

MAH 91-103-4-1



INTELLECTUALS AND THE FUTURE OF SOUTH AFRICA

BY

N. BARNEY PITYANA

The 1st Ruth First Memorial Lecture

University of the Western Cape

Bellville, Cape

17 August 1993.

1. Ruth First: A Tribute: There are very few people who, once they have seen Shaun Slovo's film, A WORLD APART, would not be moved by the resilience, commitment and passion of the Slovo family. In the film we observe the refinement of character that went to make Comrade Ruth: intelligent and yet passionate; loving and yet precisely because of that love, she was ready to make sacrifices which appeared to neglect her responsibilities to her children especially; she was courageous and daring but never lost her feminine touch. Dimza and I watched the film at the cinema in Geneva. We also saw it on television in England. On both occasion it brought tears to our eyes. Tears because we could identify so precisely with the dilemmas of an activist family. We could see how, without intending to do so, our loved ones, including innocent children, have had to battle for our attention, hurt in the process and yet, because of their love and understanding, continue to have a deep love and respect for us inspite of our parental shortcomings. There are today even more children who have come out traumatised and scarred for life by such experiences.

There are many people in South Africa who have had to battle with these dilemmas. Ruth First is only part of a band of faithful martyrs, witnesses, who have lived by example; ancestors whose protective wings brood over us giving inspiration and courage. The Scroll of Honour reads on. New names, known and unknown are being added to that list every

day. Among the latest illustrious name is, of course, that of
Chris Hani. Death is an all mighty leveller.

It remains a mystery to me as to how I came to be elected
for the honour of this Lecture. I must confess that I never
knew Comrade Ruth personally though I belong to that band of
activists old enough to have read something of NEW AGE and DRUM
and those veritable organs of liberatory politics so powerful
that the regime saw it fit to ban and to harass its
journalists. Comrade Ruth was one of those.

For good or ill, I was given no direction as to what might
be an appropriate topic for this lecture. I instinctively
lurched onto the topic of Intellectuals. This has something to
do with my own concerns about the development of intellectual
life in South Africa in the period through the transition and
beyond. I suppose, not far from my thoughts was the fact that
the lecture was to be given to a largely university audience,
indeed a place that prides itself for being the intellectual
home of the Left..

But more seriously, Ruth First's name conjures up images
of a towering intellect and activist. Speaker after speaker at
the Ruth First Memorial Colloquium held here in 1992 drew
attention to her intellectual capacities. Ronald Segal stated
that she had a "moral consistency and an independence of
judgement along with the courage to express them both" and that

she valued ideas too highly to suppose that she had all that it took for all time, namely, her own ideas were all that mattered.

The greatest challenge for intellectuals, however, is their capacity to infect others with the excitement and inspiration which they feel for themselves. At the same conference, Anna Maria Gentili testified that Ruth First was a scholar "of a special and rare kind"- a politically engaged serious researcher". She abided by the canon that "critical research and knowledge should aim to expose the contradictions: to ask relevant questions; to find possible answers for concrete action". These were all people who knew her well; friends with whom she debated and dialogued. Some were scholars who acknowledged how much they had benefited from her insights and commitment. They were her disciples.

In a Preface to Ruth First's 117 DAYS, the story of her imprisonment under the notorious 180 Days clause, reissued by Penguins after her assassination, Ronald Segal says that "she was a passionate intellectual: in love with ideas, because she desired, she needed always to learn more, to find and consider further insights and explanations. But inevitably those ideas that mattered to her most and that became her own were those that were instruments in liberating people and personality. These came in the main from the rich store of revolutionary socialist thought. But she was always testing them by new

experiences and perceptions, always ready to augment them."(1983:7) Ruth First is part of a great tradition of scholarship and commitment which has driven and energised the South African revolution to the point it has reached today.

But that is not where we end. This lecture devoted as it is to the memory of a great South African intellectual, is not just about the past but about the present and the future. Ruth First has not died. She lives. She lives to inspire others who may never have known her to intellectual pursuits. She lives. She lives today to warn us against complacency and to take the gains of the struggle for granted. She lives. She lives to challenge us to remain faithful to that vision for which so many sacrificed their lives. She lives. She lives to propel us beyond the romanticism of a new South Africa; never to be contented with the present but to seek constantly for a better world for the sake of the oppressed and marginalised. She died so that those ideas and those challenges should continue to inspire and to haunt us.

