

[0:00:00]

Interviewer: I mean, I was going to ask first really just how you ended up here at the centre in the first instance, in was it 1979?

Respondent: '79, I started the MA programme. I'd been very aware of the Centre's work for some years: the Working Papers on popular culture, the more theoretical volume *On Ideology* and, I think, *Policing the Crisis* was already out by then. So I went there primarily because I got very interested in all the research they were doing.

Interviewer: What was your undergraduate degree in?

Respondent: I studied English literature but I probably spent half my time reading history and historical sociology. I was tutored partially by Terry Eagleton, so I was pretty familiar with Marxist aesthetics and Marxist literary criticism, so that was one way I got into cultural theory. But, you know, I was of that generation where if you were on the left you read a lot of Marxist classics so I was pretty immersed in the literature on historical materialism and socialist political theory generally as well as the literary theory. *New Left Review* was a very influential journal at that time and I was following their debates pretty closely.

Interviewer: What was the appeal of the Centre?

Respondent: I liked the multi-disciplinary approach to research there, it fitted well with my own quite eclectic intellectual interests. I was also impressed by the combination of political activism and intellectual work at the Centre. That was very appealing. Plus their collaborative approach to research and writing, with the great series of Working Papers which CCCS produced. Stuart Hall himself was a big influence – not only his writings but also the various public lectures he was giving throughout that period. He was always a very eloquent speaker, of course, but it was the way he could engage with his audience and address their concerns, drawing them into his argument, which was quite remarkable. He always had an extraordinary gift for synthesis, bringing together different ideas and arguments, testing them against each other and working up something new out of them as he spoke. I used to hear him a lot at that time, and through the early 1980s, at the Communist University of London and then with the Great Moving Right Show and the various Marxism Today events which were held at the Institute of Education where I did my teacher training and still work. Stuart's lectures were so popular they had to relay them to different lecture rooms so everyone could hear, but you needed to see him in person really, because it was a whole performance. Sometimes he would stage a debate playing several parts in an argument at once. He appealed to very broad sections of the Left, which was unusual for academics at the time, when the left was often quite splintered. And, of course, he came to have a very wide political influence, particularly in his collaboration with Martin Jacques and Eric Hobsbawm and others in the Marxism Today interventions on Thatcherism and the fate of the Left. Hobsbawm was another huge influence on me, although I never met him sadly. But I became quite involved in those debates and came to write a few things for Marxism Today later.

Interviewer: So were you formally attached to any political party at the time...?

Respondent: I did join the Labour Party later, for a brief period, but I was more of a fellow travelling Euro Communist in the late seventies. The Communist Party had become quite broad by that time, and the Euro Communist wing – exemplified by Marxism Today I suppose - brought quite a lot of people on the Left together and seemed rather more grounded than a lot of the far left groups. But I was also involved various broad fronts organised by other groups – like the Right to Work movement and the Rank and File caucuses within NATHFE in London, where I was active in the London branch and in my college. I was also involved in the anti-racist movement, and did quite a lot organising in the mid to late seventies for the Anti-Nazi League and for Rock against Racism events and things like that. So these political interests, as well as my research interests, both drew me towards the Centre. I was teaching part-time in various further education colleges and adult institutes and decided to combine that with doing my MA in Birmingham.

Interviewer: What was the atmosphere like and did it match with your awareness of the Centre from reading the kind of stuff coming out? Did it meet your expectations?

Respondent: Oh yes, absolutely (laughs). I would say intellectually it was one of the most exciting environments I've been in. It was quite an extraordinary place at that time, it was so dynamic, there were so many ideas flying around. People were very committed intellectually and most of them politically as well, it was just a very, very serious set of projects they'd got going there. And, as well as Stuart and Richard Johnson, they had some very talented and creative people there at the time, all of them engaged in very public and intense debates about the future of the left, the nature of the state, the women's movement and feminism and so on.

Interviewer: What was the structure of the MA like when you were there? When you had these sessions with Stuart [Hall] were they the theory?

Respondent: Yes, Stuart did the theory course and Richard a parallel course which engaged with similar theories and debates, but through a series of historical case studies and with more empirical depth. The combination worked very well. Stuart's sessions followed a quite traditional pedagogy in a way. We'd go up there for these three hour sessions, I suppose they were two or three hours, and for at least two hours Stuart was just talking (laughs), everybody would be listening, totally riveted. There was some quite lively discussion afterwards, but it was really a lecture and discussion model. Richard's sessions were a bit different, as I remember. He set up the discussions and they would proceed in a more dialogic way. There were more presentations from students I think. Michael [Green] taught some classes as well, although not as much, or I didn't do the things he taught, I can't remember. The main thing though was the, kind of, duo between Stuart and Richard. It was an introduction, really, to theoretical and qualitative social science – with no quantitative dimension at all - primarily sociology, anthropology, social history and political theory, but through to, you know, modern cultural studies and all the debates about ideology and post-structuralism which were raging then. Stuart was doing the, kind of, intellectual traditions and it was incredibly wide ranging and he'd just weave it all together, it was extraordinary. Richard did certain key episodes from more of a social historical point of view and they were more substantive empirically. As I remember it, he was concentrating on particular historical episodes, more UK focused, and exploring some of the theories of historical development through particular critical case studies. We did a lot of work of the 1930s and cultural movements then – Mass Observation and writers on the Left and so on. It was Richard who introduced me to Edward Thompson's work and the great comparative historical sociologists like Barrington Moore and Perry Anderson who had a great influence on my later work. The debates between Thompson and Anderson - about the nature of the British state and British historical development – were a centre piece, but it also broadened out into wider theoretical debates on the nature of ideology, theories of history and epistemology.

