

INTRODUCTION: NEW SOUTH AFRICAN KEYWORDS

Nick Shepherd and Steven Robins

ON MAY DAY 2007 thousands of demonstrators marched through the streets of Durban protesting against government proposals to rename close to 200 buildings, roads and other landmarks. The protest was led by the Zulu-dominated Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP). IFP spokespersons complained that the ANC-controlled city council had bulldozed the name changes through without adequate consultation. The names suggested were all heroes of the ANC's liberation struggle, which had culminated in the first democratic elections of 1994. Opposition to the proposed name changes also came from Afrikaners, the white descendants of European settlers who had systematically inscribed their names across the entire South African landscape. Perhaps the most vehemently contested of all the proposals was that to change the name of Umlazi's Mangosuthu Highway, named after the IFP leader Mangosuthu Buthelezi, to Griffiths Mxenge Highway in honour of a slain ANC activist and lawyer. IFP leaders warned of violence and bloodshed if this name change went ahead. Clearly, names, like language and culture, have become highly contentious aspects of the political transformation in South Africa.

One of the most compelling ideas to have come out of the humanities and social sciences is the idea that language, words and the names that we give to things play an active and determining role in constructing social realities. Far from being a passive process whereby we specify what is already known, the act of naming something becomes part of the process of its constitution, and an active site of social contestation. This is especially true of societies in transition (and what society is not in transition?). To say and to name is to know – but always to know in particular ways. In this book we set out to do two things. The first is to provide a guide to the keywords and key concepts that have become central to public and political discourses in post-apartheid South Africa. Our idea in this regard is a simple one. A significant aspect

of the social, political and economic changes in South Africa in the post-1994 period has been the advent of a new terminology and a new conceptual apparatus through which to describe and imagine these changes. Some older terms have dropped out of circulation. Previously little-used terms have assumed a new prominence. In some cases existing terms have been renegotiated and have assumed new meanings.

It is part of the double nature of language itself that these new keywords and concepts are both enabling and disabling, providing both wings for and shackles to the imagination. On the one hand, they open up fields of possibility and suggest daring new formulations of self and society. On the other hand, they set limits to this project, determine it in particular ways, and involve it in new combinations of power and interest. The same gesture that opens up some new horizons makes other formulations unthinkable, unsayable. Whatever happened to notions like 'tribe' and 'revolution', staples of apartheid and anti-apartheid discourses respectively? How have words like 'culture', 'race' and 'tradition' been renegotiated and re-interpreted? What exactly is implied by newly prominent words like 'rights' and 'transformation'? In each case it turns out that the answer is quite complex. At the same time, a close reading of this changing terrain of language provides one of the surest guides to the deeper nature and the contested contexts of the New South Africa.

The second thing that we set out to do in this book is to provide a compendium of current thinking on post-apartheid society. Here again, our approach was a simple one. We asked some of the most exciting current thinkers and commentators on post-apartheid South Africa to write essays on given keywords. We wanted the chapters to be short, punchy and accessible. At the same time, we wanted them to capture the complexity of current debates and the often ambiguous, unresolved senses in which these keywords circulate. Authors were asked to avoid academic circumlocutions, and to illustrate theoretical discussions with real world examples from post-apartheid contexts. The result is a concise and insightful guide to post-apartheid society which we hope will be useful to students, citizens, tourists, business managers, decision-makers – in fact, to anyone wanting to make sense of South African society today.

A vocabulary of culture and society

This book follows in illustrious footsteps. Most immediately, it acknowledges one of the most important books to come out of South Africa in the late 1980s, Emile Boonzaier and John Sharp's *South African Keywords: The Uses and Abuses of Political Concepts* (1988). For each of us, in different ways, this book was formative. As students, it provided us with an indispensable guide to the confusing, obfuscatory political discourse of apartheid. It is still a work that we recommend to colleagues, set as reading for courses, and dip into in the course of our own work. In their preface, Boonzaier and Sharp described their project as being 'to know how some of the key

concepts of South African politics are used and abused in various arguments about the nature of society, and ... to distinguish good sense from nonsense' (1988: ix-x), an admirably straightforward intention. In his introduction, Sharp suggested why this can be a complicated business: 'one cannot assume that any representation of ... society is a straightforward description of its real nature, because each representation is a political statement which includes the assumptions and intentions of the people who make it' (2).

