

marginal, although the naming of the marginal differs greatly from one context to the other. Importantly, as we have seen, from an Australian standpoint this general theoretical principle made it possible to foreground 'Australia' itself as marginal against a dominant 'Britain'.⁴⁷ We will return to the politics of this shift shortly, especially in relation to its consequences for the international cultural studies *rendez-vous*.

Meanwhile, Hall's comment on Thompson points to another important aspect of early British cultural studies: namely, that it has foregrounded the working class as the privileged subaltern whose cultural practices were to be theoretically understood and politically vindicated. Both Hoggart and Williams could draw, at least in part, on personal experience in this rendering visible of working-class culture as a relatively autonomous 'whole way of life' – to evoke Williams' definition of 'culture' – within the British social formation. But Hall, too, whose class background in his own account is 'lower middle class', through a passionate negotiation with marxism, has always had a deep commitment to treating class as a key category in analysing contemporary cultural relations. *Resistance through Rituals*, for example, one of the major projects conducted under Hall's directorship of the Birmingham Centre in the 1970s, is primarily about working-class youth subcultures in Britain.⁴⁸

What we want to observe in relation to this strand of work, is that the notion of Britain itself has remained unproblematized in it. Britain was simply there as the more or less inert, pre-given space within which class relationships took shape and (mainly symbolic) working-class resistances were acted out. For example, never was the question asked what was distinctively *British* about spectacular working-class youth subcultures such as the mods, the rockers, the teddy boys and the punks. What is it about British 'culture', so to speak, that made it possible and appealing for sections of male working-class youth in post-war Britain to express and articulate themselves in such stylistically spectacular ways?⁴⁹ Even Dick Hebdige's work, which most explicitly took account of the British *context* of particular popular cultural phenomena, did not problematize the historical or geo-cultural *specificity* of that context as compared to other contexts.⁵⁰

In other words, when Hoggart and Williams put working-class culture on the agenda, they did so without questioning the integrity of British nationhood – their intellectual struggles took place by taking Britishness for granted as a given and secure marker of identity, as it were (although Williams' work on Welsh culture as a subordinate and colonized culture did point to the regional dimensions of British imperialism). The working-class culture they both wanted to validate was securely placed *within* the established boundaries of British 'culture' and 'society'. The working class Hoggart and Williams are talking about may have its own way of life, but there is no doubt that it is a *British* way of life. In other words, what tends

to be suppressed is a questioning of what makes up the distinctive specificity of Britishness or British cultural identity, including that of British cultural studies itself.⁵¹

In this, what Turner calls, 'ex-nomination' of British distinctiveness,⁵² an implicit universalism creeps in in the same way that it has crept into the American appropriation of cultural studies, as discussed above. In this tendency, the specifying dimension of the national remains unspoken, unaccounted for. Hall, for one, has described this ex-nomination as the product of what he calls the all-encompassing 'English eye':

The 'English eye' sees everything else but is not so good at recognizing that it is itself actually looking at something. It becomes coterminous with sight itself. It is, of course, a structured representation nevertheless and it is a cultural representation which is always binary. That is to say, it is strongly centred; knowing where it is, what it is, it places everything else. And the thing which is wonderful about English identity is that it didn't only place the colonized Other, it placed *everybody* else.⁵³

It is for this 'English eye', according to Hall a legacy of English imperial power, that Turner slaps British cultural studies as being 'resolutely parochial'.⁵⁴ Turner has been one of the most vocal resisters of the Anglo-American hegemony in 'international' cultural studies and the centrality of British cultural studies in it. As Turner puts it:

The dominance of British models is not intrinsically dangerous unless we take it for granted but, so far, I think we have failed to interrogate the nature and effects of that dominance. (. . .) As long as cultural studies resists the challenge of more comparative studies, there will be little provocation to revise British models so that they 'work' for the margins as well as the centers. Cultural studies has a lot to gain from the margins, and it should do its best to investigate the ways in which their specific conditions demand the modification of explanations generated elsewhere. At the very least, such an expansion of the cultural studies project provides a hedge against the development of a new universalism.⁵⁵

The margin, in Turner's discourse, is self-evidently 'Australia', while universalism is another word for unacknowledged Anglocentrism, reconstructed neo-colonialism. It is interesting to note, then, that while the British are complaining about the new *American* hegemony, the Australians (and to a lesser extent, the Canadians) are complaining as much – if not more – about *British* dominance. That is, although Turner, as we have already noted, appreciates the notion of a 'history from below' which he has borrowed from British cultural studies, the provocation he proposes is to turn this very notion against British cultural studies itself by foregrounding Australia and Australian cultural studies as the new 'below'.

