Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

James Cropper, John Philip and the Researches in South Africa

Ross, R.J.

Citation
Ross, R. J. (1989). James Cropper, John Philip and the Researches in South Africa. *Hugh Macmillan And Shula Marks (Eds), Africa And Empire: W.m. Macmillan, Historian And Social Critic, London, Temple Smith For The Institute Of Commonwealth Studies*, 140-152. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4227

Version:	Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License:	
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4227

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

6

JAMES CROPPER, JOHN PHILIP AND THE *RESEARCHES IN SOUTH AFRICA*

ROBERT ROSS

IN 1835 James Cropper, a prosperous Quaker merchant living in Liverpool and one of the leading British abolitionists, wrote to Dr John Philip, the superintendent of the London Missionary Society in South Africa, offering to finance the republication of the latter's book, *Researches in South Africa*, which had been issued seven years earlier. This offer was turned down.

This exchange was recorded by William Miller Macmillan in his first major historical work, *The Cape Coloured Question*,[1] which was primarily concerned with the struggles of Dr John Philip on behalf of the so-called 'Cape Coloureds'. These resulted in Ordinance 50 of 1828 and its confirmation in London, which lifted any civil disabilities for free people of colour. The correspondence on which it was based, in John Philip's private papers, was destroyed in the 1931 fire in the Gubbins library, Johannesburg, and I have not been able to locate any copies at Cropper's end. Any explanation as to why these letters were written must therefore remain speculative. Nevertheless, even were the correspondence extant, it is unlikely that it would contain a satisfactory explanation of what at first sight might seem a rather curious exchange. The two men had enough in common with each other, and knew each other's minds well enough, for them merely to give their surface motivation, and not to be concerned with deeper ideological justification. And the former level can be reconstructed fairly easily.

Cropper, it may be assumed, saw South Africa as a 'warning for the West Indies', which was especially timely in 1835 as the British Caribbean was having to adjust to the emancipation of its slaves.[2] The *Researches* gave many examples of how the nominally free could still be maintained in effective servitude, and Cropper undoubtedly hoped that this pattern would not be repeated. The slaves should not be free

in name only, but free enough to allow the West Indies to prosper as a free market economy — the only way, in Cropper's eyes, that they possibly could. Philip, we know, did not wish to exacerbate old sores — not surprisingly since the initial publication of the *Researches* had caused a storm at the Cape and had led to an expensive libel suit, as Cropper well knew.[3] Moreover, by 1835 he was more concerned with the events on the Cape Colony's eastern frontier than with the status and oppression of the Khoikhoi, who had been the main subject of the *Researches*.[4] Underlying these reasons, however, there would seem to be a number of hitherto unrecognized connections between the two parts of the British Empire, and a number of ideological concerns, mainly to do with the meaning of freedom, which I hope to elucidate in the course of this paper.

I

John Philip was the archetype of the 'turbulent priest', an intermittently recurring figure in South African history, who does not keep to his cloth but who rather meddles in 'politics' — that is, one who speaks out in opposition to the established order. Similarly, *Researches in South Africa* was the first clear South African example of a campaigning book, written not merely to inform but rather as a call to action. It is a book which mirrors the tension that Philip himself must have felt about his role. He had come to South Africa as a convinced Tory, and had to a certain extent owed his appointment as superintendent of missions to this fact. The Director of the LMS considered that this would ease his relations with the colonial government and allow the healing of the rifts that emerged in the past years between the rigid Toryism of successive governors and the campaigning evangelism of, notably, James Read. Philip was also concerned, by virtue of his function, primarily with the organization of evangelization. Nevertheless, he became embroiled in open conflict with the colonial authorities, over the freedom of the press, over the position of the Khoikhoi within the colony and, later, over the policy to be followed with regard to the Xhosa and the northern frontier. To a contemporary governor he was 'more a *politician* than a missionary',[5] and historians of the settler persuasion were to be more stringent in their strictures.[6]

Philip himself recognized, at least subconsciously, the contradiction

between his spiritual calling and his temporal activities. The last chapter of the *Researches*, whose tone is somewhat discordant with what precedes it, is an almost apologetic assertion of the centrality of the Protestant religion for material progress as well as for salvation. 'The Word of God', he wrote, 'is the only instrument adequate to the regeneration of the world.'[7] In the very last words of the book he stressed how the missionaries were working to accelerate 'the approach of that moral revolution which will shortly usher in the kingdoms of this world as the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ'.[8] On the other hand, Philip did not place any emphasis on the kernel of the evangelical message — the salvation of individual souls. This was a characteristic, if surprising, omission, which was perhaps the result of either his lack of involvement in day-to-day pastoral work, or of his age (a generation older than most missionaries) or perhaps of his own lack of an emotional conversion.[9] In time this trait was to lead to conflict with those missionaries, notably Robert Moffat, for whom the individual gospel was far more important than the social.[10]

