

## **British Cultural Marxism**

**Ioan Davies**

But there is still a struggle which is worth our powder and shot . . . and that is the class struggle. By this I do not mean that we should stand shoulder to shoulder in an effort to drive workers back to their hovels. Those battles have all been lost. The new class struggle is to reassert the ascendancy of the bourgeois culture in all the fields where it is being crushed by the Murdoch–Thatcher juggernaut: in political and administrative leadership, arts, education, entertainment, television and newspapers. By ‘bourgeois culture’ in this context I mean the standards of intelligent, liberally-educated people such as still hold the strings of power in most of Europe . . .

The class struggle must concentrate first and foremost on the Conservative Party, always remembering that the jobs are, in fact, a dying breed. There is no earthly reason to surrender to them at every turn and declare the resulting proletarian mess a ‘classness’ party.

Auberon Waugh, “Now we are Fifty,”  
*The Spectator*, 2 December 1989.

To a significant extent, Thatcherism is about the remaking of common sense: its aim is to become the ‘common sense’ of the age. ‘Common sense’ shapes our ordinary, practical, everyday calculation and appears as natural as the air we breathe. It is simply ‘taken for granted’ in practice and thought, and forms the starting-point (never examined or questioned) from which every conversation begins, the premises on which every television programme is predicated. The hope of every ideology is to naturalize itself out of History into Nature, and thus to become invisible, to operate unconsciously. It is Mrs Thatcher’s natural idiom of speech and thought—some would say her only idiom. But common sense, however natural it appears, always has a structure, a set of histories which are traces of the past as well as intimations of future philosophy.

Stuart Hall, *The Hard Road to Renewal*, 1988: 8.

Thatcherism’s ideology of individual choice runs far beyond consumerism. To argue that the Left needs an alternative individualism is not a plea for greater attention to consumer choice. It is an argument for putting individual interests at the centre of socialist strategy. For that is how Thatcherism has succeeded, by articulating a vision of how society should be organised which has individual morality at its centre. Charlie Ledbeater, “Power to the Person,” *Marxism Today*, October 1988.

## I

British cultural marxism was born in the late nineteen-fifties,<sup>1</sup> by being liberated from both Stalinism and a regimental base-superstructure model. This required not only a rethinking of Marxist theory but also of the ways that the story of British Society, Politics and Culture had been told, recorded, interpreted. From the founding of the *New Reasoner* and the *Universities and Left Review* in 1956 and onwards the debate, theorizing and research on British culture from a more-or-less Marxist perspective assumed remarkable proportions, in which concepts, metaphors, theoretical frameworks, and, above all, social, technological, and political experiences, unthought of in previous Marxisms, became centre-stage, if only in some cases for momentary existences.

In the twilight of Thatcherism and its not-so-silent minorities, it is important to take stock of the trajectory of this vast intellectual and political productivity and ask where it leaves us now. What I will argue is that throughout the late 1960s and the seventies, British Cultural studies was firmly anchored in a strategy of political struggle, that its priorities were those of an elaboration of the cultural problems facing the Left at the time. By the 1980s, however, British Cultural Marxism became more culturist and less Marxist, carried along by its own academic institutionalization, shadow-boxing with itself and only indirectly contributing to political practice, so that in the end, notably in the pages of *Marxism Today* and the cultural journals that came into being in the last few years of the decade, it became caught up in the process which it had set out to criticize.

But to do that it is important to begin, as it were, at the beginning.

## II

In November 1956, the director of the Hungarian News Agency, shortly before his office was flattened by artillery fire, sent a telex to the entire world with a desperate message announcing that the Russian attack against Budapest had begun. The dispatch ended with these words: 'We are going to die for Hungary and for Europe.' What did this sentence mean?

Milan Kundera: "A Kidnapped West, or Culture Bows Out." *Granta*, 11, 1984: 95.

The starting-point, of course, is the shattering of three illusions. 1956 was a year in which the Russians destroyed socialist resistance and turned Budapest into an armed camp and also when the British, French and Israelis immobilized the Suez Canal. Thus the various cultural-political movements, so dear to the heart of the British Left—international Bolshevism, Socialist Zionism and the British 'civilizing mission' (symbolized by the Left's relationship with India)—were revealed as little more than fronts for

naked imperialism, though in retrospect they might be seen as desperate ventures of powers on the run. Equally it was clear that after 1956 within British political parties there was emerging a consensus at the centre which governed the sense of what politics was about. The term 'Butskellism' (coined from the merger of the names of R.A. Butler, the left-Tory pragmatist, and Hugh Gaitskell, the centrist socialist) became the neologism that was used a little later to express the coalition of like-minded Keynesians in all parties who saw a mixed economy as the core of a British tradition which reached back at least as far as Lloyd George and Asquith, and perhaps even further back to Gladstone. Anthony Crosland brought out *The Future of Socialism* and John Strachey, the erstwhile Bolshevik, with R.H.S. Crossman (whose collection *The God That Failed* became the bible of Red-bashers) discovered Karl Popper and why the Open Society had philosophical enemies like Hegel and Marx. Meanwhile at the LSE Michael Oakshott was teaching a Political Philosophy which excluded Marx because, as he told a conference of political scientists in 1960, he only included thinkers who had written "at least one major theoretical book."<sup>2</sup> The appearance of the *New Left Review* (NLR) in 1960 was therefore propitious. The merger of the *New Reasoner* (NR) and the *Universities and Left Review* (ULR) represented the apparent fusion of two distinct tendencies in British Marxist thinking. NR, initially edited by Edward and Dorothy Thompson and John Saville from the North of England, was the product of a humanist, oppositional tradition in the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB).<sup>3</sup> ULR evolved in Oxford out of a "left student generation of the 1950s which maintained some distance from 'party' affiliations." (Hall in Archer et al, 1989: 15). It was initially edited by a Canadian (Charles Taylor), a Jamaican (Stuart Hall), and two British Jews (Raphael Samuel and Gabriel Pearson). Different intellectual formations, different political backgrounds, different cultural milieux: these were the juxtapositions of fusion. The new journal therefore played at the edge of Marxist theory, releasing it, in the first editor's words, from the "reductionism and economism of the base-superstructure metaphor." (Hall, op cit: 25). It was also initially a journal of movement. By 1961 there were 39 New Left Clubs across Britain, with the London Club holding weekly public meetings as well as having a series of discussion groups based on education, literature, new theatre, race relations. The Clubs also acted in many cases as the organizing centres for the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, and in many other cases were created out of the local groups of the Workers Educational Association and the National Council of Labour Colleges. The New Left was therefore bourne along by the animated presence of existing bodies of labouring intellectuals plus the few middle-class intellectuals who saw the meaning of their work as having presence in the life-blood of those

