

Intellectuals and Activists: Contemporary Challenges in the Era of Globalisation

*Dennis Brutus**

*Foreword by Mona Ibrahim***

In this keynote speech, Dennis Brutus reveals most of the aspects of his public personality: the writer, the activist, the educator and the dreamer for a better world. According to Brutus, the apartheid system, that he got jailed and exiled for fighting against in his prime, still existed at the time of writing this keynote speech but on a larger scale that involved the whole world, rather than just his native country, South Africa. Sadly, although the speech was delivered in 2005, it is still very relevant, if not more relevant, to our world today.

The world today, like it was 20 years ago, is divided into a majority of the poor ruled by a small minority of the filthy rich who run the whole world for their own benefit. Brutus tries to expose in this speech the way some global organizations such as The World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) succeed in making the poor and underdeveloped countries even poorer and the rich and developed countries wealthier. He manages to reveal facts about this enigmatic term, “globalization”, by showing how it works in contexts with which he is so familiar that he can give specific examples with particular names of countries and people. Globalization, according to Dennis Brutus, proves to be a diabolic compulsory process that nobody can reject or escape even in a country that was at the peak of its victorious sentiments like South Africa after getting rid of the apartheid system. He succeeds in explaining in detail how the system of globalization works to the benefit of the rich and how rich countries manage through their “globalizing” organizations to dominate over poor countries through loans with heavy interests that they fail to repay, and so they are forced to give away their natural resources in return for those loans. In addition, Brutus gives examples of the ways those globalizing entities succeed to implement their manipulation systems even in countries that are savvy enough to reject those systems. They usually coerce those countries through bribing a few persons in power by offering them prestigious positions, with very good salaries, in the global funding (and debt) organizations. In a glaring case of double standards, they shamelessly impose on those poor countries what might be called, according to the laws set by them in the context of their own countries, “a conflict of interest”.

* Keynote speech delivered at the Eighth International Symposium on Comparative Literature (2005); published in the Symposium Proceedings: *Power and the Role of the Intellectual*, ed. Salwa Kamel and Hoda Gindi, Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Cairo University, (2006), 1-14.

** Professor of English and Comparative Literature in the Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Cairo University.

Cairo Studies in English – 2025(1). <https://cse.journals.ekb.eg/>

The new apartheid system, as described by Brutus, is still booming and expanding to yet other countries. Poor countries are sunk deeper in debt; they are kept under the surveillance of global organizations; their resources are rapidly usurped to pay for their debts; and their rulers are chosen according to their complicity in following the rules of this vicious game. Yet, being an activist and a dreamer of a better world, Denis Brutus reminds us in his speech of the failure of the Seattle Convention that was supposed to set the rules for this form of globalization. He also reminds us of the different World Social Forums which have created a movement of resistance to the unfair process of the new apartheid that features a small minority of the rich ruling and oppressing a majority of the poor. In spite of the recurrent failures of such resistance movements in our world today, hope and the solidarity of the oppressed are our only weapons and we need to hold hard to them, as we are constantly reminded to do by such dreamers as Dennis Brutus.

**Intellectuals and Activists:
Contemporary Challenges in the Era of Globalisation
Dennis Brutus (2006)**

Let me thank you for the opportunity to be with you and to share some ideas; I offer them to you in the spirit of respect, and I'll try not to be dogmatic or too assertive of my own viewpoint. I will present them to you and I welcome an exchange of ideas. I hope that this will be a fruitful occasion for all of us. I am very pleased to be here and I am very impressed with the title you chose for your discussion. In fact when I received the invitation, the fact that you were going to talk about power and the role of the intellectual was what encouraged me to accept, because it seemed to me to pose a challenge and a demand to examine what we could do, what we might do, what we should do, and also to attempt to define the context in which we try to function, whether we function as intellectuals or as activists, or, in some cases, both as intellectuals and as activists. Sometimes it is the lack of perception of how the world has changed in our time that makes our own responses either ineffective or inadequate, or in some cases even misguided.

And so what I'm going to do is to attempt two things: to talk about the role of the intellectual or activist, and I combine the two for convenience, although it's not always true that one is both intellectual and activist. The second, to me, is an important element, which is to discuss the context within which the intellectual-activist attempts to function, and of course this requires a very specific definition of the nature of power in our time, and how we confront that power. So, I trust that, upon these two elements of my discussion, I can offer some ideas, and then there will be time for your questions and discussion.