Philip, then, chose in the *Researches*, and in his work in general, to concentrate on the 'secondary blessings which "Christianity scatters in its march to immortality"'.[11] The reason for this emphasis is perhaps best exemplified in the report he wrote in 1825 on that much maligned mission station, Bethelsdorp in the eastern Cape, near Port Elizabeth, and which he reprinted in his book. He commented on the considerable consumption of British-made goods among the people of the station. This had reached 20,000 Rix-dollars (about £1,500) in 1822 and had probably increased since then.[12] Numerous stone houses were being built, which allowed the young women to keep their clothes, on which they spent much money, in a reasonable state, and thus to maintain their respectability. At the same time books could be kept in these houses without their coming to grief and, as Philip argued elsewhere, the habit of reading, much stressed by Protestantism anyway, was the first requirement of an inquiring and improving mind.[13] The number of 'native mechanics', was also steadily increasing.[14]

The justification for this emphasis on externals was, in the first place, propagandist. Philip had to counter the claim, as he reported it, that

> You do not civilize the people; they are fit for nothing but slaves to the boers; you can never make them tradesmen, and you can never raise them

above their present vitiated state, nor impart to them a taste for the decencies of life.[15]

It was, at the very least, a tactical necessity in his conflicts with the government to be able to point to the improvement in the manners and circumstances of the mission inhabitants. Later, when he was looking back over the struggles and writing with more sharpness than earlier, Philip would comment:

The question between us and the government was one of civilisation. The criterion of a people's civilisation with Lord Charles Somerset was whether the people used knives and forks.[16]

There was, though, a more fundamental reason for Philip's stress on the achievement of a respectable way of life. He believed that Christianity and savagery were incompatible, and conversely that Christianity and civilization were indivisible:

While I am satisfied, from abundance of incontrovertible facts, that permanent societies of Christians can never be maintained among an uncivilized people without imparting to them the arts and habits of civilized life, I am satisfied, upon ground no less evident, that if missionaries lose their religion and sink into mere mechanics, the work of civilization and moral improvement will speedily retrograde.[17]

The work of raising the material level of their charges was thus just as much a sacred task for the missionaries as was the preaching of the gospel. It was this equation which provided the mainspring for all Philip's political and missionary activity.

II

As Philip saw it, the achievement of such progress required independence or at least economic liberty. This vision derived from at least three separable, if interconnected, sources. First there was the general intellectual climate in Scotland.[18] Even though he never attended university — he owed his Doctor's title to the combined efforts of Columbia and Princeton, without his ever having set foot in America — Philip was well acquainted with the writings of the Scottish enlightenment, and with the political economists. As a long-term minister of an important church in the university city of

Aberdeen — where, incidentally, he had the good taste to marry a Miss Ross — this was only to be expected. Second, Philip was, in ecclesiastical terms, a convinced 'independent', deploring state intervention in Church matters and arguing against state subsidies for churches. He believed that the congregation itself should be responsible for the purity of its doctrine, the upkeep of its churches and the support of its minister. Third, there was his own background. In his early years, Philip himself had been the epitome of the craftsman who was able to raise himself from relatively humble origins to a respected social position by dint of his own sustained efforts. He had begun work as a weaver in his native Fife at the age of eleven, by the age of twenty he was works manager of a modern 'power' mill in Dundee, and shortly afterwards he became an independent weaver, with sufficient success that in 'six months [he] was doing well'. Only after this did he decide to train for the ministry.[19] This was the sort of career pattern which he saw as an ideal. 'The labourers and artisans ... in the manufacturing districts of North Britain'[20] were the reference group against whom he measured the Khoikhoi. It did not matter, as he recognized, that such success could not be achieved by everyone. It was the opportunity for advancement that was essential, for without it there was no incentive for the continual self-discipline inherent in a Christian life.