whose ideas were generated by their everyday experiences.<sup>4</sup> But the intellectual base of the Left in the 1950s was very metropolitan-centred, and the Thompsons and Saville had to go North to get *NR* off the ground. The early editorial board of *NLR* included a large number of people who worked a long way from London and Oxbridge: Ken Alexander and D.G. Arnott in Scotland, Alan Hall in Staffordshire, Alasdair MacIntyre and John Rex at Leeds, John Saville in Hull, the Thompsons in Halifax, Peter Worsley in Manchester, Raymond Williams in Kent many of them in Extra-Mural Departments or working for the Workers Educational Association. . . *NLR* from issues #1-12 was a journal devoted both to the sense of social movement and to the exploration of the political implications of a modernist culture. In attempting to pull together the diverse strands of the Left in the early 1960s it tried to walk a tightrope between a popular style of writing and a theoretical one, between the exploration of popular culture as well as the nuances of power. The format was that of a magazine rather than a journal and the articles ranged from the journalist to the carefully researched and theoretical. Each issue also included reports on Club activities, though in retrospect it is clear that the idea of a New Left 'movement' was based more on consolidating and exploring the possibilities for action within existing networks than imagining new ones. The idea of the Clubs being the intellectual vanguard of the proletariat, the intelligentsia and youth was not very far away. As an editorial in the first issue of *NLR* put it:

The Labour movement is not in its insurrectionary phase: we are in our missionary phase. The Left Clubs and New Left Centres—the New Left in general—must pioneer a way forward by working for socialism as the old missionaries worked: as if consumed by a fire that is capable of lighting the darker places in our society. We have to go out into the towns and cities, universities and technical colleges, youth clubs and Trade Union branches, and—as Morris said—*make socialists* there. (*NLR*, No. 1 (Jan-Feb 1960:2))

In this form it was not to be. After issue #12, barely two years after it started, Stuart Hall resigned, the London Club closed, and Perry Anderson and a group of younger scholars from Oxford, who had meanwhile been publishing *The New University*, took over. Thereafter, theory, apparently sundered from social movement, took central space. *NLR* changed format to a standard academic one, though singlemindedly, through the journal and its publishing house, pursuing an agenda of translation from (mainly) European texts from the Frankfurt school, the French structuralists and post-structuralists, Italian post-Gramscian marxists, and a re-examination of the work of Lukacs as well as some Latin Americans (though oddly enough no Africans, Asians or even Russians), and attempting to integrate this work into a rethinking of the nature of British Society,

Politics and Culture. It was a formidable agenda, announced in Perry Anderson's article "Components of the National Culture" (reprinted in Cockburn & Blackburn, eds., 1969: 214-284 which made a distinction between those European intellectuals (Wittgenstein, Namier, Popper, Berlin, Gombrich, Eysenck, Malinowski) who provided a "tremendous injection of life . . . [to] a fading British culture" by being willingly appropriated to it, and those, "the 'Red' emigration, utterly unlike that which arrived here. . . [who] did not opt for England, because of a basic cultural and political incompatibility." (ibid, pp. 231-233). Thus the Frankfurt School, Neumann and Reich, Brecht, Lukacs, Thomas Mann, who chose to migrate elsewhere, were set against those Europeans who came to Britain to be appropriated by the dominant culture and receive knighthoods, thus maintaining an "insular reflex and prejudice". "For the unmistakable fact is that the traditional, discrete disciplines, having missed either of the great synthetic revolutions in European Social thought, were dying of inanation." (ibid: 232) The task of the new *NLR* was thus to rewrite the agenda of British intellectual life, and to provide the theoretical foundations for "a revolutionary practice within which culture is possible." (277)

Thus the agenda for the New Left was turned on its head. Movement took a back-seat to ideas. The last clearly political intervention by the New Left was the publication of the *May Day Manifesto* in 1967.<sup>5</sup> The Clubs disappeared, with *NLR* playing a role on the British Left similar to that played by *Les Temps Modernes* in France over the previous two decades, though, in many respects, a more exploratory and dynamic one because nowhere was the possibility for creating a vibrant, intellectual culture more inviting, and probably nowhere had an agenda been set for reexamining a national culture through a systematic programme of international and comparative theoretical scholarship. But not everyone saw it this way. By 1963 virtually none of the original board members of *NLR* remained.<sup>6</sup> A privately-funded magazine, *Views*, for a short time became the writing stable of those who felt that they were publicly disenfranchised by what they saw as the Anderson *putsch*. Many, of course, continued writing for the academic journals started in the 1950s as part of the rethinking of Marxism (*Past and Present* was certainly the most significant of these, and *The Critical Quarterly* played a part in the study of literature) and for a series of weeklies, fortnightlies and other periodicals which acted as the communicative foundation of what many members of the New Left saw as the core of their existential being (magazines such as *The New Statesman*, *New Society* and *Peace News* were certainly important, but so was *Time Out* and *City Limits* in London, not to speak of the range of 'alternative' papers that appeared in the late 1960s-early 1970s). But by the early 1970s new centres of activity had emerged and with them their own publishing arms. *The*

*Socialist Register*, an annual edited by John Saville and Ralph Miliband, came out first in 1964, in many respects initially catering to the same public as read *The New Reasoner*. *Screen* and *Screen Education* grew out of the Society for Education in Film and Television and became rapidly a source of critical (but mainly post-structural) thinking on Film and other performing arts. The History Workshop was established and by 1975 was producing its *Journal* and collections of articles, proceedings of conferences. Various feminist journals (notably *m/f*, *Feminist Review*, and *Spare Rib*) as well as Virago, the Women's publishing house, were established, arguing implicitly that British Marxism was phallogocentric. *Radical Philosophy* came into existence in 1971. Several new publishing houses came into existence that clearly had a Left (if not New Left) agenda: Merlin Press, Pluto Press, Alison & Busby, Zed, Harvester, Writers and Readers, while Penguin Books and Lawrence and Wishart were transformed into willing vehicles for New Left manuscripts. The Institute for Contemporary Arts in London embarked on a high-profile exercise in Public Education. Among the caring professions, radical social workers issued the CASECON manifesto in 1975, which set out an agenda for radical social work. Within the universities there were a number of significant developments. In 1962 the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies was launched by Richard Hoggart (under the aegis of the department of English) as a graduate research centre at Birmingham and by 1968 Stuart Hall was the effective Director. The Centre first started publishing stencilled papers, the Occasional Papers, and, later, books which thematically collected material researched by members of the centre. E.P. Thompson and Royden Harrison established the Labour Research Department at Warwick in the mid-1960s. Ralph Miliband moved from the suffocating atmosphere of Oakshott's LSE to the vibrancy of northern Leeds. At various other universities (notably Essex, Sussex, Warwick, York and Lancaster) new degree programmes or research units owed much to their contacts with the New Left, as did sociology departments in the Polytechnics. Finally, the Open University, owing much in its curriculum and personnel to pedagogical ideas worked out on the Left, became functional in the 1970s.