In the case of apartheid South Africa, he described the existence of a 'discourse of domination', which consists of 'a series of terms' that are 'related to each other by the manner in which they are understood'. Together they 'constitute a discourse about the nature of South African society, which reveals the logic and serves the interests of those who wield power' (6). Very briefly, he described a series of recognisable phases in the development of this discourse of domination. First organised around notions of 'race' and 'tribe', in the 1950s these were supplanted by a new vision of 'ethnic groups' and 'nations' as the building blocks of apartheid. In the 1980s, there was a shift to a developmentalist language, characterised by a 'two worlds' argument – that is, the notion that South Africa was a mix of 'first world' and 'third world' populations – and by the need for the 'development' and 'upliftment' of the 'backward' sectors.

In his account of the history of South African anthropology from 1920 to 1990, David Hammond-Tooke noted that the publication in 1988 of *South African Keywords* was a major contribution to South African anthropology. According to Hammond-Tooke, *Keywords* provided 'a critical examination of conventional beliefs about the nature of South African society, pointing out both the slippery nature of concepts such as culture, community, tradition, race, tribe, development, ethnic group and others, and demonstrating how they could be misused in political rhetoric and discourse' (1997: 180). Interestingly, only a few pages earlier on, Hammond-Tooke criticised the same 'University of Cape Town anthropologists' who participated in *Keywords* for endorsing a crudely materialist brand of Marxism in terms of which 'culture as an explanatory concept was rejected as idealist and encouraging false consciousness, and any investigation into ethnicity was similarly discouraged'. He challenged these anthropologists for embracing an orthodox Marxism that 'claimed to explain everything, but it did so at too high a level of generalisation, and thus explained very little' (1997: 176). Having roundly criticised this tendency, Hammond-Tooke nevertheless went on to claim that *Keywords* 'saved' South African anthropology from the clutches of a stultifying Marxist orthodoxy.

Notwithstanding Hammond-Tooke's criticisms, the *Keywords* project drew on the work of influential Marxist literary scholars and social historians such as Raymond Williams, EP Thompson and Shula Marks. In particular, it was inspired

by Williams's classic *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (1976). Williams's *Keywords* began as an appendix to his book *Culture and Society* (1956), which was cut from the final publication because it was too long. Williams wrote: '[but] the file of the Appendix stayed on my shelf. Over nearly twenty years I have been adding to it: collecting more examples, finding new points of analysis, including other words' (1976: 12). He spoke of the limitations of dictionary definitions of words, both in that they appear frozen in time, and in that they do not show the ideological struggle around keywords and their meanings.

Williams's *Keywords* was informed by a lively sense of the way in which conceptions of culture and society are both shaped by and reflected in the changing meanings of its key terms. Not only is language reflective of social and cultural formations, but struggles over meaning are a key component of struggles over the changing nature of society itself. In a central formulation, Williams referred to this as the notion of an 'active vocabulary'. In this sense, he described his project in *Keywords* as 'Notes on a list of words; analyses of a certain formation: these were the elements of an active vocabulary – a way of recording, investigating and presenting problems of meaning in which the meanings of *culture* and *society* have formed' (1976: 13).

In a similar fashion, Boonzaier and Sharp positioned their work as a polemic against apartheid state-centred discourse understood as a misuse of language. This was signalled in their sub-title: the 'use and abuse' of political language. Williams, though, has a more nuanced understanding of the relation between language, culture and society. For Williams, there is no neutral or value-free form of language which offers a stable alternative to this misuse. In a significant passage, he wrote of what it is that can be gained from an exercise in historicising and contextualising these key terms: 'What can really be contributed is not resolution but perhaps, at times, just that extra edge of consciousness' (1976: 21). He commented:

This is not a neutral review of meanings. It is an exploration of the vocabulary of a crucial area of social and cultural discussion, which has been inherited within precise historical and social conditions and which has to be made at once conscious and critical – subject to change as well as continuity – if the millions of people in whom it is active are to see it as active: not a *tradition* to be learned, nor a *consensus* to be accepted, not a set of meanings which, because it is 'our language', has a natural authority; but as a shaping and reshaping, in real circumstances and from profoundly different and important points of view: a vocabulary to use, to find our ways in, to change as we find it necessary to change it, as we go on making our own language and history (1976: 21–2).

