ESSENTIAL ESSAYS VOL. 1

Foundations of Cultural Studies

Edited and with an introduction by **David Morley**

Stuart Hall

Stuart Hall: Selected Writings

A series edited by Catherine Hall and Bill Schwarz

ESSENTIAL ESSAYS

Foundations of
Cultural Studies

VOLUME 1

Stuart Hall

Edited by
David Morley

CONTENTS

The essays published here represent a number of Stuart Hall's better-known reflections on intellectual life and politics, which, for many of us, still live in the mind. They derive from a long period, over many years. Each is written with verve and a sense of urgency. They are, properly, essays—conceived for the moment. They have a life of their own, having shaped to varying degrees the intellectual landscape that remains our own. On these terms they should be judged.

They were seldom conceived principally as contributions to academic thought, even while their academic impact proved significant. The overriding imperative was to clarify thought on the matter in hand and to suggest a route through the quandaries that, at the time, prevailed. In such circumstances, in Hall's mind the conventions required of academic writing weren't paramount. These mattered, of course, but they didn't preoccupy him. Many of the essays published here began life as talks which, when it was decided they should appear in print, were only retrospectively supplied with the academic apparatus of bibliographies and citations. As talks, or even as essays to be published, this bibliographic labor was often conducted after the event, on the run. This has led us to the conclusion that the production of a uniform text is not possible. What can be done has been done. But the retrospective reconstruction of complete bibliographic referencing is now beyond our reach.

This explains the variety of bibliographic systems that compose the volume and the variations in presentation. Meanwhile, in the body of the essays small additions and clarifications occur. Certain minor interpolations have been supplied to explain matters which might otherwise escape contemporary readers, and references from the original publication to companion articles, in journals or books, have been deleted. A small handful of obvious errors has been corrected, misprints dispatched, and the occasional refinement in punctuation has been introduced. But otherwise the essays presented here remain as they were when they first entered public life.

Catherine Hall
Bill Schwarz
Series Editors

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Stuart Hall and the End of the Twentieth Century

One of the reviewers of a previous book of Stuart's essays remarked, in a seemingly jocular aside, that anyone writing a novel about the British intellectual Left in the postwar period might well find themselves spontaneously reinventing a figure exactly like Stuart Hall, so much had his "personal narrative and the public history of Britain in the second part of the twentieth century" been "strangely intertwined, at once deeply symbiotic and sharply at odds."[1] There is much truth in this jest. Stuart's voice has been central in shaping many of the cultural and political debates of our time, ever since he first emerged into public view in the late 1950s. To this extent, two works by John Akomfrah—*The Stuart Hall Project* and *The Unfinished Conversation*— could perfectly well be regarded as constituting not only the story of Stuart's life but also a kind of alternative history of late twentieth-century Britain.[2]

The large-format photographs of members of the *Windrush* generation of migrants from the Caribbean, arriving in London, which greeted any visitor to Stuart's family home in West Hampstead marked his own relation to that critical (and liminal) moment in British history when the ss *Empire Windrush* arrived at Tilbury in 1948.[3] He was a participant observer in one of the crucial demographic developments of his own time, in which, in the context of the postwar boom, citizens of empire were invited to become migrants to the metropoles whence their colonists had set out. This was the moment at

which, as the now well-worn phrase has it, a variety of empires, having invited these migrant populations in (for reasons of shortfall in their homegrown labor forces), gradually felt themselves shudder as their erstwhile imperial subjects "struck back," not simply by turning up in their midst but by bringing their own cultures with them. Evidently, the difficulties arising from these cultural dynamics have been considerable, and at times there came to be very significant resentment toward migrants from parts of the host population.[4] Many years later, during a speech on multiculturalism he was giving in London, he was pressed on this issue by a racist heckler. The heckler complained that the British working class had not been consulted before migrants had been invited to their country. Stuart responded by declaring simply, "We are here because you were there."[5] In more expansive mode elsewhere Stuart tells the story of how "in the very moment when Britain finally convinced itself it had to decolonize . . . we all came back home. As they hauled down the flag, we got on the banana boat and sailed right into London."[6]

A Migrant's Eye: The Marginal Native Recentered

At its simplest, one might say that Stuart was born on the periphery of empire and traveled from that marginal setting to the very heartlands of the imperial center—first to Oxford University and later into the academic and media worlds of what was, in the later stages of his life, already becoming ex-imperial (or, perhaps better, postcolonial) London. In that capacity he was also one of the major analysts of what became known as multicultural Britain—and not only an analyst but an active protagonist in the crucial debates about race, ethnicity, and identity which did so much to transform Britain over the last sixty years.[7]

Stuart himself was always resistant to mere autobiography—although there is a moment at which he remarks that there are points when one has to speak autobiographically, not in order to seize "the authority of authenticity" but in order to properly situate oneself in relation to the circumstances in which one has lived and worked.[8] Thus, in telling his own family story, as he does in the interview with Kuan-Hsing Chen reprinted in chapter 6 of *Essential Essays, Volume 2*, he implicitly follows the Irish poet Patrick Kavanagh's injunction that the self is only interesting as an illustration, by rendering his experiential account of discovering his own blackness in tandem with its own theorization as part of the diasporic experience of being peripheral, displaced, and marginalized. It is in that same spirit that I venture here but a

few comments to rehearse the formation of Stuart's own family history and subjectivity. Formed as he was both by a UK-oriented middle-class family upbringing and by a classical education at Jamaica College in Kingston, Stuart always was, in many ways, very much a British figure. This was so both personally, in his sensibility and impeccable good manners, and intellectually, in his inclination toward a specifically British tradition of grounded forms of applied intellectual inquiry and his suspicion of all forms of abstract, theoretical system-building.[9]

Nonetheless, Stuart was well aware that he could never be (nor be accepted as) completely British. He was ineluctably marked by his colonial origins and remained, throughout his life, both the familiar stranger and a marginal native within his adopted country. One could argue that it was precisely that doubling of position which provided him with the epistemological privilege that anthropologists have always understood to be the prerogative of the liminal observer of any group. A person in that position enjoys the advantages of being close enough to understand the group's culture intimately, yet is distant enough not to take it for granted—and is thus able to see it more clearly than those who are completely inside it.

Notwithstanding his family's hybridity—as Stuart himself described it, "part Scottish, part African, part Portuguese-Jewish"—they, and most particularly his emotionally powerful mother, identified strongly with the ethos of an imaginary, distant England. Thus, he was schooled for a future as a member of the colonial elite but still lived those early years as a black native of the Caribbean (and indeed, as he sometimes noted, as the blackest member of his own family). On a day-to-day basis, he grew up living in the "pigmentocracy" of Jamaica, which he once described as being "the most exquisitely differentiated caste and class system in the world."[10] By his teenage years, at night he was listening on the radio to the sounds of modernity—especially modern jazz—and dreaming about how he might get to wherever it was to be found.[11] Despite his political sympathies with the independence movement, he also identified with the imaginative world of the colonizers. Well versed in the nuances of English history and literature, he recalled that on arrival in the UK, when he took the train from Bristol to Paddington en route to Oxford, he saw a landscape that felt thoroughly familiar to him from the novels of Thomas Hardy.

