TTT

Interviewee: Dudley Horner Session #1 (video)

Interviewer: Mary Marshall Clark Cape Town, South Africa

Date: August 8, 1999

Q: Thank you so much for being with us today. I'd like to ask you really about how you came to SALDRU [Southern Africa Labour and Development Research Unit]. Was it actually an operation when you came to it? And a little bit about your own background and what interested you in coming there.

Horner: Yes. It was haphazard, in a way, in that I'd been working up in Johannesburg in the Institute of Race Relations, and my particular field of interest there was labor relations, with quite close links to what we called the students wages commissions. I was also doing work on migrant labor, and that brought me into contact with Francis Wilson, because that was his specialty at the time. So we had this common interest, although we hadn't met. And quite often Francis would be flying through Johannesburg on one of his many trips, and one would leave papers and documents and that sort of thing for him to do, to deal with. And I got more and more involved with the sort of resuscitation of the trade union movement and got rather impatient with the Institute of Race Relations.

Q: Why?

Horner: Because their approach was that the Institute sat between business and labor. And I said, well, in the South African situation at that particular time, in the early seventies, you know, you're sitting on the fence. [Laughter] So, being young and radical at

that time, I decided to walk out, handed in my resignation, and went off to a conference in Durban. And Francis walked into the room and he said, "Well, I've raised some money to set up a research unit in Cape Town, and I'm looking for researchers."

And I said, "Well, how about me?"

And he said, "Well, my mother's just about to become president of the Institute of Race Relations, and I'm not quite sure how kosher that would be." [Laughter]

And I said, "Well, my notice has already been handed in, so you'll have to handle that."

And that's how it all began, in a way. Francis had raised money through the Chairman's Fund at Anglo-American. It was the time when the gold price had shot through the roof, so the mining industry was awash with money which it didn't really know what to do with. And they set up several -- or funded several organizations, and they asked for interesting projects, and Francis had this project to set up SALDRU. So I left the Institute in Jo-burg and arrived in Cape Town in June 1975, and that's how we began.

Q: As close as you can, could you describe the mission and purpose of SALDRU and how it fit into UCT [University of Cape Town]?

Horner: Well, it sat, as it still does today, within the School of Economics, and I think it was very much Francis' brainchild that at that time you had students, bright students, turning -- not necessarily at doctoral level, but honor's level, master's level -- writing papers

probably not good enough to get into refereed journals, but, nevertheless, unearthing a lot of interesting information.

So what we really decided to do is to take students in, train them as interns in research, very much a sort of apprenticeship, sort of sitting next to us and doing whatever work we were doing, or parts of the work, and then devising a series of working papers so that all that information would actually get out and see the light of day, instead of just being pigeonholed. So it was always envisaged as having a strong training component and being heavily located within the teaching departments. And the idea was, yes, to train young social scientists.

Q: What were some of the first projects you were working on? Did you get to continue your own work on labor? Could you describe that?

Horner: Yes, very much so. My own work was fairly narrow in the sense of the labor market. I was interested in trade unions, in employment conditions, minimum wages. So one of the very first papers we published was on minimum working conditions and trade unions in South Africa at that stage. Of course, at that stage the mixed and African unions, what we came to call the independent trade union movement, were not recognized by the state.

So one had these informal networks, people that you knew in the union movements who would not be recorded in the official South African records of the official South African labor

movement, so while you had the official movement, you had this other movement growing up alongside.

And a lot of students, through the National Union of South African Students, who had established the wages commissions on most of the major campuses at the time, people like Debbie Budlender were here. She was a young student on campus when I arrived from Johannesburg to set up the Unit. In that very early grouping of students that we took in were people like Brian Levy, who's now at World Bank; Debbie Budlender herself; Willie Hofmeyr, who was Parliamentary spokesperson, MP [Member of Parliament] for Thabo Mbeki until very recently; Graeme Bloch, who wouldn't like to be pigeonholed in this way, but he's married to the South African High Commissioner to London at the moment, so he's Mr. [Cheryl] Carolus.

And the very first thing we decided to do was to have a farm labor conference, and there we pulled together -- it was our first shot. We'd started formally in '76, although Francis had appointed some people in late '74, I think, got himself a secretary and set up the Unit. And, yes, we pulled in a lot of research workers from around the country and had a very big conference on farm labor. And a lot of this first group of interns, all of whom were white, were dispatched into the field to do work on conditions on the farms in South Africa.

Q: So the process of gathering people and producing a conference and conference reports and disseminating information widely was always a part of your mission, even before [The] Carnegie [Corporation]?

Horner: Even before Carnegie. That was very much a part of the mission. And I think one of Francis' greatest strengths has been networking and knowing who's doing what. So right from those early days we were able to pinpoint people, many of whom would not, in the normal course of events, have talked to each other at all, but get them working on their specialist topics and get them to present it to an audience. That was really how it started.

Q: In terms of unearthing basic facts and figures that were reliable about conditions in South Africa, whether in the mines or in the farm lands, how hard was it to get quote unquote real information? What were the sources?

Horner: It was very difficult. You had your official standard sources of information. You knew that other information existed and was collected. The state kept -- if you were known opponents of apartheid, the state kept you at an arm's length, so it would be very difficult. I mean, we read papers on farm schools. It was extraordinarily difficult, although that information, even in those days, should have been in the public domain, but just to get the lists of farm schools run by the separate departments of education, so you could actually start mapping farm schools, you know, they would delay, stall, interrogate you. "Why do you want this information?" Extraordinarily defensive in that were you actually wanting this information to go in and ferment revolution? I mean, go out into the countryside to these schools that were remote, and spread ideas that were inimical to the apartheid state.

Q: Were you familiar with the white poverty study and its impact before the Carnegie study began?

Horner: Yes.

Q: Could you talk about that?

Horner: Yes, in not as well informed way as one did when one realized that the Inquiry was going to come off, but I mean the first Carnegie Inquiry was profound, so it had a profound political effect in South Africa. So if you were a student of history or a social scientist, you would have come across references to the first Carnegie Inquiry and, indeed, in literature. I mean, the poor white problem in Afrikaans literature, particularly, was something you would read about in stories in primary school. So, yes, one was aware.

Q: How would you describe what those profound political consequences were?

Horner: Well, I think [Hendrik Frensch] Verwoerd, for one, and I think it was the difference between the first Carnegie Inquiry and the Carnegie Inquiry that we were involved with, I think people like Verwoerd, although the Carnegie Inquiry, first Carnegie Inquiry was not ostensibly political, I think they saw the political potential of the findings that were revealed in the first Carnegie Inquiry, and indeed built their platform on it. That became their constituency, the poorer white element in society.

They mobilized them, and mobilized them very effectively. I mean, some of those earlier Carnegie commissioners, like Ernie [E.G. (Ernst Gideon)] Malherbe. Ernie Malherbe was vice chancellor of my university when I was a young student. He was vice chancellor of Natal University in Pietermaritzburg, and my family, in fact, knew his wife. He was a big

role player in the Institute of Race Relations, so he was sort of -- in my schooling and my working life I kept bumping into Ernie Malherbe, who was a very influential figure. And if [Jan Christiaan] Smuts had won the 1948 election, Malherbe would probably have been minister of education and our whole education system would have been different, whereas the Nationalists won, and they had been building their constituency amongst poor whites.

Q: At this point in your life, what was motivating you to do the kind of work you were doing at SALDRU, in terms of your own life history, your own life experience? Where did your own politics come from?

Horner: Well, I grew up in a provincial capital like Pietermaritzburg in the sixties, in the fifties. I was at university in the last fifties, early sixties. You had events like Sharpeville, and one was already then pulled in very much as a foot soldier, not a leading light in the student movement, but you were sort of political fodder that was dragged out onto the streets to join the marchers and face the police. That's where you came from.

