

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

JOHN BROWN Publisher

F. L. CANNON *General Manager*  
Telegrams: OXONIAN CAPE TOWN  
P.O. BOX 1141  
Telephone: 41-0171



Thibault House  
Thibault Square  
Cape Town



SOUTHERN AFRICAN BRANCH

Representing: METHUEN & CO. LTD · JONATHAN CAPE LTD · JOHN MURRAY (PUBLISHERS) LTD  
MICHAEL JOSEPH LTD · A. & C. BLACK LTD · PICKERING & INGLIS LTD  
G. F. RAPKIN LTD · S. BAGSTER & SONS LTD · S.U. & C.S.S.M. · A. ZWEMMER LTD  
CHAPMAN & HALL LTD · E. & F. N. SPON LTD · TAVISTOCK PUBLICATIONS

OW/DHP

1/7/64

Mr A. Paton,  
23 Lynton Road,  
KLOOF,  
Natal.

HOFMEYR

Dear Alan,

Firstly to answer your queries of 26 June:

1. communist is on the analogy of liberal and Liberal Party; also of socialism, capitalism, etc. in the rest of the book.
2. goodwill it is, except in quotations.
3. coloured is on the analogy of white, black, negro (U.S.A. Negro). If we make it Coloured we shall also have to make it White throughout, which gets very ponderous-looking. African, Indian, are different because they embody geographical proper names. While Coloured would better convey, as it were, the Coloured nationalist who glories in his Colouredness, coloured is in my view more non-racial, distinguishing them less from the other races. (Isn't this what is called an argument ad hominem?) Every time we publish a book about the people of this country, this same problem arises, and the most satisfactory solution that Leo Marquard and I have arrived at is coloured, white. I have therefore overruled the query from the printer's reader, in the hope that you will approve. I have also corrected those few instances (about 4) where Coloured appears with a capital, to make it consistent throughout.
4. I find the present explanation satisfactory but am intrigued by your additional explanation. What is it? I may be able to slip it into the galleys if you sent it right away.

- 5. Surely this story is in already? But I can't find it. Where did I read it then? It is not one of those chunks crossed out on the MS, which I might have seen when reading between the lines. If you send it, I'll try to fit it in but am not sure that it is necessary or practicable.
- 6. Likewise, send it and I'll try, dependent on space. Where would you put it?
- 7. Hamilton Russell is away until next week, and nobody else not even the groundsman at Fernwood can tell me. But they are all convinced that Russell will know immediately.
- 8. These lines incorporated.
- 9. Correct on page proofs.
- 10. '... his virtues and his faults' seems more appropriate and not much less strong.

Now some further points:

- 11. Any additional pieces such as those mentioned in 4, 5, 6, above, and also the paras on Finance and Education, are, as you know, urgent because they may throw out pagination if too late.
- 12. I think it would be a pity to let go of the illuminating image of symbiosis just because a scientific pedant may object that Hofmeyr and his mother were, not dissimilar organisms. How does he know they weren't, anyway? Has he not read your life of Hofmeyr? SHORTER OXFORD (published 1947) says it is derived from Greek meaning 'a living together' (nothing about dissimilar organisms in the derivation) but its usage seems to be only 'Biol.' meaning 'Association of two different organisms, usually two plants (or two people?) or an animal and a plant, which live attached to each other...'. CONCISE OXFORD (new ed. publ. 1964) says nothing about 'Biol.' and defines it as 'permanent union between organisms each of which/for its existence upon the other ...'. Nothing 'dissimilar' about that. So let us stet.
- 13. I must still check your two points (in yours of 28 April) about the £5,000 for the SCA, and whether Fort Hare falls under BAD. By the time you return galleys of these pages I shall have them.
- 14. I propose to include in the Index a glossary of Afrikaans words and also a bibliography of works and journals cited in the text, with full details about publishers, publication date, etc.

depends/

- 15. James is coming along with the dustjacket.
- 16. Illustrations are rather behindhand and we must press on with these next week.
- 17. Blurb likewise.
- 18. Do you intend to have a Foreword?
- 19. There are various smaller points on the galleys that I hope to query with you next week.
- 20. Index. We must settle who is to do this, and how and by when. The two candidates are John Luker, editorial manager of the Rustica Press, and Randolph Vigne. Luker has done several indexes for us and he has done them well, reliably, quickly, and cheaply. Randolph has not done an index for us but he has done other work. It is my frank opinion, and James's as well, that with this index we, or rather you, would do better to employ Luker, if we are to think purely in terms of getting the best job done in the time available. But as you know, there are other considerations too, and you after all are the person with whom the choice lies.
- 21. A set of galleys has gone to the Cape Argus for them to consider for serialisation (at the instigation of Scott Haigh, I think). I should mention that we are by no means sure that serialisation will not positively harm sales of the book. There is always this dilemma: whether serialised extracts titillate the curiosity of readers into buying the whole book or whether they encourage readers to believe that, having read the extracts, they may now dispense with the need to buy the book. What it comes to, therefore, is that you and we shall need to be well remunerated for serial rights before it is worth giving them away. When the Cape Argus comes through with its offer, we shall discuss this again.
- 22. Would you check through the galleys to ensure that we should not be obtaining permission to quote passages from other publishers. Anything more than about ten lines of text needs permission.
- 23. I have written about legal opinion concerning defamation. The same applies of course to quoting banned persons etc.
- 24. In reading the galleys, how comfortable and pleasurable did you find the physical act of reading? I ask because James and I are pleased with this particular solution to the problem of cutting down the extent of the book as much as possible, while still retaining adequate readability. But then we are both short sighted and may not be the best judges of that.

(4)

This seems to have become quite a long letter. If there are other points outstanding, as I feel sure there are, would you list them too, so that we can fully take stock of what still remains to be done.

With good wishes,

Yours sincerely,

*David*

D.H. PHILIP  
Editorial Manager