The England that he had previously only encountered through its literature now confronted him as a reality, and he developed a "migrant's-eye" view of the center from the margins. Thus the erstwhile colonial subject came to

develop his own anthropology of the culture of the colonizers. He sought to survive the medieval gloom of Oxford by making common cause with the displaced migrant minority—with the rebel enclaves of demobbed young veterans and national servicemen, Ruskin College trade unionists, and scholarship boys and girls from home and abroad.[12] So far as the dominant forms of British culture were concerned, in this context, as he put it, "What I realized, as soon as I got to Oxford, was that I could never be part of it. . . . I could study English literature on the page, but I could never be part of that life." That ambivalent feeling stuck with him throughout his life, and many years later he would still say, "I don't belong anywhere anymore. Britain is my home, but I'm not English."[13] This, however, was far from being any simple matter of regret. As he put it when speaking at a conference on the question of identity in London in 1987, "My own sense of identity has always depended on the fact of being a migrant. . . . [Now] I find myself centered at last. Now that in the postmodern age you all feel so dispersed. I've become centered: what I thought of as dispersed and fragmented comes paradoxically, to be *the* representative modern experience. . . . Welcome to migranthood!"[14]

The narrative of Stuart's intellectual development is sometimes told as one in which his involvement in the British New Left constitutes a formative and foundational moment, and his involvement in matters of globalization and diaspora is only seen to come at a much later stage of his career. Nothing could be further from the truth, not least because it was among a set of ex-colonial intellectuals, many of them from outside Britain, that Stuart was engaged at Oxford in the genesis of the New Left of the 1950s.[15] This is a crucial point in decentering what is sometimes regarded as the essential Britishness both of the New Left and (later) of Cultural Studies itself.

The particularity of his formation in the anticolonial struggles of the 1950s, first in Jamaica and then in a more internationalist form in Oxford, also inflected his lifelong intellectual investment in Marxism, insofar as its unconscious European presumptions inevitably grated against his own experience of empire. For Stuart, the involvement with Marxism (deep-seated as it was) necessarily also involved a contestation of its profound Eurocentrism and its relative neglect of questions of imperialism and colonialism. For him, the missing term was, in a sense, quite particularly his own—the Caribbean, as the "Third . . . New World . . . the empty land where strangers from every other part of the globe collided . . . the primal scene where the fateful/fatal encounter was staged between Africa and the West."[16]

The Long March through the Institutions: Dialogic Collectivity

His own political formation within anticolonialism gave him a necessarily oblique perspective on Marxism's putative moral and political certainties. Nonetheless, in the moment of political opportunity created by the burgeoning Non-Aligned Movement, in the wake of the Bandung Conference of Third World nations in 1955, he was, as he described it, "dragged backwards" into Marxism, against both the Russian tanks in Budapest and the Anglo-French paratroopers in Suez. Pushed through these alliances into the momentous political events of 1956, Stuart helped to found key institutions such as the *Universities and Left Review* and the *New Left Review* and went on, in later life, to play a crucial role in British academic and political life.[17]

His ex-colleague Richard Hoggart famously remarked that Stuart used the first-person singular less than anyone else he had ever met in his life—always preferring to speak as part of the collective "we," of whichever group with whom he was working. These collectives included, at different stages of his life, the *Universities and Left Review* and *New Left Review* (1957–1962); the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (1962–1964); the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at Birmingham University in the UK (1964–1980); the Communist University of London (1976–1980); the Open University (1980–1997); *Marxism Today*/New Times (1980–1990); Rivington Place Arts Centre/Association of Black Photographers/International Institute of Visual Arts (2000–2012); and *Soundings* (1994–2014). For Stuart, the opportunities for creative, yet critical, dialogue generated by his participation in those collectives provided the lifeblood of his intellectual work. As he put it in a late interview, "I've always worked with some kind of collectives. . . . Without some sort of grouping I feel kind of lost. The idea of trying to do it all in my study on my own, doesn't feel right."[18]

Despite all his other achievements, Stuart thought of himself as, above all, a teacher.[19] Teaching was an activity he loved, and in that capacity, his great skill was (whether in formal or informal settings) to be an enabler of others—fellow members of a political collective, graduate or undergraduate students, participants in a temporary summer school. He was always delighted by the opportunity to engage in critical debate and dialogue. In this process he aspired both to help his interlocutors to better formulate their own

ideas and to recognize the limitations of any given view, and thus, by critique and debate, to search out better ways forward, intellectually and politically.

Speaking and Listening

As his epigraph to his book *Stuart Hall's Voice*, David Scott quotes Frantz Fanon's perceptive remark that the greatness of a man is to be found "not in his acts but in his style." Thus, in the introduction to the book Scott's focus is not so much on the content of Stuart's views but rather on his way of having, expressing, debating, and developing those views. Scott insists on the productivity of focusing on the relationship between Stuart's own "voice" and the "ethos" of his intellectual style—which he characterizes, as his title has it, as a form of "receptive generosity . . . a mode of giving that is, at the same time, a mode of receiving." This involves, Scott explains, a register of voice "which is at the same time a mode of listening," invested fundamentally in the notion of dialogic relations. He thus characterizes Stuart's intellectual style as that of a "listening self" who is also "an agent of attunement and receptivity."[20]

Stuart was never interested in any easy form of point-scoring critique, with its "overbearing conceits of omniscience" that presumed the capacity to achieve a final resolution of knowledge. Rather, he was always invested in creating the conditions for the most productive form of dialogue available in any given circumstances. This was a crucial part of Stuart's identity as a teacher. Most importantly, it resided in his capacity to act as an enabler of others, by setting a tone that created a context of productive engagement for any discussion. This is not to say that the intellectual standards he set—both for himself and for others, at the CCCS or elsewhere—were ever less than demanding. But he encouraged the many people with whom he worked to seek, syncretically, to make the very best of what everyone could contribute to the dialogue, rather than to allow themselves—or anyone else—to settle for the narrowly egotistical satisfactions of demonstrating mere intellectual superiority. In this context Scott talks of how Stuart characteristically encouraged an attitude of "attuned" and "appreciative" awareness, involving a mode of "attentive receptivity" to the intellectual contributions of others in the "give and take of clarifying dialogue."[21]

To broaden the point, in relation to Stuart's commitment to these more collaborative and less individualistic modes of intellectual work, it is worth noting that Scott also comments on the intellectual productivity—and indeed creativity—of the interview itself (as against the individually authored

piece of work). From this perspective, the sensitive interviewer does not simply extract information from the interviewee, but instead sees their role as seeking to constitute a context for dialogue which enables the other to express themselves more effectively. Here we might think of the parallel with the work of Studs Terkel in the US and in the USSR with Svetlana Alexievich as practitioners who have both raised the interview to the level of an art form.[22]