Interviewer: How did the sub-groups or the reading groups fit in with that? What was the atmosphere like in them compared to the atmosphere in where Stuart or Richard taught courses?

Respondent: Well, they ran in parallel and they were quite different because the core of those writing groups was more senior researchers who were either doing their PhDs or had finished their PhDs, so you had a mixture of those people, some MA students, and the staff as well. There here six or seven people, typically, something like that. I was a member of the history group which included Richard, and various people who were doing their PhDs, like Gregor [McLennan] who was doing his PhD on Marxist historical methodologies, Bill [Schwartz] had probably done his PhD by then. Richard, Bill and Greg were the key ones in the history group. A lot of the work we did in that group was incredibly intense exploration of these, you know, theoretical debates around historical materialism and history, history writing. And so it was quite abstract stuff and quite difficult, but it was, well, it was fascinating, and it was also very good training because, you know, they really went into huge depth. So, what were the kind of debates we were looking at? Well, probably one of the biggest raging at that time was the Althusser versus Edward Thompson polemic, which Richard was very involved with, and that had ramifications for your whole perspective on historical materialism and historical methods. So we spent hours and hours discussing those sort of things.

Interviewer: What was your personal, kind of, relationship with that? Would you...?

Respondent: I think I was probably more sympathetic to Thompson's position on it. Well, I'd read Althusser, of course, and he was very dominant as a theorist at that time. Althusser and various structuralist and post-structuralist Marxists were extremely dominant within Marxist sociological circles. I was fairly sceptical of Althusser himself and his writings all seemed a bit crudely reductionist to me, but that's not to say I wasn't seriously interested in some of the theoretical work around that. But I was more historically oriented. I was more interested in Gramsci as a theorist – he seemed more historically grounded and rather more subtle in his arguments than Althusser and the likes.

Interviewer: Did you feel like, as a Masters student at that point, '79, '80, whatever, did you feel that you had ownership of the cultural studies project? Or did you see it as being Stuart, Richard and Michael's cultural studies project?

Respondent: No. Well, we were, you know, at that stage we were fairly junior in it all, but you could become, yes, you could become pretty central to it quite quickly. So, you know, the race and politics group, for instance, was led by people who would have just done their MAs or doing their MAs, as I was at the time, or just in their middle of their PhDs, so I there weren't any staff involved. Stuart didn't get involved in that at all. So that was led by MA and Masters and doctoral students, I suppose, but it produced a book in the end. The history group was more dominated by the, kind of, longer standing doctoral students, along with Richard. But it was very open in the sense that you were welcome to contribute if you had something to say and had read the stuff, and everyone was just grappling with the ideas and debates anyway. Richard always had a very collaborative way of working and was always encouraging to people, genuinely working his way through the ideas with them. I'm not sure about the other groups, but could you take a central role? Yes, you certainly could do, and quite a lot of people did, probably in the other groups as well, although I'm less familiar with what other groups were running at that time.

Interviewer: What was the process of collaboration like in practice, and what would you say were the benefits and disadvantages of that?

Respondent: Well, it was very intensive discussion, for one thing, at a very high theoretical level in a way that you don't often get in many academic environments nowadays to be honest. And around a set of closely linked projects with a very clear, obviously, political agenda. But also, part of various key theoretical issues which were being debated throughout the, kind of, intellectual left at the time, it was very cohesive in that way. There was a much more confident common discourse on the left then, despite all the political sectarianism. But the Centre also had a, kind of, working practice which was quite distinctive and I think it revolved around co-production of these CCCS Working Papers volumes. So, you know, you were writing together, it was collective writing, or at least collective conception and editing. I was involved in a number of these in the early stages and throughout with the Education Limited book with Richard, which came out a while later. Outside of the natural sciences, these kind of collaborative social science projects very not very common then. I mean, now, you know, you have a large grant to do something and you may have a large number of people involved. This Centre which I'm directing here has got about 15 people involved and we've got funding to do various research projects, but in those days most of the grants were for individual work, as far as I remember, at least in qualitative and theoretical types of social science. So it was quite unusual to have a centre which was based on collaborative working amongst small teams of people, although there were some other examples like Ruskin History workshop and various feminist research groups and so on.

Interviewer: Did it ever get competitive? Not just in terms of the writing, but in terms of, like, you mentioned these seminars with Stuart, in people, was there ever a sense of people jostling for position or was that not so much?

