

[0:00:00]

Kieran Connell: So what I was going to ask first of all was about kind of the brand that the Centre has kind of become, this notion of a brand new school. You know, it's almost become, you know, like a brand that's recognised in certain circles anyway, like internationally. Were you aware of that reputation when you were there in the late '70s, is that something that students were kind of engaged with?

Paul Gilroy: I think that... I don't like to discuss this question under the heading of a 'brand' because it seems to me the idea of branding is one of the most sort of early and significant and perhaps pernicious signatures of a certain kind of neoliberal style of thought and... At least that's how it seems to me. Did the Centre have a reputation? It had a reputation, yes. I don't think that's the same as a brand. It had a reputation because of the reach of some its key working papers and journals, you know, particularly *Resistance Through Rituals*, and I suppose if it had a kind of reputation it was for a certain kind of openness and a certain sort of leftism. Now, I have to qualify that very carefully because it was clear that the people involved were, as far as I could tell from the outside, not necessarily very sympathetic to the versions of leftism I found the most stimulating or relevant to the situation we're in but it did have a reputation for being a place where people could do left oriented work. When I was trying to decide what to do when I finished my... I was finishing my undergraduate degree and I went to see some of my teachers to help ... and I said to them, "I want to go and study," and I was thinking of going to Birmingham, and one of them, who's now dead, she sort of exploded and said, "Oh God, you don't want to go there!" you know, "If you want to do anything serious don't go near that place. Actually, what you should do is you should go to Essex," because, you know, Peter Hulme and these other people, Francis Barker, you know, they were doing the most amazing work in each department and those annual conferences and again, it was an opportunity to do the Sociology of Literature which is what I was trying to do, to do work in that area in an internationally rigorous but also a practical(?) engaged way. That was my best bet. So I think that reputation wasn't straightforward in the sense that there were many people who were very hostile actually to what it represented even then; before it became anything in the world there was as lot of antipathy to what was imagined to be going on there. Of course I'm the kind of person that, for my own sins really, you know, if someone tells me not to do something I would generally try to do it, or at least to explore it sufficiently to find out why it's thought not to be a good idea. And because I had friends in Birmingham and I had been in Handsworth and I knew other things that were going on there, I just thought, "That actually works quite well for me," and I was very excited about it. So it was forbidden...which increases its allure.

Kieran Connell: Following on from that, I mean, so it had a political reputation?

Paul Gilroy: Yes, but not... Let's remember... I mean, I am a very sectarian, you know, ultra left person, I suppose, according to (inaudible 00:03:52) whether that has any value now or had any value then I don't know, certainly at that time. You know, I would say, you know, it had a reputation for being left wing and the left wing it was... wasn't very left wing at all, you know, it was what we then used to call kind of broad left, which means you know it was sort of CP... The CP was the dominant... the Communist Party was the dominant Labour Party derived party, a sort of overlap, that's where the leftism was. And, you know, obviously there were individuals who were outside of that but the consensus if there was one if you could identify it was in that sort of area.

Kieran Connell: I mean, how informed was... I mean intellectually speaking... you know, your interview with Hudson, you talked about, you know, you and Mark and others kind of establishing the Race Group, how important was the previous work of the Centre, kind of the previous canons, if you like, for want of a better word... like you know like you mentioned *Policing The Crisis*, did that have... did the students situate themselves against the previous work that had been done?