2. The South African Scenario: As I said, Ruth First was the most immediate reason for choosing my subject. The other is that I relish the opportunity to test some of my own observations and concerns about the drift of our society since I came back in January this year. These are observations I am neither ashamed nor apologetic about. They are advanced in

order to be tested and to provoke. But they arise out of a deep concern.

The history of South Africa is littered with very shameful intellectual pursuits and experiments. Separate development was a scheme of massive social engineering developed in the social laboratories of theologians and anthropologists of Stellenbosch and elsewhere. The Verwoerds of this world had distinguished academic credentials, enough to claim to be known as intellectuals. But they were intellectuals who could say that there was no point in educating Africans beyond their station in life. Intellectualism of that kind stands discredited.

There were intellectuals of no mean repute behind the phenomenon of Nazism and fascism in Europe and Stalin's court was served by no less a force of intellectual elites ready to produce the most plausible reasoning for some of the most harebrained ideas. Intellectuals are no angels. The intellectualism of the South African apartheid establishment has dominated the structure of South African society since the white settlement of our country by Europeans to the extent that everything else is merely a reaction to the thought-world of white baaskap. This is the intellectualism of power and repression, of authoritarian rule, of the violation of human liberties, physical and intellectual. This was a wholesale imprisonment of the mind for the casualties of this process were not just the Blacks and the oppressed but all in our country have been victims of this process. Freedom of thought

and intellectual adventure were circumscribed in the name of an ideology: questioning and enquiry were suspect, conformity imposed and dissent was considered revolutionary and unpatriotic. So pervasive was this poverty of thought that Archbishop Desmond Tutu says that he was once invited to address the Thinking Society at Potchefstroom University. That is one side of the South African equation.

The other side is the one which was generated by this limitation of liberties, this coercive power from which the human instinct seeks to break free. On this side there was a wide spectrum of thought and action from the Cape liberal tradition which included the church, universities and newspapers to a whole gamut of popular resistance movements formal and formal to the people's spirit of resistance daily under the weight of apartheid. But to the left of it was the liberation movement. The tools of this movement included theology, academic discipline and culture. One cannot but recall the great contributions of the fledgling Black literati of the 50s and 60s; the musicians and dramatists, poets and all. Some of these ideas found expression in journals like DRUM and Classic and for a later period in STAFFRIDER. Names like Nat Nakasa, Casey Motsitsi, Zeke Mphahlele, Can Temba, Lewis Nkosi among others, spring to mind. They had the facility for language, the use of subtle and sometimes not so subtle idiom. They captured the art of the short story which conveyed the passion and emotion of life among Black

communities. Music sang the songs of exiles in our own land and our drama and music told our stories in poignant phrases.

In the nature of things, once repression was stepped up, all forms of intellectual life were suppressed. The drift to exile was unabating and relentless in its impoverishment of the

African dream. The Black universities became technical workshops to produce subservient, uncreative and uncritical but

learned people. Intellectuals who had the courage devoted themselves to the service of the struggle. They rightly devoted their insights and skills to popularising, giving weight to and

credibility to the vision of the struggle. By so doing, the task of the committed intellectual could only be re-actionary

and its areas of engagement, of necessity, narrow. There is

also the sense that this revolutionary loyalty might have

tempered intellectual judgements in some instances.

Intellectuals often find that they have to serve too many

masters.

We would all like to believe that much has changed since those times. But the struggle is not over yet. We bring into this present and future much of the baggage of the past which

has formed us and shaped our ideas and thinking. We come now

into a contested arena of competing claims to intellectual respectability. New fetishes have come into place among them is

neutrality, values and standards. There is much talk about

tolerance but nobody really listens to the other. It is clear

that we have all perfected the art of domination, the strategies for power, of double-talk and using words in a manner that they convey neither sense nor meaning at all. We have all had to survive through difficult times. The transition is hard to make. We do not seem clear, anyhow, transition to what? What does a change to a democratic South Africa mean for our patterns of behaviour and our methods of engagement with others and in society. What are the means of relevant and meaningful inquiry. Sadly, if the discourse now being advanced by the political elite of our country is anything to go by, we shall be impoverished even further. Words like democracy seem take on meaning according to the dictates and special interests of the speaker. Negotiation is simply a means to get what my party wants out of the process. For others change becomes a device to retain the gains and benefits acquired under apartheid. Fear dominates and clouds the issues. Fear and distrust are the underlying leitmotifs of the negotiating process. Language and communication have become a problem for our understanding. That is why it occurs to me that this is the time when that breed of free thinkers called intellectuals should be brought to life. They need to rise to their calling to zoom the microscope on the games being played all around us: to provoke debate, raise awkward questions, challenge the sophistry that abounds. Without doubt, intellectuals of today are called to a new task. If I may say so, that task is not simply to service the radical, revolutionary movement but maybe to bring it to account; not to justify practices that seem

popular for the moment but to submit all claims to close scrutiny and logical examination, to be of independent mind without making a fetish of neutrality and to have the courage of their convictions.

