

## **Prefatory note**

When Stuart Hall died, I felt the urge to post one of my favorite quotes from his work to Facebook. It was a very small gesture, of course. And I was hardly alone in doing so. My Facebook feed was flooded with similar quotes from dozens of other friends. (This, of course, is what I get for having so many friends who do cultural studies.)

Trying to capture more than half a century of Hall's writing, teaching, and activism in a single quote, however, was an impossible task. His oeuvre is too big, too varied, and too rich for that. So, without ever quite planning it out, I found myself posting a fresh Hall quote the day after he died too. And the day after that. And the next one. (It helped, of course, that large numbers of my friends kept responding to these quotes in positive ways.) So I kept it going. A week. Two weeks. A month. A fresh quote every day.

Eventually, though, it had to end. On Day 50 of my unplanned tribute, I called it quits. Multiple Facebook friends told me that I should put all the quotes I'd used together in one place. It took a while, but here it is.

## Day 1

“On the one hand, we had to be at the very forefront of intellectual theoretical work because, as Gramsci says, it is the job of the organic intellectual to know more than the traditional intellectuals do: really know, not just pretend to know, not just to have the facility of knowledge, but to know deeply and profoundly. . . . Hence, there are no theoretical limits from which cultural studies can turn back. But the second aspect is just as crucial: that the organic intellectual cannot absolve himself or herself from the responsibility of transmitting those ideas, that knowledge, through the intellectual function, to those who do not belong, professionally, in the intellectual class.”

Hall, Stuart. 1992. Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies. In *Cultural studies*, ed. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, Paula A. Treichler, Linda Baughman, and J. Macgregor Wise, 277-294. New York: Routledge.

## Day 2

“The task of a critical theory is to produce as accurate a knowledge of complex social processes as the complexity of their functioning requires. It is not its task to console the left by producing simple but satisfying myths, distinguished only by their super-left wing credentials.”

Hall, Stuart. 1981. The whites of their eyes: Racist ideologies and the media. In *Silver linings: Some strategies for the eighties*, ed. George Bridges and Rosalind Brunt, 28-52. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

### Day 3

[The last line is often misquoted in ways that erase race from Hall's comments. Long past time to set the record straight.]

“Cultural studies’ message is a message for academics and intellectuals but, fortunately, for many other people as well. In that sense, I have tried to hold together in my own intellectual life, on the one hand, the conviction and passion and the devotion to objective interpretation, to analysis, to rigorous analysis and understanding, to the passion to find out, and to the production of knowledge that we did not know before. But, on the other hand, I am convinced that no intellectual worth his or her salt, and no university that wants to hold its head up in the face of the twenty-first century, can afford to turn dispassionate eyes away from the problems of race and ethnicity that beset our world.”

Hall, Stuart. 1992. Race, culture, and communications: Looking backward and forward at cultural studies. *Rethinking Marxism*, 5(1): 10-18.

## Day 4

“It was not possible to present the work of cultural studies as if it had no political consequences and no form of political engagement, because what we were asking students to do was to do what we ourselves had done: to engage with some real problem out there in the dirty world, and . . . to spend that time usefully to try to understand how the world worked. . . . So, from the start we said: What are you interested in? What really bugs you about questions of culture and society now? What do you really think is a problem you don’t understand out there in the terrible interconnection between culture and politics? What is it about the way in which British culture is now living through its kind of postcolonial, posthegemonic crisis that really bites into your experience? And then we will find a way of studying that seriously.”

Hall, Stuart. 1990. The emergence of cultural studies and the crisis in the humanities. *October*, 53: 11-23.

## Day 5

“So write like you write, accept your own voice. Having done that, I’m not very good at talking about what that process is. I think about it, and I have some thoughts now about it, and there are things which other people have said which help me reflect on it. David Scott says he doesn’t read me because of cultural theory; he reads me because of my political interventions. And I realized that almost everything I write is a kind of political intervention. It may not be about politics explicitly, but it is trying to shift the terms of the debate, intervene on one side or another, clarify something, wipe some other distorting views out of place so that something else can come through.”

Hall, Stuart, and Les Back. 2009. At home and not at home. *Cultural Studies*, 23(4): 658-687.

## Day 6

“I never thought of myself as an academic. I wasn’t sure I wanted to teach in academia. I never felt I was in academia except to describe it to other people. I mean, I know the word makes itself perfectly commonly understood. It’s how I made my living. But I don’t think of myself as an academic. I think of myself as an intellectual and a teacher. Not as an academic. I’m critical of academia as an institutional space.”

Hall, Stuart. 2013. Stuart Hall interview -- 2 June 2011. *Cultural Studies*, 27(5): 757-777.

## Day 7

“This wider social formation quest[ion] must haunt every individual . . . piece of Cultural Studies work you do. No study of Big Brother, no study of The Sopranos, no study of television programmes or any other particular instance of culture is in my view properly Cultural Studies unless, in the end, it is haunted by the question -- ‘But what does this have to do with everything else?’ The idea that Cultural Studies is going to answer that question on its own is of course ridiculous; it’s not going to answer it, it can’t possibly answer it; it isn’t that kind of thing. But you have to [do] work which allows the position of articulation to be posed, so that this wider question of the social formation can be posed.”

Hall, Stuart. 2007. That moment and this. Presented as part of a plenary panel at the conference, “Cultural Studies Now,” University of East London, UK, 20 July.

## Day 8

“The university has become so much more marketised and entrepreneurialised, and graduate research -- which at the time was very under-developed and un-regulated -- has become almost intolerably bureaucratic, in ways which are structurally hostile to the open, interrogative, inquisitive kind of intellectual environment which the Centre attempted for a time to create and sustain.”