Paul Gilroy: Well no, I mean, actually, you know, we were there... I was there at the time when that book was published and of course I'd heard Stuart talking about it before it was published so, no, that was very exciting and I think everybody knew... you know, obviously it's an uneven sprawling book and it has the imprint of its different authors, much more than anyone's ever... but I think we knew immediately

that this was an incredible example actually, incredibly important example, and I don't think... I mean, there are things one can say particularly about the book, as there are about any book, you know, I mean, I myself, you know, was never anything but inspired and impressed by what I found in *Policing The Crisis* and I am still inspired by what I find in there now. So, no, there was no sense of negativity there. I think obviously anybody who works on race in any place in higher education, anyone who thinks about race in any place in higher education is going to be dismissed, and there were a lot of people... Again, it doesn't bother me because it's what I would expect to happen, it's nothing unique. I think there were a lot of people there for whom our interests in that field were not thought to be serious or important, who couldn't see, you know, the value of work like that and... I mean, I'd like to think in some ways that they've probably had to face that in the time since, and I don't know, I mean, you know... I mean, even Stuart I think would've said, you know... I mean, he's obviously, he's an immigrant, you know, I'm not... I remember reading some interview with him somewhere – I can't remember where it was – where he said, you know, "I couldn't care less whether there's black people (inaudible 00:06:40)". So that's fine. You know. So I think I... you know, I've been... in the previous years I've been very involved with *Rock Against Racism*, I'd been writing contemporary recordings, I've been involved with that, and it seemed to be that what was going on there... and I still look back on that as a very interesting example of how the left in this country asked a question of culture and answered it in a way that's actually been very important. I mean, it's only begun very recently to be undone, you know, it's still quite hard to be cool to be a racist in Britain, you know, and the mystery of how that came about is something that needs to be learned carefully really.

[00:07:22]

So I was coming into these questions about culture and questions about the left on culture, you know, having been part of all of that, and I'm not saying that anyone designed it or whatever, it wasn't something... you know, there are people who claim that they did, I'm not going to dispute that with them, but for me that was invigorating and it prompted in me a certain angle, a perspective on the relationship between national identity, racial politics broadly conceived, memory, culture, music, youth, social movements and things like that. So I was coming into it with those things in my head. And, again, I don't think people were very accepting that that was anything much to do with politics. The other person who was like that and had been in the Centre for a little while who I really got to know very well during that time and who I miss terribly and really was very fond of - in many ways quite a damaged person for interesting reasons - is Martin Culverwell, and Martin obviously is, you know, an entrepreneur. Martin had been involved with *Rock Against Racism* in Birmingham actually the year before I got there and was trying to set up record labels and work with the punk sort of palette, do a bit of painting with the punk palette. And of course Martin had been hit over the head at Lewisham by a member of the Special Patrol Group and if you look in Sir David McNee's autobiography – I can't remember the name of it – but he used to write all the top cops used to write their own autobiography. There's a moment where he's going round the hospital trying to... what's the word... commiserate with those police officers who'd been injured in the riot in Lewisham in 1977 and he goes to Martin's bedside and realises that he's actually talking to... Martin had a fractured skull. He thought... he was a Blair Peach that didn't die at that point. McNee describes this sort of horror at realising he's talking to a demonstrator, and one of the first conversations I had with Martin was about his version of that encounter in hospital. So Martin, you know, I don't know if he had been in the IMG or at what point he left it if he had been, but Martin and I used to travel on the bus to and fro. And he was someone who, you know, looked at those questions in a way that was connected, that could be very easily connected to the way that I was looking at them, so that was nice to have him there.

Kieran Connell: So all that kind of scene then was taking place in London before you were in London then in Birmingham what Martin was doing like against racism, all fed into the concerns that the University had?

Paul Gilroy: Absolutely, yeah. I wouldn't say it was straightforward or easy, that it fitted easily, you know, and there are, you know, generational questions and there are questions of political style there, and there are also questions of political ideology there. You know. I mean, I despised the broad left people, I hated being in the Communist Party, I still have... You know, I find some of the things that they said and did very hard to forgive, I do. You know, a lot of people found *Marxism Today* to be wonderfully stimulating and important. I remember the moment they all started wearing lipstick, you know, and

talking about consumerism, I mean, to me it was death and I thought it was boring. So, you know, one person's leftism is another person's void.