Drawing out this distinction a little further helps us to make a point about the particularity of a local tradition of research in anthropology. Boonzaier and Sharp's

Keywords, and a strand of South African anthropology through the 1980s, can be characterised by its desire to be politically relevant and interventionist. This response was not surprising, given the immediacy of the horrors of apartheid. A more general critique of anthropology's complicity in colonialism (see Asad 1973) no doubt also drove some South African anthropologists to articulate a clear political position vis-à-vis the apartheid state and its discourses. It may be argued that this contributed towards the privileging of action over thought, politics over theory, and applied over pure research (see Gillespie and Dubbeld 2008). For example, Steven Robins recalls discussing with fellow postgraduate students in the early 1980s how their Honours research projects on the devastating impact of forced removals in the South Sotho ethnic homeland of Qwaqwa would be useful to a democratic government some day in the future. In other words, it was the political relevance and utility of the research for a future democratic government that justified doing this research in the first place.

This activist orientation – so clear in Boonzaier and Sharp's project – continues to animate sectors of South African scholarship, and was one of the legacies that we needed to consider in positioning our own book. Complexity is never good for its own sake. What can we offer, if not a clear account of 'use' and 'abuse'? What is the role of critique, and how do we situate our own project in relation to a tradition of critical humanities scholarship? Above all, how can we render this complexity in a form that is genuinely useful, as a set of empowering ideas – tools to think with – rather than a kind of unravelling?

How 'new' is the New South Africa?

An important insight in Boonzaier and Sharp's *Keywords* was the manner in which the conceptual apparatus of modernity made itself available to apartheid ideologues, to the extent that it was concerned with embedded notions of culture and identity, with notions of racial difference, and with elaborating categories and hierarchies of classification. One way of understanding apartheid is as the outcome of a certain strand of thought in modernity itself, along with fascism, authoritarianism (as Hannah Arendt has argued), and racial slavery and colonialism (as Tony Bogue and others have argued). This suggestive formulation has been taken up by, for example, the French philosopher and poststructuralist theorist Jacques Derrida, who described events in South Africa as a 'concentration of world history'. Writing in the mid-1980s, he said: 'we might be tempted to look at this region of the world as a giant tableau or painting, the screen for some geopolitical computer. Europe, in the enigmatic process of its globalization and its paradoxical disappearance, seems to project onto this screen, point by point, the silhouette of its internal war, the bottom line of its profits and losses, the double-bind logic of its national and multi-national interests' (1985: 336–7).

The theme here is not the familiar and discredited notion of South African exceptionalism, but rather its opposite, the notion that South Africa presents an intensification of processes and relations seen elsewhere. The extreme forms taken by the development of racial capitalism under apartheid, the stark nature of its social contexts, the dramatic political transition of the 1990s: all work together to render South Africa in some ways exemplary, paradigmatic. It is not altogether fanciful to say that in getting a handle on the contested social, economic, political and cultural contexts of contemporary South Africa, we simultaneously gain insight into a far broader set of processes and relations, particularly in as far as they affect those parts of the world that have developed in the shadow of colonialism, on the flip-side of the global economy.

At the same time, there are significant continuities between pre-1994 and post-1994 contexts in South Africa. Broadly speaking, these follow two paths. Firstly, the continuing influence of development discourses, and their articulation with notions of globalisation and with neoliberal economic strategies (see Van der Waal, Koelble and Reddy, this volume). Secondly, the recycling of embedded notions of culture, tradition and identity, and their reappearance in public life via debates around notions of rights, entitlements, citizenship and heritage (see Garuba and Raditlhalo, Boonzaier and Spiegel, Robins and Von Lieres, and Shepherd, this volume). An exemplary instance of just how complex this play of conceptual continuity and difference has been, is the contemporary fate of the notion of 'ethnicity'.

In the first *South African Keywords* project, John Sharp focused on ethnicity as a primarily (apartheid) state-driven political and historical construction. In this book, John and Jean Comaroff draw attention to new forms of non-state-centred ethnic mobilisation and identity politics. The Comaroffs' chapter highlights the salience of 'Ethnicity Inc.' as a paradigmatic post-Cold War, neoliberal form of ethnicisation that reflects the legal expression of the commodification of culture and indigenous intellectual property. This contrasts sharply with John Sharp's analysis of the rise of Afrikaner ethnic nationalism and separate development (Bantustan or homeland) policy, a project that focused primarily on capturing the institutions of the nation-state, and stressed timeless and essential ethnic identities. Rather than seeking control of the state, or reacting against state forms of discrimination as ethnic minorities, 'Ethnicity Inc.', as exemplified in the case of the San ('Bushmen'), is concerned with legal struggles over access to land and intellectual property rights.

