

# The “Birmingham School” at the Crossroads?\*

*Te-hsing Shan*

## ABSTRACT

This paper looks at the “Birmingham School” from an institutional perspective by designating four historical moments from the earliest CCCS, to DCS, and to the most recent DCSS. It addresses a number of important issues, some relating to the “Birmingham School” as an established institution in particular, others to cultural studies in general: the glory and/or burden of history, disciplinarity and/or interdisciplinarity, institutionalization and/or political commitment, as well as localization and/or internationalization.

Despite different constructions of the histories of the “Birmingham School,” what remains common is that cultural studies has always been a site of contestation and an open-ended, on-going process with high self-reflexivity, subject to change from time to time and, with its growing internationalization, from place to place. In other words, cultural studies has always been at the crossroads. Among all the cultural studies institutions, this might best be seen in the history of the “Birmingham School.” A better understanding of this history can help anchor it in its historical context, shed light on its current situation, and, hopefully, pave the way for the future.

## KEY WORDS

Cultural Studies

Richard Hoggart

interdisciplinarity

internationalization

The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS)

The “Birmingham School”

Stuart Hall

institutionalization

localization



We need histories of cultural studies to trace the recurrent dilemmas and to give perspective to our current projects.

—Richard Johnson, “What Is Cultural Studies Anyway?”

[W]hat happens when an academic and theoretical enterprise tries to engage in pedagogies which enlist the active engagement of individuals and groups, tries to make a difference in the institutional world in which it is located?

—Stuart Hall, “Cultural Studies and Its Theoretical Legacies”

The title of this paper immediately raises one question: Is it suitable to call cultural studies done at Birmingham a school? The answer to this question depends on how the word “school” is defined.

If a school is defined as a group of scholars coming from a similar disciplinary background or interest and working on a similar range of subjects under a similar methodology for a similar academic goal, then cultural studies done at the University of Birmingham, with its characteristic diversity and acclaimed interdisciplinarity, does not fit into this definition. However, judging from its radical reconceptions of and critical approaches to culture, its long-term commitment to effect social and political changes, and its tremendous influence upon different disciplines, it seems difficult to find a more convenient way to describe the varied cultural studies done in Birmingham—under the different institutional headings of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies [CCCS], the Department of Cultural

Studies [DCS], and the Department of Cultural Studies and Sociology [DCSS]—over the decades which has drastically changed the landscape and mind-scape of humanities and social sciences locally and internationally. Therefore, we can find expressions such as the "Birmingham School"—with or without quotation marks—used either descriptively or normatively.

If it is a school, what is its history and how do we periodize or characterize it? Moreover, as one of the pioneering and biggest institutions of cultural studies—sometimes hailed as the "origin" of cultural studies in narratives about the history of cultural studies—what do its history and current status tell us about some of the common concerns, contributions, difficulties, and challenges of cultural studies?<sup>1</sup>

When it comes to history, the first question is: When did it start in the first place? So far as cultural studies is concerned, Stuart Hall cautions us against the idea of "absolute beginnings" ("Some Problematics" 16). With this caution in mind—also with the need of a history in mind—the option, then, would be to confine oneself to a specific institution. It is, therefore, with good reason that the founding of CCCS in 1964 by Richard Hoggart of the Department of English at the University of Birmingham has been designated as a historic moment in cultural studies—even as "the" founding moment. Many accounts about the development of cultural studies at Birmingham have been written from both insiders' and outsiders' viewpoints. A closer look reveals that these accounts, with their focus on the CCCS period, do not present a more recent picture of the "Birmingham School."<sup>2</sup> This paper, instead, attempts to deal with the institutional aspect of the "Birmingham School" from the moment right before the new millennium.

Most accounts of cultural studies begin with three landmark texts—Hoggart's *The Uses of Literacy* (1957), Raymond Williams's *Culture and Society 1780-1950* (1958), and E. P. Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class* (1978). To Hall, these "originating texts, the original 'curriculum,' of the field" specify the "earlier founding moment" of cultural studies (16). Nevertheless, this

should not obscure the fact of the complexity and multiplicity therein. For, as Hall puts it on another occasion, “[c]ultural studies has multiple discourses; it has a number of different histories. It is a whole set of formations; it has its own different conjunctures and moments in the past . . . It always was a set of unstable formations . . . It had many trajectories; many people had and have different trajectories through it; it was constructed by a number of different methodologies and theoretical positions, all of them in contention” (“Theoretical Legacies” 278).

