

Could it be that the concepts of "praxis" and "witness" are not simply interchangeable?

One reason for thinking so is that praxis can hardly be adequately conceived except as involving not only what is said and done, but also what is thought, while witness seems to be interpreted in a strained way if it is construed so broadly that it includes thought as well as speech.

The two terms are not simply interchangeable, then, because praxis includes thought as well as speech, while witness includes only speech (i.e., what is done as well as what is said), not thought.

January 1993