The critical feature of all of this was that the Left in the 1970s redefined the nature of its activities. It ceased to be based on a set of interconnected clubs related to a central source (though in reality that had always had elements of illusion, based on playing-back strategies of the 1930s). New Left culture in Britain became decentred, while at the same time creating new institutions which arose out of the exigencies of time, space and relationships. Above all, it celebrated the liberating power of theory which, perhaps for the first time in British history could be tried and tested against other people's theory and experiences. A major element

in this was the publishing and editorial policy embarked on by *NLR* in 1963. Much of the subsequent debate on the Left was on the appropriateness of different theories to the British practice. Without the bold publishing venture of *NLR* it is doubtful if any of that would have happened. An important by-product of this was that, for a Britain that was entering the EEC, the intellectual grounds were established for a discourse between the British and the European Left.<sup>7</sup>

### III

I think that the success of a revolution in an advanced capitalist society will come from the spreading out of political power from a number of strategic localities, where it first emerges, into a nationally co-ordinated process. (Williams, 1979: 424)

One of the major effects of this was a remarkable output of research in the 1970s, a fair amount of it stimulated by those new research centres and professional associations that had emerged in the 1960s. Of this the moment of culture was a significant and powerful one. Its roots, as Anderson noted in his article on the National Culture, did not lie in philosophy, economics, political theory, sociology, or anthropology but in literary criticism: “in a culture which everywhere repressed the notion of totality, and the idea of critical reason, literary criticism represented a refuge” (ibid: 276). In many respects it was the work of Raymond Williams that set the process in motion, though E.P. Thompson’s *William Morris* and *The Making of the English Working Class* and Richard Hoggart’s *Uses of Literacy* established the groundwork for constructing an alternative narrative of British life.

Williams’ early work, in particular *Culture and Society* (1958) and *The Long Revolution* (1961), set the tone for a British critical theory by tracing an ongoing tradition from 1780 to 1950 in cultural writing, while at the same time providing a framework for rewriting conventional accounts of British history, culture and politics. Several recent studies have explored Williams’ work in some detail,<sup>8</sup> and it would be inappropriate to go over the major themes again, particularly as Williams himself, ten years before his death, engaged in a searching reappraisal of his own work which has provided the basis for all subsequent readings of his remarkably wide-ranging output.<sup>9</sup> Williams’ achievement (drawing on the literary critical tradition represented by the Leavises, his reading of Marxist critical theory, and his strong sense of colonial marginality derived from his Welsh roots) was to give to cultural studies a focus on text, social movement and subcultural dissidence which became integral to the development of British cultural marxism in the 1960s and 1970s. In many respects he was pivotal in creating the cultural/political sociology which Anderson saw as absent in the British

intellectual tradition. He did this, not by taking the external theories as the point-of-departure, but by establishing the internal experimental and textual resources as the base from which theorizing might be possible. It was therefore a cultural studies that was always open to external ideas (Williams saw himself as 'European' rather than 'British') but which saw the appropriation of other theories as an occasion to bring into sharper focus the understanding of 'home'. Thus, although *Culture and Society*, *The Country and the City*, *The English Novel*, or even *The Long Revolution* were basically about the *English*, they were about the English with a Welsh/European theorist looking over the shoulder. It was this sense of the insider/outsider that gave Williams' work its most powerful force. Or, as George Simmel, the German sociologist of the late nineteenth century, might have said, Williams' work was based on the stranger who decided to stay, but who also asked 'how is this Society possible?'<sup>10</sup> From the late 1960s to the early 1980s these questions were central to all the cultural studies' debates in Britain, and thus redefined both the sense of the individual and of the collective in Marxist theory.

The thrust of a cultural theory is clearly based on an engagement with the communications institutions within which we all have to work. Williams' writing (and his practice) provides such an engagement: university, adult education, journalism, television, drama, radio, language. It is also an attempt to connect the fragments of political experiences of others who are concerned with creating emancipatory practices. The direction of the debate and the writing in Britain took the following forms.

(i) *The Peculiarities of the English*

E.P. Thompson's article of this title, first published in the *Socialist Register* in 1965, set a critical standard for asking what comparative social theory is *for*. If Thompson's outrageous pomposity was directed against the apparently callow and naive appropriations of other societal models by Anderson and Tom Nairn, the net effect of the article was to demand of the British left a reading of its own history against the acquisition of (foreign) theory in order to denounce (domestic) tradition and practice: "what their schema lack is the control of 'grand facts', and England is unlikely to capitulate before a Marxism which cannot at least engage in a dialogue in the English idiom." (Thompson, 1978: 64) The most important work of the 1970s was precisely based on rethinking 'foreign' theory in trying to understand 'the peculiarities of the English'. The work of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at Birmingham and of the History Workshop were notable for teasing out theory in the context of English



experience. The theoretical collection, *On Ideology*, and its 'empirical' application, *Policing the Crisis*, were monuments to the working out of Gramscian-derived theories of the State and Culture, finding Althusser heuristic but not definitive. What Althusser had done was to codify Gramsci's idea of Civil Society so that culture might be seen in institutional terms. This allowed a number of writers to get a 'fix' on cultural projects (Paul Willis' *Learning to Labour* is a notable example, but so too is Coward and Ellis' *Language and Materialism*) though the danger that Althusserianism might be simply a Marxist version of functionalism was ever-present. What the debate ultimately did was to produce a Marxist cultural studies that seemed to have three interlocking premises: (i) "Cultural processes are intimately connected with social relations, especially with class relations and class formations, with sexual divisions, with the racial structuring of social relations and with age oppressions as a form of dependency". (ii) "Culture involves power and helps to produce asymmetries in the abilities of individuals and social groups to define and realise their needs." (iii) "Culture is neither an autonomous nor an externally determined field, built a site of social differences and struggles." (Richard Johnson, 1986/7: 39)