Much has been written about the characteristics of cultural studies in general. As for the historical development and theoretical mapping and re-mapping of the “Birmingham School,” Hall’s numerous essays,<sup>3</sup> Richard Johnson’s “What Is Cultural Studies Anyway?” and Michael Green’s “The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies” offer valuable insider accounts of and reflections upon the CCCS period.

For other observations, a few examples will suffice. An earlier characterization can be found in Lesley Johnson’s book on the British cultural critics. Writing in the late 1970s, Lesley Johnson underlines the intellectual diversity at CCCS and lists “a number of points of divergence from the humanist literary tradition [which] will suffice to indicate the direction of the Centre’s work”—namely, its stress on “the analysis of class as being fundamental to the study of culture,” its disavowal of “the centrality of the question of the role of art in society,” “its rejection of a moral critique of society,” and “its emphasis on theoretical concerns” (206-07). Nearly fifteen years later, Ben Agger enumerates the following features as “the Birmingham approach to cultural studies”: being “*interdisciplinary*,” emphasizing “a *broad definition of culture*,” rejecting “*the high-culture/low-culture distinction*,” regarding “*culture [as] both practice and experience*,” and building “*theoretically on both Gramsci and Althusser*” (76-92).

A more detailed and complex narrative of CCCS and its theoretical emphases over the years can be found in Lawrence Grossberg’s “The Formations of Cultural Studies: An American in Birmingham.” In this article, Grossberg constructs “five temporarily stable forms”

(33), namely, literary humanism, dialectical sociology, the culturalist formation, a structural-conjuncturalist formation, and a postmodern conjuncturalism (33-64).

An alternative account along the line of institution can be provided. The "Birmingham School" of cultural studies—either as a center or as a department—has always been an institution within the University of Birmingham and, as such, four historical moments can be readily discerned. The first was the founding of CCCS by Hoggart as a graduate research center in the English Department of the Faculty of Arts in 1964. With his background in literature, Hoggart tried to expand "a Leavisite literary criticism to *all* aspects of culture and society" (Brantlinger 61). At this stage, there were only two full-time faculty members (Hoggart and Hall) at CCCS.

The second moment was when Hoggart went to work at UNESCO in 1968 and Hall became in charge.<sup>4</sup> Under Hall's directorship, CCCS took a new turn from "liberal literary critical humanism" to more theoretically-oriented studies on a number of important, yet previously neglected issues. Institutionally, it was also in the mid-seventies that CCCS broke away from the Department of English and became an autonomous unit in the Faculty of Arts.<sup>5</sup> When Hall left in 1979, Richard Johnson succeeded as the CCCS director until its merger with Sociology in 1988. Following the general directions already established and the tradition of close collaboration with students, Richard Johnson's emphasis on the historical was also an important dimension in the development of cultural studies.<sup>6</sup>

Looking back on it, we can hardly think of another institution with so few resources that has exerted such a great influence. Through close interaction and collaboration—not without tension and contention—between teachers and post-graduate students as well as between members of various research groups on a variety of research subjects, CCCS has established cultural studies as people know it today.<sup>7</sup>

The third moment came when cultural studies became an independent department in 1988, with the original CCCS members joined by a couple of sociologists after the close-down of the Department of Sociology by the University.<sup>8</sup> This merger increased the input of the

more theoretically-oriented sociology, although the original CCCS had already been very much diversified and theoreticized. Moreover, being an independent department offering undergraduate degrees also meant the shift of some emphasis to teaching. In addition to “fusing interests from cultural studies and from sociology with a larger staff and a more stable position” (Green, “Cultural Studies” 59), this brought cultural studies and pedagogy closer to each other, although more or less at the expense of the close collaboration between teachers and post-graduate students.<sup>9</sup>