I, in fact, after that decided to leave the country, so I left the country in '62 and lived in England for three years, after which I returned, went up to Johannesburg, and there had political mentors in Helen Joseph and Shanthie [Shanthivathie] Naidoo. And I suppose that was my most profound period of political education. They came from the Congress of Democrats. The Naidoo family were Transvaal Indian Congress. Shanthie's father was an adopted son of [Mahatma] Gandhi. So you came into contract with Congress people. You came into contact, through Helen Joseph, with the Kekana family, who were leaders of

resistance in Sekhukhuneland. So, for whitey, you started getting a different view of the history of your own country.

I was working at that stage in a bookshop, which was quite a famous bookshop in Johannesburg called Vanguard Booksellers, run by two ex-members of the Communist party, and they took in all these banned people. So we had people working in the shop who couldn't talk to each other, so one was actually the messenger. [Laughter] If Helen Joseph wanted to talk to Shanthie Naidoo or give a message, under the banning orders they couldn't talk to each other. So Helen would have to say, "Dudley, will you tell Shanthie this?" So it was a profound educational experience.

And I used to go to dinner with the Naidoo family. The brother was on Robben Island with [Nelson] Mandela. The two other brothers had also been persecuted by the security branch. Her sister was in exile in London. Helen Joseph was hospitalized with cancer, and I looked after her house, which, again was a strange experience because you had shots fired in the night and that sort of thing at her house. And one became a sort of postbox messenger for the movement.

And from there I moved into the Institute of Race Relations. I had then got my librarianship diploma, moved out of the bookshop, and went to work at the Institute of Race Relations, and the first job as archivist -- they had this enormous archive down in their basement of South African newspapers from the late twenties, which included the entire run of banned Communist party newspapers, of Trotskyist movement newspapers, of Liberal party newspapers, and I put that archive together and sorted it and catalogued it,

and that was all then filmed, and got out of the country in case the security police ever got it. It was largely Gwen [Gwendolen] Carter, at Northwestern University, funds were raised and all that was put on microfiche. So Northwestern and Yale University have the whole historical collection of South African newspapers. They were stored in four or five places around the world.

Q: So, again, the importance of information.

Horner: The information thing was absolutely tremendous, and learning that they had not only this archive of newspaper, but there were papers that had been dumped by the firm of [Oliver] Tambo and Mandela down in the basement.

And the president general of the ANC [African National Congress], who was a fascinating character, who Mandela, in fact, had overthrown, Dr. [A.B.] Xuma, was married to an American woman, his second wife, and he had been -- you know, as people do in age, he had moved to the right, or was perceived to have moved to the right. So it was Mandela as a young lion and a boy called Anton Lembede and Walter Sisulu, who decided to depose Xuma, who then moved into the safer fold of the sort of liberal South African Institute of Race Relations. He became an executive member, having been deposed as secretary general of the African National Congress.

But he was an extraordinarily literate man, coming from being a herd boy in the Transkei, Mandela territory, he went to Minnesota University in the thirties. He was extraordinarily well read in black American historiography of the time, so in his papers was stuff by

[Marcus] Garvey and [W.E.B.] DuBois. In the thirties he knew all about that, and he went on to London to do a diploma in tropical medicine, then came back to South Africa and became, in time, president general of the ANC until about 1952.

And when he died in 1961 or '2, I think, his American wife decided that she'd had quite enough of apartheid South Africa, and quite by chance the garage at the home in which they lived was packed with these boxes of papers, and somebody in the Institute heard that she was going to set fire to the papers and go back to America. Down in the basement were just these boxes of these wonderful diaries, letters, right from the thirties, telegrams to United Nations, telegrams to Xuma from his ANC faction within the ANC, when he was at the United Nations in 1947, saying, "Come home immediately because the Communist party is about to take over the ANC." [Laughter]

And I sorted that collection. So one had a very privileged like eighteen months of access to information which was nowhere available in the country. Even South African historians in exile didn't have these papers. I mean, people didn't know that these papers existed. So, yes, that was my education experience. [Laughter]

Q: Tracing back and throughout that experience, because it's interesting in the overall political context, what influence did Gandhi have on the early leadership both in terms of radical whites and blacks, in terms of thinking whether or not there could be a peaceful resistance? Was there still an influence in the early sixties?

Horner: It was a resistance -- it was an emphasis -- I think by sixties, Gandhi-ism was no longer so profound, because the decision had been made to move to armed struggle if necessary. But, I mean, up until the early fifties, the idea of passive resistance was profound, and that came from Gandhi, and it came through the Indian Congresses, the Natal Indian Congress and the Transvaal Indian Congress. The presidents of those Congresses would have all been Gandhi acolytes, and certainly people like Mandela had a lot to do with Dr. [Yusuf] Dadoo and Dr. [G.M.] Naicker and those leading lights in the Indian Congress.

Q: Fast forwarding back to SALDRU, could you describe when the idea for a second inquiry on black poverty, on poverty, began to percolate?

Horner: If we take a step backwards, we had seen agriculture as an important area under research, so we marshaled a lot of students and we did the conference in '76. The next conference we held was in '78, which was on the economics of health care, following the same procedure. And it was in the late seventies -- those early days, our basic funding came from the Anglo-American Chairman's Fund. It was in the late seventies that [The] Ford [Foundation] was the first foundation to walk in very quietly.

There was a sort of gentleman's agreement between Ford, SALDRU, and the University -- in apartheid South Africa you obviously couldn't write certain things in documents. But I mean, the Ford -- you couldn't write that these funds were, in effect, earmarked for black students. You just drafted the agreement that we were going to train students, and students without fear or favor. And don't forget, on the campus of places like UCT, Wits

[University of the Witwatersrand], and [University of] Natal, you couldn't get a lot of black students, because they had set up the apartheid universities, closed the so-called open universities. But a mechanism had been devised where you set up what I think we called the permit system.

So the state would not allow black students -- and that's black broadly defined, not just African, that's colored and Indian -- to go to the white universities if courses were offered at the black universities. So if students were enrolled for economics, a straightforward bachelor's degree with economics as the major, those courses were offered at black universities, so you couldn't enroll at UCT. You could, however, become a permit student if courses were offered at the white university that were nowhere else offered. So the historically open universities set up a whole system of courses, and you started to get this trickle of black students coming on to the campuses from about the mid-seventies.

And that's when, as I say, Ford waltzed in, and that was our agreement, and the agreement was not only to train the upcoming generation, but also, where necessary, to return scholars from exile. So that funding was in place when I think Francis started talking to Carnegie. Now the actual Carnegie conference came off in '84, most of the work I remember being in the field in late '83, in the height of summer, but I think the conversations would have started in about '81, because I think people were aware that it was a political hot potato. I mean, the apartheid system was showing signs of cracking.

Q: Could you describe that? What signs?

Horner: Well, they tried to smash, for instance, the trade union movement, but, in fact, in 1979 had been forced to give it limited acknowledgement. It was clear that the system of influx control for blacks was hardly what the state wanted it to be. I mean, people were evading it. So there were fissures in this supposedly monolithic system of racial superiority, but that meant that repression would go into quite a vicious phase as a result. And I think Francis and others who were involved -- and I was not involved in discussions; it came as a surprise to me -- were aware of both the political significance of the first Carnegie Inquiry and the potential political significance of a second Inquiry.

So I would only become aware in about '82 that something was going on, and that was the buildup to Carnegie financing that inquiry. And of course, that was not the far left in South Africa. I think I would have regarded that at the time as not an entirely welcome intervention.

Q: Why?

Horner: Because of the history of the first inquiry, so that would loom large in their historical imagination. And, as a result, wondering what would be the effect of a second inquiry, and would its outcome be an amelioration of the apartheid system rather than a complete transformation.