Most of the work produced at the CCCS, through the History Workshops and in the writing of individual authors involved a working out of these problems, though often divided between those who saw that it was important to study cultures, as Johnson puts it, "as a whole, *in situ*, located in their material context," and those who "stress[ed] the relative independence or effective autonomy of subjective forms and means of signification" (ibid: 50). Although the debate between Perry Anderson and E. P. Thompson seemed in many ways to hinge on these dichotomies, in that Thompson clearly adopted a totalistic, situated perspective, while Anderson seemed to argue from a structuralism that owed much to the linguistic turn in Marxist theorizing, the debate on British culture as it evolved in the 1970s and early 1980s was much richer than these abstractions would suggest. The *real* debate on British culture was on which parts of the past made sense in confronting the present. Thompson ultimately took the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries as the major vantage-point (both in *The Making of the English Working Class* and in *Whigs and Hunters*) and much of his attack on the writing in *NLR* is derived from this and from his own experience in the CPGB. For Stuart Hall, the CCCS and the History Workshops, the crucial period was "the profound transformation in the culture of the popular classes which occurs between the 1890s and the 1920s . . . The more we look at it, the more convinced we become that somewhere in this period lies the matrix of factors and problems from which *our* history—and our peculiar dilemmas—arise. Everything chan-

ges—not just a shift in the relations of forces but a reconstitution of the terrain of political struggle itself.” (Hall in Samuels, ed., 1981: 229) Corrigan and Sayer in their superb historical overview argued the defining moment was much earlier, using a span from the great Revolution to the present to argue that the moment of *that* past was now.<sup>11</sup> It was this sense of the periodisation of history<sup>12</sup> that gave full force to the writings of Gramsci in much of CCCS work and later to the catch-phrase “post-Fordism” which dominated the ‘post-modernist’ writing of *Marxism Today* in the 1980s. The Anderson history agenda as it turned out involved neither of these senses of periodisation. His own research involved a comparative study on the nature of absolutism and a rethinking both of the concepts ‘feudalism’ and of the ‘asiatic mode of production’, emphasizing the acquisition of private property as the main distinguishing feature.<sup>13</sup> Subsequently Anderson argued against both a reading of history as being homogenous, “in which each moment is perpetually different from every other by being *next*” (he was criticising the work of Marshall Berman) or evolutionist in which, as in Lukacs, “time . . . differs from one epoch to another, but within each epoch all sectors of social reality move in synchrony with each other, such that decline at one level must be reflected in descent at every other.” (Anderson, 1984: 101-103) Instead he argued that Marx’s conception of time “was of a complex and *differential* temporality, in which episodes or eras were discontinuous from each other, and heterogeneous within themselves.” (ibid: 101) The net result of the debate on the peculiarities of the English was therefore both to set the English experience in relation to global ones and to posit the crucial moments within British culture when ideology, class formations, the state, as well as capitalism took different directions. Much of the most valuable work in the 1970s precisely explored these issues.

(ii) *The Peculiarities of the un-English.*

It was inevitable in a country whose Imperial pretensions had been pricked away that much of the discussion should hinge on the repercussions of imperialism. One of the marked features of writing in the 1970s was a series of exposures on the culture and politics of the English margins. Tom Nairn’s *The Break-up of Britain* (1977), Gwyn Williams’ *A Social History of Wales*, and Raymond Williams’ novels and periodical articles on Wales (see O’Connor 1989 for bibliographical details) provided some powerful material for rethinking the situation of the ‘Celtic Fringe’, topics which had been largely absent in the 1960s debates, and which had tended to be relegated by the English Left and Right to the loonie bin.<sup>14</sup> In this material

the Europeaness of Celtic as opposed to English culture is constantly stressed, but so also is the problematic role of the state, particularly by Nairn, although the idea that the British state was on the point of break-up had a nostalgic ring to it, based largely on the successes of the Welsh and Scottish Nationalists in parliamentary elections.

The other attack on the Englishness of English culture came from studies on Blacks and Youth in Britain. Two studies by the CCCS, *Resistance through Rituals* and *The Empire Strikes Back*, dealt with strategies of resistance by teenagers, by Blacks and by immigrant Asians. For the most part these were 'ethnographic' studies, providing a theoretically-based documentation of their subject-matter. The political underpinning of this research was contained in the volume *Policing the Crisis*, where the general thrust was rather different to Nairn's. The emphasis was on the crisis of hegemony due to an upset in the "balance of the relations of class forces" and of the increasing "reliance on coercive mechanisms and apparatuses already available within the normal repertoire of state power, and the powerful orchestration, in support of this tilt of the balance towards the coercive pole, of an authoritarian consensus." (Hall, et al: 1978: 217) The strength of this research was that it located the fragments of British society and brought them into the centre. It confronted the problems of nationalism and ethnicity as integral not only to a rethinking of the problem of class in a changing capitalism, but also (through its reading of Gramsci) provided a reading of the state as a vehicle both for coercion and for the genesis of a rejuvenation of capitalist ideas.

One book out of these concerns displayed the problems of taking subcultures as the point-of-departure. One of the contributors to *Resistance through Rituals* was Dick Hebdige. His book *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (1979) has become something of a milestone in cultural studies. It was based on a study of white rock music and Black reggae as the occasion for looking at Punk. As with most of the CCCS material at the time it took an interpretation of hegemony as the launching-pad for its analysis of culture and at the same time used the work of Roland Barthes as the basis for exploring style. It thus attempted to connect two apparently discrepant fields in working out the issue of Why the Punks now? The book was literate, drawing on Jean Genet, T. S. Eliot as well as a range of sociological sources on deviance subculture. But in the end it was a Barthesian book, exploring the gap between 'reality' and 'myth', the reader and the 'text'. By proposing a merger between a phenomenologically-based marxist cultural studies and a semiological one, Hebdige instead revealed the rift that would dominate the subject for the next decade, where the surface of 'style', 'silulacrum', 'textual representation' competed with everyday

struggle, though Hebdige's own work has kept the tension, necessarily, alive.<sup>15</sup>

(iii) *Feminism.*

The debate on the nature of English society and on the culture/ sub-culture of the margins revealed throughout the 1970s the strong phallocentrism of New Left discourse. Juliet Mitchell's "Women—the Longest Revolution" (its title a deliberate play on Raymond Williams' *The Long Revolution*) had appeared in *NLR* 40 in 1966, followed in 1971 by *Women's Estate* and in 1974 by *Psychoanalysis and Feminism*. Its point of departure was the work of Jacques Lacan and the linguistic grounding of psychoanalysis, and thus a rethinking both of ideology and feminism. In the introduction to *Psychoanalysis and Feminism*, Mitchell approvingly quoted the French feminist manifesto *Psychanalyse et Politique* which argued that Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis provided the theoretical equipment in understanding how ideology functions. Her work, and to some extent that of Jacqueline Rose, was concerned with teasing out the issues of "how adequately does psychoanalysis analyse ideology and sexuality, and if it does so, what is the political practice that follows from this theory?" (Mitchell 1974: xxii) The keywords of this investigation, superbly set out in Mitchell's two early books, were "sexuality", "phallocentrism", "femininity", "production", "patriarchy", "ideology", "reality", and, of course, "culture". Its centre of analysis was a structuralist/Marxist/Freudian feminism, setting itself quite distinctly against what it saw as a bourgeois North American feminism which repudiated all pre-feminist theory as not only being phallocentric but pre-modern. This critique ultimately suggests that North American feminism is bereft of theory, dealing largely in mere polemic, precisely because it denies the concepts of consciousness, the unconscious and of production: "When critics condemn Freud for not taking account of social reality, their concept of that reality is too limited. The social reality that he is concerned with elucidating is the mental representation of the reality of society." (Mitchell 1974: 406) Thus Marxist Feminism brought into Cultural Studies several fundamental issues which transformed the nature of all subsequent analysis. Significant, first, was the rethinking of the notion of the *subject*, which, bypassing the phenomenological issues of the purely *social* construction of reality and, equally, the merely biological base of most accounts of social differences, argued for the subject as being a mental and, hence, linguistic presence. But it is a subject that is capable of redefining itself.<sup>16</sup> And that redefinition is contingent on understanding a patriarchal power structure which uses language to appropriate biology

