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Cultural studies is magnetic.¹ It accretes various tendencies that are splintering the human sciences: Marxism, feminism, queer theory, and the postcolonial. The “cultural” has become a “master-trope” in the humanities, blending and blurring textual analysis of popular culture with social theory, and focusing on the margins of power rather than reproducing established lines of force and authority (Czaplicka et al. 1995: 3). In place of focusing on canonical works of art, governmental leadership, or quantitative social data, cultural studies devotes time to subcultures, popular media, music, clothing, and sport. By looking at how culture is used and transformed by “ordinary” and “marginal” social groups, cultural studies sees people not simply as consumers, but as potential producers of new social values and cultural languages.

This amounts to a comprehensive challenge to academic business as usual. And the investment in the popular makes waves in the extramural world, too, as the humanities’ historic task of criticizing entertainment is sidestepped and new commercial trends become part of cultural studies itself.

Cultural studies is a tendency across disciplines, rather than a discipline itself. This is evident in practitioners’ simultaneously expressed desires to: refuse definition, insist on differentiation, and sustain conventional departmental credentials (as well as pyrotechnic, polymathematical capacities for reasoning and research). Cultural studies’ continuities come from shared concerns and methods: the concern is the reproduction of culture through structural determinations on subjects versus their own agency, and the method is historical materialism (Morrow 1995: 3, 6). Cultural studies is animated by subjectivity and power – how human subjects are formed and how they experience cultural and social space. It takes its agenda and mode of analysis from economics, politics, media and communication studies, sociology, literature, education, the law, science and technology studies, anthropology, and history, with a particular focus on gender, race, class, and sexuality in everyday life, com mingling textual and social theory under the sign of a commitment to progressive social change.
The political significance of popular cultural practices is perhaps best exemplified in subcultures. Subcultures signify a space under culture, simultaneously opposed to, derivative of, and informing official, dominant, governmental, commercial, bureaucratically organized forms of life – a shift away from culture as a tool of domination and towards culture as a tool of empowerment. This move wants to find out how the socially disadvantaged use culture to contest their subservient position. Historical and contemporary studies conducted through the 1960s and 1970s on slaves, crowds, pirates, bandits, and the working class emphasized day-to-day noncompliance with authority. For example, UK research into Teddy Boys, Mods, bikers, skinheads, punks, school students, teen girls, and Rastas had as its magical agents of history truants, drop-outs, and magazine readers – people who deviated from the norms of school and the transition to work by entering subcultures. Such research examined the structural underpinnings to collective style, investigating how their bricolage subverted the achievement-oriented, materialistic, educationally driven values and appearance of the middle class. The working assumption was that subordinate groups adopt and adapt signs and objects of the dominant culture, reorganizing them to manufacture new meanings. Consumption was the epicenter of such subcultures; paradoxically, it also reversed members’ status as consumers. They become producers of new fashions, inscribing alienation, difference, and powerlessness on their bodies. The decline of the British economy and state across the 1970s was exemplified in punk’s use of rubbish as an adornment: bag-liners, lavatory appliances, and ripped and torn clothing. But then commodified fashion and convention took over when capitalism appropriated the appropriator. Even as the media announced that punks were folk devils and set in train various moral panics, the fashion and music industries were sending out spies in search of new trends to market (Leong 1992).

Awareness of this double-edged investment in commodities, as objects of resistance whose very appropriation is then recommodified, makes socio-economic analysis via critical political economy a good ally of representational analysis via cultural studies. But a certain tendency on both sides has maintained that they are mutually exclusive: one approach is concerned with structures of the economy and the other with structures of meaning. But this need not be the case. Historically, the best critical political economy and the best cultural studies have worked through the imbrication of power and subjectivity at all points on the cultural continuum. Graham Murdock puts the task well:

Critical political economy is at its strongest in explaining who gets to speak to whom and what forms these symbolic encounters take in the major spaces of public culture. But cultural studies, at its best, has much of value to say about... how discourse and imagery are organized in complex and shifting patterns of meaning and how these meanings are reproduced, negotiated, and struggled over in the flow and flux of everyday life. (1995: 94)
Ideally, blending the two approaches would heal the division between fact and interpretation and between the social sciences and the humanities, under the sign of a principled approach to cultural democracy. To that end, Lawrence Grossberg calls on cultural studies to provide a dynamic way of “politicizing theory and theorizing politics” that combines abstraction and grounded analysis. This requires a focus on the contradictions of organizational structures, their articulations with everyday living and textuality, and their intrusion with the polity and economy, refusing any bifurcation that opposes the study of production and consumption, or fails to address such overlapping axes of subjectification as class, race, nation, and gender (1997: 4–5, 9–10).

This book has been designed with that goal in mind. To specify what such work involves, this Introduction examines the lineage to cultural studies, its current manifestations and preoccupations – in short, what it is and what it isn’t.

**Fathers and Other Origins**

Richard Maxwell has provided a useful representation of global cultural studies (figure 1). Four founding parents of British cultural studies are listed, all of them postwar English-based intellectuals: Richard Hoggart, E. P. Thompson, Stuart Hall, and Raymond Williams. These men were adult educators and university professors on the left who wanted to understand the intersection of class and nation at the level of lived experience and social structure by foregrounding “the culture and sensibilities of industrial workers” (Maxwell 2000: 282).

Hoggart was a left Leavisite who favored uplift of the working class through literary study at the same time as he took their popular pursuits seriously. His classic work *The Uses of Literacy* appeared in the 1950s, after which he became a celebrated member of various review bodies into public culture, a star defense witness at the trial of Penguin Books for publishing *Lady Chatterley*, and in the mid-1960s the founder of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at the University of Birmingham. Hoggart went on to be a senior culturecrat at UNESCO and latterly a memoirist. Thompson’s key contribution came through his work on the history of the English working class (1968), a focus on the view of the past from “below” rather than on-high that eschewed theory in favor of ordinary people’s accounts of their lives. This rejection of theory involved strong opposition to structuralist Marxism (Thompson 1978), which had entered British cultural studies of the 1970s under the sign of Louis Althusser (1977). Thompson was also active in Britain’s Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in its 1960s heyday and 1980s revival. Hall started as a left Leavisite and worked as Hoggart’s deputy at the CCCS for some years, ultimately running the Centre for a decade from 1968 and marking out its classic period of collaborative, engaged Gramscian scholarship that investigated state stereotyping and ritualistic resistance. Hall continued his career at the Open University with a shift towards Foucauldianism and the postcolonial, brokering...
Britain 1950s & 1960s
Catalysts of British Cultural Studies:
- Edward Thompson (1924–92)
- Raymond Williams (1921–88)
- Richard Hoggart (1919–)
Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS), University of Birmingham (1964)

Britain 1960s & 1970s
- Stuart Hall (1932–)
- CCCS
- Althusser-inspired Structuralism
- Ideology & Media
- Articulation
- Gramscian work on Hegemony

Britain 1980s
- Critical race/gender studies
- Ethnographic study of audiences

English-Speaking Cultural Studies in the 1990s
- Feminist writers, critical analysis of race, ethnographic fieldwork, and Queer Theory make advances in CS.
- CS is a well established presence in universities, scholarly organizations, and academic markets in Britain, US, Canada, South Africa, and Australia: enjoys growing student demand for popular culture studies.
- CS became increasingly congenial with market criteria in Neoconservative political context of 1980s & 1990s.
- Critical race/gender studies
- Ethnographic study of audiences

Figure 1  Global Cultural Studies
Source: copyright © Richard Maxwell 2000; reproduced with permission.
cultural studies’ relationship to sociology and media studies, co-editing numerous works of theoretical exegesis, and becoming a key influence in the US. Throughout, Hall has sought a means of analyzing signs, representations, and ideology. Williams drew heavily on his experiences growing up in Wales to make sense of cultural change and power dynamics. He has provided the largest body of theory for ongoing cultural studies work, via a wide array of noted volumes on literary history and theory, media and communications, culture, and society. That work models a hybrid between critical political economy and cultural studies, so I shall dedicate some space to its concerns and methods.