Q: As I understand it, around that time, according to Helen Zille's work, anyway, the white government was attempting to move from a system of coercion to a system of incentive. Do

you think there was a fear that Carnegie would -- that the Carnegie work would be co-opted then by the government in a certain kind of way?

Horner: Yes, I think people from the left in South Africa would have perceived that.

Q: Could you say that for us? Could you talk a little bit about that?

Horner: It's always -- you know, Alan Drury said in the early sixties that South Africa was a very strange society. And it remains a very strange society. If you look at things from a Cape Town perspective -- and I'm not a Capetonian born, but after twenty-five years I think I'm a Capetonian. Capetonians tend not to accept that.

But this neck of the woods has a very particular set of historical political baggage. The Communist party was strong in the Western Cape. You had the third biggest Trotskyist movement in the world in the Western Cape. The Pan-Africanist Congress was strong in the Western Cape. In fact, very big riots and murders took place here in the Western Cape. It is also the spiritual home of nationalism, white nationalism. So you have a whole spectrum of deep-seated political streams in the Western Cape. I mean, the rest of the country says that we think that the country ends at the Hottentots Hollands mountains and anything that happens over there is not important.

So you get aggravated and very articulate views expressed in the Western Cape, so Trotskyists would be very suspicious of anything that Stalinists were doing, and black consciousness adherents would be very suspicious of what liberals were doing, and Social

Democrats would be suspicious of them all. So you have a potpourri of political opinion around here. And I think -- I don't know if Francis has managed to get Neville Alexander to talk to you, because I think Neville would represent a very articulate perspective on the Cape. You know, the word liberal in South Africa is used pejoratively as I don't think it's used anywhere else in the world. Almost everywhere else, liberal is quite a good thing -- to be liberal. Here it could be a really evil pejorative.

Q: So was it perceived as a liberal enterprise, then?

Horner: Yes, I think the left would have perceived it as a liberal enterprise.

Q: How did you win support among the people that you were trying to recruit, and what were your recruiting methods in terms of gathering together researchers for the Carnegie study that might have been funded under the Ford program?

Horner: Well, Ford started in such a very quiet way, and very early on we had brought back Reggie Africa from exile. He was the first. He had been, I think, at East Anglia University, a colored South African from the flats, and he came back to our farm labor conference and presented a paper there.

You then started to have, with the Ford internship program, these students entering the social sciences at UCT, and most of them -- I mean, I've often been asked the question in terms of recruitment, did we actively recruit. I think what success we had was because most of those students were self-selected. We, in fact, did not advertise, actively go out and

search for them. They had their own particular agendas, including their political agendas. We had a reading room where there were a wide range of papers, this rather marvelous collection of press cuttings, a well-equipped library with alternative literature available.

So students, and particularly black students, would gather there, read the newspaper, meet each other, and then sort of say, "Well, what work are you doing around here?" We'd say, "Well, we're going to have a poverty inquiry." [Laughter] And they said, "Well, that sounds interesting. I mean, is there money? Is there a job for me? And what do you mean by a poverty inquiry?"

So you had a pool of these --

[END TAPE ONE, SIDE ONE; BEGIN TAPE ONE, SIDE TWO]

Q: What would you say to people when they asked, "What is this poverty inquiry?"

Horner: It was a time of wonderful ferment and great exchange of ideas. One learned as much from the students. And they were coming from these different political perspectives, so, yes, you would be closely interrogated. Ultra leftist students would say, "Well, you know, alleviation of poverty, that will dull the revolutionary fervor. Is this all just a liberal plot to oil the wheels of the apartheid state?" And so that would provoke lots of discussions.

Of course, by then one had started -- we had copies of all the volumes of the original Inquiry. We had economic histories dealing with the thirties and the forties in South

Africa. You had work starting to go on on how people -- how the state had dealt with the poor white problem. And because these students were self-selected, I think more than anything we taught them, I mean, I'm sometimes amused when Francis says, "Oh, we didn't teach them anything." I think, "Well, what the hell were we doing?"

But they discussed -- and we used to have staff meetings with all these young interns who were extraordinarily articulate, and these ideas would come spilling out and be debated backwards and forth, and you'd hear on the grapevine one group of interns would be leaving, a new group would be coming in, that there'd been a political shift in SALDRU, which meant in a group of twenty students, your new intake, you had five in the black consciousness tradition instead of five out of the Trotskyist movement. So you had these students, and they taught each other a lot.

But, of course, the value of having them was that you had captive apprentices, so after all the talk and the ferment and the excitement, and, not least, given the very real intellectual isolation of South Africa -- I mean, top academics could get out. Whether their passports were limited to short periods, you could get out and you could visit your intellectual peers, but for the student body, you were starved. So any events like a conference, people get terribly excited. We think of Carnegie. Yes, so it was a very stimulating period to be living through.

And it was, for them. Most of the interns would have been urban. There were very few that came from purely rural areas. So although black, they were townies, and I think many of these information-gathering exercises were as revealing to them as they would have been

to any white South African, of being introduced to the countryside and to how people live out there and how apartheid had screened that out. You know, if you were involved in the trade union movement, you were involved in the urban movement. There were support groups. However vicious the repression of the state, you were part of the movement, an army, comrades, that sort of thing. If you were sitting out in the rural backwater, you were kind of God's forgotten, and interaction between town educators -- and I think that's still true today, in South Africa today -- really urban people who are locked in by the media and television etc., to what's going on in the world, you still find -- I sense a sense of shock when I take students out to work in the deep rural areas and to realize what life's actually like out there.

Q: Did you go with any of the students to these rural areas?

Horner: We went a lot. I don't know if you're going to meet Wilfred Wentzel. Wilfred was, again, an articulate colored South African educated in England, returned to South Africa, Cape Town boy, Cape Town family, and Francis put him to work doing the bibliography. So Wilfred sat at the center of a sort of web, if you like.

We would then have this group of students around us discussing the issues, discussing the areas. I mean, we put the huge grid over the country of what sort of areas we wanted to look at, and chose people. The bibliography Wilfred provided was pretty good, not absolutely comprehensive, not exhaustive, but pretty comprehensive. So they were reading stuff. They were reading the history of the areas they were going to go out into, some of

which had been highly politicized areas, some of which were very remote, that people had never heard of.

And as I say, '83, '84, we would then, Wilfred and I would go, the two of us together with students, or independently with students, and we were linked with students doing the studies. So Wilfred himself sort of lived out in the Greater Karoo with a group of students doing towns and villages there. I did Calitzdorp, which is in the Little Karoo, with a student, and he was there for a longer period than I was, but I would shoot out for a month at a time and check what he was doing. And I would be supervising the students who were working here in urban poor areas. So that was the sort of interaction you had.

I mean, as I think I said earlier, in '83, '84, it was the end of '83, so it was high summer, very hot in the Little Karoo. It's the period of harvest of the apricots. Calitzdorp is an area which is largely colored and white, and, in fact, even to this day if a black person walks down the street, people walk out of their shops because it's a black person. That seems hard to believe in South Africa, and fifty kilometers down the road you do have a black township, but that's the sort of isolation that exists. And the colored labor preference area prevented Africans from entering certain of these areas.

I would work there with Graham van Wyk, who was a young colored student living with the colored priest in the colored township, and I would stay at the white hotel, and then we would meet nights at the colored priest's place, and he was our principal informant. I would unpack what whites were saying to me, and Graham would unpack what he was hearing, and then we would match the information. And I think still today on farms,

getting direct access is not easy. In those days it was very hard indeed, because the farmer would shoot you. And we had to devise stratagems. I would take out books on botany and ornithology, the birds of the Little Karoo, the flowers of the Little Karoo, the trees of the Little Karoo. We'd have binoculars. We would do the farms on the weekends, because I had picked up in the bar that most of the farmers -- drinking in the bar at night -- most of the farmers would go down on a Sunday, cross the mountains to go to the sea to fish. So it was unlikely to bump into a farmer on a Sunday, so Graham and I would then do the farming areas on a Sunday. But the subterfuge was that we were studying the flora and fauna, the tourist potential of the area, and we'd have the maps and books and that sort of thing. And we were stopped on occasion, finding a farmer unexpectedly at home and having to think up an excuse for why we had left our cars and gone onto his farm.