to define the social. As Mitchell argued at the conclusion of *Psychoanalysis and Feminism*, "It is not a question of changing (or ending) who has or how one has babies. It is a question of overthrowing patriarchy." (p 416) With this agenda, Marxist Feminism also introduced to Cultural Studies the structural analysis of media and a use of semiotics that could not be seen merely as yet another tool for 'reading' texts, but a politically potent one. It was a reading that had far-reaching consequences. Throughout the 1970s and into the '80s the influence of structuralist/marxist/feminism became centre-space for *any* study of the media. *Screen*, in many senses, was dominated by the concerns expressed by the opening to the structuralist/feminist Left. In female and male production, from Laura Mulvey to Stephen Frears, it is impossible to avoid the sense that the Eye/I sees all, that the task of production is not to manufacture consciousness (as in the social realism of earlier Marxist-derived documentaries), but to assist in the creation of the self-reflexive eye. . . . The task both of producing and making film became much more complex.

But the influence was not only on the way we look at, or produce, representations, it was also centred on coming to terms with, and overturning, the manufacturing of (or objectifying) everyday life. Ann Oakley (with Juliet Mitchell) collected a series of articles on *The Rights and Wrongs of Women*, which, in biographical form, presented the strategies of women's resistance to the problematics of the everyday. It opened the door to the serious treatment of biography as the means by which any critical theory of contemporary culture might be addressed, though Dorothy Smith, writing ten years later from Canada, produced the most succinct account of how such biographical accounts might be incorporated into a Marxist/feminist theory.<sup>17</sup>

The implications of such work for cultural studies are clearly political. And, perhaps, Dorothy Smith should have the last word on the problems inherent in the project:

Though we might be able to write a method of inquiry and a method of writing texts that will construct a knowledge of society from the standpoint of outsiders to the relations of ruling, we deceive ourselves if we think that the critical moment is complete in finding new methods of writing sociological texts. Methodological strategies, such as those proposed here, do not transform in and of themselves. They make, or should make, texts that will work differently in coordinating discursive relations, hence the relations forming political consciousness and organization. But they do not work magic. Such strategies themselves become merely academic if they are contained within the relations of academic discourse, even a feminist discourse. . . . The critical force of these methods is contained and "institutionalized" if they are not articulated to relations creating linkages outside and beyond the ruling apparatus, giving voice to women's experience, opening up to women's gaze the forms and relations determining women's lives, and enlarging women's powers and capacities to organize in struggle against the oppression of women. (Smith 1987: 224-225)

(iv) *Cultural Studies, Sociology and English Literature*

The ultimate problem, forewarned in Dorothy Smith's quote above, was that cultural studies would move from being part of a social movement to being an appendix of academe, so institutionalized that it became simply a continuation of the Classics and Humanities traditions which had for long acted as the basis of a critique against the disciplinarity of the universities. But, of course, Cultural Studies had roots which were independent of academe, just as Classics had its roots in the church and in the Imperial Civil Service. And yet they were curious roots, part social movement, part the commonsensicality of a declassé *lumpenintelligentsia*. And with one or two individual exceptions (Raymond Williams at Cambridge, Terry Eagleton at Oxford, and in both cases under the aegis of Literature), Cultural Studies did not become accepted at the old, established universities, with the exception of Birmingham where it snuck in through the back-door, as it were. And yet, its publications and its influences were everywhere, so much so that throughout the 1980s Paul Johnson devoted a weekly column in *The Spectator* fulminating against the 'control' that marxist culturism appeared to have on sections of the media (notably the BBC, Channel 4 and *The Guardian*).

Anyone reading this material in, say, 1982 would have been struck by how much cultural studies had done to give marxist thinking an agenda for political action. The critique of the state was in place, writing on the national and ethnic 'margins' of British society suggested what were the problems at the core, feminist writing and group action were undermining the very basis of a patriarchal society, and the general sweep of cultural studies was questioning not only the academic disciplines' sense of themselves (they were a push-over) but also the conventional wisdoms of the media, the politicians and the apparatus of state, schooling and business. Gramsci rode high, and in some ways was also put into action (witness the GLC between 1981 and 1986)<sup>18</sup>. And yet *marxist* (or even radical) cultural studies died in the 1980s, dancing around in its own Platonic Cave.

#### IV

What all the debate currently occupying the far left is about is the breakdown not just of Leninist communism but of Marxism. For years people who call themselves Marxists have been saying that does not mean support of Russian communism. But what is left as they move at ever-increasing pace to defend private ownership? Wouldn't it just be more sensible for them to change the name of *Marxism Today* while they are in the business of changing names? What about "Next Ideas" if they want to catch the feel of dated modernity and obsession with fashion?

David Blake, "Communist Parties Play the Name Game," *Sunday Correspondent*, November 26, 1989.

By the late 1980s cultural studies was institutionalized, internationalized and virtually depoliticized. The institutionalization was clearly a consequence of the great cultural void that Perry Anderson had noted in his article, "Components of the National Culture." Cultural studies, because of its immediacy and its European theory, had a presence which appeared to shatter the pretences of insular academia. And, in many ways, because it was concerned with the media, it was able to use the media to get its points home. It was strategic that the Open University was staffed with people from the New Left and that journals like *New Society*, *New Statesman*, *Time Out*, and *The Times Literary Supplement* were stacked by contributors who saw the media as the site of a voice/pen from which academia could be exposed and (hopefully) a new readership might be galvanized. The Left certainly produced 'organic intellectuals'—but for whom? The temptation was to be culturist for the sake of culturism, for New Left Marxism was, by the eighties, vying for a different hegemonic position, that is as the arbiters of aesthetic taste and lifestyle (or a largely bourgeois audience. Within academia, cultural studies had already become a replacement for the 'humanities', that carry-over from the classical center of English literature. The New Universities of the 1960s had created interdisciplinary faculties of the humanities and social sciences, and many of the Polytechnics, following degree-granting status in the early seventies, established programmes in communication, humanities and cultural studies. None of this is to argue that cultural studies became part of the Establishment, but rather that there was an established area of scholarship into which it easily might be inserted, or with which it might compete on academic, rather than political, terms. That there might be different kinds of cultural studies with different political agendas is becoming clear once again.<sup>19</sup> The quotation from Auberon Waugh at the beginning of this article is an extreme version of seeing culture as an essential element in class struggle. But even in academia cultural studies is not the preserve of the Left. At the University of East Anglia, for example, the School of English and American Studies has for many years been the centre of programmes in cultural studies, whose concerns are about as random and 'liberal' as the American Popular Cultural Association, where anything that is shared by any group of people is 'popular' and worth studying.<sup>20</sup> As David Punter argues in an East Anglia collection on Cultural Studies, "we need to be reluctant to offer a definition of culture; to define it is already to collude in a hierarchy of meaning." (Punter, ed., 1986:14)