I should apologise for my bad voice. I've been doing a fair amount of travel and my throat is not in good shape: I'm still trying to recover from a bad cold. I am very grateful to the organizers for bringing me here, and I want to compliment them on the efficient way in which the programme has been organized. When you think of the difficulties with traffic, for instance, you would appreciate that it is quite an achievement to be able to begin your sessions on time and end them on time. Looking through the programme, I was delighted to notice some of my old friends, some people I had worked with who are the subject of your discussions. I think of people like Sonja Sanchez, a fine poet in America, and Alice Walker, a novelist, and also writers like Amiri Baraka and Ishmael Reed, people with whom I had worked in the States on various occasions. So I am very pleased to see their work being studied and discussed here.

I should mention in particular that I have seen with great pleasure the way in which the work of Edward Said is studied and is appreciated here. I had the privilege of working with him in the United States. I have a high regard for his work. He has indeed made, literally, a global intervention, because he has contributed to an understanding of some aspects, particularly what he calls 'orientalism.' His contribution being one that enabled people all over the world to have a better understanding of the richness of the culture and wisdom that came out of Egypt and out of the East; and the kinds of tragic inadequacies, either of prejudice or misconception, or even ignorance, which have bedeviled much of the discussion of the concept of the "Middle East" for a long time. I am very pleased that Edward Said is being studied and honoured here as he really should be all over the world, him and others, people like those who have really worked for the Palestinians and for Egypt.

In developing a larger perception and understanding of the situation in this part of the world, I was pleased to be invited by the special section of the United Nations. This is called the Division of Palestinian Affairs. I was invited to appear before them and to make certain contributions on how to develop a global campaign in defense of the human rights of the people of Palestine and the demand for social justice. So these are some of the elements of my work. I am not unrelated to the more narrow discussion which we are undertaking.

Now, let me just make one comment. It seems to me there have been many others who have made many thoughtful contributions to the discussion of the role of the intellectual, and so I see my own contribution is more supplementary to what others have already said. I don't see myself breaking any new grounds or making pioneering contributions. If there is something that is new, and I think this may well be true, it is in the kind of analysis I bring to the global context in our time. In understanding how the intellectual might function in a changing context, I can start with some focus on the context in which the intellectual is required to confront power. So I will start with what

Martin Luther King used to say: "You have to speak truth to power," and so this is one of the central functions of the intellectual and the activist. And in doing so, I am going to refer to two aspects of the contemporary situation which, it seems to me, are not very widely understood.

So, I'll spend a little more time talking about the role of what we call the IFIs (the International Financial Institutions), and the way they are shaping the global agenda in our time. Some of my emphasis will be on the World Bank and the IMF (International Monetary Fund) and the WTO (the World Trade Organisation) which as you know will be meeting next month in Hong Kong. And I will be returning to that topic. The other element which seems to me to be not adequately understood in our time, in addition to the pressures coming from the corporate organizations, is the fact that there is in our time across the world now the emergence of an enormously new and powerful thrust coming from a grassroots level, coming from people in many parts of the world and particularly focused in something we refer to as the WSF (the World Social Forum) which met earlier this year, some of you may know, in Porto Alegre in Brazil, and prior to that in Mumbai in India, which used to be called Bombay, and had previous meetings also in Porto Alegre in Brazil. But even those had their roots in two earlier events, and I'll spend a little time on that.

One point I trust everybody is aware of: in November 1999, around about this time, an event took place which politically changed the face of global history and which we are celebrating now, six years later. It seems to me very important that we spend a moment focusing on what happened in Seattle at the World Trade Organisation in 1999, but of course we will see that the rise of the Zapatista and the Chappas in Mexico is prior to Seattle, I will be focusing on Seattle for a moment, connecting Seattle with the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre and Mumbai because I think there is a continuity there which were followed by a series of events, a steady escalation in activism and in the involvement of intellectuals in confronting power and particularly in confronting global power, and the kind of global agenda which we must confront in our time.