Williams is critical of idealist conceptions which assume that culture is a march towards perfection measured by universal values that are basic to the human condition, as if these were timeless rather than grounded in particular conditions of possibility. He also questions documentary conceptions of culture that record artistic work to preserve specific insights and highlight them through criticism. Instead, Williams proposes that we concentrate on the ways of life and values of particular communities at particular times, noting benefits and costs in how they are represented (1975: 57).

Williams’ method, cultural materialism, works with Karl Marx’s insight that people manufacture their own conditions of existence, but often without a conscious or enabling agency. Social practices, not nature, genius, or individuality, make a way of life and change it over time. This insight directs us away from any view of historical and contemporary culture that privileges aesthetic civilization, the experiences of rulers, or the impact of religion delivered from on-high (Williams 1977: 19). Instead, we should engage culture by reading its products and considering their circumstances of creation and circulation. Art and society – Williams calls them “project” and “formation” respectively – intertwine, with no conceptual or chronological primacy accorded to either term. The relations of culture, their twists and turns, the often violent and volatile way in which they change, are part of the material life of society. For example, language neither precedes nor follows the social world, but is part of it. That means allowing a certain autonomy to intellectual work from the prevailing mode of economic production, but not from its own microeconomies of person, place, and power (1989: 151–2, 164–6). Rather than an organic community that produces a culture of artworks, or a culture of artworks that reflects an organic community, each site has its own internal politics and is connected to the wider economy.

Cultural materialism articulates material culture (buildings, film, cars, fashion, sculpture, and so on) with sociohistorical change, explaining how the culture produced by ordinary people is repackaged and sold to them. Williams divides culture into dominant versus residual and emergent forms, as per Antonio Gramsci’s (1971) model of hegemony, a process of securing consent to the social order that makes dominant culture appear normal and natural, alongside extant residual cultures, which comprise old meanings and practices that are no longer dominant but still influential, and emergent cultural practices, which are either propagated by a new class or incorporated by the dominant,
as part of hegemony. These maneuvers find expression in what Williams terms a “structure of feeling”: the intangibles of an era that explain or develop the quality of life. Such indicators often involve a contest – or at least dissonance – between official culture and practical consciousness. In short, Williams’ view of culture insists on the importance of community life, the conflicts in any cultural formation, the social nature of culture, and the cultural nature of society.

Of course, there are many other sources of today’s cultural studies apart from these four men. Manthia Diawara has provided a multicultural trace of UK–US developments that complicates the standard fatherly narrative, albeit foregrounding the later work of Hall. Diawara connects the Birmingham CCCS with London-based black cultural workers and people of color in black and feminist studies areas of US colleges. This trajectory involves certain key transformations of perspective. The initial animating force to cultural studies came from a desire to understand British culture in terms of class dominance and resistance, and the search for an agent of history that could propel radical politics. But that agency fell into doubt, with masculinity and Britishness/Englishness up for debate in ways that criticized sexism and white nationalism (Diawara 1994: 262–3; also see Women’s Studies Group 1978). And as per Maxwell’s schema, other, semi-autonomous forces have shaped cultural studies. Latin American influences include the socialism manifested in New Latin American Cinema and the pedagogy of the oppressed in the 1960s and 1970s, the Marxist media analysis done for Salvador Allende’s Chile by Michèle and Armand Mattelart (1986, 1992), the hegemony studies of Colombian Jesús Martín-Barbero (1993), and the Mexican sociologist Néstor García Canclini’s (1990) integration of social and cultural theory (Maxwell 2000: 286–7). In Africa, Ngugi wa Thiong’o, Ngugi wa Mirii, and others at the Kamiriithu Centre linked cultural critique to production (Wright 1996: 355–6, 361). In South Asia, the work of subaltern studies intellectuals such as Ranajit Guha (1982–) and Partha Chatterjee (1993) has been pivotal for postcolonial and historical research.

