Permit me to start with a brief anecdote from Marie Philip. At a discussion between publishers in London in the early nineties, someone from Faber was heard to remark: 'Books don't make money,' to which an Ethiopian librarian replied, 'No, but they make a difference.' Marie Philip's response to this was characteristic: "For books to make a difference, they first have to be made."[1]

Of the making of books, there may indeed be no end, but there had to be a beginning. This paper proposes to examine how two people set out, in the dark days of apartheid, to make books that would make a difference in South Africa. The South Africa at the time in question was a place where a difference needed to be made. It was also a place where the books being made were not designed to make the kind of difference Marie and like-minded people had in mind. Let me backtrack for a moment.

David Philip came down from Oxford in 1950 and started work as a bookshop manager in Cape Town. Three years later, in 1953, he joined OUP (SA) in Cape Town. Six years after that, in August 1959, he was entrusted with the task of establishing the first OUP branch in Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, (now Harare, Zimbabwe). With that task successfully completed, the Philips returned to Cape Town in 1962 and David became the Editorial Manager at OUP.

Like Leo Marquard, his predecessor and publishing mentor, David Philip was interested primarily in publishing good books that were relevant in the South African context - social, political and cultural. In the course of his nearly twenty years with OUP, Philip had gained a great deal of publishing expertise in commissioning publications, book production and design. He had learnt at first hand to deal with the vitally important issues of promotion and distribution. In the course of numerous informal consultations with the veteran Dutch-born publisher A A Balkema, he had absorbed much of the older man's enthusiasm for fine typography and high quality printing. He had also acquired the skills of establishing and maintaining sound relationships with creative writers, academic and other technical experts, booksellers, printers and journalists. It was a thorough-going apprenticeship and preparation for what was to come.

He had also watched, with growing dismay, how the National Party government had gradually increased the number of repressive laws it felt it needed to consolidate its power over every aspect of the physical and, particularly, the intellectual life of the country.
Censorship had already had a long and dishonourable history in South Africa, and it had always been fiercely resisted. From the confrontations of the 1820 settler Thomas Pringle against the British Governor of the Cape onwards, colonial authorities and their successors had repeatedly tried to control the free flow of information. When the NP came to power in 1948, wartime restrictions were still a very recent memory. Also still on the statute book were the Riotous Assemblies Act of 1930 and the 1931 Entertainment (Censorship) Act, which proscribed a comprehensive range of topics considered "offensive". These included just about everything that made life interesting: sex, nudity, labour relations, social congress between whites and their darker-skinned compatriots, public violence (like boxing matches) etc. Even unpatriotic behaviour was proscribed. With the accession to power of the National Party in 1948, more and far harsher laws were added.

After 1948, the determination of the white minority ruling class to achieve absolute control over the politically and economically powerless black majority gained additional impetus. The inevitable consequence was that already stringent restrictions were exacerbated to such an extent that, with each new piece of repressive legislation passed, relations between the rulers and the ruled were incrementally poisoned. Only by outright oppression could the domineering intentions of the Nationalists be realised. For them to sustain the ideology of apartheid, it was necessary to prevent the transmission of ideas and even, by means of none-too-subtle propaganda, to counter them. In Vaclav Havel's words: "Because a repressive regime is captive to its own lies, it must falsify everything."[2] As in virtually every other totalitarian system anywhere, censorship became inevitable. Just as inevitably, repression invited opposition. There could be no accommodation between censorship on one hand and morally responsible publishing on the other.

The choice facing publishers was between confrontation and capitulation. While the larger companies, both indigenous and foreign, all played it safe and made their money on school textbooks, the small oppositional publishers tried defiance and paid the price of their boldness. But in the medium term, even their best efforts were insufficient and the voices of many, particularly black writers and thinkers, were silenced - by banning, by exile, by death. Nadine Gordimer told an audience at the University of Cape Town in 1976 that "the lively and important group of black writers who burst into South African literature in the fifties and early sixties disappeared from it as if through a trap door."[3]

Like others at the time, the Philips were becoming increasingly disturbed about the oppressive apartheid regime.[4] The supremacist ideology of the National Party was anathema to people who, like them, had been nurtured in the old Cape Liberal tradition. (David Philip owned that he belonged to "the liberal-radical fringe probably more liberal than radical"[5] while Marie Philip claimed that "Politically, we are kind-of socialist liberal democrats".[6])