Let's look at those two elements, Seattle and post-Seattle, all the way to the WSF. Then we will look at the WTO all the way up to Hong Kong in December of this year. So we will pursue two tracks and situate the intellectual in the context of these two tracks. Seattle, as I hope most of you are aware and certainly should be aware, represented a dramatic turning point in global political history and not everybody of course shares this perception. But most of us who were involved, either intellectuals or activists, are satisfied that that is an accurate description of what happened. Quick reminder. The World Trade Organisation is the kind of combination of all the corporate forces of the world and indeed they say: "We, the World Trade Organisation, we write

the agenda for the world." They make no secret of that, and, in fact, the first Director General of the WTO said: "Oh, we're writing the constitution and the world will have to obey what we say." And not only did they say that, they said at the beginning of the new century: "We are going to write the agenda for the next hundred years. We are going to write an agenda for a century," and then they became even more daring to say: "We are going to write the millennial agenda."

And they had a good reason, because meeting in Seattle, the most powerful politicians in the world and the most powerful CEO's (Chief Executive Officers) of the most powerful corporations of the world were all meeting in Seattle to write what they called the 'Global Agenda' or 'millennial' agenda. Sometimes they give another peculiar term. They talk about writing "The Uruguay Draft." So you needed to know what the Uruguay Draft means. The Uruguay Round was a meeting held recently when they had drafted the millennial agenda. So when they met in Seattle, they were not even going to write the agenda. It was already written. They were going to adopt it. But when they adopted it, it would become binding for all states all over the world. They were meeting to write this new millennial agenda. Seattle was Clinton of course and Jacques Chirac and Schroeder of Germany, who'd just been invited, as well as various other people. All the heads of states were there, but also all the heads of the corporates. Microsoft of course is based in Seattle. Boeing of course and the power arms industry are based in Seattle. All the banks are there: Chase Manhattan and City Bank. When they met there, a combination of politicians full of power to write this agenda, for the first time in history, in the streets, there were thousands of grassroots organizations, students, churches, trade unions, politicians, religious groups, you name it. They were out in the streets of Seattle, and they were chanting: No new Round. Reject. Object. Turn around where were power centres in the streets. And in that confrontation, it is stunning for the first time in the history of the world, the great political and economic powers in confrontation with grassroots people from Mexico, from South Africa, from all over the world. They were in the streets of Seattle, chanting: No new Round.

What happened? People won. There was no new Round. The politicians of some corporations left without being able to write their millennial agenda. It was a historic defeat. And in the *New York Times*, an editorial said: There are now two superpowers in the world. There is now the super power of governments and organisations specifically the United States and the IMF, which is driving the World Bank and the WTO, to which we will return in a while. The people in the streets are another superpower. People in the streets were the second superpower. They confronted corporate power and defeated it. And since then, just to complete the story, the WTO has met about five or six times, and every time they try to write its agenda and every time it has

failed. It's going to meet one more time in Hong Kong; and in Hong Kong they say it is going to be 'make' or 'break.' We are either going to succeed or we will have to acknowledge defeat. So they have met in Seattle, in Genoa, in Prague, in Johannesburg, in Cancun, and in Georgia in the US, in a place called Sea Island, which most people could not find on the map.

And now they will convene in Hong Kong and again they are going to try to write the same agenda that they failed to write in Seattle. But what they called the Uruguay Round in Seattle is now slightly changed. It is now called the Doha Round. Nobody knows what Doha is. People have trouble finding that on the map too. So the agenda was written in Uruguay, and objected to in Seattle and modified in an effort to make it more acceptable. And so they will be writing it again. This is like putting a rubber stamp on it, because when it is adopted, it becomes impossible by law to reject it, and any country that does not obey can be punished by various sanctions. They could be denied trade. They get no loans from the World Bank. They get no loans from the IMF, and they will be denied trading privileges. So that either you obey them or you are in trouble, because they have the power to punish you.

They had a reference in the introductory remarks to some imposed NEPAD, and again I think this is not very well known. NEPAD is a special name for the New Economic Partnership for African Development. And NEPAD is part of the Doha agenda. It is a specific application to Africa of what's happening globally. Of course, there's also something which applies to the countries of North America and to Central America. And then there's what's coming from the United States Congress. I hate to do all these alphabet tricks, but I recognize their existence. The one applying to Africa is called AGONA (African Global Development Agenda or Alliance) or whatever. So they're all pieces, partly continental, but when put together, they become the global agenda, and it is the global agenda that will be adopted in Hong Kong. And all of this, I see it by way of ultimately we're going to have to confront what the role of the intellectual is in that context.