What it is (and what it isn’t)

What do these different legacies mean for cultural studies today? John Frow and Meaghan Morris contrast the view of hegemonic powerbrokers, who see culture as a route to economic efficiency, with cultural studies, which questions power and subjectivity rather than using them to extract surplus value from ordinary people or educate them into obedience. Frow and Morris want to audit the denial, assimilation, and invention that occur each time such words as nation, community, or society are brought into discourse, moving away from essentialist definitions of national identity and towards plural accounts of person and polity (1993b: viii–ix, xv). Morris (1992) glosses the concerns of cultural studies as
“racial, ethnic, sexual, gender, class, generational and national differences (roughly in that order), as these are produced and contested in history,” along with “a critique of cultural universals.”

At the same time as categorical devices from the social sciences are deployed here as grids of investigation, their status as machines obliterating difference is brought into question, the result being a productive intellectual polyphony that draws out contradictions and dissonances. If we link this to Frow and Morris’s (1993b) litany of interdisciplinarity, we can specify a desirable cultural studies as a mixture of economics, politics, textual analysis, gender theory, ethnography, history, postcolonial theory, material objects, and policy, animated by a desire to reveal and transform those who control the means of communication and culture, and undertaken with a constant vigilance over one’s own raison d’être and modus operandi. This could be connected to Grossberg’s (1993) map of cultural studies along twin axes of cultural method and social theory on a grid comparing five methods (literary humanism, dialectical sociology, culturalism, structuralist conjunctures, and postmodern conjunctures) with eight theories (epistemology, determination, agency, social formation, cultural formation, power, specificity of struggle, and the site of the modern) to produce historicized cultural analyses.

So what is cultural studies not? Clearly, attempts to list what does and doesn’t count as cultural studies are fraught, especially when they engage in an absolute binarization (cultural studies frequently disavows binary oppositions for failing to acknowledge the logocentric interdependence of supposed opposites, such as that whiteness depends for its sense of self on blackness, for example). But binaries are good to think with and good to tinker with, like any form of inclusion and exclusion. So here goes my list of what’s in and what’s out (table 1).

The left side of the table demonstrates a commitment to articulate knowledge with social change. It represents a will to link the professoriat with social movements as a primary locus of power, authorization, and responsibility. The right side demonstrates a commitment to articulate knowledge with social reproduction. It represents a will to link the professoriat with universities and professions as a primary locus of power, authorization, and responsibility. One is about a transformation of the social order, the other about its replication.

We can see the force of this divide in a raft of journal publications that stand for the recent and profound impact of cultural studies on a host of disciplines. Journals provide a site for investigating the difference between cultural studies and its other, so here I’m going to repeat this binarism. There is a rough bifurcation in academic publishing between journals of tendency and journals of profession, each seeking to establish hegemony within particular spheres. They operate in binary opposition to one another, although there can be an overlap of topics and authors in certain cases. A schema of this opposition is presented in table 2.
Toby Miller