Hall, Stuart. 2007. Preface. In *CCCS Selected Working Papers* (vol. 1), ed. Ann Gray, Jan Campbell, Mark Erickson, Stuart Hanson, and Helen Wood, ix-xiv. New York: Routledge.

## Day 9

“I do think it is a requirement of intellectuals to speak a kind of truth. Maybe not truth with a capital T, but anyway, some kind of truth, the best truth they know or can discover -- to speak that truth to power. To take responsibility -- which can be unpleasant and is no recipe for success -- for having spoken it. To take responsibility for speaking it to wider groups of people than are simply involved in the professional life of ideas. To speak it beyond the confines of the academy. To speak it, however, in its full complexity. Never to speak it in too simple a way, because ‘the folks won’t understand.’ Because then they will understand, but they will get it wrong, which is much worse! So, to speak it in its full complexity, but to try to speak it in terms in which other people who, after all, can think and do have ideas in their heads, though they are not paid or paid-up intellectuals, need it. They need it like you and I need food. They need it in order to survive. I commend the vocation of the intellectual life in this sense to you. I remind you that the academy is one of the places in which it takes root. It is not the only place, and I do plead with you not to over-estimate its role or to get entrapped in its internal rituals. . . . I commend that vocation to you, if you can manage to find it. I do not claim to have honoured that vocation fully in my life, but I say to you, that is kind of what I have been trying to do all this while.”

Hall, Stuart. 2007. Epilogue: Through the prism of an intellectual life. In *Culture, politics, race and diaspora: The thought of Stuart Hall*, ed. Brian Meeks, 269-291. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

## Day 10

“You have to be sure about a position in order to teach a class, but you have to be open-ended enough to know that you are going to change your mind by the time you teach it next week. As a strategy, that means holding enough ground to be able to think a position but always putting it in a way which has a horizon toward open-ended theorization. Maintaining that is absolutely crucial for cultural studies, at least if it is to remain a critical and deconstructive project. I mean that it is always self-reflectively deconstructing itself; it is always operating on the progressive/regressive movement of the need to go on theorizing. I am not interested in Theory, I am interested in going on theorizing.”

Hall, Stuart. 1986. On postmodernism and articulation: An interview with Stuart Hall. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 10(2): 45-60.

## Day 11

“Cultural hegemony is never about pure victory or pure domination (that’s not what the term means); it is never a zero-sum cultural game; it is always about shifting the balance of power in the relations of culture; it is always about changing the dispositions and the configurations of cultural power, not getting out of it. There is a kind of ‘nothing ever changes, the system always wins’ attitude, which I read as the cynical protective shell that, I’m sorry to say, American cultural critics frequently wear, a shell that sometimes prevents them from developing cultural strategies that can make a difference. It is as if, in order to protect themselves against the occasional defeat, they have to pretend they can see right through everything -- and it’s just the same as it always was.”

Hall, Stuart. 1992. What is this “black” in black popular culture? In *Black popular culture*, ed. Gina Dent, 21-33. Seattle: Bay Press.

## Day 12

“I want, instead, to draw a different lesson from this episode. It is the degree to which the left is unable to confront and argue through constructively the genuine problems of tactics and strategy of a popular anti-racist struggle. To be honest, what we know collectively about this would not fill the back of a postage stamp. Yet, we continue to conduct tactical debates and political calculation as if the answers were already fully inscribed in some new version of Lenin’s *What Is To Be Done?* Our mode of political calculation is that of the taking of absolutist positions, the attribution of bad faith to those genuinely convinced otherwise -- and thereby, the steady advance of the death-watch beetle of sectarian self-righteousness and fragmentation. It somehow enhances our left-wing credentials to argue and debate as if there is some *theory* of political struggle, enshrined in the tablets of stone somewhere, which can be instantly translated into the one true ‘correct’ strategy. The fact that we continue to lose the key strategic engagements and, in the present period, have lost very decisive terrain indeed, does not dent, even for a moment, our total certainty that we are on the ‘correct line.’ My own view is that we hardly begin to know how to conduct a popular anti-racist struggle or how to bend the twig of racist common sense which currently dominates popular thinking. It is a lesson we had better learn pretty rapidly.”

Hall, Stuart. 1981. The whites of their eyes: Racist ideologies and the media. In *Silver linings: Some strategies for the eighties*, ed. George Bridges and Rosalind Brunt, 28-52. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

## Day 13

“We had to develop a methodology that taught us to attend, not only to what people said about race but . . . to what people could not say about race. It was the silences that told us something; it was what wasn't there. It was what was invisible, what couldn't be put into frame, what was apparently unsayable that we needed to attend to.”

Hall, Stuart. 1992. Race, culture, and communications: Looking backward and forward at cultural studies. *Rethinking Marxism*, 5(1): 10-18.

## Day 14

“I come back to the deadly seriousness of intellectual work. It is a deadly serious matter. I come back to the critical distinction between intellectual work and academic work: they overlap, they abut with one another, they feed off one another, the one provides you with the means to do the other. But they are not the same thing. I come back to the difficulty of instituting a genuine cultural and critical practice, which is intended to produce some kind of organic intellectual political work, which does not try to inscribe itself in the overarching metanarrative of achieved knowledges, within the institutions. I come back to theory and politics, the politics of theory. Not theory as the will to truth, but theory as a set of contested, localized, conjunctural knowledges, which have to be debated in a dialogic way. But also as a practice which always thinks about its intervention in a world in which it would make some difference, in which it would have some effect. Finally, a practice which understands the need for intellectual modesty. I do think there is all the difference in the world between understanding the politics of intellectual work and substituting intellectual work for politics.”

Hall, Stuart. 1992. Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies. In *Cultural studies*, ed. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, Paula A. Treichler, Linda Baughman, and J. Macgregor Wise, 277-294. New York: Routledge.

