

tural role in the creation and recreation of states and societies alike. In order to provide such an explanation, Frank would have had to transform the suggestive observations in the book's brief conclusion (pp. 407–415) into a robust guiding argument, to be threaded from one end of the book to the other. He also would have needed to have been less given to accepting the orientalist views of Western diplomats like Joseph Grew at face value (p. 68), and less inclined to gloss the work of Giulio Cesare Montagna, an Italian official who played an important role in preparing the treaty for the Greek-Turkish exchange, as having “carried out his task with equanimity, fairness, and good humour” (p. 70). Perhaps most tellingly, he would need to have been less insistent on downplaying Fridtjof Nansen's role in its design and implementation as the League of Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (even as he documents in great detail how Nansen threw his weight behind the idea, laid the groundwork for its acceptance, agreed that it could be compulsory, championed it before statesmen, diplomats, and journalists, expressed dismay when initially unable to conclude a treaty that would formalize it, intervened powerfully in the Conference of Lausanne in December 1922 to underscore its urgent necessity, made glowing references to the resettlement efforts with which it was accompanied in his Nobel Peace Prize speech later that month, helped to secure the financial and institutional support of the League and foreign governments, and claimed partial responsibility for it for years to come (pp. 50–58, 61–70, 88–89, 410–411).

Making Minorities History is a deeply researched and carefully constructed work

that will be of great interest to scholars and students of state-building, forced migration, minority politics, empire and decolonization, and twentieth-century European history. Like any book, it is not without its limitations. But it is a valuable and enriching contribution to the growing literature on population transfer's manifold histories, and it should be consulted by all those interested in the study of “nations and nationalism”, broadly understood. Once again, I benefited from it a great deal.

Note

- 1 Here Frank refines and augments a discussion initially sketched in his first book. See M. Frank, *Expelling the Germans: British Opinion and post-1945 Population Transfer in Context*, Oxford 2007, pp. 15–16.

**Tanja Bühner / Flavio Eichmann / Stig Förster / Benedikt Stuchtey (eds.):
Cooperation and Empire: Local
Realities of Global Processes, New
York: Berghahn Books 2017, 392 p.**

Reviewed by
Satoshi Mizutani, Kyoto

In this age, when colonialism is universally condemned, why do we study those indigenous peoples who are seen to have cooperated with European colonial empires? Why not just focus on ‘subalterns,’ dissidents, or revolutionaries? Ever since Ronald Robinson famously brought the issue to the forefront of academic debate in the 1970s, with his theory of ‘collabora-

tion', this has been a highly sensitive topic. Surely, the academic study of collaboration should not serve to reproduce the apologist view of colonialism as equally benefiting all parties involved, including non-Europeans of all social groups. As Wolfgang Reinhard, in his historiographical chapter of this volume, rightly points out, 'colonialism was a system of rule-based upon an alliance of exploitation between colonial powers and indigenous elites at the expense of the common colonial subjects' (p. 370). If the study of cooperation is important morally, it is because certain modes of violence, exploitation, discrimination, and injustice – the consequences of which are still with us today – would not be adequately understood without a critical engagement with it. In fact, as a simple matter of fact, colonialism would not have worked without the inclusion of colonized subjects, particularly elites, into the administrative, military, and other institutions of imperial governance, even if such inclusion differed in degree and form. Like it or not, no history of a colonized society would be complete without addressing the question of the indigenous elite's relationship with the regime.

The authors of *Cooperation and Empire* re-open the question of 'collaboration' as discussed by Robinson decades ago. With the use of a more neutral term, 'cooperation', their aim is not to simply reapply Robinson's framework to newly-explored cases. Rather, they bring new ideas such as 'hybridity' and 'mimicry' into dialogue with Robinson, a cross-fertilization that re-examines the question of cooperation from critical perspectives.

One of the merits of this collection is its diversity in terms of the periods, regions,

and themes covered, which allows readers to rethink cooperation from a much wider perspective than Robinson's theory would permit. In the early modern era, the terms of cooperation were different from those in the modern era, even counter-intuitive. Dealing with the Portuguese overseas empire of the 16th century, Polónia and Rosa Capelão show how women – both European and indigenous – played active roles as intermediaries, a phenomenon less observable in more modern empires where gender, in combination with race and class, increasingly served to hierarchize imperial social relations. Geopolitical differences across continents also produced significantly different terms of cooperation. In some parts of Asia, the modes of cooperation reflected the presence of non-European empires, which remained resistant to European penetration well into the nineteenth century. Tanja Bühner's chapter on cooperation between the Nizam of Hyderabad and British diplomats shows that contexts existed where it was Europeans who found themselves in the weaker position. In fact, the British residents at the Nizam's Court tried to adapt to the local culture, giving Homi Bhabha's concept of 'mimicry' rather different connotations. In British India, where the Mughal empire had already established an imperial polity, Britain did not have to build administrative infrastructures from scratch. But this condition did not necessarily obtain in other parts of the British empire. Ralph A. Austen's chapter shows that these differences in pre-colonial structures of government-produced different results. According to Austen, tax collection in South Asia was more efficient than in Africa because of the tax system that had been developed

under the Mughal rule, which Britain inherited and made its own.