Given liberty in a society, material, intellectual and religious improvement were seen to be inevitable. In later life, Philip quoted with approval a speech by William Wilberforce in which he rather optimistically saw freedom as the palliative for all Africa's ills:

> Africa will become the seat of civilisation, because the seat of liberty — the seat of commerce, because the seat of liberty — the seat of science, because the seat of liberty — the seat of religion, because the seat of liberty — the seat of morals because the seat of liberty — the seat of happiness, because the seat of liberty.[21]

This demand for freedom permeated all Philip's actions in South Africa. It united his earliest work as a declared opponent of what he saw as Lord Charles Somerset's tyranny with his later defence of the Khoi. In the miniscule society of English Cape Town, Philip could not fail to become aware of the highhandedness of the Governor, and quite soon after his arrival in South Africa he moved into opposition, both openly and covertly. His first actions, in alliance with Thomas

Pringle and John Fairbairn, were on behalf of the 1820 settlers and to bring about the freedom of the South African press.[22] He was also instrumental in having the Commission of Enquiry to the Colony in 1824, which would eventually lead to the major reorganization of the Cape government and the demise of Somerset's personal rule. To do this he had to work secretly, through William Wilberforce and Steven Lushington, two evangelical members of the British Parliament; they were able to persuade the House of Commons to appoint the Commission without its true goal being apparent, especially as its terms of reference also included the affairs of Mauritius and Sri Lanka — presumably as camouflage. For this reason, Philip's role can only be gauged from his own reminiscences some twenty years later, not a particularly reliable type of source at the best of times, and certainly not when deriving from someone as convinced of his own importance as Philip was. Nevertheless, since there does not seem to be any other clear reason for the despatch of the Commission, his account may perhaps be accepted.[23]

Philip's first main work, though, was concerned with the relieving of the civil disabilities of the Khoisan. As evidenced by the first volume of the *Researches*, which was largely a campaigning book devoted to the removal of these disabilities, he saw these as deriving from three sources. The first was the 'Hottentot Code', promulgated by the Earl of Caledon, Governor of the Colony, in 1809. This was intended by its original authors to save the Khoi from the murderous oppression of the Dutch farmers, in particular in the eastern Cape. Indeed, by guiding exploitation within legal bounds, it may well have had that effect, and may have led to a reduction in the use of brute force against Khoi labourers.[24] Nevertheless, as Philip saw it, on the basis of considerable experience, it had the effect of maintaining the Khoi in the service of the farmers, or other Europeans, without the possibility of their escaping or even changing their level of employment. It did this in two ways. First, it required Khoi to have a fixed abode, which, since it was impossible for them to acquire land, virtually forced them to work for a farmer unless they could gain access to a mission station. It also demanded that any Khoi away from home carry a pass, made out by a European, on pain of being arrested and set to work for a neighbouring farmer. As a result, it was impossible for a Khoi to seek out the most advantageous employer and thus effectively obviated the need for competition for labour, to the great detriment of the employees.[25]

Second, Sir John Cradock's proclamation of 1812 allowed farmers to bind to them all Khoi children between the ages of eight and eighteen, theoretically to pay for the cost of their upbringing. Often this period could be surreptitiously extended, as it was difficult for Khoi to demonstrate that their period of service had ended. Moreover, it gave their parents the choice between staying with the children's master or breaking up their family, and thus tied them to the farmer.[26]

Third, and for Philip probably most significant, the administration of the law was one-sidedly in the hands of the farmers and their allies. At the local level the veldcornets, who were supposed to administer the codes initially set up for the protection of the Khoi, in fact invariably favoured their potential employers. These men therefore provided the Khoi with no escape from the oppression they experienced on the farms. Nor were the district magistrates much help. It was not merely that any Khoi lodging a complaint against a farmer would himself be put in gaol until the case was heard, often weeks if not months later, thus badly prejudicing the matter; but rather, the magistrates themselves acted as the first line of oppression, making it impossible for Khoi to escape from their bondage to the farmers. Often indeed the Khoi were forced to work for the magistrate himself at miserable rates of remuneration. The consequence was clear:

> In a state of society where there is one law for the rich and another for the poor, and the sanctions of the law are borrowed to render the poor the victims of oppression, moral distinctions are confounded and the names of virtue or vice come to be regarded as exchangeable terms.... While the administration of justice is confined to one particular class of the community only, however that administration may be regarded for its equity, it is nothing better than the equity of a party of Bedouin Arabs, who make an equal distribution of the spoil they have taken from the unprotected caravan....[27]

What was necessary to remedy this situation was not merely a reform of the legal administration, and the institution of a system of laws which paid no account to racial status, but also the establishment of a free market in labour:

> To allow the Hottentot the power of carrying his labour to the best market, is one of the first steps necessary in attempting to elevate the character of

the coloured population, to undermine the system of slavery, to encourage the increase of free labourers, and to give a healthy stimulus to the industry of the colony.[28]

Philip was thus arguing for the application of the most modern principles of political economy to the Cape, and he did this explicitly. In the *Researches* he quotes Adam Smith extensively.[29] At one point he comments on colonial policy, as made in Britain as well as in South Africa, that 'things might have gone on in this way if Adam Smith, Ferguson, Malthus, Ricardo etc., had never blotted paper'.[30] Personal liberty was essential to a free economy, which in its turn was a necessary condition of material, and indeed of moral, progress for all the inhabitants of the Cape.