Other role players were less concerned with principle and more with physical and financial threats. James Currey, who left OUP Cape Town to return to England at this time, was quite explicit about the attitude of the head of the Cape Town office: "In 1963/64," he said, Fred Cannon, OUP's General Manager, "welcomed the establishment of a censorship board because he said it made life easier for a publisher than self-censorship."[7] By 1971, the parent OUP in England, evidently fearing for the safety and profitability of their South African enterprise, ordered the latter to withdraw from publishing texts on local history and politics and to concentrate instead on increasing the company's share of the growing market.
for books for African primary schools: in effect, self-imposed censorship, in accordance with the hardening apartheid ideology of the time.

Rather than allow the expression of alternative views to be silenced in this way, and believing in "the truth of the imagination," David Philip cashed his pension and, operating together with his wife Marie, launched David Philip Publishers. It was their avowed intent to publish under the slogan "Books That Matter for Southern Africa", by which they meant "academic books and serious trade books for the thinking public"[8], "without any fixed ideological line"[9]. Since by training they were essentially academic publishers, Marie told Isabel Essery in 2004, they had initially expected "books of scholarship"[10] to be the basis of their list.

Marie Philip herself was no newcomer to publishing. After graduating from UCT 20 years earlier, she had started her career with Longmans Green & Co in Cape Town. After her marriage in 1953, she continued to free-lance for OUP, both in Cape Town and in Salisbury. In the new venture, while the vision was David’s, it was Marie’s task to ensure that practicalities were taken care of. She told the Weekly Mail: We ve always said we live from book to mouth".[11] Even allowing for the benefit of the depth of their combined experience, it was an almost quixotically courageous venture. Yet in all this, as in everything else, Marie was David’s partner, not his Sancho Panza. Looking back half a century later, she remarked: "We think that we have been doubly fortunate in also working together. there is no other way we would have wished to spend our working lives."[12]

With so little founding capital, the start of the firm was extremely modest. The staff consisted of David and Marie Philip, and two colleagues who left OUP with them: their secretary, Carol Cooper, and John Murray, who assumed responsibility for sales. Them four, no more. Their business premises were the family cottage in Newlands. Their editing desk was their bed, which had to be cleared of galley proofs each night before it could be put to more conventional uses. Their warehouse was their garage. Their marketing manager’s office was the garden shed with a telephone line slung through the branches of a lemon tree.[13] When the firm’s first co-publication from abroad arrived and the driver of the delivery vehicle called: Bring out your fork-lift truck, they brought out their wheelbarrow.[14] Themselves.

Yet it was here, Douglas Livingstone wrote, that

DPP carved Holds of Excellence:

Rare artifacts mundanely dubbed Good Books.[15]

In many ways this set the pattern for the future functioning of the company. For as long as the Philips were running it, DPP gave out the signal that David and Marie, as the managers, would remain in immediate, intimate, hands-on control. Call it "the personal touch", call it "DIY", sing "They Did It Their Way", but their system worked. More than that, against all the odds and against all predictions of failure, they achieved remarkable success in what they set out to do: to make books that made a difference. We wanted to publish books on South Africa that came from inside the country, encouraging debate, rather than books
from outside dedicated to telling us what to do, David Philip told the Weekly Mail 21 years later.[16]

The Philips' personal integrity and their unwavering commitment to publishing excellence gained, and retained, the respect and admiration of their clients, their competitors and the intelligent reading public, even though the firm was never exactly awash with cash. In fact, DPP was largely funded by bank overdraft. David wryly remarked in 1991, "during the first sixteen years of our existence, we made a living tenuous and anxious though it was but not a profit."[17] The British publisher James Currey told Isabel Essery that at times DPP had to use "their sales from imports as working capital".[18] When DPP was out of the red for the first time, their bank manager sent David a Superman card, inscribed, 'O doer of mighty deeds'.[19] Even then, such profits as they did make were not what would be regarded as adequate by most commercial standards.