Table 1  Cultural studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What it is</th>
<th>What it isn’t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnography</td>
<td>Physical anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual analysis of the media</td>
<td>Literary formalism and canon formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social theory</td>
<td>Regression and time-series analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and technology studies</td>
<td>Mathematics, geology, and chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political economy</td>
<td>Neoclassical economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical geography</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychoanalysis</td>
<td>Rational-choice theory and cognitive psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmodern art</td>
<td>Art history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical architecture</td>
<td>Engineering and quantity surveying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentalism</td>
<td>Industrial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminisms</td>
<td>Human biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queerness</td>
<td>Deviance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>Nationalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcolonialism</td>
<td>World literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental philosophy, structuralism,</td>
<td>Analytic philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and poststructuralism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular music</td>
<td>Musicology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social semiotics</td>
<td>Formalist linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>Technical design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and social history</td>
<td>Political history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical public health</td>
<td>Medical training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical legal studies and critical race theory</td>
<td>Legal training and legal formalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcultural study</td>
<td>Interest-group study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2  Cultural journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals of tendency</th>
<th>Journals of profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avowed political project seeking to make</td>
<td>Avowed truth project seeking a universalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interventions, situated in time and space</td>
<td>pursuit of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house manuscript reviewers who argue for</td>
<td>External manuscript reviewers who engage in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and against authors’ MSS along grounds of</td>
<td>double-blind review of MSS in terms of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politics and cohesiveness</td>
<td>disciplinary competence and falsifiability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open calls for MSS, theme issues,</td>
<td>Access restricted to members of professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>response to contemporary social questions</td>
<td>associations, lengthy period of review and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks hegemony of a position across disciplines</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial collective that is self-selecting</td>
<td>Seeks hegemony over entry and success within a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prone to inefficiency, sudden bursts of</td>
<td>discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energy and newness, and an eventual sense that</td>
<td>Editors chosen by association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the “moment” of the journal has passed</td>
<td>Prone to efficiency, “normal science,” and a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Text, Public Culture, Socialist Review,</td>
<td>fate that is joined at the hip to its sponsoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camera obscura, Radical History Review,</td>
<td>discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Workshop Journal</td>
<td>PMLA, American Sociological Review, Cinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal, Journal of Communication, American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical Review, Current Anthropology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As noted above, journals on the right-hand side of the grid are refereed. Double-blind refereeing (where the author’s identity is hidden from reviewers and vice versa) arose in the social sciences as compensation for not being as methodologically falsifiable or amenable to utilitarian auditing as paymasters and hegemons might wish. The system gradually spread across universities, although some of the sciences have stayed with single-blind review (where the author’s identity is revealed to reviewers). Most refereed journals are financially and intellectually supported by professional organizations. *PMLA* only publishes papers submitted by dues-paying members of the Modern Language Association, and all such offerings are read by fellow initiates. Your work is not even reviewed unless you’re a member of the club. The results leave many of us ambivalent. An editor of *Nature*, for example, has bemoaned the fact that refereeing would have prevented publication of the letter announcing the double-helix which appeared in the journal in 1953, while research on peer review shows that it generates caution and reproduces an “invisible college” of elite scholars and disciplines (Clemens et al. 1996; Maddox 1989; Willis and McNamee 1990). This college is prepared to be very political, as required: the editor of the American Medical Association’s journal was sacked for daring to print a paper during the Clinton impeachment controversy that showed 60 percent of undergraduates at “a large mid-Western university” (how many times have we read that expression in survey research?) in 1991 did not think they had “had sex” if it involved oral contact rather than intercourse.

Some journals cross the divide. In five years, *Continuum: A Journal of Media & Cultural Studies* was transmogrified from a handful of faculty in Western Australia obtaining manuscripts, editing them, and putting in desktop codes, to a journal that had a senior editor, an editor, a photography editor, 2 reviews editors, 4 corresponding editors, 7 members of an editorial collective, 59 editorial advisers, and a British commercial publisher, with only 2 of those earlier artisans numbered among the above. So this schema is not a comprehensive divide. The editors of the journal *Cultural Studies* in fact “welcome” the academic formalization of cultural studies. They view publishing growth in the area as “signs of its vitality and signature components of its status as a field,” but continue to call for “knowledge formations” that are “historically and geographically contingent” rather than obedient to disciplines (Grossberg and Pollock 1998: 1). For its part, the inaugural issue of the *International Journal of Cultural Studies* promised to localize knowledge, be “post-disciplinary,” consider “academic research itself” as an object of inquiry, and engage the fact that “‘cultural studies’ is now a management and marketing skill” (Hartley 1998: 5–7).