Q: Did you ever come close to being banned?

Horner: Me personally?

Q: Yes.

Horner: I don't know. I never was banned.

Q: What were the concrete kinds of issues you were working on yourself in the field? What were the issues in that particular community?

Horner: In Calitzdorp it was a pretty general poverty survey, a socio-economic survey. There was an agenda. I mean, our principal informant, James Buys, was a wonderful source of information because he was the manager, in his official position as a priest, of the local colored school in the colored township and of all the colored farm schools, so it got us entrée to many places we wouldn't normally get entrée to. And James' specific agenda was to improve education. The high school only went to -- no, most of the farm schools only went to standard four, some only to standard two, so that's four to six years of schooling. There was a big primary school, of which he was the school manager, in the colored township. There was no secondary school in the entire district for colored children, although there was a white, a very good white secondary school. So it meant any child who wanted to go on to secondary education had to leave the district, so families would have to find the money for them to board with people, because there simply weren't many boarding facilities for colored or African kids. So it meant if you reached that level of education, that was it.

So he wanted to improve schooling, and he was well connected through his church connections with Germany, Latin America, Holland, Scandinavian countries. So he wanted to improve the general level of education of kids in the district, so we, of course, were feeding as much information as we could which would assist that agenda.

Q: Well, that's an interesting situation, because there the frustration of studying someone but not being able to help them wasn't there. Were there other situations in which there was a lot of frustration experienced on the ground level about not being able to actually do anything with the money?

Horner: Yes.

Q: Could you describe some of this?

Horner: Oh, yes. That we had frequently, and, I mean, again I say South Africa is a very strange society. You would meet these tragic situations, but then we would be rolling around with laughter because new research interns would come back from their first encounter with very real poverty, and actually do a whip around in the unit, saying, "You know, my area is the area of the greatest poverty in the country. And they need schoolbooks and they need this, and Mrs. So-and-so is very poor and she can't get hospitalization," and we used to have to throw up our hands and say, "You know, we're sure you're right, but we're working in three, four hundred areas, and if we all just empty our pockets, is it going to help relieve poverty?"

But, yes, a very real human frustration, that you're collecting the data, but actually you're not going to make any real intervention, certainly not in the short term, I mean, perhaps not even in the long term.

Q: Did you ever feel like calling up Carnegie and saying, "Look. We know you have tremendous resources. We've done enough studying. Can you give us the money for development?"

Horner: One often cursed and swore. [Laughter] Yes.

Q: What was your contact like with Carnegie? Did you have direct contact with them? Did you meet Alan [J.] Pifer?

Horner: Again, Alan and I had met, I think in a different guise, when I was working at the Institute of Race Relations. It wasn't my first encounter with Alan, and that was a very easy relationship. Other than that, I didn't have a lot to do with Carnegie staffers. I did have a lot more to do with Ford program officers.

Q: Was Franklin [A.] Thomas president of Ford at that time?

Horner: Was it Franklin Thomas?

Q: It doesn't matter. We can fill it in later.

Horner: Yes, it was Franklin, I think. Yes, because [Robert] McNamara came later. Yes. So I suppose my interaction was with Ford, in that I was responsible for the internship programs.

Q: Do you know whether or not, either for Ford or for Carnegie, it was important to them that you were being funded by both?

Horner: Yes. I think both were fully aware of it, and I think both were perfectly happy that it was being meshed in this particular way.

Q: What were the differences in terms of your perception of the Ford Foundation's work, intentional aims in South Africa, and the Carnegie Corporation's aims?

Horner: Well, Carnegie's aim was specific and limited to the project. I think of all our donors, Ford was the most relaxed. We had the brief. The brief was to train young black social scientists. The brief was to bring back South African black scholars from abroad. And they were very generous, I mean in the sense that there was no undertaking that the black scholars returning would necessarily stay. In a way, it was funding a reconnaissance. Can you reenter the society? And of course, the eighties was not a good period for blacks who had got postgraduate degrees in the Northern Hemisphere to come back into South Africa in a very repressive phase, perhaps with families that they'd acquired over there, introducing the families to South Africans there, their South African families, after being away for ten, fifteen years. But there were people returned on that Ford program. I can't think of many that went back. They stayed.

Q: Before we leave the whole issue of interns -- [Interruption]

Q: I was going to ask you to just sort of give us a portrait of some individual interns. I was thinking of Mary-Jane Morifi in particular, and her passion around the issues of women and development. If you could talk about what she was like as an intern, because she's certainly been a terrific outcome of the whole Inquiry.

Horner: Very right. Well, the whole bunch of interns who worked on the Carnegie Inquiry were fascinating. Their interaction with each other was intense. Many of them have remained closely in touch with one another. In fact, for me, if ever there's a SALDRU event, I only have to phone two or three and say, "Round up the gang," and they're able to say, "Neville, she's in Berlin doing this and she's in Chicago," or, "He's over here." "No, he's gone to government now," or, "He's left government. He was in government, but he's gone somewhere else." So they have kept very close linkages, many of them coming from different social, ethnic, cultural backgrounds. So if we take somebody like Mary-Jane Morifi, for instance, she came to us from the Transvaal. She was doing a degree at University of Cape Town. Mary-Jane's convent-educated, which is a particular context -- strict nuns, learning by rote. [Laughter] And ebullient, a very expansive, outgoing person. She was matched with a lot of young colored boys and girls who were working on the project as well.

She was then dispatched into a rural colored area in the Western Cape. I was full of trepidation because here she came from the north, here she was black, here she was a woman, a young woman, on her own, going into what in the American context would be a real redneck area, and Mary-Jane went in there and she pushed them around. She walked into those offices of those white officials, and you must think, this is South Africa 1983, at the height of repression, and she would walk into local government offices and say, "Well, I happen to be doing a survey on poverty in your area, and I want this, that, and the other thing." [Laughter] And so confident was she that I think it takes me back to a point I made much earlier on about the fissures appearing in the apartheid state, that, you know, I think in rural areas people were sometimes confused, because the apartheid government was

setting up black structures. So if you were confronted by a very confident black person who walks into your office and you're a white state official, you think, "Well, where the hell is she coming from? She must have some authority to do what she's doing. I mean, nobody else would just walk into my office, you know." Not even a white from the local area would walk into a town clerk's office and say, "I just need a map of your area. Hand it across the desk." [Laughter] I mean, which they did with people like Mary-Jane.

She had an equivalent in Eileen Meyer, who was a young colored student who had gone for further studies in Germany and then returned to South Africa. It was her first job after returning from studying in Germany. And she was sent out into a rural area. And Eileen Meyer is now European Union Parliamentary representative here in Cape Town, so she's their official liaison on what happens in our Parliament. But there she'd come back as a Capetonian-born, but with several years of living in Germany, to be thrust out into real rural community and to encounter a very strange world. Her living experience was urban, and then an overlay of Germany, going to a German university and living within a very different society, and then going out into real poverty in South Africa. Surmounting all of that, doing a really good paper on the area, handling really racist whites, officials, farmers, and putting together the information.

Q: Let me ask you a question. In reading through some of the papers, I notice that a lot of people make a distinction between rural poverty and urban poverty. Coming from the labor movement as you did, you knew about urban. Were you surprised by the extent of rural poverty? Was SALDRU surprised by it?