And it may be that this should be seen as one of the chief factors in the success of DPP. Where, for the multinationals and other large publishers, the bottom line determined everything - and had to do so if they were to satisfy the expectations of their shareholders -, a family firm like DPP could be guided by other and worthier considerations. David Philip remarked in 1995,

"we have had the freedom to take risks and to be bold and even eccentric where we believed the situation demanded it; the freedom from cumbersome committees; the freedom to follow our own publishing instincts to back a new talent or an original line of thought that we believed in."[20]

His remark neatly encapsulates much of what characterised DPP: risk, boldness, eccentricity, flexibility, instinct, talent, originality, faith terms virtually absent from the vocabulary of business enterprises anywhere, but key words in determining the success of DPP. Let a single example serve to illustrate what such freedom meant:

"We were able to decide in 1987 to publish an investigation into detention and torture in South Africa a decision that a committee might not easily have been able to approve in 1987"[21], given that the book in question was "a powerful indictment of our security police."[22]

Typical DPP publications were Uprooting Poverty by Francis Wilson and Mamphela Ramphele (which won them the Noma Award for Publishing in Africa in 1990), Sanctions against Apartheid by Mark Orkin, Resistance Art in South Africa by Sue Williamson, God in South Africa by Albert Nolan, Women and Gender in Southern Africa by Cherryl Walker, The History of the African People of South Africa by Paul Maylam, and so on. David Philip told a conference on censorship at UCT in April 1980, "We have never declined a book because we thought it might be declared undesirable. And I trust we never shall."[23] Nor did they, as the very many awards won by their books testify. In 1991 alone, seven of their books won local and international literary awards.[24]

In addition to books with explicit political content, which were likely to give offence, DPP also published important aesthetic books: novels, poetry, art books, including many with
more than merely local interest. The remarkable diversity of the titles on their lists is a fascinating reflection of the Philips' catholic concerns. They published scores of fine children's books, among the most notable being those by Niki Daly and Marguerite Poland. Their poetry list reads like a compendium of all the major South African poets of the sixties and seventies: Douglas Livingstone, Guy Butler, Sipho Sepamla, Jeremy Cronin, Don Maclellan, Sydney Clouts, Wally Serote, Chris Mann, Stephen Watson, David Wright and dozens of others. They introduced many new young novelists like Menan du Plessis, Ivan Vladislavic, Mike Nicol and David Medalie. They actively encouraged black writers, especially black women writers, whose publishing options were extremely limited. It is safe to say that the names of Bessie Head, Miriam Tlali, Sindiwe Magona, Ellen Kuzwayo, and others who will be mentioned later, would not have been as well known in South Africa as they are, were it not for the exposure their works were given by DPP. DPP published them because they believed that "Creative writers have the power to reach our hearts and to help heal our terrible divisions".[25] It may have been a small company, but the difference it made was real.

However, courage and idealism alone cannot guarantee the success of any business enterprise. Unlike other, sometimes more radical publishers like Ravan, and later Skotaville, Seriti sa Sechaba, even AD Donker, DPP had no access to external sources of funding. The firm was reliant upon the taste, instinct, courage and hard work of the Philips. It is significant that when the apartheid regime eventually surrendered and foreign funders no longer saw the need to subsidise anti-apartheid publishers, most of these latter fell into decline. Essery has shown that this was the result largely of their reliance upon subsidies without due regard to sound management, marketing and distribution practices. DPP, by contrast, flourished through having been run as a business proposition from its inception.

Part of their success was that, from the beginning, they had shrewdly sought international as well as local markets. As Marie said: "We did not intend to limit ourselves to the small reading market of southern Africa. We would not specialise but would publish any good book that came along."[26]

Another of DPP's survival strategies was the firm's commitment to participation in international book fairs, particularly at Frankfurt, where they shared stands with British publishers, first with Rex Collings, later also with James Currey. The stand maintained in Frankfurt by the South African Publishers Association under the auspices of the Department of National Education excluded all books published by Ravan, Skotaville, Taurus and Donker.[27] DPP refused to have anything to do with it. "We would not let our books be displayed on the official South African stand," said Marie, "Books that were not welcome in libraries at home were requested for proud display amongst the proteas!"[28] In any case, "the libraries hardly [ever] bought our books, and the schools never did."[29]

Yet, ironically, the government actively encouraged the export of DPP publications giving tax advantages and grants "(even for us!)", said Marie[30] because of the foreign exchange they could earn the country!