III

Philip's *Researches* were written, during 1827, in England whither he had come to campaign for the 'emancipation' of the Khoi. This campaign was largely conducted in cooperation with Thomas Fowell Buxton, who by this time was the major parliamentary spokesman and tactician for the abolitionists. At first, Buxton informed Philip that he could not help him because all his energies were absorbed by the struggle for the emancipation of slaves and the conflict with the West India interest, but Philip was eventually able to convince him that the two causes were inextricably intertwined. As he wrote to Buxton: 'If they aim at the abolition of slavery, is it to put freed slaves in the position of "free" Hottentots?'[31] For his part, Buxton may well have realized that the cause of the Khoikhoi could perhaps be used to extract statements of principle from the British parliament which could later be used in the West Indies, without the planter interest being aroused. This was indeed the case. On 15 July 1828 the House of Commons passed an unopposed resolution that:

> ... directions be given for effectually securing to all the natives of South Africa the same freedom and protection as are enjoyed by the free persons residing at the Cape, whether they be English or Dutch.[32]

Buxton's comment on this was simply 'These men do not know what they have done.'[33] In this he was right. Two days later, and thus in the

strict sense independently, the Cape government passed Ordinance 50 which was very much of the same tenor.[34] When news of this came to England, Philip pressed that it be confirmed by Order in Council, with the proviso that it could not be amended or repealed without consent from London. The Colonial Secretary at the time, the Tory Sir George Murray, was a little fearful of the opposition this would receive from the West Indians, but it was pointed out to him that they had already had the opportunity to oppose the original motion. According to Philip's reminiscences, Murray then, more or less on the spur of the moment, decided to extend this order to all the British colonies.[35] Although this does not seem to be the strict truth, nevertheless a string of ordinances in the following years did extend the principle to the British West Indies, presumably following the precedent set for the Cape.[36] The full effect of these new regulations on the free black communities of those colonies cannot be judged with any accuracy, since slave emancipation followed only a few years later but it does seem reasonable to assume that they were of considerable importance in ensuring that no racially based measures were enacted to maintain the effective servitude of the ex-slaves.[37] In some colonies, other techniques were found, but that is another story.

IV

In addition to this exercise in political guile,[38] there was a more significant congruence between Philip and the abolitionists in Britain, namely at the ideological level. This is a field in which recent historiographic progress has been considerable, largely because of the failure of two previous attempts to explain the sudden rise of the movement to abolish the slave trade and slavery which occurred in Great Britain, and to a certain extent in North America, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. To see it as deriving from a shift in religious sensibilities, without providing an explanation of that very shift itself, was clearly unsatisfactory.[39] Conversely, the argument, primarily associated with Eric Williams, that the slave trade and slavery were abolished because they were no longer functional for capitalism became untenable in the face of evidence that slavery and the slave trade were still thoroughly profitable at the moment of abolition and were not seriously inconveniencing the consumer in Britain or elsewhere.[40] All the same, there would seem,

prima facie to be a flaw in an argument which does not link the growth of abolitionism, begun in Britain and exported to the rest of the world, with the capitalist Industrial Revolution, also begun in Britain and exported to the rest of the world at approximately the same time.

I have neither the space nor the competence to do full justice to the exceedingly subtle, and in my opinion satisfactory, solution to this paradox which has been articulated in terms of ideology. David Brion Davis has summarized both the basic tenets of the argument and the difficulties that it nevertheless contains. He wrote:

> A causal explanation [of the antislavery conquest of European opinion] would ... have to relate the antislavery sensibility to the triumphant hegemony of a capitalist world view and particularly to capitalist views of labor, while avoiding any temptation to reduce the rise of abolitionism to the interests of an entrepreneurial class, a class which for the most part detested abolitionists.[41]

For the purpose of explication, perhaps the best place to begin is with Adam Smith and *The Wealth of Nations*, which Philip knew so well. According to a recent and most persuasive account, this work's engagement with economics was not so much a starting-point, but a solution. Its central concern, rather, was