Horner: It's an interesting question about how surprised we were. I personally was not unacquainted with rural poverty, in that when I worked at the Institute in Johannesburg, although we were in a highly urban environment, we also worked with Institute of Race Relations informants living in rural areas in KwaZulu-Natal, so I visited those areas quite often. And this is where Zulu crafts, beads, pots, whatever, people in the Institute were trying to find out, to see if these could become viable economic enterprises, so I had experienced real poverty outside the cities and towns. So I was not particularly surprised.

But I was surprised by the surprise of some of my fellow workers. You know, being urban, families perhaps working in factories in the construction industry, they were familiar with certain conditions, and then to see the abject conditions on the farms was something way beyond their experience, anything they'd experienced before. And I can remember with at least one intern, him almost being in tears and saying, "We have to leave. I can't take any more of this," and saying, "Your aim -- and you're enrolled for further studies -- is to be a social scientist. Are you going to run away from every unpleasant encounter? Because what you're experiencing here is real. What you're reading in books is not."

Q: Do you think that many of the policymakers or executors in the South African government were aware of the extent of rural poverty, or did they operate as though it didn't exist?

Horner: They liked to pretend it didn't exist. I think that was a mechanism adopted by many whites, not purely the power structure. Whites were highly urbanized anyway, even though some would have had linkages with the country, still. So that sort of poverty was

beyond them. You didn't see that and you didn't want to see that. And I think that was a fairly conscious part of the policy, to sweep the poverty out, to sweep unemployment out. I think that's something we still debate with the work we do today. When we uncover huge poverty in the rural area, is that actually displaced unemployment? I mean, is that really Cape Town's unemployment problem rather than a local area 500 kilometers away called Murraysburg? A lot of people are not working in Murraysburg, but should the jobs not be being created in the metropole?

Q: What would be the trade union movement's position on that?

Horner: The union's position would be a little ambivalent.

Q: How so?

Horner: The course now in South African polity, which I think is accepting rather willingly the new global economy, so the unions are confronting, the South African unions, are confronting issues of competition, flexibility in the labor market, having themselves been a real part of change in South Africa, at least one of the main driving influences that brought about change in South Africa. So in trying to protect the minimum standards which they won for the unionized workers, there is a real conflict about what happens with the un-unionized workers, which would include a lot of the unemployed in the rural areas. I think what the union movement tries to do -- and they would not be alone in that -- is to think of systems like public works, etc., that would mop up that kind of unemployment.

[END TAPE ONE, SIDE TWO; BEGIN TAPE TWO, SIDE ONE]

Q: Before we get to the conference and to the discussions that were happening around the conference from your vantage point, I wanted to ask you again about the frustration that you and maybe some of your field workers must have felt as they were documenting poverty but not able to do anything about poverty. Did you ever feel like you just wanted to call up Carnegie and say, "Just come on, send down the money for some development projects"?

Horner: Yes, certainly. I mean, that's not limited to Carnegie. That's in a lot of the work we did then. And yes, even today one feels that with donor agencies. And, I mean, particularly when you were riding a posse of these bright, motivated politically young South Africans at this very volatile period, I mean, as a more experienced person and a white person, you would, I think, more often be frustrated than angry. They, being younger and black, were often very angry.

And of course, yes, the question of what is the purpose of all this was raised time and time again. We're assembling this mass of information. What happens to it once it's all been assembled? And is there a hope in hell of it influencing, even if it is cooptation, the government of the day?

Q: How did you work that out for yourself?

Horner: How did I work out --

Q: The purpose and the aims of it.

Horner: Aims. Well, one, I think one is conditioned as a librarian to value information for information's sake. [Laughter] So that was not too problematic. I don't think I had wildly high expectations of influencing the P.W. Botha administration, I mean, that was a very inflexible government. But there must have been at least a fairly unconscious expectation that something would happen, because I know -- not particularly immediately after the conference, which took place in '84, but by about '86, where Botha made his famous so-called Rubicon speech -- that was a period for me personally of deep depression. I then thought, "Well, I can certainly see no change in this society. We are, in a way, allowing them to hear the voices, and they're choosing to be deaf to the voices. So, yes, has it all been a waste of time?" And I think for probably the second time in my life that was the only time I thought of becoming an émigré again. It would have been in about 1986.

Because if you've read anything of the memoirs of the people on the island, South Africa wasn't always gloom and doom. I mean, South Africans are party animals, and when you assemble a bunch like this, of very vibrant, alive people, it's euphoric, and you're all working together in tandem, however much you fight. There's a tremendous dynamic going on. So it was a great letdown, and, I mean, Botha did just literally throw all the findings in the wastepaper basket.

Q: What do you mean by that?

Horner: Well, I can recall Francis and one or two people going down with this great mass of documentation to Parliament at the time and handing it over, and Botha making a very dismissive speech, saying, "This politically motivated exercise has taken place, and I have consulted other South African social scientists who assure me that this is a politically motivated exercise and there's no point in our taking any notice of the findings of this unscientific endeavor." And that was the state's response.

I think for myself there was -- I think it did strengthen some NGOs [nongovernmental organizations] and CBOs, community-based organizations, that, having assembled data in their specific fields of interest, whether it be old age, women, rural areas, it added impetus to what they were doing, justified their *raison d'être*, but I don't myself believe -- in fact, I'm pretty sure, when I mentioned earlier that Verwoerd saw the first Carnegie thing and he thought, "I can use this as a political instrument." This was a political exercise, the second Carnegie Inquiry, and I don't think anybody picked it up and ran with it, so I think a lot of ammunition was manufactured which wasn't actually employed.

So if you take the Dutch Reformed Church and particularly -- the Dutch Reformed Church was racially divided. If you take the Sending Kerk, and that was the colored part of that Reformed Church, and James Buys, our informant in Calitzdorp was the leading light in that. They had a thing that they called the *broederkring*, the "ring of brothers," very gender-insensitive. There were very enthusiastic people there who thought that they might be able to use the findings to emulate the political exercise that Verwoerd had undertaken with the first Carnegie Inquiry. And of course, Verwoerd was well plugged into the Dutch Reformed Church. He used religion and the enormous network of religion in this country.

But that kind of fizzled out. So post-Carnegie -- I know I had several meetings with people from the *broederkring*, very enthusiastic, both white and colored and some African, but it didn't really go anywhere. So there were NGOs and CBOs who benefited.

I think for the young students involved -- and we've just had a party, a farewell party, for one of our longstanding members of staff, and a number of the people who were involved in this Carnegie Inquiry in 1984 were at the party last month, talking about their experience. And wherever they are, some of them are in the big bad capitalist world, they're highly placed in places like oil companies, some are in government at both national, provincial, and local level, some have become ranking academics. It was, again, a moment of euphoria as they recalled their experiences and said -- and I thought it was very flattering -- that that had been their first encounter of doing real work. Rather than just being a student, studying the texts that your lecturers set you, there they were matching theory and praxis. So whatever ideological persuasion they had favored was then employed in the field and influenced and altered by their experience. And some, in fact, said to me, "You know, we are still using techniques today in our jobs, wherever we are, that we learned during that process."

And that's, I think, where I differ from Francis, who says we didn't teach them anything, because we did follow, I think, a very liberal policy in SALDRU of giving people time to breathe, but the rope that was given was not endless. I mean, eventually you'd jerk the rope. So when people came back from their first encounter of looking at a small, poor community, either dejected or excited in that they thought there could be interventions, you'd say, "Well, it's great to hear you talk, but how are we going to convey this to an

audience?" So you've actually got to sit down and learn to make two way tables. You've got to use an overhead and make a presentation. You've got to learn to do graphs. That's the only way you're going to tell people about what you've seen. So, yes, leaving them freedom but then saying, "Well, you've got to learn things to convey, or you just become part of the chattering classes. You can talk about this endlessly over lunch and tea and to your friends in the student cafeteria. You can stand on a soapbox and say what you have seen amongst the poor of the country, but you've now got to develop trades, the tools of your trade to tell the world what it's all about." And that's where they learned a lot and learned very fast how to do things.