A renewed study of cooperation is especially useful when it facilitates the re-examination of certain key concepts in colonial studies. One such concept is the 'invention of tradition', advocated by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger. Some of the case studies show how the European selection of indigenous cooperators was arbitrary in ways that reflected colonizers' projected images of indigenous tradition. Both Ute Schüren and Ulrike Schaper discuss indigenous people whom Europeans regarded as the 'chiefs' of colonized societies in the contexts of Spanish rule in sixteenth-century Yucatán and German rule in Cameroon, respectively. They show how Europeans imposed their own image of indigenous elites or leaders to suit their imperial ends, reducing, in that process, the original heterogeneity of the societies they colonized. European efforts to rule through a tradition they themselves fabricated did not always work, however, as Myriam Yakoubi's piece on cooperation between the British and Faisal I of Iraq shows. In its effort to invent a monarchy in Iraq to serve as a vehicle for imperial intervention, Britain installed the Hashemite Faisal from Mecca as Iraq's first king. Contrary to Britain's preconceived notion of Faisal as a natural leader of the local people, he turned out to be not a 'puppet' of Britain, but rather a person who sought to fulfill his own interests and eventually demanded independence.

The above case of Faisal calls into question the very meaning of cooperation. Did 'cooperators' actually cooperate as expected by imperial rulers? To what extent and how did they sabotage the cooperation they had

agreed to, or even resist colonial rule? Vincent O'Malley's work on the Maoris called 'Kupapas', who are commonly supposed to have 'collaborated' with the British in a treasonous way, shows that they in fact pursued their own interests, not hesitating to switch allegiance when the need arose.

It is important to understand that cooperation and resistance were not always opposites. As famously experienced in the case of English-educated Indians in South Asia, nationalism could arise from the discontent felt by those who were initially regarded as cooperators. Tensions between imperial rulers and their indigenous cooperators were not uncommon, and mismanagement of these tensions often ended up inviting anti-colonial sentiments and movements. Such tensions existed, for example, in Anglo-Sudanese cooperation in the field of school education. As the chapter by Iris Seri-Hersch shows, beneath a façade of peaceful cooperation, European officers regarded anglicized Sudanese officials as a threat, while many of the latter offered their service with eventual independence in mind. High degrees of adaptation to Western norms and values did not always correspond to an increased sense of imperial allegiance. Charles V. Reed's chapter on European-educated African elites in South Africa is highly illustrative of this point. Upholding the liberal values of the British Constitution, what these African elites demanded was nothing less than racial equality; this constituted a fundamental challenge to the asymmetrical nature of the colonial relationship, not an acceptance of their status quo position as faithful local agents of empire.

Cooperation did not just concern European imperial authorities on the one

hand and colonized elites on the other. The colonial presence of European non-officials, such as planters and private settlers, often complicated the picture, not least because of their ruthless and reckless pursuits of self-interest. In his essay on colonial Martinique, Flavio Eichmann shows how French administrators and rich sugar planters in the colony formed an alliance that subverted the aims of the imperial authorities in Paris. It was widely observed that non-official Europeans in colonies were prone to misconduct, with their violent and discriminatory treatment of indigenous subjects having a detrimental impact on ideologies of European civilization and white prestige. It was often the case that colonial states failed to control these Europeans, leaving the colonized helplessly exposed to denigrating forms of mistreatment, including genocide. The relationship between official and non-official Europeans was neither purely cooperative nor purely antagonistic. Matthias Häußler's chapter on white settlers in German Southwest Africa shows how the inability

of the colonial state to control the settlers' shocking violence against Africans sparked a revolt against German rule, the subsequent suppression of which caused even greater suffering.

As far as the harm that cooperation inflicted on common people is concerned, even more complicated is the exploitation and violence meted out by indigenous co-operators. A notable case is that of 'Native Guards': a village-level police force in colonial Africa. Comparing the institutions of Native Guards in British, French, and Portuguese colonies, Alexander Keese argues that insufficient remuneration, neglect by their European superiors, and alienation from the local population due to being from other areas combined to make Native Guards notoriously prone to extortion, corruption, and violence.

The editors of this stimulating volume should be congratulated for bringing together such a wide range of topics without a loss of focus. This book will surely serve as food for thought for anyone interested in this important topic.