The fourth moment occurred in 1998 when another institutional expansion was made—this time formally adding “sociology” to the name of the department (DCSS). As a result, there were more openings to recruit new faculty members (mainly in sociology) so as to offer degrees in both cultural studies and sociology. A new M. Phil. program was also created in 1999 in an attempt to raise the academic standard based on closer interaction between teachers and post-graduate students along selected areas of research interests. Moreover, a number of research projects have also been proposed. For instance, the arrangement with Birmingham City Council to carry out projects on school education as well as on social exclusion and community governance will provide an opportunity to combine theory with public policy.<sup>10</sup>

While the above description gives some sense of the development of the “Birmingham School” from a more strictly-defined institutional perspective, it raises a number of important issues, some relating to the “Birmingham School” as an established institution in particular, others to cultural studies in general.

### **The Glory and/or Burden of History**

More than any other institution, the “Birmingham School” has contributed to the establishment of the newly emergent field known as cultural studies. With its far-reaching influence over the years—especially along the general directions and areas explored by CCCS—the “Birmingham School” has often been regarded as the “origin” or

"fountainhead" of cultural studies. However, this "centrality" has faced more and more challenges at home and abroad. With the rapid growth of cultural studies around the world, no single institution can expect to have such a great influence as CCCS did during the formative period of this new field. It can even be said that the "Birmingham School" has been so successful as to undermine its significance as *the* center of cultural studies.

One of the fiercest challenges is Handel Wright's "Dare We De-centre Birmingham? Troubling the 'Origin' and Trajectories of Cultural Studies." Intending to offer an "alternative version of the origin of cultural studies" (45), Wright identifies several similar projects undertaken internationally, such as the Folk Schools of Denmark in the 1920s, Highlander School in North America's Appalachia in the 1930s, and the Kamiriithu project in Kenya in the 1970s.

This advocacy for "a multiplicity of origins" (33) from an international perspective is commendable. But what interests us here is not so much the establishment of an African origin of cultural studies<sup>11</sup> or any other origin as the pressing need to "de-centre" Birmingham. If the "Birmingham School" had not been so powerful, nobody would have bothered to "de-centre" it. Moreover, discussions about cultural studies are often set along or against the "Birmingham School," especially the CCCS period. Viewing from an "'international' frame," Jon Stratton and Ien Ang make the following observation: "It is undeniable that 'Birmingham' has played a crucial role in the growth of the international cultural studies network as we know it today. But there was never just a one-sided and straightforward expansion of British cultural studies to other locations; if there ever was such an 'expansion,' the reception of British work in these other locations was never passive, but always inflected by local circumstances and concerns" (374).

Therefore, "still having a hallowed ring to its name" (Alasuutari et al. 7), the "Birmingham School" with its historical legacy exerts influence, probably more so upon those who now work under its name—members with as various disciplinary backgrounds as cultural studies, sociology, anthropology, gender studies, media analysis, psy-

choanalysis, and film and literary studies.<sup>12</sup> With cultural studies' characteristic reflexivity, those in the "Birmingham School" are in a position to look at its past and present dialectically and have a special role to play to carry on that tradition, although recognizing that past glorious moments can never be repeated. Far from being static, this tradition is subject to interpretation and re-interpretation and issues such as continuity/discontinuity and tradition/innovation are to be constantly negotiated.

At present, members at DCSS have set up a new Centre for Cultural Studies and Sociology (CCSS) and identify four themes in research and teaching: rethinking inequalities, knowledge and technology, and cultures of everyday life, as well as power, language, and representation. According to Gray, the current department head, this "gives some clearer indication about our combined (i.e. Sociology and Cultural Studies) interests and trajectories."<sup>13</sup> The effect yet remains to be seen.

### **Disciplinary and/or Interdisciplinarity**

Cultural studies has prided itself on crossing disciplinary boundaries. "The relation of cultural studies to disciplines," observes Green, "is one of critique: of their historical construction, of their claims, of their omissions, and particularly of the forms of their separation. At the same time, a critical relationship to the disciplines is also a critical stance to their forms of knowledge production—to the prevalent social relations of research, the labour process of higher education" ("Cultural Studies" 54). Consequently, expressions such as "interdisciplinary," "trans-disciplinary," "anti-disciplinary," "counter-disciplinary," and "post-disciplinary" have been applied to cultural studies over and over again. Although it has been questioned and even attacked,<sup>14</sup> interdisciplinarity has been one of the hallmarks of cultural studies all along.