It should be noted that Turner's move here is, again, not an innocent one – nor is any theoretical move discussed in this paper. The position from which Turner constructs his discourse is a self-consciously *postcolonial* one. The politics of this position is to assert 'Australia' in the face of a powerful (real and perceived) 'Britain'. But this Australian postcolonial position is also, willy-nilly, profoundly informed by the former settler colony's residual preoccupation, if not obsession, with what used to be the mother country.⁵⁶ As Turner himself has put it: 'Although postcolonial identity depends on rupturing the colonial frame, the strongest evidence that such a rupture has been effected seems provided when the colonial power acknowledges it; it is as if the status of postcoloniality is dependent upon the assent of the colonizing Other.'⁵⁷ In this respect, it is telling that Turner is the author of the very first introductory textbook on the Birmingham School, simply called *British Cultural Studies*, which helped to promote the specificity of the British tradition.⁵⁸ We should remember that Frow and Morris, quoted earlier, have rejected an account of Australian cultural studies as somehow the direct result of the export of British cultural studies, favouring a more independent, locally oriented account instead. The postcolonial speaking position is thus not without ambiguity and contradiction, nor is it uncontested. In foregrounding Australia's subordinate status *vis-à-vis* Britain, it is a position with its own silences and limited horizons, not least with respect to the situation of Aborigines in Australia.⁵⁹

One important risk of equating 'Australia' with the condition of postcoloniality we want to emphasize in this article is that it may lead to an overemphasis on nationalist preoccupations. A possible problem with privileging the 'national' as the site of particularity in cultural studies, as we said before, is that it is often accompanied by a lack of reflexivity concerning the presumed fit between cultural studies and the nation-state. The nation-state then becomes not only the naturalized context of the struggles between cultures rendered intelligible by cultural studies, but also the taken-for-granted determining context within which particular versions of cultural studies develop. The nation-state specifies the idiosyncrasies of particular national traditions of cultural studies. Seen this way, the nationalist perspective turns out to be the other side of the coin of the universalist, neo-colonialist perspective which implicitly posits the British and/or American version as the original form of, and standard for, cultural studies elsewhere. If universalism is an unconscious parochialism, nationalism, at least in its radical, self-defensive mode, is a form of *self-conscious* parochialism.

Like the modern human sciences, the nation-state is a successful global export of European modernity. It is a moment of intersection between the hegemonic universalization of European ideas and practices and, in many cases, non-European local cultures. As such, depending on the 'modern' or

'postmodern' orientation of the cultural studies invoked, the nation-state can be used as an unproblematized, generalizable given, or it can be treated as an always already problematic site for the specification of local distinctiveness. When constituted as the latter, it no longer implies 'a kind of United Nations plenary session' (to repeat Jameson's phrase) but, rather, a moment in which comparison must be fought for against uniqueness and incommensurability. It would lead to a 'national' cultural studies which foregrounds the unstable, provisional and often jeopardous status of the national itself; a radical cultural studies which not only puts into question the modern assumption of a natural equivalence between the national and the cultural, but also the inherently power-ridden relations between distinct 'national' entities.

THE POSTCOLONIAL, THE DIASPORIC AND THE SUBALTERN

The concept of the postcolonial, however contentious,⁶⁰ offers one avenue for interrogating such inter/national relations. What a critical (rather than affirmative) taking up of the position of postcoloniality enables, and herein lies its productivity, is to transpose the idea of cultural struggle to a resolutely transnational dimension: cultural struggle – as well as cultural power – is now located as enacted *between* 'societies' as well as *within* 'societies'. Of course, it is precisely this transnational dimension of cultural struggle which cultural studies still needs to come to terms with. In the international cultural studies *rendez-vous*, the postcolonial speaking position provides the vantage-point from which the universalist tendencies of the ex-nominated dominant can be interrogated from without. In Turner's words:

I might even suggest that the postcolonial's version of *bricolage* – of continually modifying and adapting what comes to us so that it can be put to use – is not only a valuable tactic for Australians; it might also be salutary for others [read: the British – JS/IA] who can benefit from thinking how their ideas might be put to use in another hemisphere.⁶¹

However, we want to suggest that 'British cultural studies' can be interrogated not only from the outside from a postcolonial perspective, but also in Britain itself. Indeed, an important aspect of Stuart Hall's work offers precisely the opportunity to problematize Britishness *from within*. From Hall's (recent) work, we can distill a speaking position and discursive trajectory which, when pushed to its limits, can make British cultural studies re-nominate itself *as* British, while simultaneously questioning British national identity. This position/trajectory can be called the diasporic, the development of which, in Hall's case, was spurred by a turn towards 'race' as an intellectual and political preoccupation.