The San case reflects the emergence of new forms of ethnogenesis in terms of which identity and 'community' are reconstituted through the commodification of culture and intellectual property rights. These new forms of 'ethnic' mobilisation sometimes involve lucrative business empires. For example, in 1999, the Bafokeng Kingdom of North West Province won a ten-year legal battle for royalty payments from Impala Platinum Holdings (Implats). The Bafokeng have used these massive

deposits of platinum, the largest outside Russia, to both reproduce 'tribal' traditions and build modern infrastructure including schools, clinics, hospitals, sports and recreation facilities, and a major Science and Technology Academy (see Comaroff and Comaroff, this volume).

Nor is it the case that these new forms of ethnogenesis have displaced prior, more embedded forms of ethnic mobilisation. Rather, it seems that both forms can coexist. While the changing fortunes of the notion of ethnicity reveal particularly interesting breaks and continuities with the apartheid past, the chapters in this book on tradition, race, gender, development and transformation are equally revealing in this regard. It is clear that some keywords have long shelf lives that may defy scholarly deconstruction and critiques. Popular understandings of race, gender and development are especially immune to scholarly deconstruction. Notwithstanding ongoing anti-essentialist critiques of the sort attempted in *South African Keywords*, essentialist understandings of race, gender and tradition are alive and well in the public sphere. No longer are timeless and essentialist ideas about San identity, for instance, simply imposed from 'the outside' but they are also reproduced 'from below' by indigenous peoples making claims to the state and the courts for access to land and political resources. Whereas during the anti-apartheid struggle, Left intellectuals and activists believed that outmoded ideas about ethnic and cultural difference would give way to modern, socialist understandings of working-class consciousness and solidarity, political life in post-apartheid South Africa continues to be animated by discourses on 'African tradition' and ethnic difference.

Some of the chapters in this book reveal that there have indeed been striking discontinuities and unanticipated new developments since the demise of apartheid. For example, the AIDS pandemic has opened up questions surrounding sexuality and sexual rights as never before, and has served to place the body at the centre of public and political discourses. Closely guarded taboos around gender and sexuality have been challenged, and patriarchal sexual ideas and practices have come under the gaze of public and scientific scrutiny. The Jacob Zuma rape trial in 2006, for example, was perceived by gender activists as a disturbing lens on to patriarchal culture in South Africa. The trial also revealed the profound tensions and contradictions between progressive, constitutionally mandated sexual rights and conservative, culturally embedded sexual cultures. This made for new public expressions of sexual politics that could not have been anticipated by the contributors to the original *Keywords* project.

The public debate around the causes and correct treatment of HIV/AIDS has also served to focus attention on questions of knowledge and epistemology. In quite surprising and surely unprecedented ways, discussions around science and society, and around 'Western' versus 'African' ways of knowing and being in the world, have become staples of media reportage. This has been due in part to the peculiar centrality

of this debate, emanating from the office of the President (see Posel in this volume). Perhaps more than any other, the public debate around HIV/AIDS has presented a nation in the process of thinking through a set of meanings and values, just as it has presented the world (and ourselves) with some of the most difficult and troubling material in thinking through the New South Africa.

The idea of critique

Boonzaier and Sharp's volume was characterised by its unity of approach. The authors, all of whom were anthropologists, had their sights set firmly on the political discourse of apartheid, and it was towards the end of deconstructing this discourse that the essays in that volume were directed. Our own approach is necessarily more interdisciplinary and heterodox. It has become a commonplace that the political transition in South Africa coincided with the intensified effects of globalisation. It also coincided with a fundamental reorganisation of global political and economic power, and with the end of a certain way of understanding global social dynamics. This was not Francis Fukuyama's 'end of history', but the end of a certain teleological view of history as being bound up with class struggles, state entities and the historical movement against a capitalist mode of production. Writing ten and more years after the first democratic elections in South Africa, we need to account for a more complex and ambiguous terrain, both with regard to social processes and with regard to notions of agency, history and teleology.

One example of this is the disappearance of a consensual political vocabulary of the Left which was available to Boonzaier and Sharp (although, arguably, they overestimated the extent of this consensus, even in the mid-1980s). Ours is a situation in which, for example, a radical feminist position competes for the label of 'progressive' in the realm of cultural politics with an Afro-centric position founded on essentialised notions of culture, tradition and knowledge, with decided views on the role of women in society. It is also a situation in which a broadly Marxist political economy, transmuted into the liberal democratic language of socio-economic rights, competes for the same label with a radical anti-globalisation position founded on notions of autarky and self-reliance. More prosaically, it is a situation in which political leaders whose personal histories lie in the struggle against apartheid can appear one day in suits at Davos, and the next in Communist Party T-shirts at a meeting of trade unionists, even as they endorse conservative economic strategies whose overwhelming effect has been to benefit 'new' as well as old elites.