Cultural Studies on the Left not only became institutionalized, but it also became something of a publishing industry. Although the output from

CCCS dwindled in the 1980s, the Open University, Verso, Commedia, Methuen, Macmillan and Routledge produced a steady supply of texts on aspects of cultural studies. Several new journals appeared, notably *Cultural Studies*, *New Formations*, *News from Nowhere*, *10/8*, *Block*, *Textual Practice*, and *Theory, Culture and Society*. Cultural studies was exported—to Australia, Canada, Italy, and the United States, in most cases emerging out of departments of Communications or English. For the most part, the work fed into an international caravan of travelling scholarship which debated the finer points of deconstruction, modernism, postmodernism, gender, neocolonialism, postmarxism, even postfeminism. Such political roots as cultural studies might have had were rarely in evidence, though *Arena* in Australia and *Social Text* in the United States retained a dogged sense of purpose.<sup>21</sup>

Thus the debates on marxism and culture which had been central to the Left's sense of practice in Britain became part of a peripatetic *avant-garde* that migrated from Bologna, Rome, Paris, Bordeaux, Oxford to summer jamborees in New Orleans, Toronto or Urbana. Although the theoretical advantages that came from appropriating European theory and testing it against British experiences were evident enough in the 1970s, by 1990 it was clear that the post-structuralists *had* taken over. Critical theory had become a performance for the academic cognoscenti, and the debates could only be appreciated by an international bourgeoisie. To understand why, it is important to return to Britain and see what had happened to the Left's use of its own cultural analysis.

In different ways, the arrival of Thatcher had been predicted by Stuart Hall, Tom Nairn, Raymond Williams and Perry Anderson. The collapse of the old consensus was on the cards after Macmillan's resignation in 1962. It was a central theme of *Policing the Crisis*, *The MayDay Manifesto*, Anderson's articles on Sweden, and *The Break-up of Britain*. From 1956 to Thatcher's election in 1979, Britain lurched from one crisis of economy, law'n order, external relations, purpose, to another. All of these were carefully monitored by the left. What happened after the Thatcher coup was a redefinition both of the rules of the game and of what constituted hegemony. In his collected essays, *The Hard Road to Renewal*, Stuart Hall is absolutely right in arguing that "Since the break-up of the great Liberal formation in the early years of this century, the British political system has shown an increasing tendency, in periods of crisis, to turn to Caesarist solutions." (ibid: 66) He is also right in seeing Thatcher as the culmination of this process. And yet, as the quote from *Hard Road* at the beginning of this article shows, something has changed between the beginning and end of the book. It is a change which is at the heart of what British Cultural studies has become.



Stuart Hall's great achievement was to teach a whole generation of students how to read politically. His article, "Encoding/Decoding", ostensibly a piece about television, (and apart from a number of serious counter-critiques) was perhaps *the* most important guide to any student, anywhere, on how to interpret the material at hand, encompassing a Marxist theory of production, a structuralist theory of the text, and a phenomenological sense of knowing.<sup>22</sup> More than any of Raymond Williams' studies or the many long essays in *NLR*, this was the piece that turned people on to critical/cultural theory. It was a piece that they could take out of the classroom and apply to whatever they were about. They could apply it to the state, to the welfare office, to the local school board. Above all, they could apply it to the language and performances of politicians. But a few things happened between "Encoding/decoding" and the moment of Thatcher. The first was that the Thatcher regime looked as if it would last forever and thus became the "common sense" of continuity (Anderson's warnings about heterogeneous culture and discontinuous time went unheeded). The second, picking up from the 'fragments' of culture (including Blacks, Asians, Celts and Women), was that a theory was obviously needed to include them all, as well as the working class. Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, using a paradigm of a discursive 'civil society', seemed to provide a means of reconnecting the fragments by using a Foucaultian notion of Decentered politics, though, unlike Marcuse, without 'necessary' violence. The third was that culture was ultimately about artefacts, which might be read as bric-a-brac anywhere, but probably in our living rooms. And the fourth was that, ultimately, any form of culture was about individual, not collective, survival.

Thus Thatcherism, which had initially posed a challenge to the left because it looked like a Caesarist solution to everyday life, became the common-sense basis for understanding any of our problems. The monetarist paraphernalia of Britain's 'economic miracle' was taken as read. No more discussion about workers' control of the means of production, but an acceptance of the 'mixed economy' as a fact of life. A slogan had taken over. 'Post Fordism', which had seemed like a good idea at the time, was elided with 'Thatcherism'. But that elision displayed a formidable distrust of Marxist cultural studies' own legacy, which was not only based on theory (from whatever its source) but on the lived experience of workers in their everyday lives. Although the discourse seemed oppositional, it was oppositional within the same framework as the (new) established version. The crisis of cultural studies in the 1980s was therefore a crisis of Hegelian proportions. Like Thatcherism, which had enacted slogans, British cultural marxism ultimately abandoned Raymond Williams' sensibility of feelings, however vague that might have seemed at the time, for the brittleness of

the marketplace. Anthony Crosland, whose *Future of Socialism* had argued for the 'mixed' economy, and whose prognosis for a socialist society had acted as the mouthpiece of Butskellism, had posthumously won.

As we move into the 1990s, cultural studies has a few legacies worth building on. There is a marxist-feminism which is not only about patriarchy, but is also about reading the texts that we all have to live by. Dorothy Smith's marvellous book *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology* is certainly the most important statement of how marxism and feminism might cohere both in reading the texts that are imposed on us and the strategies that might be used to liberate ourselves. Another text, building on the slow retrieval of the past, is Ronald Fraser's *In Search of a Past* which defies quotation, but which reaches out to a sensibility of a man, well-heeled, who wants to know why he became a Marxist. It is an autobiographical account of any of us who presume to talk on behalf of the people. Dick Hebdige's marvellously tactile, sensitive work which sees hope in living through the apocalypse, is yet another grasp at apprehending the present and the future.<sup>23</sup> And yet another text, suggestive for its sense that Cultural Studies is about intellectual voyeurs, is Andrew Ross's *No Respect: Intellectuals and Popular Culture*, which tries to situate the enigma of cultural studies in the everyday reality of the complacency of intellectuals in confronting the media as the messages that they obviously portray.