In his earlier work, Hall has apparently been as equally uninterested in deconstructing 'Britishness' as, say, Hoggart and Williams. However, over the years he has become increasingly explicit in the theoretical and political bracketing and questioning of British national identity and its symbolic core: Englishness. This coincided with a growing interest in the question of race and the politics of race and racism in his own work, and in British cultural studies more generally.

In Hall's own account, 'race' entered into the critical concerns of the Birmingham Centre only at a very late stage, and 'it was accomplished as the result of a long, and sometimes bitter – certainly bitterly contested – internal struggle against a resounding but unconscious silence.'⁶² The silence, we can extrapolate, revolved around the implicit racial assumptions of Britishness and British identity. The fact that there appears to have been so much bitter contestation around the introduction of 'race' in the theoretical and political space of British cultural studies is indicative, as Paul Gilroy suggests, 'of the difficulties involved in attempts to construct a more pluralistic, postcolonial sense of British culture and national identity.'⁶³ That is, the subordinate status of blacks in Britain is much more exterior – and thus threatening – to the essential core of Britishness than that of English working-class men, whose belonging to 'Britain' was never in doubt. In a similar way, the (white) feminist introduction of 'gender' as a focal concern in the critical work of cultural studies – something which happened *before* 'race' came onto the agenda – did not require a break-up of British national identity, as the struggle of British women against their subordinate status in relation to British men could be – and was – firmly fought out *within* the British imagined community.⁶⁴ This is much more difficult, however, with 'race', as concisely exposed in the title of Gilroy's 1987 book, *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack*.⁶⁵ Gilroy even claims that there are traces of 'a morbid celebration of England and Englishness' in the theoretical traditions of what he calls English – not British – cultural studies, to be found, for example, in Raymond Williams' critical reconstruction of English cultural sensibility in *Culture and Society*. That is to say, what the introduction of 'race' exposes is 'the ethno-historical specificity of the discourse of [British] cultural studies itself.'⁶⁶ While Williams (and many others) did not query the naturalized equation of Britishness with whiteness, black British cultural studies practitioners such as Gilroy and Hall have begun to problematize it and, as a result, have started to destabilize the intellectual foundation of British national identity.

There was then, in Hall's earlier work, a certain unconscious complicity with the British or English project, for example in his commitments to marxist theory and the New Left. With respect to the former, Hall now speaks about the need for 'a not-yet-completed contestation with the profound Eurocentrism of Marxist theory',⁶⁷ while he recognizes that what he calls 'the moment of the New Left' – in his own narrative the

major political influence which made him turn to cultural studies – is of course 'a profoundly English or British moment'.⁶⁸ It is against the background of this personal political trajectory that the introduction of 'race' – marked for the first time with the publication of *Policing the Crisis* in 1978⁶⁹ – 'represented a decisive turn in my own theoretical and intellectual work.'⁷⁰

All this, of course, attests to Gilroy's remark that '[t]he entry of blacks into national life is itself a powerful factor in the formation of cultural studies.'⁷¹ Not just *any* cultural studies, we should add, but *British* cultural studies. The large-scale entry of West Indian and Asian immigrants into Britain after the Second World War is a key marker of Britain's history as an imperial nation, and occurred at the time of the break-up of the empire. Here we have a clear instance of the fact that British cultural studies did not only emerge out of forces internal and organic to Britain, but also, in a decisive manner, by the intervention of external forces. Seen this way, the rise of British cultural studies coincided with a crisis of British identity! This connection could only be made explicit, however, by the taking up of the issue of 'race' from a speaking position that can be called *diasporic*: a position which Gilroy has described as held in suspension between 'where you're from' (Jamaica, or, more metaphorically, an imaginary black Africa) and 'where you're at' (Britain).⁷² It is the sense of dislocation arising from such a double loyalty which for Hall (and Gilroy) provides the symbolic and affective reasoning for subverting, by relativizing, the self-identity of imperial British definitions of Britishness. This is the experience which Hall has begun to emphasize. As he does so he expresses a feeling of marginalization within British culture missing from his earlier work. For example, he begins the talk 'Minimal selves', published in 1987, with the assertion that '[t]hinking about my own sense of identity, I realize that it has always depended on the fact of being a *migrant*, on the *difference* from the rest of you.'⁷³ Through this experience of exteriority to the core of Britishness, Hall begins not only a problematization of his own experience of identity as a member of the black diaspora, but also an interrogation of the category of Britishness itself which, up to now, has remained so unqualified – and, indeed, unmarked in British cultural studies.