## Day 15

“We should put this as plainly as possible. Films are not necessarily good because black people make them. They are not necessarily ‘right-on’ by virtue of the fact that they deal with the black experience. Once you enter the politics of the end of the essential black subject you are plunged headlong into the maelstrom of a continuously contingent, unguaranteed, political argument and debate: a critical politics, a politics of criticism. You can no longer conduct black politics through the strategy of a simple set of reversals, putting in the place of the bad old essentialist white subject, the new essentially good black subject.”

Hall, Stuart. 1989. New ethnicities. Reprinted (1996) in *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies*, ed. David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, 441-449. New York: Routledge.

## Day 16

“We thus came from a tradition entirely marginal to the centers of English academic life, and our engagement in the questions of cultural change -- how to understand them, how to describe them, and how to theorize them, what their impact and consequences were to be, socially -- were first reckoned within the dirty outside world. The Center for [Contemporary] Cultural Studies was the locus to which we *retreated* when that conversation in the open world could no longer be continued: it was politics by other means. Some of us -- me, especially -- had always planned never to return to the university, indeed, never to darken its doors again. But, then, one always has to make pragmatic adjustments to where real work, important work, can be done.”

Hall, Stuart. 1990. The emergence of cultural studies and the crisis in the humanities. *October*, 53: 11-23.

## Day 17

“We need to be self-conscious, in terms of our method, at the point where ‘value analysis’ becomes ‘value judgment’ -- because our cultural values are themselves socially determined to some extent, and it is peculiarly difficult to tell when exactly we move from the analysis of the meaning that is there in the material we are studying to the expression of personal tastes and preferences, judgment by socially-defined categories. We have only to look at such analytic categories as ‘high’ and ‘popular’ culture, or such terms as ‘high-brow,’ ‘middle-brow’ and ‘low-brow’ to see how socially-derived concepts have served to confuse the whole debate as it has been conducted so far. The value problem sits at the heart of both the literary and the sociological approach to the analysis of culture, and cannot easily be resolved. We need some way of holding a meaningful tension between the two concerns, without allowing the field to be hopelessly blurred for us by inherited categories before we begin.”

[The proper citation here is murky. At least from the information I’ve got. The essay I’m quoting is called “Cultural Analysis.” What’s scrawled on the PDF version of the photocopy pulled from an old grad school coursepack suggests that it’s a “Centre paper” from 1966. But the Centre’s stencilled papers don’t include this essay at all.\* The bibliography in Morley and Chen’s edited collection, *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (Routledge, 1996), seems to indicate that this essay is actually from 1967, and appeared in issue #89 of *Cambridge Review*. Much of the essay can also be found (without direct attributions of authorship) in the CCCS annual report for 1965-66.\*\*]

\*<http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/schools/historycultures/departments/history/research/projects/cccs/publications/stencilled-occasional-papers.aspx>

\*\*<http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/schools/historycultures/departments/history/research/projects/cccs/publications/annual-reports.aspx>

## Day 18

“The most significant act that I performed in the democratization of knowledge was to buy a second photocopier to which everybody at the Centre had access, so that everybody could duplicate, everybody could circulate. It was a literal collectivization of the means of dissemination.”

Hall, Stuart. 1997. Culture and power. *Radical Philosophy*, 86: 24-41.

## Day 19

“Sometimes people say to me that cultural studies thinks culture is everything, but I don’t think that at all. I think culture is very important, more than important -- it’s absolutely constitutive. But it’s also one among other things -- how could you not be also interested in capital, or war, and be alive today? Of course culture isn’t everything. But culture is a dimension of everything. Every practice exists in the material world and simultaneously signifies, is the bearer of meaning and value. Everything both exists and is imagined. And if you want to play in the area where deep feelings are involved, which people hardly understand, you have to look at culture.”

Hall, Stuart. 2007. Living with difference: Stuart Hall in conversation with Bill Schwarz. *Soundings*, 37: 148-158.

## Day 20

“When I was involved in the Centre for [Contemporary] Cultural Studies we did think that there would be a few people who were interested in what we were doing and perhaps would be trying to teach it in English departments. But as a global movement, as a transnational movement, which it is -- a transnational movement in cultural studies -- it certainly went way beyond anything that I had envisaged. The institutionalisation was inevitable, I think. Cultural Studies would have disappeared if it hadn't become institutionalised, but the process of institutionalisation itself kind of robbed it of some of its cutting edge. I suppose the most important element has to do with politics. We were free because we were just a little space and a little space which the university thought would soon disappear. We were free to talk about politics more openly than you can once you become part of a big department. As part of a university department, three-quarters of the people aren't on the same wavelength as you. You can't really have a class on Maoism. That's a general point, but then there's the fact that the big expansion came first in the US. I think in the US the academic world is more self-enclosed, self-sufficient, less related to anything outside it than anywhere else. In Britain the intellectual world, and academic world, especially, are relatively small, relatively marginal. So people conduct their intellectual debates, for instance, outside academia as well as anywhere else. In the British Film Institute, in various summer schools, not really just as a member of a department. In the US it seemed to me to become more confined within a particular academic world. It's a certain kind of academicisation of cultural studies.”

MacCabe, Colin. 2008. An interview with Stuart Hall, December 2007. *Critical Quarterly*, 50(1-2): 12-42.

## Day 21

“Popular culture is one of the sites where this struggle for and against a culture of the powerful is engaged: it is also the stake to be won or lost in that struggle. It is the arena of consent and resistance. It is partly where hegemony arises, and where it is secured. It is not a sphere where socialism, a socialist culture -- already fully formed -- might be simply ‘expressed.’ But it is one of the places where socialism might be constituted. That is why ‘popular culture’ matters. Otherwise, to tell you the truth, I don’t give a damn about it.”