The sexism, racism, and militarism that pervades these genres is never expressed in a pure form (whatever that might be); it is articulated through and alongside social resentments born of subordination and exclusion. A politics that only preaches about the sexism, racism, and militarism while neglecting to rearticulate the popular, resistant appeal of the disrespect will not be a popular politics, and will lose ground in any contest that we have experienced under Reaganism and Thatcherism.

(Andrew Ross: *No Respect*, 1989: 231)

The tragedy of British Cultural Studies in the 1980s is that although it was tuned into the nuances of change, it was incapable of doing more than tagging on to the changes that were already determined by others.

The reason for this is not far to seek. Although some impressive work was done on the political economy of the culture industry (Simon Frith's *Sound Effects* is perhaps the best example) Cultural Studies did not contribute much to the reformulation of political economics as such. In abandoning the simplistic base-superstructure model, which was left largely to Ernest Mandel, the editors of *Socialist Register*, and Thatcher's economic advisors to pursue, no alternative political economy was formulated which would take into account the major force of the cultural critique. The Laclau-Mouffe decentering of political agency begged the questions both of the multinational nature of capitalism and of the exponential growth of

human consumption. Curiously, the 'green' implications of anti-nuclearism did not lead to a 'green' economics, and although feminism suggested routes to a rethinking of economics in everyday practice, it did not, as the economists would say, produce a 'macro' economics. The cultural turn in Marxism, shorn of a politico-social foundation, was therefore bound to become yet one more manifestation of the *avant-garde*, a glittery gad-fly on the wall of history. Its success (or its doom—depending on how we read our place in history) is therefore, up to now, largely aesthetic. But *that* aesthetic, *pace* Marcuse, might yet be the moment on which a new political economy will be built. But we have, up to now, been very bad at these things. The pawnbrokers are waiting in the wings.

### REFERENCE NOTES

1. There was, of course, cultural marxism in Britain before Cultural Marxism. The most important indications are Christopher Caudwell, *Illusion and Reality*, and *Studies in a Dying Culture*; A.L. Lloyd, *Folk Song in England*, *The Singing Englishman*, *Come All ye Bold Miners*; John Berger, *Permanent Red*; Arnold Kettle, *The Modern Novel*; Ralph Fox, *The Novel and the People*; Moses Findlay, *The World of Odysseus*; Hugh MacDairmid, in his *Collected Poems*; C.L.R. James, *Beyond a Boundary*; Eric Hobsbawm, *The Jazz Scene*; E.P. Thompson, *William Morris: From Romantic to Revolutionary*.
2. Private conversation with John Rex.
3. For a somewhat breathless account of the founding of the *Reasoner* and the exit of the Thompsons and other intellectuals from the CPGB see Neal Wood, 1959.
4. This story obviously needs to be told. The institutional base of the New Left came from an intellectual tradition of popular education which had been established by different routes: the Worker's Education Association, the Extra-Mural Departments of the Universities, the National Council of Labour Colleges, the CPGB, the emergence of Penguin Books and the Left Book Club in the 1930s, Ruskin College at Oxford. In many senses that tradition had become ingrown. The intellectuals used the experiences of working there as catalysts, but the structures themselves were ossified. They were replaced by the Open University, the Birmingham Centre, the Polytechnics, the History Workshop, but with an agenda which was more based on the market than on the free flow of ideas in a political world. But, meanwhile, under the old structures, the concatenations of solidarity persist. The old structures at least promised the *ideal* of intellectual/social solidarity: the new display the rupture, while preserving the intellectuals in their socialist ghettos.
5. Edited by Raymond Williams with an editorial board that included Edward Thompson and Stuart Hall. First published by the May Day Manifesto Committee in 1967, revised and expanded and published by Penguin Books in 1968. The contributors did not include any of the then members of *NLR*.
6. E.P. Thompson, borrowing a metaphor from recent cuts in British Rail, wrote in 1965:
 

Early in 1962, when the affairs of *New Left Review* were in some confusion, the New Left Board invited an able contributor, Perry Anderson, to take over the editorship. We found (as we had hoped) in Comrade Anderson the decision and intellectual coherence necessary to ensure the review's continuance. More than that, we discovered that we had appointed a veritable Dr. Beeching of the Socialist intelligentsia. All the uneconomic branch-lines and sociocultural sidings of the New Left which were, in any case, carrying less and less traffic, were abruptly closed

down. The main lines of the review underwent an equally ruthless modernisation. Old Left steam-engines were swept off the tracks; wayside halts ("Commitment," "What Next for C.N.D.?", "Women in Love") were boarded up; the the lines were electrified for the speedy traffic from the marxistentialist Left Bank. In less than a year the founders of the review discovered, to their chagrin, that the Board lived on a branch-line which, after rigorous intellectual costing, had been found un-economic. Finding ourselves redundant we submitted to dissolution.

From *The Socialist Register* No 2, 1965. Reprinted in E.P. Thompson, 1978: 35.