This new interrogation enables us to distinguish British cultural studies – defined as the specific form of cultural studies which evolved in Britain – and cultural studies of 'Britishness,' or of 'Britain'. Hall's most recent work has taken British cultural studies this one, crucial, step further, opening the way for a study of the peculiarities of 'Britishness' (to hijack the title of E. P. Thompson's 'The peculiarities of the English'),⁷⁴ something which, as we have argued, has previously been missing in the cultural studies practice associated with Hoggart, Williams and, in particular, the Birmingham Centre. In other words, what the diasporic position opens up is the possibility of developing a post-imperial British identity, one based

explicitly on an acknowledgement and vindication of the 'coming home' of the colonized Other. Here then we have one possible trajectory for a British cultural studies which does not ex-nominate Britishness but exposes it.

What makes the diasporic position particularly relevant in the context of this essay is that it is necessarily transnational in scope; it provides us with the resource to link Britain to the outside world, a position which makes explicit – through concrete historical connections – how Britain is not a self-sufficient national entity, but has not only been constitutive of, but also – in this postcolonial age – remains deeply interdependent and interconnected with, national others. Such a position, we would argue, can be usefully mobilized in an international *rendez-vous* which takes account of the claim to open-endedness of cultural studies. How then can such a *rendez-vous* operate in practice?

Let us return, first of all, to Graeme Turner's attempts to assert a distinctively Australian cultural studies which has to stake out its own terrain in a field dominated by the hegemonic claims of British and American cultural studies. As we have seen, one of Turner's reproaches against British cultural studies has been its tendency not to name its own 'identity', that is, to repress (and therefore absolutize as universal) its own Britishness. In this Turner sees a continuation of the colonial project: a form of intellectual neo-colonialism. Turner's adoption of a postcolonial position is propelled by the desire to shed off any remnants of colonial dependence, and to assert its independence by emphasizing its own specificity, its own postcolonial identity. What we have here is a distinctive cultural studies project, the construction of an Australian cultural studies which negotiates its identity through the recognition of the historical formation of Australia as, in the first place, a 'British' settler state. (The inverted commas here serve to acknowledge the problematic status of 'British' here – first of all as a national category in its own right and, second, as a recognition that 'white' Australia has been settled by many other national groups, most importantly the Irish but also, among others, the Chinese.) If, for the sake of argument, we describe the postcolonial project as a part of the inventory of an Australian cultural studies, as it is of all postcolonized countries, it would be an enlightening exercise to apply the category to Britain itself. The imbrication of the colonizer and the colonized is deep and complex. A postcolonial investigation of Britain would be just the kind of jeopardous work which we are suggesting for a radical international cultural studies.

The diasporic project and the postcolonial project are two, among many, trajectories of doing cultural studies. They meet in a concern with the effects of colonialism. The diasporic position emphasizes spatial (as well as cultural) displacement within the nation-state. In the hands of Gilroy and Hall, it articulates the experience of negotiated and problematized national identity. The postcolonial position tends to operate on a temporal axis,

emphasizing the historical connection between nation-states, and, as articulated by Turner among others, it tends to be more concerned with the modes of construction of emergent forms of national identity. The diasporic project, then, problematizes 'Britishness' from within, from the experience of the marginalized. The postcolonial project makes it possible to problematize 'Britishness' from without, situating Britain in a postcolonial world. Both projects confront the idiosyncratic specificity of 'Britain'. Of course the same situation can be read as both diasporic and postcolonial. For example, 'white Australia' has been populated by diaspora, but it is also postcolonial. At the same time, a further elaboration of the diasporic project in Australia – which arguably would foreground issues related to Australia's history of non-Anglo immigration, the politics of multiculturalism and its impact on Australian national identity⁷⁵ – would usefully complement and complicate Turner's postcolonial project and its preoccupation with the heritage of British colonialism for the construction of 'Australia'.

What we have staked out here then are two formal positions/trajectories – the diasporic and the postcolonial – which are both inherently relational and intrinsically transnational, while acquiring their concrete effectivity only in specific national contexts. The playing out of these two positions/trajectories against each other can stimulate the reciprocal probing of both projects, the radical and continuous questioning of both national contexts. We think that it is through the elaboration of such positions that the international *rendez-vous* of cultural studies practitioners can attempt to problematize the universalisms of existing core/periphery relations, on the one hand, and avoid degenerating into a polite but ultimately indifferent conversation between particularist, mutually exclusive nationals, on the other. Both the diasporic and the postcolonial give rise to trajectories of intellectual work which, by virtue of their ability to overcome the apparent fixity of the inter/national divide through cross-cultural and transnational comparison, make the most of the provisionality of constant renegotiation and re-articulation which has been heralded as one of the hallmarks of cultural studies.