Even though it might be maintained that the founding of a department within a university can still be interdisciplinary, the recent expansion of DCS to DCSS is bound to generate further arguments



about disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity. In other words, if cultural studies is interdisciplinary, what will happen to DCSS when a well-established discipline such as sociology has been added to the self-proclaimed interdisciplinary cultural studies?

A look at the history of the "Birmingham School" shows a long and entangled relationship between cultural studies and sociology. Even before the founding of CCCS, Hoggart had already outlined an approach "provisionally called Literature and Contemporary Cultural Studies" (254) in his 1963 inaugural lecture at University's "Schools of English and Contemporary Society." To him, "the field for possible work in Contemporary Cultural Studies can be divided into three parts: one is, roughly, historical and philosophical; another is, again roughly, sociological; the third—which will be the most important—is the literary critical" (255).<sup>15</sup>

Institutionally, this is shown by the fact that CCCS was first set up in the Department of English, Faculty of Arts and became an independent department in the School of Social Sciences. Moreover, cultural studies, especially as it has been practiced at Birmingham, has been very much informed and strengthened by theories from sociology. In the "Editorial" to the inaugural issue of *European Journal of Cultural Studies* co-authored by, among others, Gray, a member of the "Birmingham School," it is said that "[t]he Birmingham School of cultural studies was itself a hybrid, emerging originally from within English and drawing on sociology, which combined ideas from Marxism, feminism, structuralism(s), and forms of ethnography to develop a loose working theory of culture and society and methods for its investigation in concrete settings" (7).

However, the relationship between cultural studies and sociology is never smooth or simple. To Richard Johnson, "[t]he relation of cultural studies to 'social science' is a pretty ambiguous one" (3). Having learned from each other, "the two approaches are often indistinguishable," though cultural studies maintains a "whole-hearted opposition of a quantitative, policy-related and officially-funded sociological mainstream" (3). In his narrative of CCCS, Hall mentions specifically "the break with sociology" ("Some Proboematics" 20-26)

and “the ‘sociological encounter’” (22) and cautions against a simple-minded merging of cultural studies and sociology. In Hall’s view, the interaction between the two “could not be done by simply grafting sociology on to Cultural Studies from the outside—although this was often what, at the time, ‘interdisciplinary’ was taken to mean. . . . Thus began the Centre’s appropriation of sociology from within” (“Some Problematics” 23).

Although Hall’s remarks were made in early 1980s, it takes on a new significance when the very name of “sociology” has been grafted to the formal title of the Department. As a degree-granting institution, students will be given more exposure to sociological theories and practices, and faculty members (more than half of them with sociological background) are expected to carry out more exchange between cultural studies and sociology. Even though sociology has become more and more diversified and cultural studies has appropriated a lot from sociology over the years, the “grafting” of discipline-specific sociology to interdisciplinary cultural studies may still generate some tension. With their common interest in theory, mutual concern with culture as lived experience, and shared goal of interventionist scholarship, this tension might prove to be creative—which is probably one of the main reasons behind this merging. Still, the theoretical issue of disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity remains, and the actual practice in the “Birmingham School” will be a meaningful index to this theoretical issue.

### **Institutionalization and/or Political Commitment**

Although situated in an academic institution, cultural studies, as Hall observes, “[f]rom its inception . . . was an ‘engaged’ set of disciplines . . . This tension (between what might loosely be called ‘political’ and intellectual concerns) has shaped Cultural Studies ever since” (“Some Problematics” 17). Drawing inspiration from Antonio Gramsci’s concept of “organic intellectual,” cultural studies is committed to bringing about social and political changes by way of studying culture(s). The numerous working papers and publications of the