Hall, Stuart. 1981. Notes on deconstructing “the popular.” In *People’s history and socialist theory*, ed. Raphael Samuel, 227-240. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

## Day 22

“Should we go through again the nature of neo-liberalism, the emergence of market society, the destruction of the public sphere, the constitution of the private, validation of the market as the only measure of cultural and social value? This is the yellow submarine, and we’re all inside it. One of the reasons why neo-liberalism can be described as hegemonic is precisely because of the number of different social sites which it has invaded and transformed. Of course it invades and transforms the economy, of course it invades and transforms the state; but did we know it would invade and transform the university? Did we know it would invade and transform social work? Did we know it would invade and transform the artistic world? One after another, these life worlds have all been reconstituted by the way in which social relations are understood and reshaped by neo-liberalism. So my task is not to try and characterise that moment, but I ask you to think for a moment about the moment, the conjuncture, in which we are and ask yourself a question: which forms of Cultural Studies not only address but are really haunted by that question?”

Hall, Stuart. 2007. That moment and this. Presented as part of a plenary panel at the conference, “Cultural Studies Now,” University of East London, UK, 20 July.

## Day 23

“Both [Richard] Hoggart and [Raymond] Williams rightly protest against the use of the terms ‘mass’ and ‘masses’ (See *Culture & Society*, p.297-312). ‘Masses,’ as Williams argues, is a kind of formula for progressive manipulation of anonymous groups of people -- ‘our listeners,’ ‘our readers,’ ‘viewers.’ ‘There are in fact no masses: there are only ways of seeing people as masses’ (p.300). But what we need to ask is not ‘who are the masses?’ but ‘why is it necessary in our society for people *to be seen, and be persuaded to see themselves* as “the masses”?’ It is necessary because this sense of classlessness, which can only be engendered by the persuasive use of a formula, must exist before people will accept their own cultural and economic exploitation. They have to be made accessories after the fact. This is the context in which we should understand the discussion about ‘the mass media,’ about advertising and culture. Every form of communication which is concerned with altering attitudes, which changes or confirms opinions, which instils new images of the self, is playing its part. They are not peripheral to the ‘economic base’: they are part of it.”

Hall, Stuart. 1958. A sense of classlessness. *Universities & Left Review*, 5 (Autumn): 26-32.

## Day 24

“No doubt there are certain general features to racism. But even more significant are the ways in which these general features are modified and transformed by the historical specificity of the contexts and environments in which they become active. In the analysis of particular historical forms of racism, we would do well to operate at a more concrete, historicized level of abstraction (i.e., not racism in general but racisms). . . . It is often little more than a gestural stance which persuades us to the misleading view that, because racism is everywhere a deeply anti-human and anti-social practice, that therefore it is everywhere *the same* -- either in its forms, its relations to other structures and processes, or its effects.”

Hall, Stuart. 1986. Gramsci's relevance for the study of race and ethnicity. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 10(2): 5-27.

## Day 25

“I do not claim that, in any simple way, Gramsci ‘has the answers’ or ‘holds the key’ to our present troubles. I do believe that we must ‘think’ our problems in a Gramscian way -- which is different. We mustn’t *use* Gramsci (as we have for so long abused Marx) like an Old Testament prophet who, at the correct moment, will offer us the consoling and appropriate quotation. We can’t pluck up this ‘Sardinian’ from his specific and unique political formation, beam him down at the end of the 20th century, and ask him to solve our problems for us: especially since the whole thrust of his thinking was to refuse this easy transfer of generalisations from one conjuncture, nation or epoch to another.”

Hall, Stuart. 1987. Gramsci and us. *Marxism Today* (June): 16-21.

## Day 26

“When cultural studies began its work in the 1960s and ’70s, it had . . . to undertake the task of unmasking what it considered to be the unstated presuppositions of the humanist tradition itself. It had to try to bring to light the ideological assumptions underpinning the practice, to expose the educational program (which was the unnamed part of its project), and to try to conduct an ideological critique of the way the humanities and the arts presented themselves as parts of disinterested knowledge. It had, that is, to undertake a work of demystification to bring into the open the regulative nature and role the humanities were playing in relation to the national culture. From within the context of that project, it becomes clear why people wrote us rude letters.

That represents the negative side of how we had to distance ourselves from some of the ongoing traditions in the humanities. The positive work one then went on to do in the Center had still to be invented. No place existed at that stage, whether in the social sciences or in the humanities, where one could find the concept of culture seriously theorized. Contemporary cultural forms did not constitute a serious object of contemplation in the academic world. And the political questions, the relationships, complex as they are, between culture and politics, were not a matter considered proper for study, especially by graduate students.”

Hall, Stuart. 1990. The emergence of cultural studies and the crisis in the humanities. *October*, 53: 11-23.

## Day 27

“You know the story about the organic community? The organic community was just always in the childhood you have left behind. Raymond Williams has a wonderful essay on these people, a range of social critics who say you can measure the present in relation to the past, and you know the past because back then it was much more organic and integrated. When was ‘back then’? Well, when I was a child, there was always some adult saying, ‘When I was a child, it was much more integrated.’ And so, eventually, some of these great collectivities are rather like those people who have an activity of historical nostalgia going on in their retrospective reconstructions. We always reconstructed them more essentially, more homogeneously, more unified, less contradictorily than they ever were, once you actually know anything about them.”

Hall, Stuart. 1991. Old and new identities, old and new ethnicities. In *Culture, globalization, and the world-system*, ed. Anthony King, 41-68. London: Macmillan.