However, these two positions are neither sufficient nor without limitations. Not only can they be mobilized to critique each other; but other positions can be put forward which may be able to illuminate the geopolitical and cultural limits of both positions, as well as their enmeshment. One such position, we suggest, would be the *indigenous* (whose voice has been scarcely heard in cultural studies anywhere);⁷⁶ another one would be the *subaltern* – a position to be distinguished from both the diasporic and the postcolonial as it tends to be spoken from a very different geo-political and geo-cultural space, namely the 'Third World'. We want to discuss the subaltern position/trajectory briefly to end this article as it clarifies how the

introduction of new speaking positions can further extend the international conversation in the cultural studies *rendez-vous*.⁷⁷

As we said at the beginning, the most subversive 'international' cultural studies *rendez-vous* thus far, in our view, was held in Taipei, Taiwan in 1992. The driving force behind the conference, titled 'Trajectories: Towards an Internationalist Cultural Studies', was Kuan-Hsing Chen, who had worked in the United States with Lawrence Grossberg, one of the organizers of the Illinois conference and one of the editors of the book *Cultural Studies*. This personal detail helps to illuminate the complex lines of connection which exist in the deployment of transnational intellectual practices in the new global capitalist order. Taiwan, after all, occupies an unusual position. It was, apart from Hong Kong (which is itself embroiled in a complicated history of colonialism), the only part of 'China' not overrun by Mao Zedong's communist forces. It therefore remained 'free' and developed a capitalist economic system sponsored by the West. Taiwan is now one of the so-called 'Four Dragons' of Asian capitalism. What does this first international cultural studies conference in a non-western context represent for the present and future state of 'internationalism' in the field?

At the 'Trajectories' conference, speakers came from Taiwan, Korea, Thailand and Hong Kong as well as Canada, Australia and the United States. A number of British speakers, including Stuart Hall, were invited but were unable to attend. This signifies much more than a decentring of British cultural studies. What became clear in the proceedings of the conference was that the absence of representatives from Britain and British cultural studies was hardly noticed, let alone a major topic of discussion. This reflects the current intensifying formation of an Asia-Pacific network of interconnections, where Britain – and more generally, Europe – are hardly relevant.⁷⁸ Here, then, a very different configuration of the 'international' is taking shape, where the fine distinctions between neo-colonialist, post-imperialist, postcolonial and diasporic are put to a severe test. New oppositions, new hierarchies are created here: and one of the most subversive aspects of the 'Trajectories' conference may be the very relativization of all discursive self/other positionings within the Anglo-phone cultural studies community.

From a Taiwanese perspective, the United States, Canada, Britain and Australia are all part of the globally dominant English-speaking West. One of the most impressive feats of the conference was the provision of high-tech simultaneous Chinese/English and English/Chinese translation for all participants – highlighting the hegemony of English as the naturalized *lingua franca* in international cultural studies encounters (orally and in writing). Furthermore, the very antagonism between Britain and Australia on the grounds of British colonial history and Australian ambitions to declare its independence from its British heritage, stops being relevant here, where the notion of postcoloniality is mobilized primarily with

regard to the fifty-year long Japanese colonization of Taiwan earlier this century. The notion of diaspora, too, in this context appears in a very different inflection, to characterize the relation of Taiwan to mainland China. However, neither 'Japan' nor 'China' exist today outside of the globalizing force of capitalist modernity with which the 'West' has so identified itself. In other words, from a non-western, Taiwanese perspective the categories of postcolonial and diasporic themselves must be interrogated on their western assumptions (or more precisely: on their being predicated on the consequences of western hegemony). But so far such historically specific cultural displacements have been so beyond the repertoire of concerns of contemporary cultural studies that they have barely been responded to in the western, English-speaking mainstream. The very fact that something like 'cultural studies' is now in the process of emerging in newly industrialized countries such as Taiwan and Korea is itself something which needs to be considered further.