Tough Love and Splendid Rhetoric

Many have commented on the perennial warmth of Stuart's manners, which, in a lived form of the politics of affect, functioned as a complexly articulated complement to his deep intellectual seriousness (as he might perhaps have put it himself).[23] Indeed, for such a rigorous thinker, Hall displayed unusual kindness, tolerance, and generosity of spirit—but this seemingly contradictory combination was in fact central to his character. This combination of personal warmth and intellectual rigor lasted throughout his life and can be seen to telling effect in Isaac Julien's film of the "Choreographing Capital" event.[24] In one scene in the film, from his wheelchair, Stuart engages David Harvey in public debate about the deficiencies of what he saw as Harvey's economistic determinism, which, so far as Stuart was concerned, lacked any sense of conjunctural mediation of the manner in which economic factors might have their various effects. In the interview Stuart remains as courteous and well-mannered as ever but is nonetheless relentless in his determination to push his critique of Harvey's position through to the ultimate conclusion of its own internal logic. At one point he apologizes to Harvey for the discomfort, saying that he recognizes that "I am perhaps pushing you further than you feel comfortable to go." Yet his sense of intellectual responsibility will not permit him to allow their serious theoretical disagreement (about what role the economic can play in constituting an adequate explanation of events) to be fudged, simply in order to avoid a conflict he regards as intellectually and politically necessary.[25]

In his public appearances (which, until illness limited his energies in later life, were legion) Stuart was gifted with the capacity to stand up at the end of a grueling conference debate and synthesize its key issues in a condensed and readily graspable form. He was gifted with the power of speech in a very special sense: as a public intellectual, he was also a rhetorician of great splendor, capable of catching the nascent mood in a room and converting it into

something more tangible—clearer and more coherent than anyone there had, till that moment, realized it could be. He also possessed—or, one might even say, at his best moments, was possessed by—formidable powers of communication when, at a public occasion, his speech having gathered rhythm, he would abandon his prepared notes and his words would seemingly become airborne, almost in the style of a preacher speaking in tongues.[26]

Influence and Interdisciplinarity

Among the tributes to Hall's standing among his fellow intellectuals that were gathered together in the context of his nomination (more on that later) for a "career achievement" award by the International Communications Association in 2013 we find the following encomia: "There is no other theorist whose international standing is higher, or whose work has had a greater influence in defining the studies of history, literature, art and the social sciences"; "One of the most prestigious, productive and creative intellectual figures of our time"; "One of a handful of intellectuals, anywhere in the world, who can claim to have literally transformed the character and practice of the social sciences and humanities in the twentieth century." To take one simple measure, his international stature can be judged by the fact that at his death, Stuart's work had been translated into Italian, Korean, French, Arabic, Finnish, German, Turkish, Spanish, Hebrew, Chinese, Portuguese, Japanese, and Dutch, among other languages, and he was a Fellow or honorary degree holder at thirty-two universities in eight countries.

He displayed a quite breathtaking capacity to span different disciplines and to combine expertise from a wide range of perspectives, in order to develop the interdisciplinary approach that always characterized his work. In this respect we might think of how his early work, with Paddy Whannel and others at the British Film Institute, bridged the humanities and social sciences—bringing the skills of textual analysis, as they had been developed in film theory, into the field of social science studies of the media.[27] This approach—in parallel with the work of Richard Hoggart and Raymond Williams—thus added a capacity for the analysis of cultural meanings which had previously been significantly lacking from the conventional forms of social science. At a later point, at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at Birmingham, he enthusiastically (if critically, as ever) encouraged the appropriation of the semiological approaches to visual language then being developed by European theorists such as Roland Barthes and Umberto Eco. However, his

ambitions went much further than simply importing humanities perspectives into the social sciences. Thus, in his 1977 essay "The Hinterland of Science" he declared his ambition to "do sociology better than the sociologists" by rescuing the lost tradition of Durkheim and Mauss.[28] All of this can also now be seen to have foreshadowed his major influence on what came to be known much later as the cultural turn across the social sciences.

Hall's work not only rewrote the common sense of the discipline of media and communication with which, in a sense, he began, by establishing the legitimacy of new fields, objects, and methods of study in relation to the media. As the form of Cultural Studies that he spawned grew in strength—and in the overall span of its concerns—it also transformed the assumptions of a variety of cognate disciplines that had previously paid insufficient attention to the cultural dimensions of analytical work—hence the booms in cultural sociology, cultural geography, cultural history, and so forth. There is an important formal homology here. For Stuart, in his early work on the media, it was precisely their role in the construction (and naturalization) of what they presented as only common sense, which was in fact their crucial ideological function.[29] His central point in that analysis is that while its (unconscious) taken-for-grantedness renders common sense largely invisible, it nonetheless plays a crucial role in defining the limits of thought.

To shift my argument to a different level of analysis, it may well be that some key aspects of Stuart's influence on the study of media and communications are today almost invisible, insofar as they concern the transformation of the unspoken premises on which the field rests. Nowadays, it goes without saying that there is more to the media than questions of economics and that issues of culture and representation are equally important; that we must pay attention to questions not only of class but also of race, gender, and sexuality; that low-status, fictional media can play just as important a cultural role as serious news and current affairs; that the field of the political must be extended to include its vernacular forms; and that audiences are evidently not passive dupes or zombies. However, if all that now seems no more than common sense, this is because the kind of Cultural Studies that Stuart initiated has made it so, over the last thirty years, forcing these issues onto the research agenda against a background of the wailing and gnashing of teeth in some quarters.

To return to the question of the contribution of European critical theory to the development of Cultural Studies, it is worth recalling Lévi-Strauss's argument (drawing on Saussure) that social analysis should be concerned with the "study of the life of signs at the heart of social life."[30] That semiological

tradition, to the potential benefits of which Stuart was so alert, has been an important part of the attempt of Cultural Studies to better understand the role of the media in shaping the limits of public knowledge, reframing those questions of how meaning is made by drawing on literary theory, linguistics, and cultural anthropology.

However, besides these questions centering on media theory, Stuart's work simultaneously traversed many distinct bodies of thought, including Western Marxism, ethnography and cultural anthropology, psychoanalysis, feminism, poststructuralism, and postcolonial theory. If his early work redefined the terms of debate around questions of media, deviancy, youth, subcultures, critical theory, and Marxism and reshaped the field of the social sciences, his later work has now become canonical in the study of postcolonialism and studies of ethnicity, identity, race, multiculturalism, and diaspora.[31]

A Public Intellectual: The Politics of Cultural Studies

Stuart was not simply an outstanding academic but also a public intellectual who, as noted earlier, served on a large number of important public bodies and committees. His concern, ultimately, was with trying to understand how ideas, politics, popular culture, and the movements of history can be understood in relation to each other—and how the theorization of those conjunctions can better shape effective political interventions.