3. Who are the Intellectuals? Brian Horne wrote this about Professor Huw Parri Owen when he retired as Professor of Christian Doctrine at King's College London: "Huw possesses that rare gift of intellectual economy; of distilling great learning into a fine essence; of treating highly complicated problems with such insight and acuteness that the solutions which emerge seem self-evident.." What I gather from this is not simply that an intellectual is someone of great learning but one who does not flaunt such learning, one who does not belittle others or put himself/herself above the fray. Instead an intellectual is there to make his/her learning accessible and understandable to others; to be engaged with others in the process of discovery. Frantz Fanon makes much of the fact that a "native intellectual" must not be alienated from his/her context if he is to be an interpreter and inspirer of the culture of the people. The intellectual needs to draw from the roots and drink from the wells which inform his/her intellectual enterprise.¹

¹ Frantz Fanon: **WRETCHED OF THE EARTH**; Penguins, London; 1983; pp166-183 "On national Culture".

On that basis it is not surprising that some of our country's best intellectuals were in the forefront of evolving social movements: whether it was Oliver Tambo, Nelson Mandela and Anton Lembede who redirected the Youth League and through it the Congress Movement articulating afresh the ideals of the liberation struggle or Clements Kadalie of ICU, that nascent pioneering germ of the Labour Movement; or Robert Sobukwe and the new pan Africanist, Kotane and the socialist dimension. I could go on and include I.B. Tabata, Steve Biko and Chris Hani. We have all seen Spike Lee's film Malcolm X and we should note the intellectual personality that went to form Malcolm X in the America of his time, self taught but able to distil learning and interrogate his environment, and the condition of the Black people. Dr Martin Luther King Jr came from a different pedigree but he used his great learning to advance the cause of the oppressed and shaped the Civil Rights Movement² Gandhi was another one and so was Lech Walesa and his Solidarnosc workers movement in the shipyards at Gdansk, Poland. Wherever one goes intellectuals are behind contemporary society's great social movements. I submit that they could only do so only by internalising the need to be driven by selflessness where there need not be anything in it for themselves. A vision wider than their own needs and interests.

² Cornel West: "Martin Luther King Jr: Prophetic Christian as Organic Intellectual" in Cornel West: **PROPHETIC FRAGMENTS**; William B. Eerdmans; Grand Rapids, 1988 and James H. Cone: **MARTIN & MALCOLM & AMERICA: A Dream or A Nightmare**; Orbis, 1991.

Secondly, these were not intellectuals of the academe but people who were able to discern the necessity for new direction in the life of our struggle and had the courage to honour their instincts, the insight to discern new and exciting possibilities. Intellectuals are never complacent or satisfied with what is but are forever digging for new possibilities, excited by new discoveries and the challenge of the novel. Very often, however, intellectuals have to live with unanswered questions; in the knowledge that not all inquiries bring satisfactory results and not all problems are solved instantly. In a recent study called **CULTURE WARS: The Struggle to Define America**³, James Davison Hunter says that the elites in society are charged with the task of developing and articulating the systems of meaning that inform society, they "create the concepts, supply the language and explicate the logic of public discussion." (1991:59) All inquiry bides its time and by a process of construction, brick upon brick, the pieces of the jigsaw gradually come together. Indeed, Fanon says that "each generation must, out of its obscurity, discover its mission, fulfil it or betray it." (1983:167) But intellectuals should be visionary enough to see through for the possibility, the outlines of a dinosaur and its eggs embedded on a rock face millions of years since the creature befell its face on what is alleged to have been once upon a time a molten surface. In

³ Basic Books,, 1991

South Africa, we are indebted to the intellectuals who were able to discern the future, who moved this nation like Archimedes. In honouring Ruth First we honour them all.