We would like to characterize the position of 'Taiwanese' cultural studies in relation to all versions of western cultural studies as *subaltern*. The three positions we have differentiated in this article can be described in this way: the diasporic is *in* but not *of* the West; the postcolonial is *of* but not *in* the West; the subaltern is neither *in* nor *of* the West but has been problematically constructed by the West. From the perspective of the (Taiwanese) subaltern, the complicity of the (British) diasporic and the (Australian) postcolonial can be illuminated, in so far as their concerns are shown to be bracketing their common denominator: their belonging to 'the West', and therefore the dominant pole, in the West/Rest divide. However, the subaltern cannot escape from the web created by western hegemony either. Kuan-Hsing Chen has put it this way:

From the point of view of the geopolitical location within which I am situated, the necessity for an internationalist strategy is not an ideological position, since historical conditions themselves urge such a move. Given the fact that capital, patriarchy and racism have no nationality, it makes no sense to insist on the priority of nationalism or national identity. (. . .) I am not suggesting that we should give up the local and only opt for the internationalist agenda; I am urging the local struggle should always be conscious about, and possibly forming connections with, the international.⁷⁹

What Chen clearly expresses here is the necessity, from his subaltern perspective, to be both local and international at the same time, or better, to overcome the local/international dichotomy. But this is precisely what all the three positions/trajectories we have elaborated here have in common. Through them, and by juxtaposing their particular inflections under concrete historical conditions in an ongoing *rendez-vous*, we can construct practices of cultural studies which are neither universalist nor

particularist (in the nationalist sense), but are both partial (in a positive [self]critical sense) and at the same time aware of their own distinctiveness in relation to each other. In our view, a cultural studies informed by such positions would match the current condition of the new world (dis)order where the success and failure of European/western modernity (in which British imperialism was a major force) has led to both its globalization and its problematization; where all identities, national or otherwise, are being relativized as a result of their increasing interconnection and interdependence. In such a situation, if we are going to continue to speak to each other, we have to insist on the recognition, in Hall's words, that 'what [we] have to say comes out of particular histories and cultures and that everyone speaks from positions within the global distribution of power. Because these positions change and alter, there is always an engagement with politics as a "war of position".'⁸⁰

NOTES

- 1 Stuart Hall, 'Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies', in Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson and Paula Treichler (eds) *Cultural Studies*, New York and London, Routledge, 1992, 278.
- 2 Richard Johnson, 'The story so far: and further transformations?', in David Punter (ed.) *Introduction to Contemporary Cultural Studies*, London and New York, Longman, 1986, 278.
- 3 Angela McRobbie, 'Post-Marxism and cultural studies: a postscript', in Grossberg *et al.* (eds) *Cultural Studies*, 722.
- 4 Tony Bennett, 'Putting policy into cultural studies', in Grossberg *et al.* (eds) *Cultural Studies*, 33.
- 5 Bennett, 23.
- 6 Simon During, 'Introduction', in Simon During (ed.) *The Cultural Studies Reader*, London, Routledge, 1993, 13.
- 7 Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson and Paula Treichler (eds) *Cultural Studies*, New York and London, Routledge, 1992.
- 8 *Ibid.*, ix.
- 9 Jorge Luis Borges, *A Universal History of Infamy*, trans. Norman Thomas di Giovanni, London, Allen Lane, 1972, 141.
- 10 Fredric Jameson, 'On "cultural studies"', in *Social Text* 34, 1993, 25.
- 11 See Ien Ang and David Morley, 'Mayonnaise culture and other European follies', *Cultural Studies*, 3 (2), 1989, 133-44.
- 12 Cary Nelson, Paula Treichler and Lawrence Grossberg, 'Cultural studies: an introduction', in Grossberg *et al.* (eds) *Cultural Studies*, 5.
- 13 Jameson, 27.
- 14 Both the title and the history of this journal are ironical in this context. Before it became an international, US-based journal with its current unmarked, universalist title, it was an Australian based journal which defined itself explicitly in national terms and called itself *The Australian Journal of Cultural Studies*. Among Australian cultural studies practitioners there is widespread resentment about the fact that 'internationalization' has *de facto* meant the (apparently unintended though unacknowledged) Americanization of the journal.
- 15 Ien Ang, 'Dismantling "cultural studies"?', *Cultural Studies*, 6 (3), 1992, 312.