There were other ironies, too. With the withdrawal of multinational publishers during the cultural boycott of South Africa in the late seventies, the influence of the old colonial models declined. As more South African writers were published for South African readers, local
voices became more audible. One outcome of this was that during the boycott, DPP gained some of its best-ever orders!

A notable contributory factor in this was the launching, in 1982, of Africasouth Paperbacks. DPP's intention here was "to provide previously unavailable texts for use in southern African universities,"[31] and, in the process, to go some way towards bridging what David Philip had called the "Unbridgeable Gap" when, for more than a decade, authors had been silenced. The 1960s became known as the decade of black silence .[32] The series brought back books by Z K Matthews and Es'kia Mphahlele, as well as others by Dan Jacobson and William Plomer. As a result of DPP's persistent applications to the Publications Appeal Board, many other, previously banned, books were unbanned and then republished in the series. They included such classic texts as Richard Rive's Emergency, Peter Abrahams' The Path of Thunder, Todd Matshikiza's Chocolates for my Wife and Can Themba's The Will to Die.[33] It is hardly an exaggeration to say that, thanks to DPP, South African fiction came home. Between 1982 and 1994, no fewer than 50 titles were issued as Africasouth Paperbacks and Africasouth New Writing. Indeed, the series formed the foundation of DPP's fiction list.

A further feature of DPP's strategy was its deliberate focus on co-operation with a remarkably varied range of British and American publishers. Up to a third of all DPP's academic titles were co-published with foreign companies. In the 12 years between 1973 and 1994, DPP co-published some 90 books with 25 British and 15 American publishing houses, as well as with a slight scattering of others elsewhere. Also, as James Currey noted, "DPP were very effective agents in SA for a whole range of British publishers."[34] It was a strategy that yielded enormous benefits. It extended their print runs. It boosted morale. It helped DPP gain recognition as a publishing entity with an international presence. It secured many an opportunity to sell and buy co-publication and translation rights. All this helped DPP to counter both the customarily low sales figures in South Africa and the relative weakness of the local currency. Co-publication was a vitally important factor in enabling DPP to avoid being absorbed by the multinationals. Marie Philip said that it was a tremendously important part of our survival, as a small publisher. [35]

Another, though less predictable, benefit inherent in the entire ethos according to which DPP functioned was the genuine care expended by the Philips on those they called "their" writers. "For us," Marie told an interviewer,

"the best part of publishing has been the camaraderie with the authors whom the crises and excitement of these years have brought into our lives essentially because they had books in them that spoke to the times, whether in literature or politics, theology or social history or nature conservation whatever. We've been educated by our authors and are proud of them... [36]

The feeling was reciprocated. In a personal letter, Govan Mbeki wrote that DPP was a happy meeting place for all of us who are ... associated with it. [37]

On their retirement, a journal wrote: "Their authors read like a Who's Who of the best literary and political thinkers in SA."[38]
Speaking of what he termed the "privilege" of working with a wide range of people, David Philip affirmed this view: "For us, publishing has been a people business, and we like that." [39] "And," Marie told me with characteristic enthusiasm, "it was fun!"

It was not all fun. Almost before the firm had got off the ground in 1972, Student Perspectives, only their second book, was banned. A pattern had been established and from then on they were continually harassed by the security police. Their books were confiscated, their mail was tampered with, their home telephone number was tapped, their daughter was detained. But none of their pain and distress was able to shake their conviction that the censorship laws and publishing restrictions had to be opposed as fiercely as possible. David Philip admitted the danger in such oppositional publishing, but continued: "All I can say is that we can do no other." [40] Needless to say, this did not make them popular in the corridors of power.

The artist Townley "Ginger" Johnson, author of the beautiful 1979 DPP publication Major Rock Paintings of Southern Africa, sent David Philip a painting with the title "Intrepid Publisher Being Chased By Hostile Forces ."