I think they -- well, they moved, if you run down through the list of people involved in the inquiry. I mean, Francis only told me yesterday that you were going to interview me, and I drew out the list. And it's quite amazing where people have gone in the new society. You have [Arthur] Chaskalson, highly placed in the judiciary. You have [Geoffrey] Budlender as a director general of the lands department. You have Wallace Mgoqi as the acting chief land claims commissioner for the country as a whole. And Chabani Manganyi as director general of education for the nation. You have Helen Zille herself as minister of education in this province, although not ANC. David Maralack was the development officer for the city of Cape Town's Olympic bid, did an enormous amount of work on development issues in sport in this province. Ebrahim Patel is the labor convener for NEDLAC [National Economic Development and Labour Council]. He came in as a very young untried student. Andre Kriel is a leading trade unionist in the country and plays a lot of -- a big role in developing labor-market policies in a consensual way through NEDLAC.

Mary-Jane's in the private sector, initially with British Petroleum South Africa as a public affairs officer, which was a huge job because BP Southern Africa covers everything from Tanzania down, with a big budget at her disposal. She has moved on now to Sekunjalo Investments, which is a black empowerment company. And somebody like Mary-Jane, who, I mean, had her own natural confidence, vivacity, became -- you had not only the network developed through the Carnegie-Ford connection at this time, but you then have overlapping networks. So that quite often -- in '91, for instance, I was on sabbatical leave. Francis had been part of an expert group set up by the commonwealth, and they wrote a book, a blueprint for skills beyond apartheid. In my leave, I was seconded there, and I was returning South African exiles from Canada, Cuba, East Germany, Russia, India, the Solomon Mehlanga College in East Africa, interviewing them, placing them. If they were mining engineers, they were reeducated. If they'd been educated in the Communist bloc, they were sent to Canada or to New Zealand. If they were hydroelectrical engineers, they went to New Zealand. If they were petrochemical engineers, they went to Canada. And a lot of this sort of network had created further networks, so I found I could sit in London and pick up the phone to Berlin or Bonn and say, "Well, I'm looking for this," or, "I'm coming to Ottawa. I need to see this, this, this, and this, and this, because we're going to send people across to be trained in Canada."

So I suppose the network was a really positive outcome. And that their basic education received on this project set the map in a very profound way for the future and, as I say, have all kept in touch in one way or another. So giving a farewell party the other day at very short notice, you had fifty people from a twenty-year period arriving, and it's a new South African elite all gathered in one room. [Laughter]

Q: Do you think the amassing and dissemination of information about poverty, including the book that Dr. [Mamphela] Ramphele and Professor [Francis] Wilson, Dr. Wilson, wrote together was useful to the leaders of the new South Africa in any ways that you know about or could discern, as they were setting forth a blueprint for the new government?

Horner: We're talking about Uprooting Poverty?

Q: Yes.

Horner: [Pauses] I'm not really quite sure what I want to say about it. I think it was a fairly masterly summation of the findings. What some critics say -- and I think I would include myself there -- is that it should have come out quicker than it did. You know, the whole event was in '84. The book didn't appear till '89. There had been lots of discussions on what the final product would be, whether there would be a series of books. Of course, there were several products. That was not the only consolidation product. You had [South Africa:] The Cordoned Heart for the photographic exhibition. You had the book on education, edited by Bill Nasson. But you had the Carnegie conference. In '86 you had the Rubicon speech, which more or less was putting a lid on any change in the society. Then in '89, by the time the book appeared, things had moved on in quite a big way, but I think as a record, in summing up many of these papers, it was a fairly masterly summation. I have been astounded by how many people abroad, social scientists abroad, know about the book. I mean, in this period in '91 when I was returning South Africans and I was in Stockholm, which was an interesting period because Nadine Gordimer was about to get the Nobel Prize

for Literature, Swedes that you met, who were not necessarily politically connected or had South African interests, if they'd read anything, would have read novels by Nadine Gordimer and Uprooting Poverty. [laughter] So I think it was more praised outside the country than it was in the country. Now that is not necessarily a criticism of the book; that is a fact of South African society. And I think we denigrate ourselves and we denigrate each other very readily in South Africa.

What I have found now is with development work we're involved with currently, I have gone back to Carnegie products, sometimes to a chapter in the book and said, "Look. If we're going to do this, you'd better just read this. Get a background." And then if we're working on a particular area, you can still go back to the Carnegie papers, because that's the only thing that's ever been written about this area. And I myself, working with the Provincial Development Council for this province, at least three of us in SALDRU are working with them, have been taken back to Calitzdorp, in that one of the regional representatives of the Development Council comes from Calitzdorp. I said to him, "Well, here's a paper we wrote fifteen years ago. Take it and see what it says." And he came back and he said, "Well, with very little change, that's Calitzdorp today," and he said, "You've got one or two things wrong at the time," he said, "I assume that's because you wouldn't have been able to talk to state officials." And he said, "You counted every job, and that's still what Calitzdorp looks like. There were two garages then and there's two garages now, and there were six petrol jockeys employed in the town, and there are six petrol jockeys employed there now. So many teachers were employed then and there are still only so many teachers employed now. You got the railway employees wrong because you assumed they live in Calitzdorp. They don't. They all live in Oudtshoorn, although they work in

Calitzdorp." He said, "What you wrote then is still the picture of our village today, so there has been no development whatsoever in fifteen years."

I am using those papers now for a lot of the areas in the Western Cape and saying, "Well, if there's one thing we know about an area, here it is. Can we now update with latest censuses or whatever and see what's happened in this dorp in fifteen years, if anything?" So they are still serving a purpose. [Laughter]

Q: Could I rewind a little bit to the conference itself? Could you just give us a little bit of descriptions of some of the highlights of the conference and what it was actually like to organize?

Horner: It was hell. It was a big undertaking. For a small unit like SALDRU, that was the biggest thing we had done. It was the biggest amount of money we'd ever handled. [Interruption] Coming to the conference, the actual conference, it was the biggest thing we'd ever handled. It was the most amount of money we'd ever handled. It was putting together foreign participants, many of whom were prestigious names, to South Africans, at least. Many of the South Africans were South Africans who would not normally enter into discourse with each other. Many, many disparate themes, how to handle all of that, to manage that within a short period. And compounding it all was the fact that the photographic exhibition was going to be one of the highlights. It was going to kick off the first social event. Security police intervened and locked up Omar Badsha. And Omar Badsha was the only one who really knew the whole story, so we had to ham it, wing the whole social function. The vice chancellor at the time, we had to try and brief him. Much of

the stuff, of course, was in Omar's head, and Omar was in jail. [Laughter] So it was a big jamboree. I think it went off quite well. There was wide press coverage at the time.

Q: How was that possible? Who had the press contacts?

Horner: We were always quite well connected in the press. I mean, people like Barry Streek, Helen Zille, had in periods of their life, as working journalists, taken short sabbatical times and come to work at SALDRU. So they linked into the journalistic establishment, if you like. So it was largely print media, not much -- well, nothing, I don't think, on television, South African television, which was very right wing in those days. Possibly a little bit of radio at the time.

Q: Before we leave the part about Omar being thrown in jail, why was he thrown in jail? How long was he put there? And was anybody else thrown in jail?

Horner: I think Omar was the only one. It disrupted the whole thing because Omar had -- and you're going to see Omar, so you'll be able to check his memory. All I know is that we had assembled everything we needed, we'd assembled all the display boards, we had all the photographs framed, we had slide shows. Omar would have been talking. Photographers, because he managed that as a photographers' cooperative, so photographers were driven in from all corners of South Africa for the event. And yes, they picked Omar up like two nights before, I think, the opening. They didn't hold him for very long. I think about a week, maybe longer, but it wasn't a long time.