Let me make the point that the examples I have given may well be of educated people, university graduates and more some of them might be. But I would like to believe that they are part of this roll of honour less because of their academic training than for their insight, wisdom and intellect⁴. On this basis I doubt that many of those who taught me at Fort Hare were intellectuals in the sense in which this term is used here. They may have been teachers. By the same token, I can think of many wise men (and women) in traditional societies who have been relied upon to give wisdom and direction to community life, the depository of the customs of the people, the judge and interpreter of the history, customs and life of the people.

4. A Theoretical Elaboration: Throughout this presentation this far, I have desisted from the temptation to talk about the role of an intellectual in a functionalist sense. Even my topic is not about the role of intellectuals in

⁴ Antonio Gramsci makes the point that there are no non-intellectuals. He goes on to say that "Each man (sic), finally, outside his professional activity, carries on some form of intellectual activity, that is, he is a philosopher, an artist, a man of taste, he participates in a particular conception of the world, has a conscious line of moral conduct, and therefore contributes to sustain a conception of the world or to modify it, that is, to bring into being new modes of thought." (Forgacs:1988;321)

a future South Africa. No, I want to talk about intellectuals as a concept, an epistemological category, a category of understanding if we are to unravel the future of our country. I admit readily that in doing so, my method is flawed in at least two respects. One can hardly talk about Intellectuals as a category of understanding without examining their roles in the process. Who intellectuals are can best be discovered around the roles they play. To put it differently, there can be no intellectual outside of the tasks which they fulfil in society. Again one must turn to Gramsci who says that determining the character of intellectual activity engaged in and to evaluate it means that one must engage in "a critical elaboration of the intellectual activity that exists in everyone at a certain degree of development, modifying its relationship with the muscular-nervous effort itself, insofar as it is an element of a general practical activity, which is perpetually innovating the physical and social world, becomes the foundation of a new and integral conception of the world." (321)

Secondly, I make reference to intellectuals as a category of understanding but intellectuals can never be understood outside of their social environment nor can they be viewed as a static phenomenon. There is a necessary dynamic relationship which can hardly be captured as if in a laboratory situation.

Thirdly, I just make the obvious point that being an intellectual has something to do with how and what others

perceive you to be, how they judge your contribution to human development.

Post modernist social theorists like Zygmunt Bauman⁵ tell us that intellectuals throughout European history have been motivated by a desire to construct "the good society" founded on a rational basis. Intellectuals engaged with society from an inner urge to be legislators, or the theorist of the good society. Intellectuals were in this regard historical agents and actors of history themselves. Later, however, intellectuals took on the role of being interpreters of the good society. They discerned prevalent meanings, studied the shape of the society and examined its direction. Having said that, Bauman, however, warns that the category of the intellectual can never be "definitionally self-sufficient" nor can one determine who an intellectual is by pointing at the tasks and functions of intellectuals in any one period in history. " In any place and at any time", he writes, "intellectuals are constituted as a combined effect of mobilisation and recruitment.. The dividing line between intellectuals and non-intellectuals is drawn and redrawn by decisions whether or not to join in a particular mode of activity."

On my way to discussing the Gramscian analysis of intellectuals, let me say in passing that classical Marxism was

⁵ Legislators and Interpreters: On Modernity, Post-modernity and Intellectuals; Cornell University Press, New York, 1987.

clearly in a dilemma about the place of intellectuals in the scheme of historical materialism. Lenin, somehow came to the rescue when intellectuals were viewed as the vanguard of the struggle, I suppose on the basis that they would have to commit some sort of suicide (is it the same as class suicide?) Despite that, intellectuals have always played a very crucial role in the development of Marxist-Leninist social thought.⁶

It was Antonio Gramsci who addressed this casuistry in Marxist thought. He viewed the intellectuals as indispensable for the intellectual formation of the working class movement. This he justified on the basis that the role of philosophers is "to change the , correct or perfect the conceptions of the world ... and thus to change the norms of social conduct that go with them.." What, Gramsci called "the organic intellectuals" those engaged in the business of change without being institutional, were by their engagement in the struggle of the working class seeking the fulfilment of the project of philosophy⁷. Institutional intellectuals were the tradition-oriented elites who put themselves up as heirs of the truth of the past. "Their legitimacy" says James Davidson Hunter,

⁶ I am indebted to Professor Andre du Toit of the Department of Political Studies at UCT for permission to use his notes from a project he is undertaking on Role of Intellectuals in South African Politics. I have drawn heavily on Dr du Toit's notes but I bear responsibility for the selectivity and the manner in which they have been used.