Chased or not, they persevered, and continued boldly publishing as many "good books" as they could. In this, they had the support of notable liberal authors, among them Alan Paton. Paton's Apartheid and the Archbishop was their first big break-through. Co-published in the UK and the USA, it won a major literary award. James Currey states that "Alan Paton and Nadine Gordimer were well established with publishers in the UK. They insisted that they should be co-published in SA by DPP." [41] Twenty years later, Gordimer, the first South African to win the Nobel Prize for literature, paid them this tribute: the Philips, she wrote, had "started an independent publishing firm during some of the darkest days of censorship [and] In spite of all the odds, they have come of age as among not only the bravest, but also among the most highly regarded of our publishers." [42] Gus Ferguson was even more explicit: "DPP carried the flag of liberal democracy in a climate of political barbarism." [43] [Essery interview. 25 August 2004]

The barbarism was perfectly legal. Allister Sparks, former editor of the Rand Daily Mail, repeated the observation of his newspaper's legal adviser that there were 120 pieces of legislation that ... restricted what could be published on pain of prosecution. [44] This is not the place to catalogue them, but mention must be made of some which impacted severely on the South African publishing industry, for, if found guilty of contravening them, a publisher was liable to a heavy fine or imprisonment or both. The Suppression of Communism Act of 1950 prohibited outright certain listed individuals (regarded as dangerous to the State) from being quoted. The Post Office Act of 1958 prohibited "undesirable" publications from being sent by post. The Publications and Entertainment Act of 1963, revamped and made even more draconian as the Publications Act of 1974, had the power to ban books. And then there were several versions of the General Law Amendment Act. The 1969 one, nicknamed the "BOSS law" [Bureau for State Security], was "designed to control all information prejudicial to the interests of the state". [45]

After the Soweto uprising on 16 June 1976, Sipho Sepamla's poetry collection The Soweto I Love was banned. David Philip issued a press statement, saying:
"Whether we like what we hear or not, we should at least be able to know how the people of Soweto have responded to these events. Here is the articulate voice of an internationally recognised poet telling us what it is like in Soweto - and the authorities will not let us hear him. Do we realise what is happening to us?"[46]

The proclamation of the nation-wide State of Emergency in June 1986 led in the worst time of all, the proverbial darkness before the dawn. The combined effect of these and other laws was to prohibit the publication or dissemination of any material that quoted any person or publication proscribed by state officials, however ignorant or ill-informed. In the ten years between 1964 and 1974 alone, 8768 titles were listed.[47]

In June 1989 when police, acting under the Internal Security Act, seized the book Culture in Another South Africa, David Philip released a press statement, saying: "Only a government with little or no popular support could feel so threatened by a book about culture."[48] David Welsh pointed out that the chairman of the Publications Control Board J J Kruger had denied the existence of censorship, claiming that it was merely "control".[49]

While it is true that recourse might be had to the courts, the processes involved were lengthy, expensive, debilitating and by no means sure of success. The sheer weight of numbers eventually some 40 000 titles were "banned" made the life of publishers and librarians a nightmare. One example: Bloke Modisane's autobiography Blame Me on History was banned for being a "communistic" publication.[50]

But absurd laws often have loopholes. One such was that a book printed in South Africa could be sold here, while the imported version of the same text was banned by the South African Customs authorities. In this way, DPP co-published and sold Alex La Guma's A Walk in the Night, issued abroad by Heinemann in the African Writers Series but banned from being imported into South Africa.

So DPP did fight the censors and, as mentioned above, in many cases they won. They also fought on another front. At the quadriennial Congress of the International Publishers Association in London in 1988, David Philip spoke out against the imposition of sanctions on the export of books to SA, which he characterised as "doing the censors' work for them".[51] Later that year the US House of Representatives voted to exclude publications from the US's anti-apartheid sanctions.[52]

DPP's example was followed by other, sometimes even more "radical", publishing firms. And all paid the price of their audacity in opposing the ideology of the time: their premises were raided by the security police, their stock was confiscated, their staff were intimidated, their titles were banned. Nevertheless, and despite all this, publishers like DPP and Ravan Press, and later also Skotaville, Seriti sa Sechaba and the university presses at Wits and Natal succeeded in helping to keep intellectual debate alive and in promoting an awareness of alternative ideas.