Q: Building on what you referred to as the press that the book received in the U.S. and maybe also the conference, there were lots of discussions and debates at that time, heated debates, about whether or not the U.S. should pull out of South Africa and engage in sanctions, and there was a huge debate in the philanthropy movement about this. Could you talk a little bit about your perspectives on sanctions?

Horner: Yes. My involvement with sanctions, particularly disinvestment -- disinvestment, divestment -- predated my coming to SALDRU. So when I was working at the Institute for Race Relations in 1971, I, in fact, had written a very cautious paper on American investment in South Africa, which was very cautious in that it had to be very cautious, because they had introduced a law at the time that if you said anything to damage business in South Africa, you could go to jail for five years, with six lashes, and 5,000 rand, or a combination of the three.

South Africans internally couldn't actively plead for disinvestment, because obviously that would harm business in South Africa. So I had written a paper couched in cautious terms, saying, well, you do some good things and you do some bad things, trying to send a signal to the outside world. It was as a result of that that I paid my first visit to the States. That's, in fact, I think when I first met [J.] Wayne Fredericks of Ford Foundation, because Ford Foundation was funding the Institute of Race Relations in those days as well. And there was a big conference that took place in Westchester County, and it revolved around Polaroid, because Polaroid were heavily involved in South Africa. They were a progressive employer, and that was the image they were projecting in the States. And the motor companies were all here then, so General Motors was still here, Chrysler [Corporation] was

still here, Ford [Motor Company] was still here. IT&T was still here. So you had all these very high-powered executives at this conference, and you had the church groups, the African American Institute. Gosh, what was Tim Smith involved in? There was a big Christian -- American -- it was an American Christian coalition pushing disinvestment in a very strong way. It gathered them all together.

So my own personal stance at that stage was for a targeted sanctions approach, but I couldn't openly say so. That remained my position to the end, I think. After that conference, I addressed several groups in New York and in Denver and in Chicago and in Washington, on American investment, and it was right around that time that the Sullivan Code started to be developed.

Q: Could you explain for people who don't know what that is what that is?

Horner: Sullivan Code. That was a code developed by the Reverend Leon Sullivan which would monitor American business performance in South Africa. Firms volunteered to take part in the exercise, and they would reveal a whole number of characteristics of their employment practices in South Africa, with a heavy social responsibility focus. It was not only were you paying good wages; it was did you recognize a trade union that existed, did you supply bursary funds for your black employees, a bit of monitoring of the color and, very lastly, the gender of your composition, staff composition. That ran for quite a long time and it was monitored by the International Investor Responsibility Group in Washington. They published books every year on American investment performance in South Africa.

Now, of course that was a real hot potato, and that's where you enter the realm of where liberal in South Africa becomes pejorative, because liberal in South Africa is used as in -- you can be a political liberal, which is a good thing, in that you're opposed to racism and whatever, but an economic liberal means you are right wing on economic policies. So you would never favor sanctions investment and you would probably not look too kindly on trade unions either. [Laughter] So that's the particular issue of liberalism in South Africa. I think the point of sanctions, all sorts of sanctions -- I know myself I was rather doubtful about the whole sporting sanctions thing, in that I didn't think that was terribly important. I think in the event it proved to be very important indeed, very, very important indeed. As a South African who is very mad about sports myself, I thought, you know, there are bigger issues than sport, but a combination of disinvestment and a combination of social forces moving inside the country, a combination of all these sanctions and, not least, the international banking community, that's what actually brought the South African government, the apartheid government to its knees. And I think all those years that the liberals had argued that you would hurt the blacks by imposing sanctions were not wrong, in that you did hurt the blacks. People did suffer when firms withdrew, but I think it brought apartheid to an end much faster than if it hadn't been imposed.

[END TAPE TWO, SIDE ONE; BEGIN TAPE TWO, SIDE TWO]

Q: I wanted to ask you about the whole issue of sanctions within philanthropy. There were lots of debates happening in the U.S. with Alan Pifer, Frank Thomas, and others. Was it a slightly different issue than other kinds of sanctions?

Horner: Yes, I think it was. The question of academic sanctions and the involvement of foreign foundations was, as you've rightly said, very hotly debated. I mean, there were endless papers produced on that. There were some very violent incidents took place in South Africa. The visit of Connor Cruise O'Brien was disrupted here at the University of Cape Town, and passions ran very high in the academic community. The grand academic liberals threatened to resign en bloc because this was interfering with freedom of speech. The foundations right around the world -- it was not just American foundations. It was debated in Germany, it was debated in the Scandinavian countries, and it was debated in Holland, and we in SALDRU had been recipients of funding from all those countries. We had been funded for some of that work by the Social Democratic Foundation Friedrich Ebert Stiftung in Germany for a number of years, almost as long as the Ford Foundation. We were funded by Misereor, the German Catholic Bishops Foundation. We received funds from Hivos in Holland. We received Carnegie money. We received Ford Foundation money. We received money from one or two British foundations. So we were well aware of all those debates.

I am still amazed today, and again it comes back to what I think the amnesia, that is rather alarming in the society, of what actually happened, because many of those foundations targeted, because of the intensity of the debates in their home countries, anti-apartheid organizations, and they really supported them. So a lot of the NGOs which became part of the mass democratic movements would not have existed without that foreign funding. So it played a very big role, and Nelson Mandela has, I think, tried to visit each of the nations to

whom gratitude should be expressed. As a South African, I've been wryly amused at the jealousy of who gets visited first by the icon to thank them for the aid.

Q: Is there competition, then?

Horner: Well, certain countries have expressed reservations that he should have visited one country before he visited them, because they put in more than the country he was visiting first. But they played a very supportive role. And, I mean, I must say of Ford, we just simply could not have operated. We would have closed down. We wouldn't be around today if Ford Foundation hadn't continued to put the money in. And it wasn't always an easy ride for the foundations.

Q: In what sense?

Horner: Well, when we had very radical students, they're apt to bite the hand that feeds them. It's what students do.

Q: Can you give me an example?

Horner: Ford is giving the money that is paying the student interns rather well, so that they're studying and working, earning enough to pay -- more than enough to pay their fees, doing interesting work, so they're in a very privileged position in a way compared with other students in the student body. But, of course, then a scandal breaks out about Ford's involvement in Latin America and the CIA [United States Central Intelligence Agency],

and all South African students, of course, revolt and say, "Well, this is rotten money." [Laughter]

The Friedrich Ebert Stiftung had a very hard ride when they were coming in. I mean, here were people coming, offering us nice German Marks, and my students at the time sat down a very nice young programmer who himself would have been about twenty-six, twenty-seven, not very old and experienced, and he had to endure three hours of badgering from my students about how Ebert had killed Rosa Luxemburg in Germany in the 1930s and we weren't sure that we should take the German Marks because of the ideological impurity of the FES and the Social Democratic Party in Germany.

Q: Comparing Ford and Carnegie in terms of their intentions for this work, how would you compare the organizations politically?

Horner: Hard for me to distinguish, because Carnegie was a finite project, whereas Ford was an ongoing project, you know. Ford came in and supported us from 1979 up until 1984, fifteen years of ongoing support over long periods on a program. So Ford was a program and Carnegie was a project. Again, I would say the German FES was a program for almost as long a period, and all of those had as their intention training and then skilling young black South Africans. That was the aim. And it came without strings attached. Nobody said, "They must all be economists," or whatever. We could take -- our catchment area was ours. I mean, what it then meant for Carnegie is that you had students from the College of Music doing poverty studies in the Little Karoo, which is fairly unconventional. [Laughter] I can't think of many places that a pianist would be counting old age pensioners in a small

town, but that's what happened. So they were flexible and very sensitive. One can't, then, I think, compare Carnegie, because Carnegie came and said, "We're going to do the poverty study."