[00:10:59]

Kieran Connell: And I wanted to ask you about the relationship between the Centre and the University of Birmingham. The first thing I was going to ask is, to what extent do you think that strained relationship contributed to its... the sense of a growing kind of reputation externally and internally?

Paul Gilroy: What, you mean the idea that because the Centre had a sort of adversarial relationship to its umbrella institution that would have made it seem more of a rebel and therefore more exciting? Well I suppose... I mean, that may well be true. I mean, I wonder how widely the sense of an adversarial relationship between the Centre and the University, how widely that knowledge would've been known, I rather doubt that it was publicly known. Perhaps after Champagne, which is one place where that, thanks to the energies of Larry, you know, that what you call 'brand identity' began to be identifiable on an American horizon. Perhaps after that that became known. Because, again, I can't remember where these things are and I seem to remember Stuart sort of talking about that in a bit of the talk he gave which is in *October* or something like that, something like that.

Kieran Connell: Yeah, that's an American journal.

Paul Gilroy: I think where I first became aware of this international enthusiasm for or appreciation of what had been possibly known was not in my dealings with American academics at all actually, it was in my dealings with northern European academics and Germans and Danes and... you know. I don't know if you've talked to people like that. Michael Bomas has died, unfortunately, the German student who was there the first year I was there, he went on to become a very distinguished professor in Germany, but there were other people who were coming from... as visitors passing through there was a kind of connection with people in Denmark.

Kieran Connell: Yeah, Russ Gilder(?), wasn't it?

Paul Gilroy: It was Russ Gilder(?). There was that sense of actually suddenly realising that this thing you took a bit for granted that was very much generated out of the, you know, soil of Birmingham was something that actually corresponded to the way that people in other parts of Europe were beginning to do their work, beginning to want to do their work. And so I think that's where I first became aware of it. I know Angela went to... didn't she go to Aarhus or something?

Kieran Connell: There was two, wasn't there? (Overspeaking).

Paul Gilroy: The second year that I was there I think Angela was my best friend in that time, apart from Bob, you know. She went off to Aarhus. So I began to think oh well, actually so there's... It never occurred to me that there might be any sense of a wider public for this kind of work until that point. And then of course, you know, when I very first turned up there in 1978, you go into your initial session and nervously, you know, and you realise that there's sort of Americans in the room, you know, there was Michael and a guy called Adam, who also is a very distinguished American academic now he teaches at Boston University or somewhere like that. So there was Michael and there was Adam and obviously (Inaudible 00:14:07) from Sussex and... I'm trying to think who else. There were other people who were coming from other places and you began to think, "Oh well maybe actually, maybe these conversations have reached out". And then I began to wonder well what was that, what were the things that corresponded to my enthusiasm and my passions intellectually and my curiosity, were they the same sorts of things? And I don't think they were actually, I think that there was more... Because I don't really think of myself as a theory head, you know, and I think that there was that around, there was that, you know, sophistication of a certain articulation of Marxism that was quite specific.

Kieran Connell: Mm. The notion of... I know that there was an emphasis placed on being rigorous, I know Tricia talked about rigamortis, that kind of, that... the kind of... you say like 'theory head', that focus on being, you know, Althusserian theoretically rigorous or...

[00:15:07]