> ... with the issue of justice, with finding a market mechanism capable of reconciling inequality of property with adequate provision for the excluded. Smith was simply transposing into the language of markets an ancient jurisprudential discourse ... about how to ensure that private individuation of God's dominion would not deny the propertyless the means of satisfying their needs.... The answer which Smith gave to this problem [was] that a system of competitive markets in food and labour could guarantee adequate subsistence to the labouring poor.... Smith's arguments were designed to show how an economy of abundance could be created in which this ancient jurisprudential antinomy between the needs of the poor and the rights of the rich could be transcended altogether.[42]

This was clearly an attractive argument to those who prospered during the Industrial Revolution. Much as they might be worried or shocked by the conditions of the labourers in the new factories, or feel guilty about their own wealth, they could take solace in the thought that, although things were not as they should be, they could

be made as good as possible if men (and to a lesser extent women) both followed their own economic advantage and agitated for the removal of all limitations on economic freedom. Moreover, despite the horrors of early industrialization, the steady economic growth and general prosperity of Great Britain, the European country with the least economic regulation, probably seemed to confirm these men in their convictions.

There is an obvious corollary to this. If a free market in labour was not only economically advantageous but also morally right, it follows that slavery was both inefficient and therefore sinful. Middle-class Britons therefore attacked slavery with religious fervour, just as they attacked other trammels on the free economy, such as the Corn Laws. They could only justify their own prosperity by agitating against the causes, as they saw them, of other people's unnecessary misery. For this reason, anti-slavery became a major mass movement, probably the first modern political campaign in Britain.[43]

This certainly was how James Cropper saw his role in the world. A devout Quaker, he had had in his youth doubts about the legitimacy of his activities as a merchant until he read *The Wealth of Nations*, which for the rest of his life he treated almost literally as a second Bible. And, as one of the men who took the initiative in 1823 for the foundation of the Anti-Slavery Society, he was a key abolitionist and was certainly not considered an eccentric within that community.[44]

This is undoubtedly an oversimplified description of the mainsprings of abolitionist ideas. It can explain much, such as the contemporality of the abolition of slavery and the passing of the New Poor Law. Nevertheless, it was not of universal application. Ideally, though of course not in practice, the requirement of labour was limited to post-pubertal males. Economic liberalism and the economic restrictions of the ideal evangelical family found no difficulty in accommodating to each other, despite their apparent contradictions.[45] This explains, for instance, Philip's boast that he had decided to set up as an independent weaver master (in the 1790s) because of his abhorrence at the use of child labour in the factory where he then worked.[46] But his arguments in the *Researches* fell within the framework of Smithian liberalism, and this seems to have been why they were so easily accepted by the British government.

If this is the case, then the arguments put forward by Susan Newton-King, to the effect that Ordinance 50 was part of an attempt

'to increase the labour supply available to the colonists',[47] would not seem valid. Certainly in the early nineteenth century, not all the measures of the colonial government were in direct response to the demands of colonial landowners. As W. M. Macmillan had argued in *The Cape Colour Question*, the changes of Cape policy have to be seen within the context of the British Empire as a whole, and of the metropole in particular. He did not himself provide an explanation for the change in sentiment, which he considered to be crucial to the emancipation of the Khoi and the slaves, but the ideas which have been developed in the sixty years since *The Cape Colour Question* was written could be incorporated into his arguments without doing them fundamental damage.

V

In view of this, it is not difficult to understand Philip's refusal to acquiesce in the republication of the *Researches*. In the imperial context, the book still had its relevance, as the British West Indies began to adapt to a world without slaves, but in South Africa its role was finished. It had been a campaigning book, and the campaign had been won. Ordinance 50 of 1828, and its confirmation by the British government, which Philip saw as a more important measure (perhaps because he was personally involved in the decision-making process in this latter case), had given the Khoi freedom from legal discrimination. Submitting to a common human failing, Philip overestimated the importance of what he considered to be his major achievement. The Khoi had now been given the chance to make their own way in the labour market and it was up to them to take it. Philip was confident that many of them would succeed and that the failure of those who did not would be their own fault. Philip's sentiments were also shared by the earliest Cape liberals, who looked to him for leadership, as they viewed the emancipation not only of the Khoi but also of the slaves. Just before the ex-slaves acquired full control over their labour, with the end of the so-called apprenticeship in 1838, an editorial in the *South African Commercial Advertiser*, written by Philip's son-in-law John Fairbairn, stressed that, when the apprentices were free, 'it will be as other free men, *who depend on employment for food and upon character for employment*'.[48] If it was to work more efficiently, they felt, the labour market should be harsh but fair.