His insistence on the importance of taking popular cultural forms seriously, in the service of this endeavor, has often been badly misunderstood. Critics of the ways in which Cultural Studies developed, in its later, more populist phase, have sometimes assumed that an unthinking cultural relativism was somehow intrinsic to a Cultural Studies approach.[32] However, Stuart himself was always at great pains to distance himself from any suspicion of that kind of populism. Thus, as he put it in an interview with Laurie Taylor, which was rebroadcast after his death in early 2014, "If I have to read another cultural studies analysis of *The Sopranos*, I will simply implode. That's just . . . telling stories—it has to be about politics, not just as a 'celebration' of the popular: it needs to be a way of investigating politics through culture."[33]

Perhaps most notably, Stuart took this cultural analysis of politics forward in his collaboration with Martin Jacques and the members of the *Marxism Today* collective in producing his pathbreaking analysis of the emergence of the form of politics which from the late 1970s came to dominate the British

landscape for the next generation. He and his coauthors argued that any model that used the concept of false consciousness to explain away working-class support for these forms of conservative politics was utterly inadequate. What was needed, he claimed, was an understanding of the capacity of political ideologies such as this to articulate an effective appeal to the lived experience of subordinate groups.[34] In his closing remarks to a British Sociological Association conference in May 1978, Stuart insists that while racism is certainly an ideology which serves the function of refracting quite other problems onto the question of race, it is not "a set of phoney conspiracies in the heads of the ruling class." He argues that it is not to be seen (and cannot usefully be opposed) simply as a set of "false . . . or . . . mistaken . . . perceptions" but rather that it has its roots "in real . . . material conditions of existence . . . and arises because of the concrete problems of different classes and groups in the society . . . especially in an economy in recession. . . . [It] has these authentic, material conditions at its roots . . . involv[ing] the real problems of the people."[35]

The CCCS's collectively authored book *Policing the Crisis* (published in 1978; see chapter 12 of this volume) had identified race as a defining feature of the increasingly conservative form of authoritarian populism developed by Margaret Thatcher. Stuart then coined the term "Thatcherism" in a prescient article, "The Great Moving Right Show," in *Marxism Today* (included in this collection, chapter 13) in January 1979, some months before Thatcher herself was elected.[36] Up until then, she had been patronized by many on the Left as an insignificant, shrill-sounding housewifely voice espousing an anachronistic form of old-fashioned domestic moralism. However, Stuart recognized her as a person who, in Hegel's terms, constituted a historic individual—whose politics instantiated, in personal form, and served to crystalize much wider social and political forces that were already in play. To this extent, he rightly recognized that Thatcherism might be able to redefine the public mood, and appeal to the disaffected, through its appeal on moral and cultural grounds that had previously not been considered as part of the political agenda. Thus he argued for the necessity of a corresponding cultural struggle against Thatcherism, and his great regret, twenty years later, in the run-up to the 1997 general election was that Thatcherite arguments, philosophies, and priorities still defined the agenda on which New Labor founded its own appeal.[37] A further decade and a half on, one of his last published works, "After Neoliberalism: Analysing the Present" (jointly written with his longtime *Soundings* coeditors Doreen Massey and Michael

Rustin), once again focused on these same themes, in the attempt to articulate a form of political opposition to the international hegemony of neoliberalism that avoided a return to fundamentalist Leftism.[38]

Conjunctural Analyses, Provisional Truths: The Form of the Essays

As Kuan-Hsing Chen and I have noted elsewhere, Stuart was never interested in modes of intellectual work that, in absolutist terms, present themselves as definitively superseding all that went before.[39] His concerns were always conjunctural in nature, developing in response to emerging social and political questions. His strengths lay not in making definitive statements but in his capacity to take on new political or theoretical issues and his determination to continually try to move beyond his own previous limits. He always worked to encourage an open-ended approach to debate and the politics of discipleship or denunciation were equally anathema to him. He refused the temptation to enhance his own arguments by rubbishing those of others. His tendency was always toward a productive sort of eclecticism that looked for the best (or most useful) points which could be taken from other positions and then worked on them in a selective, syncretic mode of dialogic inclusiveness. He had no interest in the production of any exclusive orthodoxy—not least because such systems of thought, after enjoying a brief (if absolute) intellectual reign, tend then to be dethroned and discarded in favor of another. In his view, the production of a succession of temporarily fashionable theoretical paradigms offered no useful model of intellectual life.[40]

This commitment to necessarily provisional modes of analysis also had consequences for the form in which that work was produced. The essay—dense, allusive, synthetic, opening up some current political issue or intellectual debate in new ways, inevitably unfinished, identifying issues still to be resolved while setting an agenda for future debate—was Stuart's chosen medium, and over his long working life, he produced a vast number of such occasional essays.[41] Consequently, the task I have faced in making a selection from that overpowering range of available work for inclusion here, to represent the most important elements of Stuart's work, has been a daunting one. Moreover, the process of the production of these essays, in different institutional circumstances and in response to changing long- and short-term, cultural, economic, and political dynamics—both in matters of the *longue durée* of

periodizations and the particularities of given and specific conjunctures—was itself an organic one, some part of which I hope to capture here.

It would be perfectly possible to offer a good rationale for a wide variety of hypothetical selections from Stuart's essays, each of which would differ in important ways from the one you have before you here. As this introduction now proceeds, and in the shorter sections that offer commentary on each section of the book, I shall attempt to explain why it is that the particular pieces represented here have been selected. I will also attempt to offer some guidance to the reader, with respect to how each of the essays selected stands in relation to others within Stuart's overall oeuvre. However, I would not attempt to argue that this is necessarily the best selection that could have been made, and certainly not the definitive one. It could have been done differently and doubtless another editor would have made other choices and produced convincing reasons for having done so.

The prehistory of the process of attempting to collect Stuart's work into a set of edited volumes is long and convoluted. In that context, the process of selection of these particular essays was an organic one, made in conversations with Stuart himself that stretched over thirty years. In the mid-1980s, when Stuart and his family had not long since moved to the large house they shared with his mother-in-law in Kilburn, Stuart invited me into his study one day and asked me to try to help him sort out the piles of material he had laid out on the floor, by way of preparation for work on a collection of his essays which, at that stage, was planned for publication by Macmillan. I suspect that my own qualification for the role of informal assistant in this process rested on little more than the fact that I had, by then, acquired a certain amount of editorial experience in the process of running an independent publishing company that I and some colleagues had set up.[42] Stuart and I did manage to sort the materials on the floor into two different piles—from which the materials for a two-volume collection were to be selected, with one volume focusing on questions of class and another on something provisionally called "questions of identity." Unfortunately, although our discussions of this project continued for a while, other priorities intervened, things were removed from each pile for cannibalization by other, ongoing work, and the rationale for the division between the two piles began to feel unsatisfactory to Stuart. So, like many of the other attempts to collect up his work for publication (which followed at regular intervals over the years, as detailed below), the sands of time gradually disaggregated the project.