Paul Gilroy: Well the thing about the Althusserian moment was that actually, even though I was part of it, I didn't agree with some of its theoretical underpinnings because I never bought the idea – and I never ever did buy this idea, I think it's something Bob and I agreed upon – that the theory of reification in capital is different in kind to the theory of alienation in early manuscripts, the ones that the Althusserians wanted to dismiss as the sort of humanistic anthropology of Marx. You know. So because I was... I'd been taught by people like (Inaudible 00:15:41) and Gillian Rose and whatever who were the people who worked from Marx in a different way and didn't necessarily accept that the sort of Platonist Scientism that one discovers in what one, you know, French intellectual who went on to become a complete traitor described as 'ventriloquist structuralism'. But that was something that was appealing, that notion of scientific Marxism. And of course, you know, these were things – as I said, I was sectarian – these were the things that made me sectarian. You know, I was interested in... You know, Timpanaro had written a book about some of this, others had... you know, there was a critique of western Marxism underway in the world, you know, and there are ways of reading things like the efflorescence of the post colonial intelligence as being either part of that or against it. And so those are the things that were sort of on my mind, you know. I mean, I'd wanted to find... I suppose putting it really crudely, I wanted to find a frequency on which I could understand the relationship between Fanon and Gramsci. You know. And I'm still doing that. (Laughs) I haven't finished that work, I'm still doing that. And the humanism that connects these writers is part of that conversation. I mean, another person you should try and reach out to, I would say, and it would be very interesting to know what they would say about it, is Mohammed Asrura(?).

Kieran Connell: Believe it or not, I've tracked him down.

Paul Gilroy: Yeah, he's easy to find on the... and the internet is your friend.

Kieran Connell: Yeah, Facebook is just... I wouldn't know what to do without it... it was on Facebook, yeah.

Paul Gilroy: Well Mohammed... I remember when Mohammed arrived in Birmingham brandishing a copy of Orientalism and... you know. And I think... So Edward, of course, who we didn't read in the Centre, you know, because that was too far off the map as a lit crit thing... maybe it should stay there, I don't know, but things were moving around an awful lot. Edward is someone who helps you to tune into the frequency you need to understand the relationship between Fanon and Gramsci. So that's a kind of incidence of where... I mean, you know, we didn't really read... There was a lot of stuff we didn't read in those... absolutely wonderful intellectual mappings of the world of... intellectual world of the Centre. I suppose I... and I got there, I wasn't just thinking about it, I was intoxicated by Adorno at that time. So I was always a bit... I was a bit sort of frustrated with the version of the critical theory that was part of the intellectual conversation because I mean I think I felt that in some senses that was a bit underplayed somehow... significantly some aspects of that were underplayed.

Kieran Connell: I mean, you've talked a bit, I mean again in Hudson's interview about obviously the ethos of the Centre was not to have a traditional relationship between postgrads and staff members. There were only three full-time members of staff anyway at any given point and I know students sat on a admissions boards –

Paul Gilroy: That's another thing (overspeaking).

Kieran Connell: No, I think that's quite (overspeaking) -

Paul Gilroy: I just felt enough bloody time had gone by. I mean, I know I shouldn't really have taken that task on but I just felt like... you might as well be, you know, damned for what you actually did. You know. (Laughs)

Kieran Connell: (Laughs) Well what I was going to ask was, in light of all thought, though, how important were the staff, in particular how important was Stuart above all?

Paul Gilroy: Well that's a very interesting and very hard question. I think... How important were the staff? Gosh. The people that really helped me, as I've said repeatedly, were the older PhD students like Hazel and Research Fellows like John Clarke and... oh, and I should mention Dorothy Hobson to you because she was very helpful and important Research Fellow. So those were the people that helped me in many ways. I was a bit frightened of Stuart, you know, to be honest, I mean, he had a lot of authority, and even though he always... I think I began to see how involved he was in dismantling the plinth on which he was placed. He was always... He would be on the plinth trying to dismantle it and other people would be trying to build it up. You know. So it's an interesting sort of thing but, again, you don't... I was new to it so I didn't see all of that instantly. And Michael... Michael, I always felt Michael... Michael did the admissions and managed all that sort of thing, that was really important. And Richard was a very faithful, very acute and very fastidious supervisor of these actually, so I think... you know. And I don't want to play down the contribution of Richard and Michael's teachings because obviously they took us through a lot of stuff too. So I would actually say that, oddly, although it's only one dynamic of many, I would say that the role of the staff was important and that they were very present and very energetic in their commitment to the project even though you could see it was complicated.