In the event, Philip came to realize that the fairness of the labour market had to be continually defended. In the 1830s he was one of those who were most instrumental in ensuring that a proposed Vagrancy Act was vetoed by the Colonial Office as in contravention of Ordinance 50.[49] Also, right at the end of his life, his last struggle was to maintain the position of the mission stations which he saw not just as religious institutions but as bases from which the labourers could defend their freedom by giving them some limited bargaining position. It was, he wrote, 'the old struggle under a new form ... to bring the people back to slavery by putting down the Institutions'.[50]

Philip's achievement in this regard should not be overestimated. Such research as has been done on the workings of Ordinance 50 would seem to suggest that its actual effect on day-to-day labour relations in the eastern Cape was fairly slight.[51] Nevertheless, perhaps Macmillan was right to argue that, by the 1920s, 'The Coloured People have no political grievance, are proud of their rights and, in spite of all disabilities, not only survive, but are definitely making upward progress'.[52] This was a result of the outlawing of legislation on the basis of colour in the Cape colony, and he hoped that similar action might yet save the Africans from the degradation with which they were threatened. This was the political message of *The Cape Colour Question,* and it was one that was signally not heeded. Not only were the civil disabilities of the Africans steadily sharpened, but, from the very moment at which he wrote, the rights and position of the so-called 'Cape Coloureds' were steadily eroded.[53]

6. JAMES CROPPER, JOHN PHILIP AND THE *RESEARCHES IN SOUTH AFRICA*

1 W. M. Macmillan, *The Cape Colour Question: a historical survey* (London, 1927), p. 226.
2 It will be remembered that the slaves of the British Empire were emancipated in 1834, but until 1838 they were considered to be 'apprentices' and forced to serve their masters as before.
3 Cropper had indeed contributed £45 to the fund set up in Britain to cover Philip's costs. He was apparently the most generous single donor, in a list which contains many of the leading figures of the abolitionist movements, inc. ding Wilberforce and Hannah More, and many lesser lights. In total more than £1,100 was subscribed. See *The Evangelical Magazine and Missionary Chronicle*, New Series IX (1831), p. 87.

The volume also contains, on p. 135, a poem of praise for Dr Philip which is one of the worst conceivable examples of pious verse.
4 On these, see above all W. M. Macmillan, *Bantu, Boer, and Briton, the making of the South African native problem* (2nd edn., Oxford, 1963), especially chs 6–10.
5 Macmillan, *The Cape Colour Question*, p. 96, emphasis in original.
6 See, for instance, Sir George Cory, *The Rise of South Africa*, 6 vols, ii (London, 1910–1930), pp. 403–440.
7 John Philip, *Researches in South Africa: illustrating the civil, moral and religious condition of the native tribes including journals of the author's travels in the interior; together with detailed accounts of the progress of the Christian missions, exhibiting the influence of Christianity in promoting civilization*, 2 vols, ii (London, 1828), p. 365.
8 Ibid., ii, p. 370.
9 Macmillan, *The Cape Colour Question*, p. 98. It may of course have been a purely tactical decision, and later in his life he would stress the religious function of the missionary institutions, when arguing with those who, in the interests of a yet more all-inclusive economic liberalism, wished to provide their inhabitants with individual title to their land, and thus open them to purchase by Europeans. Ibid., p. 276.
10 On this conflict, see Martin Legassick 'The Griqua, The Sotho-Tswansa and the missionaries, 1780–1840: the politics of a frontier zone', (UCLA, 1969) ch. 9, although Legassick stresses the political content of the conflict more than the more strictly missiological.
11 Philip, *Researches*, i, p. xxviii.
12 Ibid., i, p. 216.
13 See above and ibid., p. 356f.
14 Ibid., i, pp. 218–19.
15 Ibid., i, p. 218.
16 John Philip, 'A narrative written for Buxton', (hereafter 'Narrative') in LMS archives, Africa Odds, Philip papers, Box 3, folder 5. Such matters were indeed taken seriously: Before Andries Waterboer dined with Governor Benjamin D'Urban in 1834 he was put through a course in table manners by Mrs Philip: Macmillan, *The Cape Colour Question*, p. 174.