## Day 28

“If you have a historical imagination, you have to transport yourself to the moment you’re writing about and what it is like to be interior to it, to live inside it. There’s no point asking why wasn’t she a feminist in the seventeenth century -- excuse me. It has nothing to do with whether women weren’t oppressed and exploited, or whether there wasn’t, as there was in the seventeenth century already, a small consciousness of women who thought they would have to struggle to be independent. There was a large number of women who talked about marriage as a form of slavery, even by the time you get to Wollstonecraft. But you can’t just say why weren’t they feminist, in the same way as you can’t really say about British politics in the 1950s, why wasn’t it black? Now I want to separate that from the question, was I at fault? Was I not sufficiently involved and committed? Couldn’t I carry the argument with those people? Were they blind to it? All of those things are true.”

Hall, Stuart, and Les Back. 2009. At home and not at home. *Cultural Studies*, 23(4): 658-687.

## Day 29

“Popular culture, commodified and stereotyped as it often is, is not at all, as we sometimes think of it, the arena where we find who we really are, the truth of our experience. It is an arena that is *profoundly* mythic. It is a theater of popular desires, a theater of popular fantasies. It is where we discover and play with the identifications of ourselves, where we are imagined, where we are represented, not only to the audiences out there who do not get the message, but to ourselves for the first time.”

Hall, Stuart. 1992. What is this “black” in black popular culture? In *Black popular culture*, ed. Gina Dent, 21-33. Seattle: Bay Press.

## Day 30

“The Left’s resistance to cultural change is reflected in our everyday practices and languages. The style of propaganda, party political broadcasts, of much educational and agitational material locks us into very traditional and backward-looking associations. Our political imagery is even worse in this respect. We virtually fought the 1983 election on the 1945 political programme. I am not suggesting that the Left can survive without a sense of history. Our own people know too little, not too much history. But developing a real popular historical consciousness on the Left is *not* the same thing as thinking the present in the language and imagery of the past.”

Hall, Stuart. 1984. The culture gap. *Marxism Today* (January): 18-22.

## Day 31

[Discussing “news agency photographs of the early arrival of Black people from the Caribbean on the boat-trains, taken at the big London rail-stations.”]

“They contradict our expectations. Why are they so formally got up? Why does everybody wear a hat? Why are they carrying their clothes in straw baskets? Why do they look so respectable? Where are the street fighters, the rude boys, the Rastas, the reggae? How are we to read what these photographs most powerfully construct: a certain form of *innocence*?”

Innocence is a dangerous, ambiguous construction for us. White discourses have been constructing us as simpletons, as simple-minded primitives, as smiling country people not yet quite up with the fast ways of the advanced world, for centuries, ever since slavery. It is a reading to be refused. These are not country bumpkins, or indigent cousins ‘from the Tropics,’ or primitives just swinging down from the coconut trees or anybody’s *Smile Orange* folks. These people have just survived the longest, hardest journey in their lives. They are probably from a city, like Kingston, as big and swinging in its poverty and style as any small colonial capital. They have torn themselves up by their roots, saved up what for them, considering the annual average wage, is a colossal sum, paid to the steamship company travelling incognito under some assumed Panamanian flag. Half the family is left behind and nobody knows when they will ever be together again. They have just burnt their boats in the determination to carve out a better life for them and their children.

All this may be ‘beyond the frame,’ but it registers inside the frame as a kind of ‘innocence.’ This is another way of referring to that moment of ‘waiting’ just before you step off the end of the earth into . . . another life, in a Britain the ingrained, embattled nature of whose racism you do not yet know (that is, of which you are still in a way ‘innocent’) because it hasn’t yet hit you between the eyes.”

Hall, Stuart. 1984. Reconstruction work: Stuart Hall on images of post war black settlement. *Ten-8*, 16: 2-9.

## Day 32

“Although cultural studies as a project is open-ended, it can’t be simply pluralist in that way. Yes, it refuses to be a master discourse or a meta-discourse of any kind. Yes, it is a project that is always open to that which it doesn’t yet know, to that which it can’t yet name. But it does have some will to connect; it does have some stake in the choices it makes. It does matter whether cultural studies is this or that. It can’t be just any old thing which chooses to march under a particular banner. It is a serious enterprise, or project, and that is inscribed in what is sometimes called the ‘political’ aspect of cultural studies. Not that there’s one politics already inscribed in it. But there is something *at stake* in cultural studies, in a way that I think, and hope, is not exactly true of many other very important intellectual and critical practices.”

Hall, Stuart. 1992. Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies. In *Cultural studies*, ed. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, Paula A. Treichler, Linda Baughman, and J. Macgregor Wise, 277-294. New York: Routledge.

### Day 33

“If somebody now said, ‘Well, cultural studies is a big operation these days, which we’re willing to fund’ -- would I go back to the encoding/decoding model? I think I would not. That’s not because I don’t think it has some purchase in it: in the field of communications research, in the study of networks of communication, and in the study of audiences. I think the model still has some purchase in those areas. . . . But I think that, for me, a lot of the theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of the model have been somewhat dismantled or deconstructed by the movement in poststructuralism because textuality -- Barthes’s notion of textuality -- is no longer amenable to the identification of those clearly distinguished analytic moments of encoding and decoding.”

Hall, Stuart. 1994. Reflections upon the encoding/decoding model. In *Viewing, reading, listening: Audiences and critical reception*, ed. Jon Cruz and Justin Lewis, 253-274. Boulder: Westview.

## Day 34

“In insisting that academics sometimes attend to the practical life, where everyday social change exists out there, cultural studies tries in its small way to insist on what I call the vocation of the intellectual life. That is to say, cultural studies insists on the necessity to address the central, urgent, and disturbing questions of a society and a culture in the more rigorous intellectual way we have available. Such a vocation is, above all, in my view, one of the principal functions of a university, though university scholars are not always happy to be reminded of it.”

Hall, Stuart. 1992. Race, culture, and communications: Looking backward and forward at cultural studies. *Rethinking Marxism*, 5(1): 10-18.