"Birmingham School" on a variety of subjects, in addition to exerting academic influences, also aim at challenging the status quo and generating transformations in a much wider context. However, as cultural studies becomes more and more institutionalized with its theory-laden language, it is in danger of losing its cutting edges and distancing itself from the society it sets out to reform. This is especially true in the American academy.<sup>16</sup>

Hall addresses this situation head-on in "Cultural Studies and Its Theoretical Legacies" and expresses his ambivalent feelings. In Hall's view, "the enormous explosion of cultural studies in the United States, its rapid professionalization and institutionalization, is not a moment which any of us who tried to set up a marginalized Centre in a university like Birmingham could, in any simple way, regret." However, Hall hastens to add, "[a]nd yet I have to say, in the strongest sense, that it reminds me of the ways in which, in Britain, we are always aware of institutionalization as a moment of profound danger" ("Theoretical Legacies" 285). That is one of the reasons why many practitioners have expressed their concern with the depoliticization of cultural studies.

This can also be seen in the popularization and even vulgarization of cultural studies. Today almost anybody in the humanities and social sciences can claim to be doing cultural studies. Confronted with "a cultural studies boom," Simon During finds it imperative to distinguish between "engaged cultural studies" and "a general 'turn to culture' (or 'cultural turn')" (24). In fact, this is a need felt by many people. However, whether cultural studies can effect political changes often depends upon the criteria applied. Fish categorically denies this possibility, while many working on cultural studies claim to be doing something political. Therefore, Hall's advocacy for "intellectual modesty" is of great relevance here: "I do think there is all the difference in the world between understanding the politics of intellectual work and substituting intellectual work for politics" ("Theoretical Legacies" 286). And Davies's observation is even more detailed and his suggestion, illuminating: "[a]s a political agenda, however, cultural studies had no visible agents or actors, no networks, no com-

mandeering heights of the economy: it operated by secreting itself into the body politic, a samizdat of computers, publishing houses, venues, which bent and reformed themselves. If it existed as a political force, it was guerrilla war against that political center, or else as the avant-garde of the nomadic cultural elite" (44).

Although much can be debated about institutionalization and political commitment, the intention to effect such changes via academic works is inherent in cultural studies and laudable. As most of the practitioners of cultural studies are academically based, how to strike a balance between institutionalization and political commitment is indeed an important issue.<sup>17</sup>

### **Localization and/or Internationalization**

The issue of localization and/or internationalization can be viewed from different angles. One is closely related to the issue of teaching and pedagogy. Due to its reputation, the "Birmingham School" has drawn a lot of international students for post-graduate studies. Take the academic year of 1998-1999 for instance: nearly half of the Ph. D. students and more than five-sixths of the M. A. students are from abroad. This huge international presence demonstrates the attraction of the "Birmingham School" and its possible international influence on the educational level. And the exchange of views of people from different cultural, national, and ethnic backgrounds is beneficial to both teachers and students. However, this international presence, overwhelming on the M. A. level, also indicates the failure of British higher education, with its increasing tuition and low pay for students, to offer enough incentive to attract a reasonable number of local students to pursue advanced studies. If cultural studies is committed to bringing about changes in a wider environment, the significance of the local cannot be ignored.<sup>18</sup>

Furthermore, as cultural studies has become more diversified and internationalized, challenges from at home and abroad are bound to contribute to its re-configuration. Although cultural studies pays attention to the analysis of power relations, "the culture of cultural

studies," as Stratton and Ang remind us, "is not exempt from power relations" (362). According to them, "[c]ultural studies is now being practised in many parts of the world (although definitely not everywhere), and is rapidly becoming a central site for critical intellectualism in the postmodern, postcolonial, postcommunist new world (dis)order. In this development, what has become known, rather misleadingly, as 'the Birmingham School' has operated as a symbolic centre" (362). Wright's proposal for an alternative history of cultural studies is a forceful interrogation about that monolithic myth of origin surrounding the "Birmingham School." Other prominent reconceptions of cultural studies from a cross-national perspective include Kuan-Hsing Chen's advocacy for a "new internationalist localism", Benjamin Lee's urge for "the creation of a culturally sensitive international cultural studies" (233), and Alan O'Connor's idea of "transnational cultural studies," to mention just three of them. All these express "a necessary desire against 'Euro/America-Western-centrism'" (Chen, "Introduction" 5).