- 16 Meaghan Morris, "'On the beach'", in Grossberg *et al.* (eds) *Cultural Studies*, 456. Morris should have said 'British' rather than 'European', as one thing that is clear is that the international cultural studies 'society' is definitely not a 'European' affair, but, on the whole, confined to English-speaking constituencies. This doesn't mean that there is no cultural studies in other languages than English (there most definitely is), but by and large these other cultural studies traditions are ignored by Anglo-American dominated, English-speaking cultural studies.
- 17 Hall, 'Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies', 292.
- 18 *Ibid.*, 277.
- 19 The construction of these sets of fraternities of founding fathers leads them to bear a striking resemblance to Freud's brotherhood of the primal horde after they have killed and consumed the first Father, thus paving the way for the exchange of women and the establishment of 'society'.
- 20 Meaghan Morris 'On the Beach', 455.
- 21 John Clarke, 'Cultural studies: a British inheritance', in his *New Times and Old Enemies*, London, Harper-Collins, 1991.
- 22 Richard Johnson, 'What is cultural studies anyway?' *Social Text* 16, 1986/7, 38-80.
- 23 Lawrence Grossberg, 'The formations of cultural studies: an American in Birmingham', in Valda Blundell, John Shepherd and Ian Taylor (eds) *Relocating Cultural Studies: Developments in Theory and Research*, London, Routledge, 1993, 21-66.
- 24 It is worth suggesting here that this has been an exclusively male genre so far.
- 25 Stuart Hall, 'Cultural studies and the centre: some problematics and problems', in Stuart Hall *et al.* (eds) *Culture, Media, Language*, London, Hutchinson, 1980; Stuart Hall, 'The emergence of cultural studies and the crisis of the humanities', *October* 53, 1990, 11-23; Stuart Hall, 'Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies', in Grossberg *et al.* (eds) *Cultural Studies*.
- 26 Hall, 'Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies', 277.
- 27 *Ibid.*
- 28 *Ibid.*
- 29 Hall, 'The emergence of cultural studies', 12.
- 30 Perry Anderson, 'Components of the national culture', in Alexander Cockburn and Robin Blackburn (eds) *Student Power: Problems, Diagnosis, Action*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1969, 225.
- 31 *Ibid.*
- 32 *Ibid.*, 269.
- 33 Clarke, 1.
- 34 Hall, 'Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies', 285-6.
- 35 *Ibid.*, 281. In passing here we can note how the Birmingham Centre's preoccupation with the Gramscian idea of the organic intellectual can be read as a transformation of the British traditional literary critical concern with morality. From the point of view of the Birmingham Centre, where the literary critic expressed the morality of the bourgeois class as if it were universal, the organic intellectual of today spoke out for a generic political project (perhaps best associated with diverse manifestations of the 'the popular') and helped to effect a 'better' future. The morality may be different but, in both cases, it remains a central concern.
- 36 McRobbie, 720-1.
- 37 Hall, *ibid.*, 282.
- 38 We tend to agree with Hall, McRobbie and others that the current dominance in

- cultural studies of literary scholarship at the expense of sociology, social history and political theory has meant an impoverishment of the intellectual scope and force of a heavily textualized cultural studies.
- 39 The classic article on this theme is Dick Hebdige, 'Towards a cartography of taste 1935-1962', in his *Hiding in the Light*, London, Routledge (Comedia), 1988, 45-76.
- 40 'Editors' introduction', in Blundell, Shepherd and Taylor (eds) *Relocating Cultural Studies*, 2.
- 41 'Introduction', in John Frow and Meaghan Morris (eds) *Australian Cultural Studies: A Reader*, Sydney, Allen & Unwin, 1993, xxvi.
- 42 Blundell, Shepherd and Taylor, blurb.
- 43 On the role of the New Left in the formation of cultural studies in Britain, see Ioan Davies, 'Cultural theory in Britain: narrative and episteme', in *Theory, Culture and Society* 10 (1993), 115-54.
- 44 Hall, 'Cultural studies and the centre', 20.
- 45 Graeme Turner, "'It works for me": British cultural studies, Australian cultural studies, Australian film', in Grossberg *et al.* (eds) *Cultural Studies*, 643.
- 46 *Ibid.*, 643.
- 47 Of course, the theme of Australia's antipodean relation to Britain did not emerge with Australian cultural studies. It has a history as long as that of the British settlement of Australia and has long dominated Australian intellectual life.
- 48 Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson (eds) *Resistance through Rituals*, London, Hutchinson, 1976.
- 49 See on this theme Jon Stratton, 'Youth subcultures and their cultural contexts', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 21 (2), 1985, 194-218.
- 50 Dick Hebdige, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*, London, Methuen, 1979. The very title of this important book could misleadingly suggest that 'style' has a universal meaning.
- 51 Thus, while Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class*, perhaps because historians are taught always to be as denotative as possible, was presented as an empirically specific history of the making of the English working class, Williams' historical reconstruction of British intellectual culture was just called *Culture and Society*, not *British (or English) Culture and Society*.
- 52 Turner, 'It works for me', 642.
- 53 Hall, 'The local and the global', in Anthony D. King (ed.) *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, Basingstoke, Macmillan, 21.
- 54 Turner, 'It works for me', 641.
- 55 *Ibid.*, 650.
- 56 There is a long history of Australian cultural sentiment in this respect that goes under the phrase 'cultural cringe', introduced by Arthur A. Phillips in his *The Australian Tradition: Studies in a Colonial Culture*, Melbourne, University of Melbourne Press, 1958.
- 57 Graeme Turner, 'Of rocks and hard places: the colonized, the national and Australian cultural studies', *Cultural Studies* 6 (3), 1992, 427.
- 58 Graeme Turner, *British Cultural Studies: An Introduction*, Boston, Unwin Hyman, 1990.
- 59 The very applicability of the category of the postcolonial to contemporary Australia is, understandably, rejected by Aboriginal people, for whom living in 'Australia' means living in a permanently colonial condition, never post-colonial.