## Day 35

“Questions of strategy and tactics are not easy, especially when what is at issue is the winning of popular positions in the struggle against racism. There are few short cuts or ready-made recipes. It does not follow that, because our hearts are in the right place, we will win the struggle for ‘hearts and minds.’ And even the best analysis of the current situation provides few absolute guide-lines as to what we should do, in a particular situation. Neither passionate left-wing convictions nor the immutable laws of history can ever replace the difficult questions of political calculation on which the outcome of particular struggles ultimately turns. This essay is written in the firm conviction that we need to be better prepared, both in our analysis of how racist ideologies become ‘popular,’ and in what are the appropriate strategies for combatting them. Both, in their turn, depend on a more open, less closed and ‘finalist’ debate of positions among people on the left committed to the anti-racist struggle.”

Hall, Stuart. 1981. The whites of their eyes: Racist ideologies and the media. In *Silver linings: Some strategies for the eighties*, ed. George Bridges and Rosalind Brunt, 28-52. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

## Day 36

“I think that the same process is involved in the construction of any event televisually. That is to say, you can’t develop an account of it out of absolutely nowhere every time you tell the story. You constantly draw on an inventory of discourses which have been established over time. I think in that sense we make an absolutely too simple and false distinction between narratives about the real and the narratives of fiction. A lot of the coverage of Northern Ireland has in fact been constructed precisely around some of those adventure stories. And you can find that in the news: the news is full of little stories which are very similar to war romances. And so there isn’t, I think, any way of simplifying that relationship between reality and fiction.”

Hall, Stuart. 1984: The narrative construction of reality: An interview with Stuart Hall. *Southern Review*, 17(1): 3-17.

## Day 37

“Photography is a language -- or rather a set of languages. It is consequently not timeless or eternal. It changes, historically, as do the very ‘ways of seeing’ through which the act of photographic inscription takes place. Photographic discourses work through the production and interpretation of signs (the photographic image), and therefore, like all languages, make use of a complex set of codes. Codes are conventional; that is, they are socially constructed -- a product not of Nature but of culture. However, precisely because photography appears to be so good at ‘capturing Nature’ we must constantly be on our guard against the illusion that it is a ‘natural’ activity. The intervention of the camera, the interface between convention and tradition, the play of aesthetic value, the intersection of ideology in the image, even the simple fact of the inevitable selectivity which structures the production of any photographic image, should disabuse us of this ‘naturalistic illusion.’”

Hall, Stuart. 1987. The mirror or the lens. In *Pictures of everyday life: The people, places, and cultures of the Commonwealth*, Noelle Goldman and Stuart Hall, 9-15. London: Comedia.

## Day 38

“We think of a nice, polite, consensual discussion; everybody agreeing. What you heard there was what democracy is really like: an absolutely, bloody-unending row. People hammering the table, insisting, ‘Do not ask me to line up behind your banner, because that just means forgetting who I am.’ That row, that sound of people actually negotiating their differences out in the open, behind the collective program, is the sound I am waiting for.”

Hall, Stuart. 1991. Old and new identities, old and new ethnicities. In *Culture, globalization, and the world-system*, ed. Anthony King, 41-68. London: Macmillan.

## Day 39

“Cultural difference doesn’t mean that I am totally different from you. But I come to the present, to who I am, by a different route from yours; and therefore our conversation has to recognise that different histories have produced us, different histories have made this conversation possible. I can’t pretend to be you. I don’t know your experience. I can’t live life from inside your head. So our living together must depend on a trade-off, a conversation, a process of translation. Translations are never total or complete, but they don’t leave the elements exactly as they started. I don’t want to be you. I don’t want you to be me. I don’t want to insist that you give up being who you are and become me. Well, how are we to proceed? Questions of democracy, questions of equality, questions of difference, all have to be resolved. Together -- and in ways which are unfamiliar to the culture of the left, which has long grounded its constitutive basis in quite unexpected and unexamined kinds of Eurocentrism, in which the civilizational value of one of those ways of life over all the others is taken for granted. Multiculturalism is a peculiar kind of way of trying to manage the problems which globalisation has created.”

Hall, Stuart. 2007. Living with difference: Stuart Hall in conversation with Bill Schwarz. *Soundings*, 37: 148-158.

## Day 40

“I want to tell you some of the difficulties I have with the term ‘popular.’ I have almost as many problems with ‘popular’ as I have with ‘culture.’ When you put the two terms together, the difficulties can be pretty horrendous.”

Hall, Stuart. 1981. Notes on deconstructing “the popular.” In *People’s history and socialist theory*, ed. Raphael Samuel, 227-240. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

## Day 41

“If post-war prosperity have lifted this working class generation up out of poverty, and raised their cultural experiences and their social contacts -- that is an unqualified gain. It is the sophisticated advance guard of the teenage revolution who are -- at universities and training colleges and art schools and in apprenticeships -- the most articulate in their protest about social issues, and who feel most strongly about South Africa or the Bomb. If the cool young men [sic] of today were to become the social conscience of tomorrow, it would be because they had seen sights in the Twentieth Century closed to many eyes before. It would not be the first revolution which came out of social deprivation, nor the first Utopia with absolute beginnings.”

Hall, Stuart. 1959. Absolute beginnings: Reflections on the secondary modern generation. *Universities and New Left Review*, 7 (Autumn): 17-25.

## Day 42

“The most profound challenge to any attempt to establish a Cultural Studies ‘orthodoxy’ has . . . undoubtedly arisen from the emergence of feminism within the Centre’s work. In challenging the male-oriented models and assumptions and the heavily masculine subject-matter and topics which for long constituted the assumed terrain of Cultural Studies (in a profoundly unconscious and unreflexive way), feminism has had an obvious impact on Cultural Studies. It has forced a major rethink in every substantive area of work. But its impact can in no sense be limited to these substantive reworkings. It is impossible, from a vantage point inside feminism, to retain a reductionist theory of culture. . . . All that is involved in thinking about the specificity of ‘gender’ -- distinct from, even though it can be shown to be articulated with, ‘class’ -- has moved Cultural Studies away from its tendency to a complex class reductionism.”