A few years later, in the early 1990s, I met the Taiwanese scholar Kuan-Hsing Chen. As a graduate student at the University of Iowa when Stuart was a visiting professor there in 1985, Chen had persuaded him to cooperate in the production of a special issue of the *Journal of Communication Inquiry* (vol. 10, no. 2) published in 1986, which combined both previously unpublished material by Stuart (including "Post-Modernism and Articulation," "The Problem of Ideology: Marxism without Guarantees," and "Gramsci's Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity") and commentary on his work by others. However, that special issue only ever had limited circulation; Chen and I then persuaded Stuart to allow us to put together an expanded version of that collection under the title *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. When it was launched in 1996, simultaneously in London and in Tokyo (with British Council support, that august institution having realized that Cultural Studies was one of the most viable cultural exports the UK could offer), it was the first substantial collection to include a spread of Stuart's own published work alongside a set of critical commentaries. Naturally, the selection of pieces for the collection was conducted in close collaboration with Stuart, and the publication, building on the editorial work that Chen had performed in putting together that special issue, laid the foundations for the collection you have before you.[43]

By the late 1990s, after Sage had begun to publish much of the work that Stuart and his colleagues were by then writing at the Open University, he was in negotiation with them to produce an edited collection of his work and then, separately, about their plans for a four-volume collection of critical commentary. Ultimately both of these projects ran into the ground, largely as a result of his unwillingness to prioritize that kind of self-curatorial work over the more pressing demands of his ongoing involvement in questions of public policy and politics in relation to multiculturalism and questions of identity and diaspora, and in contesting the damaging effects of the continuing hegemony of neoliberalism in the United Kingdom. Besides, there was also the matter of his own ambivalence about the retrospective status of his essays—which were, in fact, always produced for a particular occasion, in a specific context, rather than representing any kind of eternal truths. As he once put it to me in correspondence about yet another inconclusive proposal to collect his work for publication, "I just don't write the kind of academic article which is easily canonisable."[44] He always said that, as they were always written in and for a specific context, were he to republish any of his older essays, it would require a great deal of time and work for him to

update them, so as to recontextualize them in relation to the new conjunctures in which they would appear. The corollary, though, was that the longer they were left, the more time (increasingly precious, once his activities were also limited by long-term health issues) he felt he would have had to give to the process of preparing them for republication.

In fact, after the publication of *Critical Dialogues* in 1996, the first collections to appear that were entirely devoted to his own essays did so in Brazil and Finland, following his influential lecture tours in both countries. In both cases, Stuart and I discussed attempting some form of reverse engineering, which would have then made these collections available in English-language editions. Evidently, the circuitousness of that (hypothetical) process would have offered a curious echo of the history of Stuart's own diasporic journey from the imperial margins to the center. However, for all the reasons indicated above, neither of those collections ever quite made it into English.[45]

The Difficulty of Concluding . . .

In 2010, fourteen years after the appearance of *Critical Dialogues*, on returning from a visit to Beijing organized by scholars keen to introduce Cultural Studies into China, I reported to Stuart how very much enthusiasm there was there for a collection of his essays to be translated into Chinese.[46] On that basis, I showed Stuart the list of his essays that our Chinese colleagues already had in hand and he invited me to help him select which ones from that list he would want them to include or exclude and which others he should add to the list from his own files. At that point, Stuart produced a provisional "long list" of around seventy essays that he had already compiled (with help from Nick Beech) for consideration as the basis of a potential English-language collection. Naturally enough, this was a complex business, as it involved marrying up the candidate essays identified in these different lists and attempting to put together a selection short enough to be viable for a potential publisher but substantial enough to satisfy Stuart that all his most important concerns had been included. Of course, while he found that this process made for an interesting dialogue, which gave him a good opportunity to review older work in the light of new developments and to rediscover some things that had been lost, it was nonetheless never a priority for him.

The production of an essay such as the *Soundings* manifesto on neoliberalism, on which he was still working in his last months, was always more attractive to him than carving out a definitive version of anything older. In

fact, that very same predisposition also came into play in another way in those final months, when as mentioned earlier the International Communications Association (ICA) wanted to nominate him for the lifetime achievement award. Naturally enough, Stuart was honored by the invitation. But when he discovered that the terms of reference required the nominee to demonstrate that they had "definitively solved an identifiable problem in communications research," he chuckled, declaring that he couldn't possibly accept the nomination, insofar as solving preestablished problems had never been something that interested him, as opposed to deconstructing their changing nature and/or reformulating the questions we might ask about them. Indeed, he saw the terms of reference of this award as representing almost a direct antithesis to the pattern of his own working career—in which he always felt most comfortable opening up theoretical problems in one field and then moving on, leaving others to pursue, in their own ways, the issues he had raised. Happily, the ICA so much wanted to be able to give him the award that they changed their terms of reference accordingly, although Stuart's declining health meant that he was unable to travel to receive the award in person.[47]

Stuart was thus always more interested, right to the end, in what he might be able to say that would speak to the changing circumstances of the day, rather than in perfecting a selection of his work for the historical record: a task which, in any case, must inevitably have also involved the unnerving recognition that he was being asked, in effect, to help engrave his own intellectual tombstone. For these reasons, the selection remained unfinished at his death. We continued to discuss the project whenever I visited him and we corresponded about it—exchanging possible lists, adding things here, subtracting them elsewhere—right up until the summer of 2013, beyond which point ill health made it impossible for him to concentrate sufficiently to pursue the project further. However, what this means is that the selection presented here is not simply mine—with whatever intellectual justifications I might adduce for its nature—but is, in fact, one that comes with Stuart's own imprimatur in its overall shaping, if not in its final detail. That is why I have thought it worthwhile to present this micronarrative of how the book was shaped in our dialogues rather than presenting it in abstract intellectual terms or claiming that these particular choices were somehow inevitable or unarguable.

The Logics of Presentation: Innovations and Continuities

The presentation of the essays here is fairly simple: evidently, many of them cross boundaries and articulate a wide range of complex issues in different ways. To that extent, any principle of division by subject or topic is bound to appear simplistic. My main ambition has been to give a reasonably balanced presentation of Stuart's work in each of the main fields in which, at different points in his career, he was active.

The key editorial task has been to try and square the circle of making the selection comprehensive enough to represent the full range of Stuart's interests and achievements, while restricting it to an overall length that made it manageable as a publishable project. The material in the two volumes combined runs to approximately 300,000 words—which was clearly beyond the manageable contents for a single book. The key decision was then how best to divide the materials between the two volumes. The main organizing principle adopted, for heuristic reasons, has been a chronological one. Volume 1 concentrates, on the whole, on the products of the earlier parts of Stuart's career; volume 2, on the later work.