Q: Did you ever come to a point when you wished or you asked for Carnegie to extend its support into program from project so that you could begin to seed some development projects, or was that not the role of the University?

Horner: I don't remember that happening. I certainly didn't. Whether Francis asked for it to go on or to go on in an adapted form but he was turned down or not, I don't know. I don't know. But, I mean, as a recipient, that, I think, is a huge distinction in funding, in aid, if you like, is the parachute jump approach. "Here we're jumping in with half a million. Do it, and we're taking off." Or the longer-term program which allows you to develop things, and gives you a bit of security.

And that's, of course, I think what is happening in the new global economy, where it's tough to keep things going. We would not be able now to train any of these interns in SALDRU. It just simply wouldn't be, because I couldn't promise them that there'd be money there for them to be trained. I couldn't promise the University that we'd have the money, that we would exist.

Q: Could we talk a little bit about the role of gender in the Inquiry? How well was the issue of gender treated, do you think?

Horner: In terms of both gender and color, that was given a lot of attention. So, I mean, in selecting people to do work, one was always conscious of trying to achieve a balance. And that fed through into the conference. I mean, the chairs of sessions, the rapporteurs, we looked at that very carefully. So, yes. And I think if one actually did a head count of the research papers, women would be pretty well represented in the Carnegie Inquiry.

Q: Can we talk a little bit about Ramphele coming to work with you on the production of the book?

Horner: Right.

Q: Could you describe her for us, your impressions?

Horner: Well, she was, again, financed with Ford money, and therefore allowed us to -- [Interruption]

Horner: In the case of Mamphela Ramphele, there again Ford allowed us a slight variation of our rubric. We were allowed to train black students. That's what the money was for. We were allowed to bring back returning scholars. Then when we realized what was happening to Mamphela, we said, well, there is a kind of third category. I mean, she's not an undergraduate, she's not a returning scholar, but she is a more mature person. Now, that's not quite in our terms of reference. And Ford said, "No, you can use the money for that as well."

So we had the Ford money. It was in the middle of a funding period, I think, so it wasn't like having to raise fresh money for her, and we could then bring her on board as a research fellow, and that's how she entered us from the Eastern Cape as a medical doctor having been banned, having been to the Eastern Cape, and wanting a period -- I think she needed a period of reflection rest, time to find a new direction, if you like, and that's when she came in, at the period of the Carnegie Inquiry.

Q: What did she bring to the thinking process, about goals, strategies?

Horner: [Pauses] That I'm not sure about. I mean, she and Francis were locked together, kind of writing things. The rest of us were busy writing our own things and doing things. I don't remember Mamphela joining these students sessions that we used to have, so I don't have any strong impression of input at that level from her. As I said, I think she was taking a period out of heavy activism to find where she was going, and I think what happened with SALDRU and the Carnegie Inquiry is that gave her the space to rethink her role and to go in a different direction, which is when she went into anthropology to do her doctorate.

Q: Can we pause for a second? [Interruption]

Horner: I don't think we know why, but --

Q: We can ask him.

Len Morris: They didn't like having him running around taking all those coercive photographs.

Horner: Yes. But, you see, Omar also comes out of the trade union movement, so --

Q: Maybe we could talk about that.

Horner: He came bringing baggage, and there was a lot of volatility in the trade union movement in Cape Town. And there were people who were picked up mistakenly at the time. I mean, Charles Simkins was banned because they thought he was doing something with trade unions in Cape Town. In fact, it was somebody else in SALDRU who was doing it. [Interruption]

Q: Could we go back a little to the goals and intentions of the photographic aspect of the project and then move into a discussion of Omar Badsha, the environment at the time in relation to the trade union movement?

Horner: All right. Now, again, I think Francis rather bowled a googly at me, because Omar and I went back a very long time before SALDRU existed. Badsha and I had known each other in 1971 and 1972, when he was an active trade unionist in Durban and I was sitting at Institute for Race Relations in Johannesburg and I was doing the background research for the labor movement. And in visiting Durban, going to seminars with the trade unionists in Durban, and it was Omar, in fact, who took the dock workers to the Wage Board. I did background information on wages and living conditions. And for the first time ever, Omar

bused in dock workers to flood this hearing of the Wage Board. So that's how long he and I went back. Francis then, when Carnegie was sort of beyond the drawing-board stage, it was going to roll, said, "We're going to have this photographic exhibition as well, and the person doing it is Omar Badsha." And I said, "Not the same Omar Badsha." [Laughter] He said, "Yes, well, I think he must be. He comes out of the trade union movement."

So that kind of reconnected Omar and me. And I don't think that came out of any think tank in SALDRU or UCT. I think that was some idea possibly being developed between Francis and people in the States about why not have a photographic exhibition, and then Francis getting in touch with Omar. And Omar had sort of -- after a very torrid period in the union movement, I think had moved out and had set up as a professional photographer, and had his own network of photographers around the country. There were several photographers' cooperatives, and Omar was linked or had links with them. So he was chosen then to set up the photographic exhibition. Again, I think, you know, in the academic environment, people weren't quite sure why you should have a picture show. [Laughter] When you were doing serious social studies, I mean, why let all these crazy photographers in? And some of them were crazy and still are. [Laughter] They drink down at my local pub. That was all put together and was very wild and woolly and again a very volatile period.

Q: He was arrested. Why? Or do you know?

Horner: That I don't know. As I say, he may have some idea. He and I have never discussed it afterwards, of whether they gave him any reason for his arrest, because they

often didn't. I mean, you were just taken away for a week and locked up, and they didn't have to tell you why they were locking you up. So I've never unpacked that with Omar. But they may have told him something. But it was just an act of intimidation, because that was the way they used to work. They often didn't attack the principal that they wanted to attack; they attacked a subsidiary person just to give you a warning.

Q: But effectively it removed him from the conference and it could have potentially destroyed that aspect of the conference.

Horner: Well, it could have been an absolute mess. As I say, we winged it. But it wasn't the big opening event that it would have been.

Q: Let me ask you a hard question. At the end of the day, what has all this meant to you personally, watching the development of these students, watching the conference, unfolding the results?

Horner: Wild euphoria, really, and a sense of tremendous satisfaction. A lot of these students have become close friends and work associates and political allies. It has exceeded anything I expected, certainly anything I expected in 1986. And I must say I was one of the skeptics, thinking of all my own baggage. When it was being hotly debated in this country about whether [F.W.] de Klerk would actually release Mandela, I actually lost money in a bet because I said, "He's never going to do it."

Q: So you didn't think you would see change in your lifetime?

Horner: I didn't think I would see the change in my lifetime, and I have. And yes, all these people are in place. I can remember very shortly after the new government was elected and the Minister of Labor had appointed me to chair the Wage Board, which was ironic, and Omar Badsha and I rolled around laughing, because for twenty years of my life I had been the principal critic of the Wage Board of South Africa, and the new minister appointed me to chair the Wage Board. And flying up on a plane with a couple of our ex-students, all of us going to Pretoria, and young Gregory Erasmus sitting next to me, and he said, "I think we know three-quarters of the people on the plane." I said, "I think we do know three-quarters of the people on the plane." And then Gregory started to moan about the government doing this, that, and the other, and I said, "But Gregory, we *are* the government." [Laughter] "I mean, we are the government. I'm flying up to chair the minister's Wage Board and you're flying up to the Department of Water Affairs. We are the government, you know." [Laughter] So, yes.

Q: Unimaginable.

Horner: It was. It has been unimaginable. As I say, we have revisited that. I am revisiting it now, working with the Provincial Development Council in the Cape and working with many of the people from that period. So, yes. It's not a bad place to be.

Q: Good. I think we may be done. Fantastic. Thank you.

[END OF INTERVIEW]