- 60 See Vijay Mishra and Bob Hodge, 'What is post(-)colonialism?', in *Textual Practice* 5 (3), (1991), 399-414.
- 61 Turner, 'Of rocks and hard places', 432.
- 62 Hall, 'Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies', 283.
- 63 Paul Gilroy, 'Cultural studies and ethnic absolutism', in Grossberg, Nelson and Treichler (eds) *Cultural Studies*, 190.
- 64 See, on this theme, Catherine Hall, *White, Male and Middle Class*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1992.
- 65 Paul Gilroy, *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack*, London, Hutchinson, 1987.
- 66 Gilroy, 'Cultural studies and ethnic absolutism', 187.
- 67 Hall, 'Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies', 279.
- 68 *Ibid.*, 283. In his interview with Kuan-Hsing Chen (in this volume), Hall complicates this account by emphasizing the significance of the fact that many leading New Left activists were actually *not* English. However, this does not invalidate the fact that, as a political movement, the New Left operated and intervened in a profoundly British conjuncture.
- 69 Stuart Hall, Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J. and Roberts, B., *Policing the Crisis*, London, Hutchinson, 1978.
- 70 Hall, 'Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies', 283.
- 71 Gilroy, 'Ethnic absolutism', 190.
- 72 Paul Gilroy, 'It ain't where you're from, it's where you're at . . . : the dialectics of diasporic identification', *Third Text* 13, Winter 1990-1, 3-16.
- 73 Stuart Hall 'Minimal selves', republished in Ann Gray and Jim McGuigan (eds) *Studying Culture: An Introductory Reader*, London, Edward Arnold, 1993, 134.
- 74 E. P. Thompson, 'The peculiarities of the English', reprinted in his *The Poverty of Theory*, London, Merlin Press, 1978, 35-91.
- 75 See for example Stephen Castles *et al.*, *Mistaken Identity: Multiculturalism and the Demise of Nationalism in Australia*, Sydney, Pluto Press, 1988.
- 76 One of the very few examples would be the work of Gail Valaskakis, who has written to give voice to a native American perspective. See for example her article 'The Chippewa and the Other: living the heritage of Lac du Flambeau', *Cultural Studies* 2 (3), 1988, 267-93. In Australia, Aboriginal studies is still very marginal to the concerns of Australian cultural studies, though growing. See, however, Eric Michaels' work, for example his *For a Cultural Future*, Sydney and Melbourne, Art & Text Publications, 1989. See also note 59.
- 77 We borrow this term from the Indian work gathered around the influential journal *Subaltern Studies*, perhaps best known in the West in relation to the work of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. See for example Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (eds) *Selected Subaltern Studies*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1988.
- 78 Another major absence was Japan, the significance of which is extremely important for any future regional development of cross-national dialogue in cultural studies. We cannot go into this issue - i.e. the place of 'Japan' in the Asia-Pacific region - here. Work relating to this is currently being undertaken at the Program for Cultural Studies at the East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawai'i.
- 79 Kuan-Hsing Chen, 'Voices from the outside: towards a new internationalist localism', *Cultural Studies* 6 (3), 1992, 481-2.
- 80 Stuart Hall, 'The meaning of New Times', in Stuart Hall and Martin Jacques (eds) *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s*, London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1989, 133.

Stuart Hall

Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies

Edited by David Morley and
Kuan-Hsing Chen



London and New York

ALD
HM
101
583
1996

First published 1996

by Routledge

11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada

by Routledge

29 West 35th Street, New York, 10001 a division of Routledge,

Chapman and Hall, Inc.

© 1996 Selection and editorial matter: David Morley and

Kuan-Hsing Chen

Individual chapters: the respective authors

Typeset in Times by

J&L Composition Ltd, Filey, North Yorkshire

Printed and bound in Great Britain by

Clays Ltd, St Ives PLC

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book has been requested

ISBN 0-415-08803-8 (hbk)

ISBN 0-415-08804-6 (pbk)