17 Philip, *Researches*, i, p. 219.
18 C. Duncan Rice, 'Controversies over slavery in eighteenth and nineteenth century Scotland' in Lewis Perry and Michael Fellman (eds.), *Antislavery Reconsidered: new Perspectives on the abolitionists* (Baton Rouge, 1979), pp. 24–48.
19 Macmillan, *The Cape Colour Question*, p. 278. In his book, *John Philip (1775–1851): missions, race and politics in South Africa* (Aberdeen, 1986), pp. 65–6, which I only saw after this paper was largely completed, Andrew Ross points out that this comment by Philip does not mean that he had himself become a factory owner, but rather an independent artisan. This strengthens the case for Philip seeing his own career as a role model for the Khoi.
20 Philip, *Researches*, i, p. 218.
21 Cited in Philip, 'Narrative'.
22 Macmillan, *The Cape Colour Question*, p. 109f.
23 Philip, 'Narrative'; Harry A. Gailey jr., 'John Philip's role in Hottentot emancipation', *Journal of African History*, iii (1962), p. 426.
24 On brutality, see Henry C. Bredekamp and Susan Newton-King, 'The Subjugation of the Khoisan during the 17th and 18th Centuries', Conference on Economic Development and Racial Domination, University of the Western Cape, Bellville (1984), pp. 28–35, and Susan Newton-King's forthcoming thesis for the University of London; on the code, Hermann Giliomee, 'Die Administrasie-tydperk van Lord Caledon, 1807–1811', *Archives Year-Book for South African History*, xxix (1966), pp. 274–9; on the problem in general, D. van Arkel, G. C. Quispel and R. J. Ross, *'De Wijngaard des Heeren?': Een onderzoek naar de wortels van 'die blanke baasskap' in Zuid-Afrika* (Leiden, 1983), ch. 4.
25 Philip, *Researches*, i, pp. 142–174.
26 Ibid., pp. 175–89.
27 Ibid., pp. 384–6.
28 Ibid., i, p. 366.
29 For example, ibid., i, pp. 369–70. He also quotes from David Hume, a more unlikely source for a Christian minister, given Hume's notorious irreligion
30 Ibid., i, p. 378.
31 Macmillan, *The Cape Coloured Question*, p. 217.
32 Ibid., p. 218.
33 Philip 'Narrative', section entitled 'Beneficial effects of the labours of the missionaries in South Africa'.
34 Gailey, 'John Philip's role', pp. 431–2.
35 Philip, 'Narrative'.
36 Keith S. Hunt, *Sir Lowry Cole: Governor of Mauritius 1823–1828, Governor of the Cape of Good Hope 1828–1833; a study in colonial administration* (Durban, 1974), pp. 87, 94.
37 See, for example, William Green, *British Slave Emancipation: the sugar colonies and the grest experiment, 1830–1865* (Oxford, 1976).
38 This seemingly negative description of Buxton's activities would probably not have been disavowed by the man himself certainly not by the modern

historian most sympathetic in outlook to the abolitionists. See David Brion Davis' 'Commentary' on Roger Anstey, 'Slavery and the Protestant Ethic' in Michael Craton (ed.) *Roots and Branches; current directions in slave studies* (Waterloo, 1979), p. 180.

39 See, for example, Howard Temperley, 'Capitalism, slavery and ideology', *Past and Present*, lxv (1977), pp. 97–8, commenting on Reginald Coupland, *The British Anti-Slavery Movement* (London, 1933).

40 Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1944); Seymour Drescher, *Econocide: British Slavery in the Era of Abolition* (Pittsburgh, 1977).

41 David Brion Davis, *Slavery and Human Progress* (New York and Oxford, 1984), p. 119; see also *idem*, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770–1823* (Ithaca and London, 1975); Temperley, 'Capitalism, slavery and ideology'; and the various essays in Christine Bolt and Seymour Drescher (eds), *Anti-Slavery, Religion and Reform: essays in memory of Roger Anstey* (Folkestone, 1980) and in James Walvin (ed.), *Slavery and British Society, 1776–1846* (London, 1982), especially David Eltis, 'Abolitionist perceptions of society after slavery'.