What we offer here is not a single reading but a set of perspectives from which to make sense of these entangled contexts, based on a close account of their key terms and the social and intellectual contexts in which they have been used and articulated. This is not to say that there are no firm positions from which to view developments, decide

between competing approaches, even make judgements and take sides. Rather, it is to say that the hopes of a single, encompassing narrative have been largely frustrated. Or that key questions of agency, causality and value now seem more complexly nuanced. Or that the binaries set up by colonial discourse and adopted and inverted by anti-colonial discourses – us–them, black–white, South–North, the Rest–the West – begin to break down in the face of more ambiguously interpenetrating social and political arrangements. We might say that there is no easy walk to enlightenment.

One of the threads running through the explication of keywords in this volume has to do with their ‘protean’ nature, whereby ‘meanings tend to go in several directions at once’ (Garuba and Raditlhalo, in this volume). Harry Garuba and Sam Raditlhalo are writing of culture as a postapartheid keyword, but the same might equally be said of ‘tradition’, ‘ethnicity’, ‘heritage’ or any number of other keywords. Each is situated at a complex juncture, pointing forwards and backwards, gesturing towards the fixed and essential even as they function as complex sites of cultural construction and self-stylisation. In our account, a starting point for critique is a willingness to hold this kind of doubleness in mind. It means resisting the pull of either a (self-defeating) search for authenticity, or a (defeated) relativism whereby all meanings become equally valid. It also means being prepared to occupy a slightly indeterminate middle ground, tacking backwards and forwards between seemingly contradictory sets of meanings, taking local contexts and histories of usage as appropriate reference points.

A second point is the realisation that it is precisely their protean and ambiguous nature that renders such terms available and attractive as sites of cultural construction and contestation. As Nick Shepherd argues in this volume in relation to the notion of heritage, it is its indeterminate nature – situated at a point of conjunction of past and present, the individual and the collective, rootedness and constructedness – which makes it available as a site where new subjectivities and notions of citizenship are negotiated and contested. In these terms, a notion of critique which thinks of itself as uncovering some essential logic or true meaning cancels the very quality that makes these terms critically interesting and significant.

A further point to be made in relation to such a conception of critique is that it implicitly demotes the role of the scholar-political activist. In the traditional notion of critique the high priests and priestesses of the academy or of the Party, appropriately conscientised and in touch with theory, rip aside the veil of language and customary usage to reveal the real conditions of existence. In contrast to this image, we would want to emphasise the often sure-footed manner in which citizens in the postcolony themselves negotiate a difficult and contradictory conceptual landscape. In this volume Steven Robins writes in relation to a conception of ‘citizenship and rights’, ‘In the daily scramble for livelihoods and security, poor people tend to adopt several strategies and draw on multiple political identities, discourses and social relationships

to navigate daily life'. We might extend this insight to a landscape of meanings, point to the irony and realism which allow people to enjoy the faux authenticity of GrandWest Casino's reconstructed District Six (from which people were forcibly removed under apartheid) even as they experience the unrequited pangs of forced removal, or wear global brand-name goods even as they retain allegiances to the local and distinctive.

Another thread running through these chapters is the question of what to do when discourses themselves become historically overdetermined, weighed down by a set of traumatic histories. More subtly, many chapters are haunted by an unfulfilled project of redemption. How does one evade or emerge from underneath these traumatic histories? What would it entail to achieve a full realisation of rights and personhood, to seize control of the alienated terrain of meaning and representation? In the case of Boonzaier and Sharp's *Keywords*, the answer took the form of a project of political liberation, but what does it mean to ask these same questions in the context of the postcolony? One of the contributions to this volume that breaks format is an interview with Achille Mbembe, which is constituted as an answer to this set of questions.

Achille Mbembe is an indispensable commentator on postapartheid South Africa and on the postcolony more generally. His considerable ingenuity and importance has been to locate himself at just the kind of critical juncture that we describe above, rejecting an easy set of binaries, suspicious of an inherited set of discourses of liberation, be they Marxist, nationalist or nativist. In an interview with Isabel Hofmeyr – herself a distinguished critic – reproduced here under the heading 'Writing Africa', he talks about the process of writing his landmark book *On the Postcolony* (2001). More generally, he discusses the politics of representation: as Hofmeyr puts it, 'the difficulties of writing about Africa in a field that has been overburdened by centuries of formulaic representation' (262); and as Mbembe has it, ways of evading 'the cul-de-sac of the many discourses on Africa ... means for escaping the trap of the name' (262–3).