If I were to summarise what the Doha agenda is about and the Uruguay Round, and all the rest of them, I can isolate two points out of many; of course I can't do justice to all. One is that we have a set of trading rules and these trading rules are punishable by law, so that any country that does not comply can be punished in various ways including various sanctions. But more seriously, much more seriously, the Doha agenda, the Uruguay Agenda, the corporate global agenda, is based on one central concept: the transfer of wealth from the underdeveloped world to the developed world. The poor must get poorer; the rich must get richer. The wealth flows from the South to the North but not from the North to the South. And when the North does in fact send money to the South, the return on that investment is far greater than the amount that was invested in the first place. So there is always a profitable process of

what is called the G8, the highly industrialized countries of the world who, of course, write the agenda for the World Bank, for the IMF, and for the WTO.

It is important to understand that in our time there is an incredible systematic and cynical transfer from the poor countries to the rich countries by a series of processes and I will get into that in a moment. But that is the central idea. Not only is it the transfer of wealth, but those who resist the transfer of wealth are penalized, are punished for resisting that transfer of wealth. That's one element. Another thing that must be mentioned is the dependence on the collaboration of people in the countries of the developing world who are willing to participate in this process of the transfer of wealth, the exploitation of the people, and literally the destruction of the people, because their basic doctrine is: profit is more important than people, and that means people must suffer as a consequence of our pursuit of profit. If people must die, as a result or consequence of our pursuit of profit, that's too bad. If they must die, they must die. But for us, profit takes precedence over everybody else. And this is central to what is called the Washington Consensus.

I'm sure you are familiar with the term, which drives the ideology of the World Bank, of the IMF and of the WTO. If you are patient, I will recount one curious episode just as an illustration of how the process works. Let me choose my own country, South Africa, a country which, as you know, engaged in a long struggle against what was really colonialism: a colonial power by a white racist minority. They'd taken many of their ideas from Adolf Hitler, and the notion of the super race, the 'Urbarmensch'. This was what apartheid was about. It is not only keeping people apart, this is what the word 'apartheid' means, because it is keeping some people on top and other people at the bottom. It is the oppression of a majority of 87% of the population by a 13% minority, which has all economic power and all political power, and, most important of all, legal power. They wrote the law. And those were the laws that sent people like myself and Nelson Mandela to prison, and we broke stones together on Robben Island. I escaped twice, some of you may know, but was captured both times. The second occasion in Johannesburg, I was shot in the back by a secret policeman. The bullet entered my back and came out of my chest, going right through me in what the doctors on the operating table called a 'through and through wound'. I heard the term for the first time on the operating table. But we understood this was not about race, even though they talked a lot about race. This was about power, this was about the ability to exploit, this was about the ability to control. This was about the ability to write the laws, which only they had. And only those who could vote can write the law. And so we had this whole intricate process that we had to challenge.

You know that eventually Nelson Mandela comes out of prison, he becomes President. He invites me back. Before that, I was in exile. If I'd

returned to South Africa. I'd have been arrested. But once he was President of course I did return. And so we have emerged from this horror of apartheid, this system of oppression by a minority over a majority. We emerged out of the system of national apartheid into the system of global apartheid. We are living in a world that is dominated by a minority, the world which controls political power all over the world. And they know that they have the military resources, so that if you disobey, they can punish you. They also know that they have very useful collaborators with economic, political and legal power, and they would give themselves more power in Hong Kong when they adopt their global corporate agenda.

But let me correct myself here. I think maybe I was making the same mistake. We talk of people as being anti-globalisation. It is not true. We are not anti-globalisation. We accept that the world is shrinking. People can communicate more openly. The internet is there for us to communicate. Capital moves around more freely. All this process we do not fight with. What we do fight with is the determination of the corporations that they should write the agenda for the world, and so our opposition is not to globalisation but to corporate globalisation, a globalisation by corporations.

Other than that, South Africa became independent, and no sooner did we become independent than the World Bank posed us an offer of \$ 8 billion at a really low rate, nearly 2%. Of course later on they made it 23%. And they, the South African people said: "No, thank you. We do not want your money. Because we have seen that you use your money in Ghana, in Sierra Leone, in Kenya and elsewhere in Africa to create such a burden of debt, and then you raise the interest, and the people cannot repay your loan." And then you say: "We lent you in dollars, so you must repay in dollars." "But we do not have any dollars." Then you say to us: "Well, that's alright. All you have to do is sell to us. We are your market because we have the dollars. Of course right now you are growing food for people in Kenya...coffee...forget it. You've got to grow flowers because we want flowers." And so, now in Kenya, there are huge refrigerator plants. They fly flowers to New York and to Paris, instead of growing potatoes, tomatoes, carrots and corn. So that now they import the food they used to grow, because they grow for the export market, in order to earn the dollars, if they want to repay the loans. And so they are trapped into this kind of mechanism.