⁷ Gramsci states that the only means of distinguishing among intellectuals is by means of determining "the direction in which their specific professional activity is weighted, or towards muscular-nervous effort." David Forgacs:1988;321

"derives from their appeal to historical continuity." (61) A similar comment was made by Herbert Marcuse in a recent BBCTV interview with Bryan Magee criticised what he regarded as the anti-intellectual streak in the New Left Movement which he said was caused by "the isolation of the student movement from the working class, and the apparent impossibility of any spectacular political action. This led gradually to some kind of .. well. let me say, inferiority complex, some kind of self-inflicted masochism, which found expression in, among other things, contempt for intellectuals because they are only intellectuals and 'don't achieve anything in reality' (1978:62) I can testify to this sense of anti-intellectualism of the Left in our country. Shortly after the 1976 revolts and the emergence of Black Consciousness as a force in the South African political landscape, there were some, among them Baruch Hirson, who were very anxious to undermine the achievements of Black Consciousness philosophy criticising it on the basis that it was intellectual, built on the Hegelian concept of "consciousness" and "idea" and as such capable of a right-wing drift and certainly not rooted in actions and strategies of living and struggling communities. I am the first one to concede that there was much that could be criticised about BC but to concentrate attack on that issue betrays a malady of anti-intellectualism that Marcuse was referring to. Ideological posturing can never be a valid substitute for intellectual probity.

There is a growing school of sociological inquiry which suggests that intellectuals should be seen in the context of social movements as a driving force, the energising engine of ideas and activities. In a recent study, Ron Eyerman and Andrew Jamison⁸ bring into the study of social movements the idea that these are the laboratories for the development of "cognitive praxis". Social Movements are the bearers of new ideas and through them such ideas are tested and falsified. They bring inspiration and open windows of perception enabling others to see something of their own inner selves in the problematic that is being addressed. Social movements therefore form intellectuals and so these authors refer to a category of "movement intellectuals."

My own thinking on the genesis and dynamics for the formation of ideas out of which flows action has been enriched a great deal by a book by Robert Wuthnow which I have recently come across.⁹ In his book, **COMMUNITIES OF DISCOURSE: Ideology, Social Structure in the Reformation, the Enlightenment and European Socialism**, Wuthnow notes that forces of change must always relate to their social environment while also remaining autonomous enough from that environment to acquire "a broader, even universal and timeless appeal." (3)

⁸ **Social Movements: A Cognitive Approach (1991)**

⁹ I acknowledge the assistance of David Field and the postgraduate seminar group in the Department of Religious Studies, UCT for insights contained in this section.

Change makers have to contend with what he calls the "problem of articulation". He explains thus: "if cultural products do not articulate closely enough with their social settings, they are likely to be regarded by their potential audiences of which these settings are composed as irrelevant, unrealistic, artificial and overly abstract or worse, their producers will be unlikely to receive the support necessary to carry on their work; but if cultural products articulate too closely with the specific environment in which they are produced, they are likely to be thought of as esoteric, parochial, time bound and fail to attract a wider and more lasting audience."

Wuthnow was not talking here about intellectuals as such but about the processes which go towards change in society and the agents of that change. His analytical device is what he calls a scaffold meaning a framework where details and refinements may be embellished. He builds his system by way of three trilogies: *environmental conditions, institutional contexts and Action Sequences; production, selection and institutionalisation; social horizon, discursive field and figural action*. One need not see these in chronological order but as building blocks of a very creative kind.

The first group can be applied to the context from which change emerges; the second to the processes of change and the last one to the discourse which becomes the instrument of

change. The process is triggered by social conditions which bring about a state of mind which points to a need for difference. The institutional context refers to the "organisational situations in which ideology is actually created and disseminated". The change agents need a base from which to operate, resources and access. Then the action sequences point to the fact that no change ever happens without human agency even if there is no mediacy between the dissemination of ideas and the changing action. "... cultural innovations" he argues, "do not emerge full-blown all at once but are the result of years and decades, and for that reason have a sequential effect on their own development." (7)

The next set points to the process necessary to bring about change. Ideas are formulated from a nascent notion in someone's mind to being shared with a collective who own it and then it gets disseminated and advocated by the collective. Wuthnow refers to a process of selection of an idea that is found fitting to an environment. He appears to disregard the power of charisma, authority and power in the advancement of ideology. The idea, however, has to be owned or institutionalised, to become more familiar and acceptable. Acceptability actually happens when a growing number of people get to the point where the statement addresses their innermost feelings, articulating what they felt but never expressed. Finally he comes to the content of the discourse for change and how discourse shapes the final product.