Thus we begin this volume with a section on "Cultural Studies: Culture, Class, and Theory," featuring some of the foundational essays in which he first laid out the debates concerning the initial paradigms—and later reviewed the legacies—of what came to be known (through the process of its internationalization) as the "Birmingham School" of Cultural Studies. We move on through "Theoretical and Methodological Principles" with its particular focus on questions of class, Marxism, articulation, and determination, including an important early essay on the articulation of questions of race and class, to focusing on the work from the late 1970s and 1980s on questions of "Media, Communications, Ideology, and Representation." We then turn to matters of "Political Formations: Power as Process," featuring essays in which Stuart outlines the elements of his theorization of popular culture, populist politics, and the dynamics of hegemony.

VOLUME 2, *IDENTITY AND DIASPORA*, begins with a prologue in which Stuart's essay on Antonio Gramsci's relevance to the study of race and ethnicity sets the theoretical framework for much of the contents of the volume. The volume presents the work of the period from the late 1980s onward, in which Stuart began to reconceptualize the dynamics of racial and ethnic

politics in the context of debates about multiculturalism. This is followed by attention to "The Postcolonial and the Diasporic" and a collection of interviews and reflections in which he presents succinct conversational summaries of his perspective on these matters. The book is then concluded by an epilogue in which Stuart offers his responses to the various perspectives on his work presented at a conference in his honor held at the University of the West Indies in Mona, Jamaica, in 2004.

Within each section, the material is presented in broadly chronological sequence, although the logic of exposition of the arguments precludes a strict adherence to the historical sequence of authorship. More importantly, I have also been at pains to make clear the strong continuities that run throughout the work over the whole period. Thus, important aspects of Stuart's later work on the "New (Post-Fordist) Times" of the 1980s can be seen to be foreshadowed in some of his early and prescient observations on consumer culture and its effects on the preexisting class structure and on the traditional labor movement. In "A Sense of Classlessness" (1958) Stuart had already recognized that the decline of the old manufacturing industries was associated with a transformed consumer culture, with a new range of domestic interests—in homemaking and interior decoration, for example—and with a whole host of new spending habits, involving cultural shifts in "attitudes to things and people, whereby possessions such as a new car, a new house[,] . . . a TV set" acquire quite new symbolic meanings.[48]

Naturally, this approach was cause for consternation among those of a more conventionally Marxist orientation. Colin Sparks complained that the demotion of class from its position as the "ultimate cause" and source of final determinations was a "crippling incapacity" of the more populist forms of Cultural Studies.[49] However, far from being unaware of this danger, in a later interview (1996) Stuart explicitly bemoaned the fact that class had subsequently fallen off the agenda of Cultural Studies. As he put it, "In the early days, perhaps we spoke too much about the working class and subcultures. Now, nobody talks about that at all: they talk about myself, my mother, my father, my friends, and that is a very narrow experience in relation to classes."[50] Of course, for Stuart, any return to the question of class could not simply go back to the classical Marxist perspective that Sparks invoked; it needed to be handled so as to articulate the analysis of social classes, race and ethnicity, gender and sexuality, nation and global capital, into a forceful explanatory framework adequate for the analysis of our contemporary situation.

Even in the earliest work on class (and classlessness) we already see Stuart struggling to formulate adequate forms of periodization: "Where does the 'old' end, where does the 'new'—the real, not the superficially new—begin, in this maze of gradual accommodations?" This concern is driven by an attempt to identify the significantly novel aspects of the New Times of the day, while nonetheless recognizing that one or another form of newness is, by definition, a historical constant. Here we already find him asserting the urgent need for a revisionist form of Marxism that would "give a different weight . . . to questions of superstructure than we would imagine simply from a study of *Capital*."[51] Such an approach would, in particular, reject any "simplistic economic determinist reading of the conventional model of base and superstructure."[52] In "The Hippies: An American Moment" (1968) we find him distilling from the alternative lifestyles of that "progressive" culture an important part of the genesis of the individualist consumerist cultures that reemerge in quite different—and politically regressive—forms in the "me-decade" of the 1980s, themes revisited in his later work on the politics of Thatcherism. Thus, to take one emblematic British example, in that later period, Richard Branson transformed himself from his initial status as a cool, schoolboy-hippie entrepreneur into a scion of international capitalism.[53] Here Stuart's prescient analysis chimes with that of Tony Judt, who (several decades later) argued that, in the same process through which the New Left rebelled against both the injustices of capitalism and the constraints of collectivism in the 1960s, simultaneously with the liberatory flowering of a variety of identities, individualism—the assertion of every person's claim to maximize private freedom and "the unrestrained liberty to express autonomous desires"—became the watchword of the hour. As we have seen in recent years, libertarianism can be articulated just as effectively to a Right as to a Left politics.[54]

If Stuart's understanding of Gramscian theories of hegemony provides the basis not only for his initial analysis of Thatcherism and its new modes of authoritarian populism but also for his later analysis of the continuities between Thatcherism, New Labor, and the subsequent Conservative/Lib-Dem Coalition government in the UK, Gramsci also provides a crucial theoretical bridge between the politics of class and the politics of race and ethnicity (as demonstrated most vividly in the essay on Gramsci and race that functions as the prologue to volume 2). Further, as John Akomfrah has recently pointed out, the focus on questions of diaspora, migration, and creolization in Stuart's later work, far from being a sudden disavowal of his Marxism, is

well exemplified in Akomfrah's own *Unfinished Conversation* when Stuart is heard talking on 1960s British radio about the articulation of class with ethnic identities.[55]

The Journey to Rivington Place . . .
and Back to *The Popular Arts*

After Stuart's retirement from the Open University, his growing involvement in the Black Arts movement gave him a new lease on intellectual life and he became chair both of the International Institute of Visual Arts (inIVA) and of Autograph ABP—the Association of Black Photographers—and organized their successful joint bid for grant funding. This then provided the possibility to create a secure institutional home for both of them—at the purpose-built Rivington Place Arts Centre in East London, which opened in 2007.[56]

In some quarters, this engagement with aesthetic matters in the Black Arts movement was treated as a new (or even a surprising) development. However, as Stuart explains in the interview in chapter 9 of the succeeding volume, in many ways this simply took him back to his early interest in documentary photography.[57] Moreover, as made clear in an interview with Colin MacCabe in 2007, so far as he was concerned, he had been involved in arguments about aesthetics for almost fifty years, ever since writing *The Popular Arts* with Paddy Whannel. His aesthetic position was always premised on the notion that deconstructing the claims of high art to monopolize aesthetic value does not in any way involve uncritically celebrating *all* aspects of popular art. For Stuart, the argument about any particular cultural form still has to be evaluative, and the value of any particular manifestation of popular art has to be established by close critical attention. As he scathingly remarks, the kind of "flat populism" that came to prevail in some sections of Cultural Studies (as in the critiques made by Simon Frith and Jon Savage) is no use at all in this endeavor. For him, it remained crucial to be able to make distinctions of value that would enable us to identify (in the example he chooses) precisely why Billie Holiday is far better than other popular singers: because, he explains, her voice can be argued to find a form of expression for a complex range of feelings and experiences toward which others can only gesture. While he is concerned to destabilize the uncritical canonization of the established hierarchies of fine art and to argue for the *potential* value of the popular, the fine-grained process of evaluation of what exactly it is about one piece of art

that makes it better than another remains crucial. As he explains it, what he is interested in is "the decanonization of the (established) categories" alongside the "retention of the critical function." As always with Stuart, that is a Big Ask. But equally, to return to my earlier comments on his interest in—and commitment to—opening up, rather than closing down, debates, this is also a creative reposing of the questions at stake.[58]

In trying to answer these perennially difficult questions, we shall, of course, badly miss his voice; and perhaps most of all, we shall miss that good-humored chuckle, usually articulated at moments of particularly acute political or intellectual difficulty. Nonetheless, we shall still have the inspiration he provided—and the legacy of the work that he leaves behind—to encourage and stimulate us in our work.