The brigands on the left of the grid have gathered force in book publishing, too. The 1990s saw the appearance of numerous cultural studies anthologies, such as feminist readers edited by Sarah Franklin et al. (1991), Terry Lovell (1995), and Morag Shiach (1999), an omnibus internationalist survey (During 1993), a volume on black British cultural studies (Baker, Jr. et al. 1996), and national mixtures of solid gold and future memories from Australia, Germany,
France, Spain, Italy, Asia, Russia, Canada-Australia, and the USA. The gigantic Cultural Studies collection (Grossberg et al.) came out in 1992, and family-resemblance volumes exist in lesbian/gay/queer, legal, multicultural/postcolonial, regional, sports, political, and alterity studies, while there is a call within biomedicine to adopt a cultural studies research agenda, and notable contributions have been made in areas such as AIDS. Several “Cultural Studies at the Crossroads” conferences have been held, and Honolulu convened a major event in 1993, with one block dedicated to cultural studies journals from New Zealand/Aotearoa, Australia, India, the Philippines, and the US. Major scholarly bodies have been transformed from within by cultural studies tendencies, notably the International Communication Association, the International Association for Mass Communication Research, and the National Communication Association. Finally, there is the inevitable raft of websites (Berry and Miller 2000).

Cultural studies has not avoided the eyes of academic and political invigators, and the right-hand side of the publishing grid has analogs on the right of politics. Cultural studies’ concerns with identity, and its struggles against a canon of supposedly elevating aesthetic work, lead to accusations of a fall from the grace of connoisseurship. Kenneth Minogue polemizes in the Times Literary Supplement about this “politeo-intellectual junkyard of the Western world” (1994: 27), while neoconservative readers of Partisan Review and the New Criterion are alert to the danger as well (Wolfe 1996; Kimball 1996). Chris Patten, a former Conservative Member of the UK Parliament and the last Governor of Hong Kong, calls cultural studies “Disneyland for the weaker minded” (quoted in Morley 1998: 478), and Simon Hoggart, son of Richard and a notable journalistic maven, is an implacable foe. He could be seen on British television in February 2000 chiding local universities for wasting time on this nonsense when they should be in step with Harvard and MIT. As there have been several conferences at Harvard Law School about cultural studies, and MIT is forever promoting these areas, cultural studies has obviously hit some hallowed targets in complex ways. Perhaps this is no wonder, for some right-wing libertarians welcome cultural studies. Virginia Postrel, editor of Reason magazine, wrote a 1999 op-ed piece for the Wall Street Journal in which she described cultural studies as “deeply threatening to traditional leftist views of commerce” because notions of active consumption were so close to the sovereign consumer beloved of the right: “The cultural-studies mavens are betraying the leftist cause, lending support to the corporate enemy and even training graduate students who wind up doing market research.”

In the US, some sociologists, confronted by departmental closures, amalgamations, or a transmogrification into social policy, bury their heads in methodological anguish when confronted by cultural studies, or claim the turf and terminology as their own. What do you get when you cross Talcott Parsons with Émile Durkheim and Harold Garfinkel? “A New Proposal for Cultural Studies” (Alexander and Smith 1993). This position says Marxism has been
overtaken by a revised functionalism that uses interpretative cultural anthropology and “subjective perceptions” to link meaning with social structure. Symbols and ideals, not power relations, are the appropriate focus. To underline the point, Cambridge University Press’s “Cultural Social Studies” series is an avowedly Durkheimian project. It echoes both the “Editor’s Note” (Salzman 1975) that inaugurated Prospects: An Annual Journal of American Cultural Studies over 25 years ago as an attempt to “elucidate the essential nature of the American character,” and claims that cultural studies is just symbolic interactionism (Becker and McCall 1990). So conventional critics either throw up their hands in horror, or seek to incorporate the upstart hybrid as normal science.