[00:21:09]

Kieran Connell: And, given that they... you know, the students were given this support, had this kind of degree of input to, you know, the running of the department and the intellectual progression of the department at the Centre, did the students also have an input in the relationship between the Centre and the University, or were you aware as students, of how fraught relationships got?

Paul Gilroy: No, I think one of the things that they did, I guess I would say having now been in a department in (inaudible 00:21:36) of that sort of thing in a couple of places, is that they probably acted as a buffer and absorbed all that shit, frankly, and, you know, thank you to all of them for doing that, because actually if they hadn't done that, if they'd transmitted it to us, we would have all been distracted. And I imagine now, looking back, I think probably Stuart did a lot of that. And the only place where you would occasionally get a window into it was in the general meeting, you know, the... and, again, my experiences of that were difficult because there were some people who wanted it to be more of a corporate body than others and of course that's where the political differences came out and where probably, you know, it would've been very difficult to formalise or reconcile the contending claims of sort of intellectual integrity or projects... I don't think they really managed very well... on that basis.

Kieran Connell: I mean, one of the things that I've come across in Richard's archive is some discussion between the Race Group and Richard about the protests about the raising of overseas students fees. Was that one area where you as students did have a relationship with the wider University in the sense that you were protesting against the –

Paul Gilroy: I mean, that wasn't something that was universally shared by people in the Centre and I put that down to the CP broad left labourist sort of orientation of people, you know, that they felt – as many still do from that quarter that students should be making a contribution and they didn't see it as part of the sort of, you know question of post-colonial political culture. So I remember my feelings about it but I don't remember the detail of those exchanges, and actually it was one of a couple of things that were going on around that time. I mean, remember that this is the... we're talking, I think, about the Spring of 1979, I mean, and that's the moment of Southall and of the run-up to the election when there was rioting in Islington which I guess I was part of and, you know, and... I think there was rioting in Birmingham actually, (overspeaking).

Kieran Connell: The one in '81. (Overspeaking).

Paul Gilroy: Yeah, there was a... '81 there was a big one but wasn't there a National Front –

Kieran Connell: Yeah, there was, yeah.

Paul Gilroy: - thing in a school in (overspeaking) Ladywood somewhere and... Yeah, I mean, there are things I would want to say about that but I can't say on the tape. So there were a number of these things going on and there was an argument about, you know, what the politics of racism and the politics of Little England is and the politics of national identity it was turning into in that moment and of course with that Rock Against Racism mentality and you see those things as maybe more important than some other people might have done. So there were a number of things going on at that particular moment that made it difficult and it was a little bit frustrating, but then, you know, I didn't... I guess, although I felt obliged to be part of the discussion of these things in the body of the Centre, you know, I didn't go away saddened because, you know, there were other places where one could seek comradeship and other vehicles for doing political work, it wasn't like that had to be the only one, so I think... And, you know, obviously Bob was still I think in the IMG at that time, you know, I was involved in various things, and some of the other people in the group were also, you know, doing things on the ground. Valerie was very involved with her (Inaudible 00:25:39) Housing Association. You know, there are a whole range of things that were going on that we were involved in in different ways so it wasn't like, "Oh, well we've got to rouse the Centre". You know.

[00:25:50]

Kieran Connell: There was talk at one point of having the Centre Political Party, I believe.

Paul Gilroy: Really?

Kieran Connell: (Overspeaking).

Paul Gilroy: Well, I mean, I do think that there were one or two people who wanted it to behave as though it might have been, and then there were one or two people who wanted to caricature the critique that was made by those people as though that is what they were asking for. So that's how I'd put it.

Kieran Connell: Okay.

Paul Gilroy: There was irony on both sides.

Kieran Connell: (Laughs) And, I mean, you've talked before about like the absence of a sort of what you might call today 'careerism' amongst a lot of people and that's one of the things that comes out from the people I've spoken to as well, it wasn't really... for various reasons, people didn't see the work that they were doing as (overspeaking) –

Paul Gilroy: (Overspeaking).