And it gets a lot worse, much worse. Because then something happened in South Africa, after they rejected the World Bank offer which is called, somebody may know the term, SAP. That's when the World Bank comes to you and offers Structural Adjustment Programmes, The Structural Adjustment Programme means changing the entire structure of your economy so that you no longer produce for your own people. You produce for the export market because you need to get those dollars. South Africa rejected the Structural

Adjustment Programme. We saw what happened elsewhere and we've learnt the lesson. We are not going to be so stupid and then suddenly there is a change. Two things happen. A couple of members of World Bank staff are seconded to serve on the staff of the Ministry of Finance South Africa and the Minister of Finance is invited to become the new Chairman the World Bank finance division. So he now has a job in two places. As for the leader of Trade Unions that was resisting the World Bank, he was offered a job to become a non-executive director of the diamond mines, which means he's got a job with no work. And when you have a job where you do not have to do any work, and you get paid every month as a non-executive director of diamond mines, it's very hard to say no.

So today we have people who serve both in the South African government in the World Bank, and one of them, the Minister of Finance, is chairman of one the key divisions of the World Bank. The Minister of Trade in South Africa has two jobs. One job I never heard of before, and you probably have not heard of either. He's appointed officially as "Friend of the Chair." And his job is to communicate between the Chairman of the World Bank and the heads of African states, who get instructions from the Friend of the Chair, who tells them what to do. He was one time member of the Communist Party. Very radical. Coming from the ghettos of Marxism, he is now the Minister of Finance in the South African government. These people are active collaborators in implementing the policies of World Bank and the IMF and the WTO, and they will be in Hong Kong, needless to say, and will meet in the green room, because that is where all the powerful people meet. And then he goes from the green room as "Friend of the Chair" carrying orders from the Chair who happens now to be as you may know Paul Wolfowitz. So, South Africa now is in fact an active collaborator with the World Bank. It collaborates once by NEPAD, which we mentioned earlier, and twice, through direct connection with the World Bank.

And I am going now to just round up that statement by one last point about South Africa. One of the interesting things the World Bank did in South Africa was to go into the Ministry of Education. It says: There are so many PhDs that are unemployed. Frankly, your system is not effective and you must improve. And there are two things you can do to improve it. One, you have to merge the institutions, because in the process, you can cut faculty on both sides. And, two, you can cut down the number of admissions. And, three, you can cut down on the cost of the facilities, the buildings and so on. You are wasting a lot of money right now and it is misdirected. The Minister of Education, who was a friend of mine and we worked together in the resistance movement, now has consented. And I don't have the exact statistics, but something like 17 universities are reduced to about 6. And they merged with what are called Vocational Colleges, which are really training schools.

So two things happened. The quality of what is offered goes down, at the same time people who are going to cheap colleges are now being required to pay at the rate of the institutions. There has been a dramatic reduction in the number of admissions to universities, so there are no places for them. One other interesting thing that is not yet happening in South Africa but happening elsewhere: the schools and colleges in West Africa are standing empty because budgets are cut and when budgets are cut the salaries are cut, and when the salaries are cut the professors are not paid for six months. Some of them go to Europe or America to get good jobs. In other cases the institutions are empty. And then business schools would come in and provide MBA programmes, so the whole complex process is further complicated by the active collaboration of the government in power.

One other very interesting issue. When the people—the same people who have struggled for a better society—get jobs such as director of gold mines, you find yourself ostracized and marginalized because you are speaking out against the system and you can be punished in more than one way if you resist the system, if you decline to collaborate. And of course two very interesting minor consequences are that the people the government appoints in education know nothing about it. They are so inefficient they cannot run a decent classroom. But they are well paid and never say 'no' to the minister, and so the process goes on and on, and that's one of the consequences.