On the left, cultural studies’ concerns with identity have led to accusations of a fall from the grace of “real” politics (recalling Don DeLillo’s character in the postmodern novel White Noise, who complains of his university that “There are full professors in this place who read nothing but cereal boxes”). New Yorker journalist Adam Gopnik has accused radicals in the US of being overcommitted to abstract intellection and the assumption that “consciousness produces reality,” such that the “energy on the American left is in cultural studies, not health care” (1994: 96). But processes of consumption should include questions of pleasure and resistance as well as banality and domination, and debates over healthcare are partially conducted through the popular. In any event, the supposed distance between cultural studies and “real” politics is spurious: cultural studies in the US, for example, has been in the forefront of apparel-industry sweatshop activism and the documentation of contemporary labor conditions in education (Ross 1997; Nelson 1997; Martin 1998). This is no “flaky” area, thank you very much.

But the longstanding cultural studies journal Social Text (1979– ) became mired in public controversy over social constructionism and scientific truth claims in 1996–7 when a physicist published a paper there stating things he did not believe, then announced this in a populist academic magazine, claiming his duplicity as a sign of the area’s sloppy thinking and its weakness as a site for radical politics. There was massive media attention. Given the deceitful nature of this conduct, we can see why it is necessary for the US government to house a full-time bureau dedicated to scientific fraud by holders of Federal research grants, but it is still worth asking the question: what is going on with these critiques?

It seems as though cultural studies occupies the space of 1960s British sociology – an irritant to hegemonic forces because of its radical anti-elitist critique. This antagonizes both traditional academic disciplines and media mavens, who see it as the humanities’ sacred duty to elevate the population (or at least segments of it) through indoctrination into a sacred array of knowledges carefully removed from the everyday. The DeLillo quip about full professors reading cereal boxes is funny and pointed. Of course, it is odd to turn away from high-cultural pursuits and invest one’s academic capital in the banal, to shift direction from the Bauhaus to the Brillo box. The Patten quip about “Disneyland for the feeble-minded” is also funny and pointed. But in each case, there is
something behind the remark. Understanding the iconic significance and material history of American food is of great importance, while acknowledging the pleasures of ordinary people rather than privileging the quasi-sacerdotal pronouncements of an elect may not be so much “feeble-minded” as threatening to cultural elites.

Conclusion

This volume is designed to show where cultural studies exists and what it does there, reflecting a significant diversity of interests and methods. We reach across disciplines, places, issues, and sources, in keeping with the postdisciplinary project of cultural studies – and do so in the interest of deprovincialization (contributors reside in five different continents). Part I, Disciplines, looks at the ways that cultural studies has intersected with an array of knowledges. After all, cultural studies must always find “a home . . . within specific disciplines even as it challenges the legitimacy of the disciplinarization of intellectual work” (Grossberg 1997: 5). Mark Gibson and Alec McHoul investigate what has constituted interdisciplinarity from Hoggart’s time to our own. Rosemary Coome asks whether there is a cultural studies of the law. Randy Martin lays out the terms on which American social theory has encountered cultural studies and Frank Webster does the same for the UK. Cultural studies’ febrile relationship with science is addressed by Marianne de Laet. Richard Maxwell confronts the ongoing dialogue between political economy and cultural studies, arguing for their profound connectedness, while Douglas Kellner does the same for intersections with the Frankfurt School of critical theory. Silke Morgenroth surveys archaeology and George Marcus looks at anthropology, twin disciplines with quite distinct experiences of cultural studies – the former has remained aloof, to its cost as argued here, while the latter has seen its terrain and method both criticized and “borrowed.” The section concludes with John Nguyen Erni’s summary of cultural studies’ most significant home, media and communication studies.