42 Istvan Hont and Michael Ignatieff, 'Needs and justice in *The Wealth of Nations*: an introductory essay', in *idem.* (eds), *Wealth and Virtue: The Shaping of Political Economy in the Scottish Enlightenment.*

43 Seymour Drescher, 'Public opinion and the destruction of British colonial slavery' and James Walvin, 'The propaganda of anti-slavery', both in Walvin (ed.), *Slavery and British Society.*

44 Davis, *Slavery and Human Progress*, pp. 180–91.

45 Whether or not Philip's recollections of his motives half a century earlier are accurate is beside the point. If they were, he was well ahead of his time in condemning child labour. Further, the relationship between early liberalism and the evangelical remodelling of the family, which determined its age- and sex-specificity, has not been fully discussed, so far as I am aware, but see for example Catharine Hall, 'The early formation of Victorian domestic ideology' in Sandra Burman (ed.), *Fit Work for Women* (London, 1979).

46 Macmillan, *The Cape Colour Question*, pp. 97–8.

47 Susan Newton-King, 'The labour market of the Cape colony, 1807–1828', in Shula Marks and Anthony Atmore (eds), *Economy and Society in pre-industrial South Africa* (London, 1980), pp. 171–208. The quotation is from p. 197.

48 *South African Commercial Advertiser*, 21 November 1838 (emphasis in original), cited in Nigel Worden, 'Cape slave emancipation and rural labour in a comparative context', unpublished paper, 1983.

49 Macmillan, *The Cape Colour Question*, pp. 249–59. An attempt to introduce a Squatters Act in 1851, of much the same tenor as the Vagrancy Act, was to be torpedoed by the resistance of the western Cape agricultural proletariat, or at least by fears of this among the white élite. See John Marincowitz, 'From "Colour Question" to "Agrarian Problem" at the Cape: reflections on the interim', below Chapter 7.

50 Cited in Macmillan, *The Cape Colour Question*, p. 227.

51 L. C. Duly, 'A revisit with the Cape's Hottentot Ordinance of 1828' in Marcelle Kooy (ed.), *Studies in Economics and Economic History: essays in honour of Professor H. M. Robertson* (London, 1972); J. S. Marais, *The Cape Coloured People, 1652–1937* (London, 1939), pp. 179–86.
52 Macmillan, *The Cape Colour Question*, p. 287.
53 It is not just the disenfranchisement of the so-called 'Cape Coloureds' in the 1950s and 1960s which is of importance here, but also the workings of the Industrial Councils and Apprenticeship Boards from the late 1920s on, which greatly restricted 'coloured' entry into the skilled trades. On this, see the forthcoming Leiden PhD thesis by Pieter Van Duin on the Cape Town artisanate and, in the meantime, S. T. van der Horst, *Native Labour in South Africa* (Oxford, 1942), pp. 24–45.

7. FROM 'COLOUR QUESTION' TO 'AGRARIAN PROBLEM' AT THE CAPE: REFLECTIONS ON THE INTERIM

1 'The Cape Colony ceased to know any legal distinction between white and coloured....' W. M. Macmillan, *The Cape Colour Question. A historical survey* (London, 1927), p. 257.
2 W. M. Macmillan, 'The problem of the Coloured people 1792–1842' in E. A. Walker (ed), *Cambridge History of the British Empire*, viii (London, 1963), p. 299.
3 Macmillan, *The Cape Colour Question*, p. 265.
4 For example, P. L. Scholtz, 'The Cape Colony, 1853–1902' in C. F. J. Muller (ed), *Five Hundred Years. A History of South Africa* (Pretoria, 1969); T. R. H. Davenport, 'The consolidation of a new society. The Cape Colony' in M. Wilson and L. Thompson (eds), *Oxford History of South Africa* (Oxford, 1969).
5 These views are outlined in B. J. Liebenberg, 'Die vrystelling van die slawe in die Kaapkolonie en die implikasies daarvan', MA thesis, (Univ. of the Orange Free State, 1960), pp. 183–99.
6 For example in his article, 'The abolition of the Masters and Servants Act', *South African Labour Bulletin*, ii, (1979), Colin Bundy is quite correct to emphasize the continuities in the conditions of farm work and the composition of the farm labour force during and after slavery. However, his assertions that the 1841 and 1856 Masters and Servants Acts entrenched racial domination at the same time as it did class domination because all servants were 'browns' and all masters were 'whites', and that the 1873 Act was merely a quantitative step towards increased coercion, both fail in their blandness to grasp the complexities, struggles and sense of process involved in constituting the western-Cape's labouring classes. Macmillan stated: '... the study of events in the second half of the nineteenth century makes it clear that those have done a disservice to historical understanding who have deprecated the fundamental importance of the abolition of slavery.' Macmillan, *The Cape Colour Question*, p. 6.
7 Macmillan, *The Cape Colour Question*, pp. 267, 271.
8 Ibid., p. 267 *et seq.*