NOTES

1 Terry Eagleton, "The Hippest," *London Review of Books*, March 7, 1996.

2 John Akomfrah, *The Stuart Hall Project* and *The Unfinished Conversation*, both produced by Smoking Dogs Films/British Film Institute, 2013. Readers wanting a fuller account of Stuart's life and work than I can give here could usefully consult any of the following: Geoff Eley, "Obituary of Stuart Hall, 1932 to 2014," *History Workshop Journal* 79 (2015). Book-length studies are offered by Helen Davies, *Understanding Stuart Hall* (London: Sage, 2004); and James Procter, *Stuart Hall* (London: Routledge, 2004). There is also Chris Rojek, *Stuart Hall* (Cambridge: Polity, 2003), although Stuart himself regarded this last as rather ill-considered; see also the review by Bill Schwarz, *Cultural Studies* 19, no. 2 (2006).

3 Mike Phillips and Trevor Phillips, *Windrush: The Irresistible Rise of Multi-Racial Britain* (London: HarperCollins, 1998).

4 In an ironic role reversal, in recent years, some members of that generation of Commonwealth migrants have themselves been resentful of the claims on UK resources now made by Eastern European migrants.

5 Stuart Hall quoted by Ben Carrington, in his contribution to the discussion of "Thinking It Forward" at the Policing the Crises conference held at Barnard College/Stonybrook University/Columbia University, New York, September 24–26, 2015.

6 Stuart Hall, "The Local and the Global," in *Culture Globalisation and the World System*, ed. Anthony King (London: Macmillan, 1991).

7 See below and *Essential Essays, Volume 2* on Stuart's participation in a variety of policy-review processes, including his role in the "Runnymede Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain" in 1997. The commission was set up by the Runnymede Trust under the chairmanship of Professor Bhikhu Parekh in 1997 and its *Official Report* was published by Profile Books in 2000.

8 See his comments on these issues in the talk given at the Illinois conference on Cultural Studies: ch. 3, below.

9 This predilection is also reflected in the work of some of Stuart's foremost students: thus Dick Hebdige begins his *Hiding in the Light* with a quote from the quintessentially English poet William Blake, to the effect that "To Generalise is to be an Idiot. To Particularise is the Alone distinction of Merit. General Knowledges are the Knowledges that Idiots possess." Dick Hebdige, *Hiding in the Light* (London: Comedia/Routledge, 1986).

10 Hall in Akomfrah, *The Stuart Hall Project*.

11 Arjun Appadurai's comments on the crucial role of the media in forming what he calls "the migrant imagination": *Modernity at Large* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996).

12 Here I draw on David Morley and Bill Schwarz, "Obituary of Stuart Hall," *Guardian*, February 11, 2014.

13 Hall in Akomfrah, *The Stuart Hall Project*.

14 Stuart Hall, "Minimal Selves," in *Identity: The Real Me*, ed. Lisa Appignanesi, ICA Documents, no. 6 (London: ICA, 1987), 44.

15 In reminiscing about that experience, Stuart once observed that among that group, Perry Anderson was probably the only British person and that, anyway, he was partly Irish.

16 Stuart Hall, "Cultural Identity and Diaspora," in *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, ed. Jonathan Rutherford (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990), 234. For further development of these arguments, see Hall, *Essential Essays*, *Volume 2*, ch. 5, "The West and the Rest."

17 For Stuart's own retrospective view of those New Left years, see his "Life and Times of the New Left," *New Left Review* 2, no. 61 (2010). The phrase "Non-Aligned Movement" first came into usage in United Nations debates in the early 1950s as non-aligned nations began to search for a way to escape the bipolar politics of the Cold War. Following the Bandung Conference in Indonesia, the Non-Aligned Movement was formally established under the leadership of politicians including President Sukharno of Indonesia, Marshall Tito of Yugoslavia, President Nehru of India, and President Nasser of Egypt, to create a new, independent political space between the American and Soviet spheres.

18 Interview with Laurie Taylor, "Deeply Disillusioned but Not without Hope," *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, March 3, 2006.

19 As one of his many ex-students, I can testify that he was, indeed, uniquely gifted in that role.

20 David Scott, *Stuart Hall's Voice: Intimations of an Ethics of Receptive Generosity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017), 21, 5.

21 Scott, *Stuart Hall's Voice*, 5, 14, 17.

22 Studs Terkel, *American Dreams* (New York: Ballantine, 1985) and his *And They All Sang* (London: Granta, 2006); Svetlana Alexievich, *Second-Hand Time* (London: Fitzcarraldo, 2016). In this context Les Back's interview with Stuart in *Essential*

Essays, Volume 2 should be seen within the frame set by Back's own work in *The Art of Listening* (London: Berg, 2007).

23   See the comments in my and Bill Schwarz's obituary of Stuart on his principled willingness to be tough in arguing a difficult case, whenever necessary, against a position he thought to be politically dangerous: Morley and Schwarz, "Obituary of Stuart Hall."

24   In summer 2013 Isaac Julien orchestrated (and filmed) an event under that title, at which Stuart and others posed critical questions to the Marxist theorist David Harvey at the Hayward Gallery in London. The filmed version of this event was incorporated into Isaac Julien's two-screen videowork *Kapital* (2014): https://www .isaacjulien.com/projects/Kapital.

25   In this encounter Stuart vividly embodies Clifford Geertz's injunction about our responsibility as intellectuals to vex each other ever more precisely in search of truth and understanding.

26   Although the qualities of his spoken voice cannot, by definition, be captured in print, the epilogue to *Essential Essays, Volume 2*, "Through the Prism of an Intellectual Life," perhaps comes closest to capturing this quality of Stuart extemporizing, on the wing.

27   Stuart Hall and Paddy Whannel, *The Popular Arts* (London: Hutchinson, 1964; Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018).

28   See ch. 4 in this volume. On being offered a professorship in sociology at the Open University in 1980 he declared that he was very happy to accept, now that the discipline was less sure of its identity.

29   For an economically explicit formulation of these issues, see Stuart Hall's early essay "A World at One with Itself," *New Society* 403 (1970).

30   Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Scope of Anthropology* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1967); Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics* (London: Fontana, 1976).