And in the streets there are teenagers who cannot get into college. There are no jobs, there are no skills for them. They get no training, and then we discover the need to build more prisons. So there are people who could be in college, but instead they are in the streets and are in desperation. They would rob women going into the supermarket or coming out of the, supermarket, rob them of their small change. They are desperate. These are young men and young women with no prospect of ever getting a job, ever getting a job. This is what's happening in South Africa. Then George Bush flies to Pretoria and addresses Mbeki saying: "You are my point man." So Mbeki becomes the instrument for the penetration of the entire continent of Africa. The entire continent must be brought into the discipline and obedience of the World Bank, the IMF and the WTO.

Finally, just to wrap up this section, referring to the document called NEPAD, it is a new document about how to develop Africa and also how to improve the African economy, the lies of the African people and how to improve governance in Africa; in fact the keyword in NEPAD for every country in Africa is good governance." If you want money from the World Bank you've got to have good governance, from the IMF, you've got to have good governance. What is good governance? How is good governance defined? And if you look at the end of the document, it says: "Good governance is defined by obedience to the World Bank, the IMF and the

WTO." If you obey them, you're OK. You got good governance. If you don't obey them, you are in trouble. No loans, no trade, no development for you. All depends on your conforming to the agenda they tried to write in Seattle, and which they are going to try to write in Hong Kong.

This then is the context in which intellectuals are operating, and not all intellectuals are aware of. And those who are, are not always willing to confront it. There are very pleasant rewards if you collaborate. And on the other hand if you resist, you may find yourself in a lot of trouble. There are pretexts to punish you: denying you promotions, denying you tenure, a whole range of possibilities.

My time, I suspect, has already run up. But I must, as I promised, look at the positive side as well as the negative side. Back to Seattle and what has happened since Seattle and what has happened in Porto Alegre and what has happened in Mumbai and what may happen in Hong Kong. Hong Kong is very racial. Each year the movement of corporate globalization has grown. This year in Porto Alegre there will be 155,000 people coming from 110 countries all over the world, NGOs (non-government organizations) to write an alternative agenda to the corporate global agenda. They have a slogan: "We say another world is possible." An alternative world, a better world, a more humane world, a world in which people are more important than profit, in which we reject this diabolical notion that we should accept profits as being most important. This is against the Washington consensus. This is the corporate global agenda and this is the agenda we must present. And this is the agenda we are building steadily in order to develop an alternative world.

Now you can ask one difficult question, and you'd be entitled: "As of now, what is our agenda?" And the short answer is: "We're still working on it." It is not something that we can solve overnight. More important, there has to be consensus. There has to be a very serious consideration of all voices. Men and women must have equal power, must have equal participation in that process of an alternative world that we are trying to develop. And so we don't have a ready-made kind of order of how the world is going to be. We know what we are against. We know what we would like to see. And we are still working on that process. So we will meet next year. There will be several meetings. The World Social Forum will have what is called 'decentralised' meetings. One will be in Bamako, in Mali, near the great wonderful city of Timbuktu, another one will be in Conakry, in Guinea, then in 2007, we will be meeting at the World Social Forum in Nairobi, so I hope many of you will be there. But there will also be meetings in Caracas, in Ecuador, and possibly in Atlanta in the USA.

So all over the world people are meeting and they are gradually coming together. I may add one closing note and then I will stop for questions, that is, to remind you, not only was Seattle an important success where we

defeated the corporate global agenda. I have to remind you that before the war began in Iraq, the invasion of Iraq, this immoral and unjust process which we must denounce—of course I don't have the time to do it or to look at the way the so-called 'global war against terrorism' is being used as one other instrument of domination; we don't have time for that—let me remind you, before the invasion of Iraq there was a protest. It was the biggest protest in the history of the world. In February 2003, there was a protest on every continent of this planet. Every continent, including the Antarctic in the South and the Arctic in the North. Scientists were marching in the snow to say: "We are against this war." The estimates vary. Some say six million people marched all over the world. Some say it was as many as eleven million people around the world who marched against the war and in support of peace, of negotiation, of discussion, instead of dominance and so-called 'shock and awe' terrorism of the state, which is supposed to oppose terrorism of the people. That to me is the sign of an enormous hope. Eleven million people marching around the world against war, That, I think, is the kind of world that we are going to build, That is the kind of alternative world that we must be building, and in that process, the ordinary worker, the ordinary housewife, the garbage collector, as well as the intellectual, all of us must engage in that process and say our commitment is to a just, humane society, a society with decent lives for people, decent education, and decent jobs. This is our commitment, and this I think is where the intellectual has a role no less than anybody else, as a human being. He/she must have that commitment towards a more just society.

Thank you.