England given to me by my grandfather, which presented an imperial version of British history. I early developed the habit of browsing the history shelves of the local public library, which seemed to be crammed with books on empire. It was the history of the empire that first made me want to be a historian. At university, I was lucky enough to be taught by Ranajit Guha, who mentored me as an undergraduate and as a graduate student. I wrote a thesis which later became a book on the culture
of empire and the working classes, using the case of the South African War of 1899–1902. After that, I went in a different scholarly direction, although I never lost interest in the question of empire and always regarded the imperial experience as essential to a full understanding of Britain’s history.

By 2000, however, these influences of empire had been reawakened by personal circumstances. A few years before, I had traveled to South Africa on personal business. I was struck by the beauty of the place and, of course, by the exciting political changes that were associated with the transition to a democratic nation. That visit in 1996 also rekindled the interest in empire that had been my starting point as a historian. So I began to scheme in my head for ways to return to the Cape more regularly, as something slightly more than a tourist.

My inclination was reinforced as I watched how empire had recently become important again in my own field of modern British history and beyond. The publication of Edward Said’s *Orientalism* in 1978 may be said to have initiated this renewed interest in empire, and following his lead, post-colonial theory moved the focus of attention in empire studies away from its traditional concentration on politics and economics and towards culture. In the past, historians had treated empire almost entirely from the standpoint of political economy, so the shift that Said initiated was quite a departure. But there were other sources, too, for the renewed attention to empire in scholarly consciousness. In Indian history, for example, the Subaltern Studies project sought to place the colonial subject at the center of the imperial experience. Elsewhere, the disciplinary lines were constantly being breached. Indeed, some of the most important work on colonial relations was being done by anthropologists who possessed a historical bent, such as Greg Dening for the south Pacific, Anne Stoler for the Dutch empire, and John and Jean Comaroff in southern Africa.

I watched this scholarly turn to empire from the sidelines. I was impressed with its vitality and appeal. In British history the scholarly turn to empire focused on the way empire had been central to the making of Britain’s history and had permeated deeply into its culture. I was in sympathy with this move. But I was somewhat reserved as to the degree to which one could reduce British history to the imperial connection. Other contexts also seemed important – such as Europe, or even class. More interesting to me was the question raised by the Indian scholar Ashis Nandy in a wonderful book, published in 1983, which he titled *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*. One of Nandy’s major themes was precisely the way empire damaged and distorted British culture; so that ultimately, perhaps, this damage was greater to the colonizer than it was to the colonized. And personal conversation with Ranajit Guha helped keep that question in my head. My scholarly inclination, therefore, drew me
more and more away from Britain itself. I thought it might be useful to go to the empire and see what happened to British culture there, at the frontier of empire. This book is about what I found when I made that journey.

It was these vague and unformed intentions that I carried to Cape Town in January of 2000. There, I did what historians do when they are not quite sure where they are going: I began to rummage through the archives, testing various ideas against what the sources revealed. On the morning in question I opened a binder whose title page read: “List of British Kaffraria Records.” A distant memory stirred in my mind. I had heard the name “British Kaffraria” many years before in some long-forgotten school lesson, or perhaps from one of those old books in my home town public library. The “Kaffir Wars” were frontier and land conflicts on the eastern Cape frontier in the middle years of the nineteenth century; some of Queen Victoria’s little wars; wars which hardly rippled the tides of British public opinion; wars which did not figure in most histories of colonial warfare, and occasioned little notice in contemporary politics. I called up some of the volumes in the finding list, opened the large books into which the material was bound, and knew almost instantly that I had found my project.

The material handed me was often disorganized and eccentrically classified. But it electrified me. Among the first things I examined were reports of British colonial officials – they were variously termed diplomatic or resident agents – who lived with the Xhosa tribes in the 1830s. It was immediately evident that this was amazing stuff – especially to a British historian. Imperial states are obsessed with recording, watching and surveilling, and the compulsion to inform and log was evident in these reports and letters. The volumes contained records of what the early imperial administrators were doing and thinking. Stories of encounter, observation and of the struggle to understand the culture and politics of the Xhosa tribes were all to be found in these volumes. It was a rich collection which allowed me insight into the mentality of people who were constructing the empire on the ground in the context of their encounter with the Xhosa. This was the empire as it was experienced at the frontier, not as it was imagined to be back home.