So debate and ideas did survive in apartheid South Africa. The oppositional book scene in the 1980s, especially in literary criticism, was a lively one. A "vigorous and often vehement debate of astonishing complexity and subtlety"[53] had been raging for some time between
literary critics of various persuasions. But the struggle was unrelenting. David Philip describes the situation as follows:

"In the 1980s, the ultimate excesses of the Afrikaner Nationalist preference was reached. In the libraries, no books of a liberal or radical nature were acquired lest they should influence or even corrupt their (white) readers. In bookshops like the Central News Agency, the managers were reluctant to buy oppositional books because they claimed that their shop assistants’ lives would be endangered and because the books were often mutilated and made unsaleable by ill-disposed customers. In the schools, the Afrikaner Nationalist publishers and writers (often school inspectors) monopolized the lists of approved books all over the country."

"It was the practice of the Nationalist government to pass legislation for every conceivable eventuality, to create sledgehammers to crack nuts. If one were actually to read and take seriously the details of their legislation on censorship and banned people and the penalties for infringements, one would end up publishing nothing. It was therefore necessary for a publisher to develop a blanking of the mind towards this legislation and not to be guided by it."[55]

As recently as May 1989, the provisions of the Internal Security Act in force under the State of Emergency regulations allowed the security police to raid the premises of oppositional publishers with impunity. DPP had such four such visits in six weeks. Ravan and Skotaville and other presses suffered similarly. "Large quantities of books were confiscated at the whim of the police and without recourse to the courts."[56] Even in the dying days of the old regime, the State's "dirty tricks brigade" actively spread disinformation about DPP, whispering that the firm was on the verge of bankruptcy, etc. Henrietta Dax of Clarke's Bookshop was putting it mildly when she said "David and Marie faced great economic hardships [in order] to publish."[57]

By always conforming and playing safe, the larger firms and other members of the Publishers Association of South Africa were not subjected to such raids, and did little to support the smaller ones who were. This led David Philip and Glenn Moss of Ravan Press to form IPASA, the Independent Publishers Association of South Africa in 1989. Its founding statement of principles concluded: IPASA believes that intellectual freedom is inseparable from liberty itself. Freedom to write, to publish and to read, are among the most important of human rights. [58] It is pleasing to be able to report that even some multinationals like Oxford, Heinemann and Penguin soon joined this body and added their strength to its voice.

DPP generously maintained a mutually supportive relationship with other oppositional publishers. Glenn Moss of Ravan Press expressed his appreciation of DPP’s support with distribution and sales representation[59], even though they were competitors. And yet, DPP was the only one of them all that was genuinely independent. It had no access to outside funding and was therefore constrained to function as a commercial concern. As may be imagined, this made running DPP a precarious business, and one which placed enormous pressure on its management. While not compromising their integrity or deviating from the path they had chosen, the Philips had of necessity to call on unknown reserves of enterprise, resourcefulness, imagination, strategy and cunning in order to survive. It is part of the happy story of DPP’s survival that it succeeded in resisting take-over or absorption by
conglomerates right until it was time for David and Marie to retire. By then, South Africa had a new constitution and many of the former things had passed away.

Yet, even on the cusp of the new age, David Philip made no bones about proclaiming:

"The role of an oppositional publisher doesn't disappear just because the government changes. Publishers of integrity are, or ought to be, endemically independent, always prepared to give voice to criticism of the establishment, always the supporters of freedom and creativity, holding open the doors for discussion and debate."[60]

Oppositional publishing, he insists, is "part of the normal role of publishing in a free society."[61]

His views were echoed by the newly released Nelson Mandela: We want open debate, contrary views, opposition and the ballot box. We will not be the new censors... [62] South Africa had had a long walk to freedom.

At UCT, on 16 August 1995 the English Academy awarded the Philips the Academy medal for their services to English.

With the advent of the new dispensation, and with their efforts to maintain liberal publishing throughout the days of oppression now fully vindicated, the Philips retired from full-time publishing and sold the company to New Africa Books in 2002.

Their integrity and all that flowed from it was publicly recognised when, in 2001 and again in 2002, David and Marie both received Honorary Doctorates from the University of Natal and the University of the Western Cape.

They had devoted a major portion of their working lives to making good books, and their books had made a difference.
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