In short, with more and more practitioners across disciplinary, cultural, geographical, and linguistic boundaries, the inadequacies of Western-centered cultural studies have gradually been exposed and opportunities for more diversified dialogues arise.

This recent development towards internationalization does provide a chance to re-think the centrality of British cultural studies, especially the "Birmingham School," a thing to be not only recognized, but also welcomed. In his 1995 postscript to an earlier article on "The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies," Green has this to add: "cultural studies 15 years on looks very different. . . . No longer does cultural studies fight for institutional existence (at least in Britain), however uneven and under-resourced its academic lodgements. . . . Nor does cultural studies any longer feel so English (so Welsh?) . . . It is trying, in Birmingham, to be less West-centred, to be more global and also to be more local and conscious of links with a wider world" (59-60).

Moreover, the editorial of the inaugural issue of *European Journal of Cultural Studies* openly acknowledges that "to continue to situ-

ate Birmingham, or Europe for that matter, at the heart of a cultural studies map of the world is to ignore how cultural studies has developed from highly different disciplinary backgrounds in different places over the years" (7). In other words, both within and without the West, there is a growing consensus of the necessity to view cultural studies both locally and internationally. Whereas this recognition is true to the current situation, much remains to be theorized and practiced about cultural studies from a more pluralistic perspective—with the "Birmingham School" as one among many cultural studies institutions around the world, each with its unique histories, trajectories, aims, and possible contributions.

Cultural studies has become such a diversified field that any generalization tends to lose its validity. Grossberg observes, "[a]t every moment, every practice of cultural studies is something of a hybrid, with multiple influences. Every position in cultural studies is an ongoing trajectory across different theoretical and political projects. Moreover, there have always been multiple practices and sites of cultural studies in every context" (*We* 17). This paper tries to look at the "Birmingham School" by dealing with the issues of the glory and/or burden of history, disciplinarity and/or interdisciplinarity, institutionalization and/or political commitment, as well as localization and/or internationalization.

Despite different constructions of the histories of the "Birmingham School," what remains common is that cultural studies has always been a site of contestation and an open-ended, on-going process with high self-reflexivity, subject to change from time to time and, with its growing internationalization, from place to place. In fact, cultural studies has always been at the crossroads. Among all the cultural studies institutions, this might best be seen in the history of the "Birmingham School," from the earliest CCCS, to DCS, and to the most recent DCSS, with differing goals and projects under changing historical contingencies. This history carries its weight. If history cannot be repeated and the past glory cannot be regained, an understanding of the history of the "Birmingham School" in a more

comprehensive way can help anchor it in its historical context, shed light on its current situation, and, hopefully, pave the way for the future.

## NOTES

\*I would like to thank the National Science Council of the Republic of China for a one-year grant which enabled me to conduct research at the Department of Cultural Studies and Sociology, the University of Birmingham, from 1998 to 1999. This paper benefits from the conversations I had with colleagues at the department, especially Michael Green and Ann Gray, who also gave valuable comments on its earlier version. However, I am solely responsible for the views expressed.

<sup>1</sup> My recognition and strategy are, therefore, not unlike Colin Sparks's when he says, "as a result of its unique institutional position the Birmingham Centre has, in its own internal development, confronted the dilemmas of the project of cultural studies with a particular intensity" (14). Sparks's essay was written in 1977. Today, new issues, such as internationalization, need to be addressed.

<sup>2</sup> Paul Gilroy, a former member of CCCS, even uses such expression as "the fading embers of the 'Birmingham School'" (47), which puts an equation between CCCS and the "Birmingham School." While there is no denying that CCCS, as both initiator and explorer, occupies a most prominent position in the history of the "Birmingham School," it is not the *whole* story. This paper tries to argue against this idea of "absolute endings."

<sup>3</sup> Notably, "Cultural Studies at the Centre: Some Problematics and Problems," "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms," and "Cultural Studies and Its Theoretical Legacies."

<sup>4</sup> When Hoggart formally left CCCS in 1972, Richard Johnson joined from the Department of History, while Green was "shared" with the Department of English.