Hall, Stuart. 1980. Cultural studies and the Centre: Some problematics and problems. In *Culture, media, language: Working papers in cultural studies, 1972-79*, ed. Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson, Andrew Love, and Paul Willis, 15-47. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

## Day 43

“I think the film [*Malcolm X*] is something slightly different. I think the film does heroize the figure. I think the film belongs to a strand which one can see in many other contemporary recent black American films -- namely, a sort of return to a very strict conception of black masculinity. I know that it belongs in the culture of Islam and so there is a rationale for it, but, nevertheless, I think the film adds to that and I agree that the film *Malcolm X* is a biopic in the classic sense. It's a better film than *Ghandi*, but it's not a different film than *Ghandi*. At the center of films like that is always the sacrificial figure. The closing three-quarters of hour of the film, I think, moves for my taste *too* much in that direction. Malcolm is almost blameless; he has almost become a kind of cypher which is filled with our desire to find the perfect black hero. He's depicted as very much at rest, waiting for the what he knows is going to come, a certain doom-laden unfolding of a narrative towards a closure that I think is really the film's reading of that life, not necessarily what other people could get out of it (including, I would say, the autobiography, which I think is more open in the different kind of readings that you can make of it).”

Goodman, Lizbeth. 1992. Race and the cinema: An interview with Stuart Hall and Paul Gilroy. *Critical Sociology*, 19(3): 107-120.

## Day 44

“A new Centre for the study of contemporary cultural problems has been established within the English School at Birmingham University. This will be the first centre of its kind in an English university. The director is Professor Richard Hoggart, and the scope of the Centre’s work has been most fully defined in his inaugural lecture, *Schools of English and Contemporary Society* (recently republished in two issues of *Use of English*, Winter, ‘63, Spring, ‘64).

Prof. Hoggart proposes three main areas of interest for the new Centre. The first -- ‘historical and philosophical’ -- will be concerned with the terms in which the debate about contemporary culture and cultural change is carried on. It will try to trace out climates of opinion, main movements of ideas, their sources and interactions, and their influence upon social change, in the last fifty or sixty years. For example, one of the first projects in October will be a study in depth of the period of the ‘Thirties, using Orwell’s work as a ‘key.’ The second area -- the ‘sociology of literature and the arts’ -- will seek to develop a critical language for dealing with phenomena which have both artistic and social significance. Here the Centre will try to bring to bear the disciplines of literary criticism, sociology and social psychology. It will also be concerned with the nature of different audiences for different kinds of art and literature, with the formation of opinion and attitudes, with the influences of communication upon audiences, and with relationships between different ‘kinds’ of art.

In the third area -- the ‘critical-evaluative’ - a great deal of attention will be given to the critical examination of mass art, popular art and the mass media. ‘Essentially, we will be trying to understand how the mass arts or the popular arts achieve their effects.’ This field includes popular fiction, the press, films and television, popular music and advertising. Projects in these fields will, of course, draw on the evidence and methods of sociology and social psychology, but the main approach throughout will be a critical-evaluative one.

The Centre will be primarily a research centre, and those engaged in the work will be either post-graduate students working for a higher degree or research fellows sponsored to undertake a particular study jointly between the Centre and interested outside bodies. At present, the main source of funds is from research foundations and similar organisations. The first research fellow was appointed in April under a generous grant offered by Penguin Books. It is expected that about ten full-time research students, and several closely-associated part-time workers, will begin their work in October, 1965. There will be a Centre ‘workroom’ in the Department, with available library facilities and a collection of materials; and a critical bibliography of the field is to be prepared. In addition, the Centre will, from time to time, publish pamphlets and ‘occasional papers’ as contributions to the general debate, and sponsor a selective number of conferences.

There is already a close association growing between the Centre and its research projects, and people more actively engaged in the field of education and teaching. It is likely that, out of this contact, will grow a number of services available to teachers and lecturers, including, perhaps, materials for class discussion, a news bulletin on ‘work-in-progress,’ access to the workroom collection, and a regular journal. Such a service would be available to teachers and lecturers in schools and colleges for a small ‘association fee.’ We should be pleased to hear from anyone who would support such a service. It is also possible that one of the main projects will be directly concerned with the impact of modern forms of communication upon children, especially in the context of the teaching of English.”

Hall, Stuart. 1965. Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. *English in Education* A2(1): 27-29. (may actually be *The NATE (National Association for the Teaching of English) Bulletin*)

## Day 45

“In my own case, it required a not-yet-completed contestation with the profound Eurocentrism of Marxist theory. I want to make this very precise. It is not just a matter of where Marx happened to be born, and of what he talked about, but of the model at the center of the most developed parts of Marxist theory, which suggested that capitalism evolved organically from within its own transformations. Whereas I come from a society where the profound integument of capitalist society, economy, and culture had been imposed by conquest and colonization. This is a theoretical, not a vulgar critique. I don't blame Marx because of where he was born; I'm questioning the theory for the model around which it is articulated: its Eurocentrism.”

Hall, Stuart. 1992. Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies. In *Cultural studies*, ed. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, Paula A. Treichler, Linda Baughman, and J. Macgregor Wise, 277-294. New York: Routledge.