In summary, then, Wuthnow has moved us from the initial idea of the intellectual as an interpreter and legislator. Interpretation without engagement is what both Gramsci and Fanon warn against hence the distinction between the institutional intellectuals and the organic intellectuals or the more useful term used by Hunter, the "knowledge workers". They trade in more common and more accessible system of ideas and symbols and "collectively their efforts constitute the heart of the formation and maintenance of public culture." (60) The activities of intellectuals form a structure and a process whereby they can be understood and shaped and that is what makes the change-agents influential and effective. That is what Wuthnow has helped us to understand.

There is a more dynamic theological angle to the task of intellectuals. It is that intellectuals are facilitators. "They draw", according to Hegel, "from a concealed fount ... from that inner Spirit still hidden beneath the surface which, impinging on the outer world as on a shell, bursts it in pieces..." This is discerning and bringing into visibility the collective consciousness that may lie hidden or obscured. That consciousness is being human itself and, as Jean-Paul Sartre would express his Existential notion, "condemned to be free." An existentialist theologian like Paul Tillich extends this notion further when he argues that to break the shell of captivity, humanity must transcend the given and look beyond

the present and existential. Liberation theologian Gustavo Guitierrez sums up the radical vision as understood by

Liberation Theology:

We will not have an authentic theology of liberation until the oppressed themselves are able to freely and creatively express themselves in society and among the people of God... We shall not have our great leap forward, into a whole new theological perspective, until the marginalised and exploited have begun to become the artisans of their own liberation - until their voice makes itself heard directly, without mediations, without interpreters - until they themselves take account, in the light of their own values, of their own experience of the Lord in their efforts to liberate themselves. We shall not have our quantum theological leap until the oppressed themselves theologise."¹⁰

The task of the intellectual on this reasoning is to people the whole world with organic intellectuals.

5. What has this got to do with the Future of South Africa? It is my contention that South Africa needs a new breed of intellectual for her health and well-being. I believe that the intellectual traditions of this country have earned us a great deal but has also crippled us in other respects. We have learnt to speak and act in partial categories; we have relied too much sometimes on sponsorship by some powerful interests. We are now, I believe, called to a universalising vision. We must claim a category of thought which is authentically South Africa refusing to be shoved into partial corners. And yet we have never needed more what Ronald Segal says about Ruth First that "she valued ideas too highly to

¹⁰ Robert McAfee Brown: **GUSTAVO GUTIERREZ, An Introduction to Liberation Theology**; Orbis, Maryknoll, 1990; p70

believe that she had all of them." We need to learn to listen to others intently because they are the field or space for our inquiry, what F.D.Maurice called "a digger" We need the facility to communicate plainly even the most abstruse ideas. We need to become engaged; to be "both scientific and non-academic" as Anna Maria Gentili again said of Ruth First's contribution to intellectual life. Never afraid to admit our ignorance or our mistakes. To be an intellectual has nothing to do with "knowing all" but with seeking, a thirst for knowledge.

All of this is vital for our country because we are in danger of losing our excitement for engagement, dialogue and debate. We are rapidly getting used to knocking those who disagree with us on the head or labelling them too easily as "enemies" who must be destroyed. In fact it is a feature of societies in transition for there to be intense debate and disagreement among the intellectual elite whether organic or institutional. It is important that such debate and conflict must never be allowed to obscure the project of national direction and purpose. We shall need to find a way of overcoming this legacy of impatience and intolerance. We need a new devotion; devotion to the betterment of society not ourselves; the poor and marginalised not the rich and powerful.

Intellectuals must continue to raise questions about the direction of the nation long after the particularities of the struggle have faded from memory. The intellectuals of our day need to have courage and be ready to take risks, to stand by

the truth even when others have killed truth by a multiplicity of definitions and explanations; to honour justice even when the political elite has found it in themselves to privatise and appropriate the meanings and symbols of justice; to take sides out of principle and not expediency. Wuthnow's architectural typology helps us frame a possible new social movement in our country that will take on the baton of quality of life and sincerity of vision.

Like all emerging societies, South Africa will need a vigorous civil society, binding values which must be interrogated and examined closely at each stage of development and implementation in policy. South Africa will be served well if intellectuals discharge their historic task sincerely though with humility.

- ends -