The book that has resulted from my encounter with this colonial archive has been the most enjoyable of all the books I have researched and written. It was impossible not to be hooked by the stories that I found in the Cape Archives and elsewhere. As the reader who persists will discover, the archives that have provided the key source material for this book – that is, the missionary archives and the records of the imperial administration – are packed with stories detailing the nitty-gritty of the encounter between the British and the Xhosa. This turned the book into a very personal project. Inevitably, I found myself fascinated by the personalities that were my daily companions in the sources. This was particularly true of
the Xhosa chiefs who will appear throughout the whole narrative. But it was true also of figures like Sir Harry Smith and Sir George Grey on the British side. My engagement with these and other luminaries was a determining influence on the way I wanted to shape the book. It is therefore appropriate to explain why the book takes the shape that it does, to declare its historical logic and to deal with other housekeeping matters that will enhance the reader’s understanding of the narrative.

When I sat down to write this book, I was very conscious of those historians who had explored this frontier of empire before me. The story of how the Xhosa came to be part of the British empire has been told before — although it has received relatively little attention in imperial history. My own excursion into this corner of African and imperial history has depended entirely upon the work of others, particularly those colleagues working in the area of South African history. South African history is a lively field and at many points this book bumps up against the debates and controversies that animate the field. The book also touches on histories that are often distant from imperial historiography, such as the history of African religion; and it draws upon scholarship in fields other than history, such as historical anthropology.

But while I wanted to properly acknowledge my considerable debt to other specialists, I did not want to write a book whose narrative was constantly interrupted by the need to address this or that historical controversy, or comment on how my argument contrasts with the theoretical framework of other historians. I have drawn upon other scholars where I feel they help me understand and illuminate the historical processes I am describing. And I have taken issue with the way other historians have treated particular events where I felt it would help the reader better understand the historical story I wanted to tell. But I did not want to frame this book around engagements with other historians or historiographies. I have not aspired to write a book whose principal aim is to displace, contest or confirm the work of other historians. And the reason for this is very simple. The story that I have to tell is too dramatic and too important for that. I do not want readers to be diverted away from the rich and engaging stories that are told between the covers of this book. Although the book was partly inspired by the “imperial turn” in British history it has not been written either within that school of history or as a counterpoint to it. It is, rather, a study of how colonial encounter produced a culture of imperial rule.

I use the word “culture” a lot in what follows, and this is a good place to describe what I have in mind by that term. By “culture” in this context I am speaking of how a culture of difference, power and domination emerged out of the dynamics of the encounter between the British and the Xhosa. The argument tracks the growth of an imperial culture that
enabled, explained and rationalized why the British should establish dominion over the Xhosa. I am concerned principally with the practices, modes of behavior, mindsets, values and ideologies that shaped the way relationships between the British and Xhosa played out. I am less concerned with the institutional forms of this imperial culture — with the structures of imperial administration, for example — than I am with how the ideologies of that culture evolved and worked.

By the same token, I have not intended to track the debates and divisions within imperial culture itself. That is, I do not focus on the differences within the various segments of the cultural processes I describe. I am aware, of course, that cultural forms are not monolithic, either in ideology or in political practice. In the present case, for example, doctrinal differences between the various missionary groups influenced their attitudes to racial politics. Within the apparatus of imperial administration, the competing priorities of the frontier officials, the provincial administration at Cape Town, and the metropolitan authority of London are mainstays of imperial historiography. Such divisions are important. But to highlight the internal histories of the cultural formations would shift the focus of the book more toward the cultural institution itself. I have wanted to put the behavior of individuals at the center of my story; to use the experience of individual stories to explain what happened when British culture met Xhosa culture and politics.

Finally, a word about nomenclature. The nomenclature of African history is, of course, inevitably inflected with the experience of colonialism. Africanists are still sorting out what are the most appropriate spellings to describe indigenous peoples and cultures. When I have used the word “Kaffir,” for example, it is either because it is in the historical sources, or because it refers to a particular epoch when the historiography used that disparaging term. In other cases, such as the word Khoesan for Khoisan (what an earlier generation would have referred to as “Hottentot”), I have tried to use the word most widely accepted at the present day. Xhosa spelling presents special difficulties because when the British encountered the Xhosa there was no dictionary or orthography they could use to understand the Xhosa language. They had to make these aids for themselves. As a consequence Xhosa names and words appear in the sources in a variety of different spellings. The chief Maqomo, for example, was recorded as Maqoma, Mocomo, Macoma, and even MacKomer! Except when I am quoting from an original source, I have tried to use the word most widely accepted at the present day. Xhosa spelling presents special difficulties because when the British encountered the Xhosa there was no dictionary or orthography they could use to understand the Xhosa language. They had to make these aids for themselves. As a consequence Xhosa names and words appear in the sources in a variety of different spellings. The chief Maqomo, for example, was recorded as Maqoma, Mocomo, Macoma, and even MacKomer! Except when I am quoting from an original source, I have tried to achieve a consistent spelling throughout which uses the form that is accepted as most reflective of Xhosa grammar itself. For guidance in these matters, I have consulted Africanists and I have noted the usages in books by other scholars.
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