<sup>5</sup> I want to thank Green for his comments here (Hoggart's "liberal literary critical humanism" is Green's expression).

<sup>6</sup> I want to thank Gray for her comments here. See especially the

three articles by Richard Johnson included in *Working Class Culture: Studies in History and Theory*. All focusing on British working-class culture, they cope with three different aspects of historical studies. "Culture and the historians" discusses a specific "cultural" approach to history; "'Really useful knowledge': radical education and working-class culture, 1790-1848" provides an in-depth case study; and "Three problematics: elements of a theory of working-class culture" attempts to offer a theoretical framework.

<sup>7</sup> See, for instance, Hall's section on "Developing a Practice of Intellectual Work" ("Some Problematics" 42-47). Writing nearly two decades later, Green remarks that this kind of collaborative research "was not only a wide intellectual and political agenda, but also distinctive forms of intellectual organization which helped constitute the 'Birmingham School.' . . . [However,] the conditions from which [these practices and circumstances] arose would seem to have almost vanished" ("Working Practices" 195).

<sup>8</sup> In fact, the situation of CCCS itself in the 1970s was not secure. Hall recalls in an interview that "[w]hen in 1972, he [Hoggart who went to UNESCO in 1968] decided not to come back, there was a huge attempt by the University to close the Centre down, and we had to struggle to keep it open." It was not "until the end of the 1970s, that the position was secure [when Hall] felt free to leave" ("The Formation" 500). Hall left CCCS for the Open University in 1979 as a professor in sociology.

<sup>9</sup> According to Green, the decrease of the number of post-graduate students was because "funding diminished." He admits, "a research unit became a teaching and research department."

<sup>10</sup> According to Green, this funding from the City Council is "in return for some research done by the students inside the Council."

<sup>11</sup> Wright's article begins with the assertion that "[i]t is a little-known fact that cultural studies proper started in Africa in the 1970s" (33).

<sup>12</sup> See <http://www.bham.ac.uk/publications/culturalstudies>.

<sup>13</sup> Gray's words are from her comments on an earlier version of this paper. There are subdivisions within each of the four research



themes. Under the theme of rethinking inequalities are: (1) "revisiting debates about race, class, gender, sexuality, age and exploring their interconnections," (2) "mapping divisions in relation to place, space and knowledge," and (3) "postcolonialism." Under the theme of knowledge and technology are: (1) "consequences of information and communications technology," (2) "representations of science and technology," and (3) "constructions of knowledge." Under the theme of cultures of everyday life are: (1) "cultures of work and leisure," (2) "identities," (3) "consumption," (4) "media and popular culture," (5) "constructing families and the domestic," (6) "youth," and (7) "commodification, conflict and resistance." Under the theme of power, language, and representation are: (1) "forms of governance and relations to the state," (2) "public sphere and citizenship," (3) "politics of representation," (4) "contested constructions of community and culture," and (5) "media representations." See <http://www.bham.ac.uk/publications/culturalstudies>.

<sup>14</sup> A case in point is Stanley Fish's polemical *Professional Correctness: Literary Studies and Political Change*, especially the chapter on "Looking Elsewhere: Cultural Studies and Interdisciplinarity" (71-92).

<sup>15</sup> In "The Literary Imagination and the Sociological Imagination," a talk given three years later to the Sociology Section of the British Association at its annual conference, Hoggart further compared these two kinds of imagination. It is important to point out that although Hoggart proposed the significance of making connections between literary studies and sociological studies, or to use his own words, "contemporary cultural sociology" (256), his main concern was, without doubt, literary criticism.

<sup>16</sup> That is why Cary Nelson finds it necessary to draft a 16-point cultural studies manifesto against "the widespread dissolution and depoliticization of cultural studies in the United States" (197-202).

<sup>17</sup> One of the most direct ways is to conduct projects which combine solid academic research with policy-making so as to produce effects in real-life situations.

<sup>18</sup> That is why the arrangement with Birmingham City Council

for two placements in the M. Phil. program on policy-oriented projects in the 1999 autumn term is of special significance.