## Day 46

“In very general terms, and with many honourable exceptions, political analysis on the left seems pitifully thin, and ideological analysis is, if anything, in a worse state. As conventionally practised, both lack and sense of the specificity or real effectivity of what we might call the political and ideological instances in the shaping of contemporary developments. This is not because the left is stupid but because, in both its orthodox Marxist and economistic variants, it tends to hold to a very reductionist conception of politics and ideology where, ‘in the last instance’ (whenever that is), both are determined by, and so can be ‘read off’ against, some (often ill-defined) notion of ‘economic’ or ‘class’ determination. This now looks less and less like the sign of active and ongoing theoretical work likely to break new ground and tell us things we did not already know, and more and more like a confirmation of the correctness of what we always, anyway, believed to be true: the product of a sort of self-confirming circularity, theoretical whistling in the wind. It is partly the product of the inherited habits of a low-flying economism masquerading as ‘materialism,’ or the search for some philosophical guarantee that the law of history will, like Minerva’s owl, take wing at five minutes to midnight, rescuing us from the vicissitudes of the present. If Thatcherism has done nothing else, it has surely destroyed for good these fatal consolations.”

Hall, Stuart. 1988. Introduction: Thatcherism and the crisis of the left. In *Hard road to renewal: Thatcherism and the crisis of the left*, 1-15. New York: Verso.

## Day 47

“In this way television does *not* favor one point of view, but it *does* favor -- and reproduce -- one definition of politics and excludes, represses, or neutralizes other definitions. By operating balance *within a given structure*, television tacitly maintains the prevailing definition of the political order. In one and the same moment, it expresses and contains conflict. It reproduces unwittingly the structure of institutionalized class conflicts on which the system depends. It thereby legitimates the prevailing structure of interests, while scrupulously observing ‘balance between the parties.’ It also, incidentally, offers a favorable image of the system as a system, as open to conflict and to alternative points of view. It is this last twist which keeps the structure flexible and credible.”

Hall, Stuart. 1974. Media power: The double bind. *Journal of Communication*, 24(4): 19-26.

## Day 48

“Ours remains a deeply anti-intellectual movement. Of course, intellectuals have much to atone for in the labour movement: their lack of involvement in the struggle, their lack of centrality in active politics, often, their divorce from the experiences and aspirations of ordinary working people. Nevertheless, in addition to duties, intellectuals also have responsibilities to the movement. And their prime responsibility is to analyse in depth the situation which confronts us so that our analysis may inform political action and strategy, and prepare people to be better armed intellectually, theoretically, politically, in the struggle that lies ahead. Intellectuals can only discharge that duty if they are prepared to speak of the situation as honestly and ruthlessly as they find it. ‘Pessimism of the intellect, optimism of the will’: that was Gramsci’s watchword and I do not hesitate to say that it will do for me too.”

Hall, Stuart. 1985. Faith, hope, or clarity. *Marxism Today* (January): 15-19.

## Day 49

“So there’s been a segmentation of these contradictions. Everybody is separate. I’m really worried about my pension. Oh yes, but I’m worried about my council house. Oh yeah, well I’m worried about my invalidity benefits. Oh well, I’m worried about my child benefits. Round the issues. If you could get them all into one basket, they are the majority of the society. But you can’t get them into one basket. It’s very difficult to get them into one basket. And that in the end comes down to political agency. There is nobody willing to practice that politics of explaining to this one that what they are worried about depends on what that one’s worried about, that they all connect together somewhere, and that they all have something to do with the economic system, something to do with the prevailing ideology, and something to do with the social structure. Unless your political vehicle is (1) educating people that that is so (that’s Gramsci who said a party is also and always an educator) and (2) working out strategies to raise the tempo, the temperature on it, then you’ll get a general depoliticization, which we have in Britain at the moment.”

Hall, Stuart. 2013. Stuart Hall interview -- 2 June 2011. *Cultural Studies*, 27(5): 757-777.

## Day 50

“I’ve been talking very much in terms of a previous history. But I have been reminded of this tension very forcefully in the discussions on AIDS. AIDS is one of the questions which urgently brings before us our marginality as critical intellectuals in making real effects in the world. And yet it has often been represented for us in contradictory ways. Against the urgency of people dying in the streets, what in God’s name is the point of cultural studies? What is the point of the study of representations, if there is no response to the question of what you say to someone who wants to know if they should take a drug and if that means they’ll die two days later or a few months earlier? At that point, I think anybody who is into cultural studies seriously as an intellectual practice, must feel, on their pulse, its ephemerality, its insubstantiality, how little it registers, how little we’ve been able to change anything or get anybody to do anything. If you don’t feel that as one tension in the work that you are doing, theory has let you off the hook. On the other hand, in the end, I don’t agree with the way in which this dilemma is often posed for us, for it is indeed a more complex and displaced question than just people dying out there. The question of AIDS is an extremely important terrain of struggle and contestation. In addition to the people we know who are dying, or have died, or will, there are many people dying who are never spoken of. How could we say that the question of AIDS is not also a question of who gets represented and who does not? AIDS is the site at which the advance of sexual politics is being rolled back. It’s a site at which not only people will die, but desire and pleasure will also die of certain metaphors do not survive, or survive in the wrong way. Unless we operate in this tension, we don’t know what cultural studies can do, can’t, can never do; but also, what it has to do, what it alone has a privileged capacity to do. It has to analyze certain things about the constitutive and political nature of representation itself, about its complexities, about the effects of language, about textuality as a site of life and death. Those are the things cultural studies can address.

I’ve used that example, not because it’s a perfect example, but because it’s a specific example, because it has a concrete meaning, because it challenges us in its complexity, and in so doing has things to teach us about the future of serious theoretical work. It preserves the essential nature of intellectual work and critical reflection, the irreducibility of the insights which theory can bring to a political practice, insights which cannot be arrived at in any other way. And at the same time, it rivets us to the necessary modesty of theory, the necessary modesty of cultural studies as an intellectual project.”

Hall, Stuart. 1992. Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies. In *Cultural studies*, ed. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, Paula A. Treichler, Linda Baughman, and J. Macgregor Wise, 277-294. New York: Routledge.