In a formulation which takes us back to Raymond Williams's notion of an 'active vocabulary' in the original *Keywords*, Mbembe describes his project in *On the Postcolony* as being 'an attempt to experiment with a different dictionary of representation – a lexicon in which to pose different questions about the "now"' (258). In relation to a critique of 'certain strands of postcolonial theory or nativism', he says: 'any serious critique of freedom entails, of necessity, a revisiting of our fables and the various grammars that, under the pretext of authenticity or radicalism, prosaically turn Africa into yet another deadly fiction' (259). In his own work he points ahead, suggesting ways around the traps of discourse, combining modalities from music, poetry and the sensuality of lived experience, to allude to new ways of writing Africa.

Thinking allowed

For many South Africans, as for the majority of humanity, the basic struggle remains the same: the struggle against material want, the struggle for human dignity, the struggle for the wrongs of the past to be recognised, the struggle for reparations and for representation. At the same time, the ground on which these struggles are fought now seems more complex and ambiguous, and offers fewer signposts and fixed points. The challenge which we set ourselves, and which we set our readers, is to steer a course through these complex and entangled histories, dynamics and genealogies. The essence of critique is to opt for neither a blinkered fundamentalism nor a helpless relativism. Rather, it is to stay close to the particularity of given contexts, and to retain a firm sense of social justice and the political ideal – of the kind so admirably set out in South Africa's Constitution, for example – even as one recognises the kind of real-world constraints which shape lives, direct resources and constrain political ideals. It is to attempt the kind of broadly secular scepticism and humane engagement championed in the work of Edward Said, for example, or in the work of Frantz Fanon, Amílcar Cabral and Njabulo Ndebele.

Thinking about South Africa in this way involves a willingness to situate phenomena in a double set of contexts. Firstly, in the context of a set of specific, local histories, trajectories and genealogies: slavery, colonialism, apartheid, the specific forms that development has taken in the post-1994 period. Secondly, in the context of a set of global trends, developments and dynamics, and in understanding the particular place that South Africa occupies – politically, economically, symbolically – in relation to the West or the North. What Raymond Williams characterised as adding 'that extra edge of consciousness' we would characterise as 'reading through' or 'thinking through' the multiple, sometimes confusing contexts that constitute the present moment in South Africa. Ultimately, it was with this challenge in mind that we approached the idea of *New South African Keywords*, as a guide to some of these thickets and byways.

Regarding the scope of this book and the selection of keywords: at a certain stage we were confronted by the impossibility of being comprehensive in our coverage. In part, the selection of keywords was determined by whether we were able to get just the kinds of chapters that we wanted from our contributors. In part, it was determined by our own interests and predilections. There are some obvious gaps. Where are the chapters on 'state' and 'nation'? Why doesn't 'sexuality' have a chapter on its own? What about 'sport' and 'nationalism'? Ultimately we make no apologies. We hope that, like us, you will take this as the start of a conversation, as a first word rather than a last.

For South Africans, this book offers an understanding of the ways in which we describe ourselves to ourselves in the process of becoming. For observers, it offers

a detailed account of the articulation between language and society, in all the particularity of a complex and fascinating social context and historical moment. Thinking allowed.

References

- Asad, Talal. 1973. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter* (London: Ithaca Press).
- Boonzaier, E and Sharp, J (eds.). 1988. *South African Keywords: The Uses and Abuses of Political Concepts* (Cape Town: David Philip).
- Derrida, J. 1985. 'Racism's Last Word' in J Henry Louis Gates (ed.), 'Race', Writing and Difference (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), pp. 329–338.
- Gillespie, Kelly and Dubbeld, Bernard. 2008. 'The Possibility of a Critical Anthropology after Apartheid: Relevance, Intervention, Politics', Paper presented at the Anthropology Southern Africa annual conference, Pretoria, 26–29 September 2008.
- Hammond-Tooke, David 1990. *Imperfect Interpreters: South Africa's Anthropologists, 1920–1990* (Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press).
- Mbembe, A. 2001. *On the Postcolony* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Williams, Raymond. 1976. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (London: Fontana).