Part II, Places, locates the impact of cultural studies on transnational and national levels, a necessary move given the speed and depth of its diversification and its claims to be an emancipatory, inclusive project. George Yúdice contrasts the US and Latin American experiences, while Jorge Mariscal homes in on US cultural studies’ attitude to Hispanic specificity and diversity. The New Zealand/Aotearoa and Australian encounters with cultural studies are addressed by Graeme Turner, and Eric Kit-wai Ma explains how the geopolitical and disciplinary changes experienced in Hong Kong in recent years have staged the advent of cultural studies. Ben Carrington offers an account of the UK’s origin myths and Paul Moore inquires into European cultural studies.

Part III, Issues, grounds cultural studies practice in particular topics and struggles. Cultural studies’ ongoing investment in youth culture is considered
from a pedagogic point of view by Justin Lewis. Paul Smith calls for a renewed engagement with Marxism and C. L. Cole connects sport to science and political culture, while cultural policy is foregrounded as a pragmatic site of political intervention by Tony Bennett and problematized by Ana Maria Ochoa Gautier in the Colombian context and Andrea Fraser via a performance piece. Melissa Deem uses cultural studies methods to engage the current status of US feminism in popular culture, taking the 1999 impeachment crisis as a case study, and Jason King peers into the body via dance music. Fashion is the backdrop to Sarah Berry’s essay, Robert Stam looks at cultural studies’ vital connections to race, and Geoffrey Lawrence and I analyze globalization. The section is rounded out by Suvendrini Perera on diasporic identities. Part IV, Sources, concludes the volume with a bibliography, critical to so dispersed an intellectual field as this one.

Any undertaking that aims to map cultural studies is partial and potentially controversial, because the terrain is up for grabs in definitional and power terms, and is avowedly political. Let it be so. My own view? For what it’s worth, I maintain that cultural studies should look at social movements and actionable policy as lodestones and direction-finders. In recognition of this, we must turn our gaze onto shifts in public discourse between self-governance and external governance, and track the careers of the commodity sign and the state sign as they travel through time and space – Hall’s “circuit of culture” that focuses on practices of representation, identity, production, consumption, and regulation (1997: 1). This means recalling Foucault’s provocation that the modern has as much to do with the governmentalization of the state as of the social. Then we shall have something to say about the institutional control of culture and the democratic potential of everyday life, pointing out erasures in the former and the potential of the latter. As Justin Lewis puts it, a concern with political power exercised over majorities need not be at the expense of specificity and marginality; rather, it should be regarded as a precondition to empowering the marginal (1999: 199–200). Maxwell stresses articulations between the two:

People work to make culture. Not only the writers, technicians, artists, carpenters and all those who put together movies, books and such; culture is also made by labour not directly involved in the culture industries. Consider your own daily works of judgement and interpretation about a film plot, your grammar or a classmate’s joke. Think of all those whose efforts built the bridges you have crossed, the roads travelled, the means of transport and human relationship …your love story, a brief encounter …and all the hardship, strikes, solidarity, death, wage negotiations, debt and satisfaction embodied in those structures. (2000: 281)

I recall my excitement when I first saw the front cover of the Birmingham Centre’s Working Papers in Cultural Studies 4 of 1973. Alongside a bricolage graphic of a thoughtful cherub, some compass-points with dollar and pound signs, and a few printers’ codes, the bottom center-left read like this:
LITERATURE~SOCIETY

MOTOR RACING

It seemed natural to me for these topics to be together (as is the case in a newspaper). But of course that is not academically “normal.” To make them syntagmatic was utterly sensible in terms of people’s lives and mediated reality, and utterly improbable in terms of intellectual divisions of labor and hierarchies of discrimination. Bravo.

Notes

1 Thanks to Marie Leger for her comments.
2 The inaugural issue of the International Journal of Cultural Studies features an interview with Hoggart and a bibliography of his work (Gibson and Hartley 1998).
3 The Festschrift entitled Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies (Chen and Morley 1996) collects some of his work, reacts to it, and provides a useful bibliography.
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