### WORKS CITED

- Agger, Ben. *Cultural Studies as Critical Theory*. London and Washington, DC: Falmer Press, 1992.
- Alasuutari, Pertti, Ann Gray, and Joke Hermes. "Editorial." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 1.1 (1998): 5-11.
- Brantlinger, Patrick. *Crusoe's Footprints: Cultural Studies in Britain and America*. London and New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Chen, Kuan-Hsing. "Voices from the Outside: Towards a New Internationalist Localism." *Cultural Studies* 6.3 (1992): 476-84.
- . "Introduction: The Decolonization Question." In *Trajectories: Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*. Ed. Kuan-Hsing Chen. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. 1-53.
- Clarke, John, Chas Critcher, and Richard Johnson, eds. *Working-Class Culture: Studies in History and Theory*. London: Hutchinson, 1979.
- Davies, Ioan. *Cultural Studies and Beyond: Fragments of Empire*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- During, Simon. "Introduction." In *The Cultural Studies Reader*. Ed. Simon During. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. 1-28.
- Fish, Stanley. *Professional Correctness: Literary Studies and Political Change*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1995.
- Gilroy, Paul. "British Cultural Studies and the Pitfalls of Identity." In *Cultural Studies and Communications*. Ed. James Curran, David Morley, and Valerie Walkerdine. London and New York: Arnold, 1996. 35-49.
- Green, Michael. "The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies." In *What Is Cultural Studies? A Reader*. Eds. John Storey. London and New York: Arnold, 1996. 49-60.
- . "Working Practices." In *Cultural Methodologies*. Ed. Jim McGuigan. London: Sage, 1997. 193-209.

- Grossberg, Lawrence. *We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Conservatism and Postmodern Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.
- . "The Formations of Cultural Studies: An American in Birmingham." In *Relocating Cultural Studies: Developments in Theory and Research*. Ed. Valda Blundell, John Shepherd, and Ian Taylor. London and New York: Routledge, 1993. 21-66.
- Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Studies and the Centre: Some Problematics and Problems." In *Culture, Media, Language*. Ed. Stuart Hall et al. London and New York: Routledge, 1980 15-47.
- . "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms." *Media, Culture and Society* 2 (1980): 57-72.
- . "Cultural Studies and Its Theoretical Legacies." In *Cultural Studies*. Ed. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula A. Treichler. New York: Routledge, 1992. 277-86.
- . "The Formation of a Diasporic Intellectual: An Interview with Stuart Hall by Kuan-Hsing Chen." In *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. Ed. David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. 484-503.
- Hoggart, Richard. *Speaking to Each Other: Essays by Richard Hoggart*, Vol. II, *About Literature*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1970.
- Johnson, Lesley. *The Cultural Critics: From Matthew Arnold to Raymond Williams*. London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Johnson, Richard. "What Is Cultural Studies Anyway?" *Stencilled Occasional Paper*. Birmingham: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, U of Birmingham, 1983.
- Lee, Benjamin. "Between Nations and Disciplines." In *Disciplinary and Dissent in Cultural Studies*. Ed. Cary Nelson and Dilip P. Gaonkar. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. 217-33.
- Nelson, Cary. "Always Already Cultural Studies: Academic Conferences and a Manifesto." In *English Studies/Culture Studies: Institutionalizing Dissent*. Ed. Isaiah Smithson and Nancy Ruff. Urbana and Chicago: U of Illinois P, 1994. 191-205.
- O'Connor, Alan. "What Is Transnational Cultural Studies?" *Bor-*

*der/Lines* 29/30 (1993): 46-49.

Sparks, Colin. "The Evolution of Cultural Studies . . . ." In *What Is Cultural Studies? A Reader*. Ed. John Storey. London and New York: Arnold, 1996. 14-30.

Stratton, Jon, and Ien Ang. "On the Impossibility of a Global Cultural Studies: 'British' Cultural Studies in an 'International' Frame." In *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. Ed. David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. 361-91.

Wright, Handel K. "Dare We De-centre Birmingham? Troubling the 'Origin' and the Trajectories of Cultural Studies." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 1.1 (1998): 33-56.