7. There were, of course, different ways of 'translating' European writers. By-and-large the American academic press chose to translate European authors whose works could either contribute to a Cold War freeze-out or whose writing was so eclectically *academic* that it became part of the cultish research of the universities. Very few American publishers saw it as their task to translate work which contributed to a sense of radical movement. Even individual authors were sanitised by American publishers: see my article on Walter Benjamin—"Approaching Walter Benjamin: Retrieval, Translation and Reconstruction", *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory*, Vol IV, No 1 (1980): 59-74.
8. See, in particular, Alan O'Connor *Raymond Williams: Writing, Culture, Politics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
9. In *Politics and Letters* (1979), Williams was interviewed by the editors of *NLR*, book-by-book, epoch-by-epoch, political commitment-by-political commitment. The book is in many ways not merely a study of Williams' own work, but an account of the political growth of cultural studies on the Left.
10. The two major collections of Simmel's work are: Donald N. Levine (trns, introduced and edited), *Georg Simmel: On Individuality and Social Forms*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971; and Kurt H. Wolff (trns, introduced and edited), *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. New York: The Free Press, 1950.
11. Phil Corrigan and Derek Sayer's book (1986) is certainly one of the most graphic accounts of a narrative which is implanted in the institutions within Britain over the past 400 years. Its only rival, in conceptual terms, and also in graphic detail, is Tom Nairn's two studies of the Celtic issue and the role of the monarchy. (See Nairn, 1977 & 1987)
12. The large majority of History Workshop books dealt with the period and so did the two CCCS studies of history. See, *inter alia*, Samuel (ed) 1981 for papers on some of the research issues, and also Samuel (ed) *Miners, Quarrymen and Saltworkers*, 1977 and Samuel, Ewan MacColl and Stuart Cosgrove, *Theatres of the Left*, 1985 for representative samples of History Workshop material. The two CCCS books are John Clarke, Chas Critcher and Richard Johnson (eds) *Working Class Culture*, 1979, and Richard Johnson (ed) *Making Histories*.
13. See his *Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism* (1974) and *Lineages of the Absolutist State* (1974)
14. It is peculiar, to say the least, that the Irish question did not loom large in this Celtic debate, although Nairn gives a chapter to it. The most important book which he quotes, is in French: Jean-Pierre Carasso, *La rumeur irlandaise: guerre de religion ou lutte de classe?* Paris: Maspero, 1970. Richard Rose, *Northern Ireland: A time of Choice*, London, 1976, is a competent, structural-functional account of the Northern Irish situation.
15. And it is, perhaps, Hebdige who has, more than anyone else, maintained in his writing the spirit of the origins of the British cultural discourse. Both *Cut 'n' Mix* (1987), a study of Black music in Britain, and *Hiding In the Light* (1988), a collection of essays around, through, and beyond the idea of the post-modern, are monuments to a sensitive imagination in command of all the senses. His photographic essay, "Some Sons and their Fathers" (*TEN/8*, October 1985) stands with Ronald Fraser's *In Search of a Past* (1984) as a model of self-critical autobiography.
16. Jacqueline Rose makes this point clear in her introduction to Lacan's *Feminine Sexuality*. In discussing Lacan, she writes:

There is . . . no question of denying here that Lacan was implicated in the phallocentrism he described, just as his own utterance constantly rejoins the mastery

- which he sought to undermine. The question of the unconscious and of sexuality, the movement towards and against them, operated at exactly this level of his own speech. But for Lacan they function as the question of that speech, and cannot be referred back to a body outside language, a place to which the 'feminine', and through that, women, might escape. In the response to Lacan, therefore, the 'feminine' has returned as it did in the 1920s and 1930s in reply to Freud, but this time with the added meaning of resistance to a phallic organisation of sexuality which is recognised as such. The 'feminine' stands for a refusal of that organisation, its ordering, its identity. For Lacan, on the other hand, interrogating that same organisation undermines any absolute definition of the 'feminine' at all. Psychoanalysis does not produce that definition. It gives an account of how that definition is produced. While the objection to its dominant term must be recognised, it cannot be answered by an account which returns to a concept of the feminine as pre-given, nor by a mandatory appeal to an androcentrism in the symbolic which the phallus would simply reflect. The former relegates women outside language and history, the latter simply subordinates them to both. (Lacan, 1982: 56-7)
17. *The Everyday World as Problematic* (University of Toronto Press, 1987), while ignoring the Lacanian underpinnings of much of British Feminist/Marxism, is a consummate argument on behalf of a decentred, subject-based, feminism which takes the phallogocentric institutions as the main problem. The terms of reference, however, are a phenomenological Marxism rather than a structuralist one, which creates a wonderful tension in feminist thinking.
  18. The most succinct account of this experiment is provided by Franco Bianchini in *New Formations*, No 1 (1987): 103-117
  19. Once *again*, because a cultural studies of the Right was always present in the works of the literary critics and many poets and novelists. Raymond Williams' *Culture and Society* was an attempt to counter this tradition.
  20. The best-known book from Norwich is, of course, Malcolm Bradbury's *The History Man*, the image of which all lecturers at UEA must spend their days trying to live down. The American Popular Cultural Association was an offshoot of the Modern Languages Association. Operating from Bowling Green, Ohio, it is a largely untheoretical exercise in eclecticism. Its journals are *The Journal of Popular Culture* and *The Journal of American Culture* and it operates The Bowling Green State University Popular Press.
  21. In the United States a series of journals emerged in the eighties that might be called Cultural Studies journals. Three earlier journals (*Telos*, *New German Critique*, and *Yale French Studies*) which specialized in European studies were joined by *Cultural Critique*, *Social Text*, *October*, *Communication Inquiry* and *The International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*. In 1988 *Public Culture* appeared from the University of Pennsylvania. In Canada, *The Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory* started publication in the late 1970s and *Borderlines* in 1984. *Studies in Political Economy* and *Labour/Le Travailleur* were high on political commitment but low on cultural studies.
  22. The article may be found in Stuart Hall et al, *Culture, Media, Language*. London: Hutchinson, 1980: 128-138.
  23. The most succinct statements are to be found in *Hiding in the Light* (London: Commedia, 1988).

### Bibliography

- Anderson, Perry, "Modernity and Revolution," *New Left Review* 144 (1984): 96-113. Reprinted in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988: 317-333.
- Cockburn, Alexander, and Blackburn, Robin (eds), *Student Power*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1969.

- Davies, Ioan, "Approaching Walter Benjamin: Retrieval, Translation and Reconstruction." *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory*, IV, 1 (1980): 59-74.
- Hall, Stuart and others, *On Ideology*. London: Hutchinson, 1978.
- Hall, Stuart, *The Hard Road to Renewal*. London: Verso, 1989.
- Hebdige, Dick, *Subculture: the Meaning of Style*. London: Methuen, 1979.
- Johnson, Richard, "What is Cultural Studies anyway?" *Social Text* 16 (1986/7): 38-80.
- Lacan, Jacques, *Feminine Sexuality*. Trs. by Jacqueline Rose, and edited by Juliet Mitchell and Jacqueline Rose. New York: W. W. Norton, 1982.
- Mitchell, Juliet, "Women—the Longest Revolution." *New Left Review* 40 (1966): 11-37.
- Mitchell, Juliet, *Psychoanalysis and Feminism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974.
- Nairn, Tom, *The Break-up of Britain*. London: New Left Books, 1977.
- O'Conner, Alan, *Raymond Williams: Writing, Culture, Politics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- Punter, David (ed), *An Introduction to Cultural Studies*. London: Longmans, 1986.
- Ross, Andrew, *No Respect*. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Samuels, Raphael (ed), *People's History and Socialist Theory*. London: Routledge, 1981.
- Smith, Dorothy, *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- Thompson, E. P., *The Poverty of Theory*. London: Merlin Press, 1978.
- Williams, Raymond (ed), *May Day Manifesto*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968.
- Williams, Raymond, *Politics and Letters*. London: New Left Books, 1979.