Kieran Connell: Yeah.

Paul Gilroy: No, that's right.

Kieran Connell: But what I find puzzling about it and want to ask about is about... so what's the motivation behind like the kind of prolific output in, you know, stencilled papers, working papers in Cultural Studies, the book contract with Hutchinson? Was that –

Paul Gilroy: The motivation (overspeaking)?

Kieran Connell: Yeah, was that like just a belief, a naive almost belief in the kind of importance of academic work that was going on...? You know. Because from the perspective today, the New Right settlement that I'm a product of, you know, it seems like a different time in that respect.

Paul Gilroy: Well I think that's a very interesting question actually, it's not one I'd have thought of myself. I mean, maybe there were people who were ambitious and wanted to be academics. I mean, you hear stories retrospectively about people who say, "I want to be a professor, I want to be a famous professor." You didn't want to be famous, you never thought to have that kind of career, there were lots of other things you could have done. You know. So that's the first thing. And I think... Naive? Well, maybe naive but, I mean, I suppose I... One of the things that working with race teaches you, I

think, is that it's not really about having the best epistemology, you know, but actually there are areas of what you want to do, critically speaking, that require a good enough epistemology, but you learn quite quickly that just by having the best explanation and the best command of the data and the best command of the facts and different arguments you don't win because it's not really about that, it's not about... It's not about the world that emerges from your epistemology, it's about producing the world politically. So, you know, you can have the best argument and you can command the best information and the best technology but you won't win because it's not really about that, it's about... you're dealing with something that's about producing the world in a certain shape and... explaining it. And maybe, you know, it took me a while to work that out, you know, although... And maybe some people still haven't worked that out yet, I don't know. (Laughing) So what motivates you? I suppose the truth, the idea that the truth somehow, you know, has consequences. You know, one of the things about the interview with technological revolution is that the politics of ignorance has been altered by the way information and power are mediated. So I think it was in a sense a simpler way of understanding those problems because you thought that when you put the truth out there you could make a difference. And I remember when *Policing The Crisis* came out watching Stuart on maybe one of the London local news things being interviewed about mugging, you know, and thinking to myself, "Okay, you can get into that space if you want to get into it by doing critical work and speaking with authority and clarity about these questions". So I'm not sure that it was naive really, I think it just corresponded to a world that was somewhat simpler than the one we have now. And obviously in the time that I was there there were people like Roger and Rob Berkeley who were sort of very involved in the discussion around the setting up of Channel 4, you know, so I would say that in terms of the politics of the work, things like the discussion around Channel 4 and advocacy, alternative space and information that was being won through that initiative, was something again that evaporated quite quickly. That's the sort of context in which we want to see those aspirations to truth and the power of truth and the power of critique. You know, I mean, a lot of academics now, you know, the critique is past its sell-by date. I guess I don't really...

[00:30:41]

Kieran Connell: And I was going to ask you about the kind of ironies around the project that I'm involved in, quite deep ironies in the sense that, you know, there's a (inaudible 00:30:50), there's the archive, or an archive, not *the* archive but *an* archive of material relating to CCCS is now housed at the University, the very place that closed the Centre down. What are your kind of feelings on the politics of that?

Paul Gilroy: Well I think that allowing the University to control the archive is the equivalent of that... actually, and, you know, I get... I mean, I know that there are small amounts of money involved in this but I tried when it became something that I was able to speak about... to say, the independence of the archive is more important to me in the context of thinking about the politics of that history. So I tried to argue that it would be much better to spend a bit of time to try and seek independent resources for scanning and cataloguing and placing that archive (inaudible 00:31:55) as a free thing. And there are lots of places that could do that without having to go through the University of Birmingham as a provider. Well others didn't see it that way and that's fine, but I think that's a misreading of the likely trajectory of education and of the University of Birmingham and... you know, if people feel that there are enough safeguards in place to do that, that's fine, but for me, you know, I guess I'm a little bit reluctant to concede the control of any of this to that (inaudible 00:32:30).