31   Geoff Eley, private communication, for access to which I am indebted to Bill Schwarz.

32   For invidious examples of this kind of misinterpretation of Stuart's work, see Simon Frith, "The Good, the Bad and the Indifferent: Defending Popular Culture from the Populists," *Diacritics* 21, no. 4 (1991); and Simon Frith and Jon Savage, "Pearls and Swine: The Intellectuals and Mass Media," *New Left Review* 1, no. 198 (1993).

33   Hall, interview with Laurie Taylor, "Thinking Allowed," BBC Radio 4, rebroadcast in a memorial edition of the program, February 13, 2014.

34   In this respect, Stuart's approach was close to that of John Mepham, whose article "The Theory of Ideology in *Capital*," *Radical Philosophy* 2 (1972), provided him with a useful correlative in the development of his own perspective. See Stuart Hall, "A Reading of Marx's '1857 Introduction' to the *Grundrisse*"; and also the discussion of these issues in the introduction to part II below.

35   Stuart Hall, "Racism and Reaction," in *Five Views of Multiracial Britain*, ed. D. J. Twitchin (London: Commission for Racial Equality, 1978).

36 Stuart Hall, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, and Brian Roberts, *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State and Law and Order* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); and Hall, "The Great Moving Right Show," chs. 12 and 13 below.

37 See the discussion in the introduction to part IV below, and in particular Stuart Hall and Martin Jacques, "Tony Blair: The Greatest Tory since Margaret Thatcher," *Observer*, April 14, 1997.

38 Stuart Hall, Doreen Massey, and Michael Rustin, eds., *After Neoliberalism: The Kilburn Manifesto*, *Soundings* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 2015).

39 David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, introduction to David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, eds., *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (London: Routledge, 1996).

40 However, one might say that the academic circumstances of universities in the contemporary West unfortunately now work to encourage young scholars toward exactly this kind of exaggeration of the novelty of their latest intellectual breakthrough, in order to enhance their own profile relative to others and thus generate funding and prestige.

41 The full list of these can be found among the entries in Nick Beech's comprehensive bibliography of Stuart's published work in print and in audiovisual form, produced in 2015.

42 Comedia Publishing, which existed as an independent company from 1979 to 1986 and was then sold to Routledge, with the Comedia series then continuing as a Routledge imprint over the subsequent thirty years.

43 Thus, among the essays that now appear here, *Critical Dialogues* included not only all three of Stuart's papers listed above but also his overview of the relation between the British and American versions of Cultural Studies reprinted here as ch. 3. Furthermore, it included a raft of what was at that time his most recent work on questions of race, ethnicity, and identity, including "New Ethnicities" (included here in a later, expanded version) and "What Is This 'Black' in Black Popular Culture?" (see *Essential Essays, Volume 2*, chs. 2 and 3). The volume also included a slightly longer version of the interview conducted with Stuart by Kuan-Hsing Chen, "The Formation of a Diasporic Intellectual," which comprises ch. 6 of *Essential Essays, Volume 2*.

44 Private communication, June 1999. Evidently, given that so many of his essays have, in fact, became canonical in different fields, he was wrong about that, at least in one sense. But just how happy he would have been with their variously recontextualized interpretations (my own included) necessarily remains a moot point.

45 Following Stuart's lecture visit to Brazil, Liv Sovik produced a collection in Portuguese titled *Stuart Hall: Pensando a diaspora: Etnia, midia, cultura* (Belo Horizonte, Brazil: Editoria UFMG, 2001). The contents were "The Formation of a Diasporic Intellectual"; "When Was the Postcolonial?"; "Gramsci's Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity"; "For Allon White: Metaphors of Transformation"; "Notes on Deconstructing the Popular"; "Cultural Studies and Its Theoretical Legacies"; "Encoding/Decoding"; "What Is This 'Black' in Black

Popular Culture"; "Thinking the Diaspora"; "Cultural Studies—Two Paradigms"; "Signification, Representation, Ideology"; "The Multicultural Question"; "Reflections on the Encoding/Decoding Model"; and "The Problem of Ideology." A year later, Mikko Lehtonen and Juha Herkman at the University of Tampere produced a Finnish collection of Stuart's essays under the title *Stuart Hall: Identiteetti*, published by Vastapaino, Tampere, in 2002. Its contents were "Minimal Selves"; "The Question of Cultural Identity"; "The West and the Rest"; "The Spectacle of the Other"; "Cultural Identity and Diaspora"; "Who Needs Identity?"; "New Cultures for Old"; and "The Multicultural Question."

46 That project, initiated by Professor Zhuoyue Huang and his colleagues at Beijing Language and Culture University, with China Social Sciences Press, has sadly suffered many subsequent delays as a result of the complexities of university publishing in China and remains incomplete as I write in November 2017.

47 The ICA granted the Steven H. Chaffee Career Achievement Award to Stuart posthumously, in 2014.

48 Stuart Hall, "A Sense of Classlessness," *Universities and Left Review* 5 (1958): 26. For an interesting parallel analysis of the cultural dimensions of postwar consumer culture in another context, see Shunya Yoshimi on the symbolism of the fridge, the car, and the washing machine in postwar Japan in his "Made in Japan," *Media*, *Culture and Society* 21, no. 2 (1999).

49 Colin Sparks, "Experience, Ideology and Articulation: Stuart Hall and the Development of Culture," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 13, no. 2 (Summer 1989): 85.

50 Stuart Hall, "Cultural Studies and the Politics of Internationalisation," in *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues*, ed. David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen (London: Routledge, 1996).

51 Hall, "Sense of Classlessness," 26.

52 See Stuart's later essays on these themes in the collections from the Communist University of London in the late 1970s—e.g., "Rethinking the 'Base and Superstructure' Metaphor" (1977), reprinted here as ch. 5; and his "The Political and the Economic in Marx's Theory of Classes," in *Class and Class Structure*, ed. Alan Hunt (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1978).

53 Stuart Hall, "The Hippies: An American Moment," Birmingham University, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies Stencilled Paper, 1968; reprinted in *Student Power*, ed. Julian Nagel (London: Merlin, 1969).

54 Tony Judt, quoted in George Monbiot, "Labor Can Still Survive, but Only If It Abandons Hope of Governing Alone," *Guardian*, July 6, 2016.

55 And see John Akomfrah, "The Partisan's Prophecy: *Handsworth Songs* and Its Silent Partners," in *Stuart Hall: Conversations*, *Projects and Legacies*, ed. Julian Henriques and David Morley with Vana Goblot (London: Goldsmiths, 2018).

56 The securing of this funding, in which Stuart played a leading role, was an enormously significant achievement, as this was the first publicly funded new-build international arts gallery to open in London since the Hayward Gallery forty years earlier.

57 As outlined in his essay on "The Social Eye of *Picture Post*," *Working Papers in Cultural Studies* 2 (1972).

58 Colin MacCabe, "Interview with Stuart Hall"; republished as Colin MacCabe, "Stuart Hall—Some Personal Memories," *Critical Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (2015).