Kieran Connell: Through the bitter question of like authorship or ownership or, you know, the story of... how do you kind of write or come to the histories of the Centre, you know, what are your kind of thoughts on that in terms of the ownership of stories and how they would manifest in terms of the trajectory of the Centre?

Paul Gilroy: Well we don't really have a history of the Left in this country at that time, you know, so I'm sure there'll be people who will want to write a history. It's there in some of the memoirs I think that have been written. I suppose there's no surprises, mostly the memoirs were written by feminists, you know, people like Elizabeth Wilson Lynne Segal, I mean she goes back as one of the external examiners for the Centre. I haven't trawled through all these memoirs but it just seems to me there's an identifiable body of autobiographical reflection on that time and I hope that in due course that will be open to a different kind of historical scrutiny, in the same way it has taken a long time, and very often requires outsiders to do this, to write the histories of the New Left impression, maybe

the same sort of process will happen. I don't know if there's any American PhDs written about all this, you know, that's not really what I'm talking about, you know, about... history, seeing these things as interesting and where that threshold actually does fall, you know, when things become historical and the present ends, that sort of question. Ownership? Well to me it's a case study, you know, it's a case study of a number of interesting tendencies in the story of the last 50 years of the 20th century and the demise, the destruction of the university in Britain, that sort of long impact of that neoliberal reform of... the regressive modernisation of the university, that's what the story...the defeat of the leftism...

[00:34:46]

Kieran Connell: Mm. And just quickly, and I know you must be really busy, but just finally, you talk a lot about...the phrase that stood out in your interview with Hudson, you talked about the fantasy version of Birmingham and there does seem like a sense of the nostalgia kind of creeping in about the Centre and I suppose our project would be a big contributor towards that, you know –

Paul Gilroy: ...it wouldn't be.

Kieran Connell: But, I mean, what I was going to ask was, you know, given the kind of events that will happen next year around the 50th Anniversary, what do you think are the dangers of this fantasy version of Birmingham becoming the predominant narrative?

Paul Gilroy: I wouldn't worry about that. I really... I mean, I used to think... That interview was done a couple of years ago and there was still a moment where you would sometimes go somewhere and give a talk and people would say, "Oh The Birmingham School, blah, blah, blah," or whatever, and I suppose that's what I mean about the fantasy version actually, that it excludes... I am a romantic so I don't... you know, I'm not against fantasy, I just... I worry a little bit where people project... where the fantasies that they develop are sort of inversions of their own immediate defeat, you know, and where... Because we can't find our way back to that until we set up our own universities actually. I mean, for me the future is really about setting up our own universities and thinking about what a free education involves. I'm sure that there are things in that archive, things in that history, which will foster and nurture those possibilities, and that's the thing I'm kind of committed to, and that's why I suppose I feel a little bit uncomfortable about giving it back to the University of Birmingham. But I don't blame anybody for not being able to know because I think probably not everyone understands what's going on technologically right now...you know they... they might, not everybody understands. I mean, Stuart, for example, was very hostile to the internet, you know, and I don't... I'm hostile to it too but I know that there are things that it can yield for us, unfortunately, and... So I think we have to try to use it. I mean, it's a bit like you said initially actually, I need to learn how to do the case studies (overspeaking), which is a bit of trial for me even though... you know, I'm trying to think if I'd used it before making leaflets and things, probably had. But I remember, you know, bumping very rapidly to - because there was no photocopier - bumping very rapidly into Stuart's sort of line about learning to use Gestetner machine as a tool. You know. And I feel like that probably about the internet. (Laughs)

Kieran Connell: Thanks very much. I'll turn this off.

[End of transcript]