Respondent: Well, I wasn't very aware of it, certainly not in the MA, no, not really.

Interviewer: What's the motivation, because a lot of people I've spoken to, kind of, talked about the absence of a, you know, careerism in the centre in terms of an academic career, you know, it wasn't so much as I

guess it is in many ways now. So what would you say was the motivation behind wanting to write and producing these kinds of publications?

Respondent: Well, for some people it was just to be involved in political intellectual work. They weren't necessarily pursuing an academic career. And then there were people who were clearly stuck into their PhDs and going to make a career like Gregor and Bill Schwartz, and others.

Interviewer: Did you see yourself as being, where were you?

[00:22:04]

Respondent: No, no, I didn't really then, that was the interesting thing, I wasn't very career oriented (laughs), not when I was doing my MA. I had certainly wanted to research and get a lecturing job when I left university but in 1975 there were many jobs – even you had published good book it could be difficult. So I had pretty much given up on that. I was doing the MA out of just a political intellectual commitment and I still thought at that time I was going to be, you know, a college teacher, which I was already doing. After the MA Stuart offered me a scholarship to do a PhD but I didn't take it because I was very into developing my teaching in London. I was really enjoying it, and I didn't want to do any more formal academic work at that point. A few years later though I worked on a book on education with Stuart and Ann Marie Wolpe and others and by that time I had realised that I needed some new challenges and didn't want to stay teaching in the college forever. So I started thinking about doing a PhD. It was a tough decision though because I had a career and a steady income in London and there wasn't much prospect at that time of getting a university job even if you had your phd. It was the late 1970s and things were pretty tough during that period and there were no jobs in academia. I can remember talking to Richard (inaudible 00:25:44) and saying, "Look, I'm thinking about doing PhD, Richard." And Richard said to me, "If you're doing it to get a job, Andy, don't bother." Which was (laughs) slightly discouraging. I was really thinking very seriously about whether I would ever earn a living if I did this. But I spoke to Stuart about it later and he changed my mind. I told him I wasn't sure about it because there weren't any jobs and he just said, "You should do it, Andy, you need to do it spiritually." And that swung it, I did it. And I never regretted it. The fact that I was starting the phd when I was older – around 30 – and with a good deal at stake, just made me more focussed and determined to do it well and write something worthwhile I suppose.

Interviewer: Right, so you came back to Birmingham in, what –

Respondent: I went back and started the PhD in, probably, 84 while continuing with my college lecturing job which was full-time by then.

Interviewer: In London, in (overspeaking 00:27:16).

[00:27:16]

Respondent: Yes, I was working in Lewisham College, teaching basic numeracy and literacy to adults and sociology A level evening class students. So I had to do the PhD whilst working full time, I didn't do it under Stuart's supervision, I did it with Richard.

Interviewer: Stuart, of course, left to join the Open University.

Respondent: Yes. So, I went there to work with Richard who was a historian of education originally, and my topic was about education and state formation in the 19<sup>th</sup> century so he was the right one to supervise it. I did the PhD part time whilst doing a full time job in FE for three years and then for the last year I got an ESRC scholarship and I was able to give up my job in Lewisham, or largely give it up, and just survive on credit and a small scholarship. I did it in four years in the end which would have been impossible now to do while working full-time. But then the teaching in FE was a bit easier, I have to

say. A lot of people combined their teaching jobs with other things – writing books or giving Yoga classes or whatever. I just carried on in the last year writing in the day time and teaching my evening classes.

Interviewer: So did the actual, I mean, does cultural studies feed into that?

Respondent: Oh yes, absolutely. So it's quite helpful in that respect.

Interviewer: I mean, quite a few of your cohort, I guess, were doing similar things. I know John Clarke taught –

Respondent: In FE.

Interviewer; He was in FE, so did (inaudible 00:29:22). So in a sense –

Respondent: It wasn't abnormal at all, no, Marilyn was teaching in FE, yes, yes.

Interviewer: So that, kind of, the cultural studies that being learnt at very, very dense level –

Respondent: Was being fed into –

Interviewer: Was being fed into the, kind of, practice in FE colleges (overspeaking 00:29:39).

Respondent: Yes, I'm sure it was. I mean, it was being fed into teaching on more formal courses like A level sociology and the Access courses I was teaching to adult returner students. But also it was feeding into people's political practice, I suppose.

[00:29:57]

Interviewer: I was going to ask you about politics more generally really, about did you see the intellectual worth both on your Master and then your PhD as being connected to the political, kind of, associations, the fellow traveller you had with that, kind of, Euro Communism, kind of...?

Respondent: Yes, it was very connected. I was never party politically active particularly, although I did join the Labour Party for period later. But where I was most active probably in that era was in the anti-racist movement in the late 1970s as I mentioned.

Interviewer: The Anti-Nazi League?

Respondent: Yes, the ANL, were very prominent, particularly in South London where I was living for a lot of the time, so I was very involved in all of that, setting up carnivals in Brixton and obviously (inaudible 00:31:13) demos and campaigns of various sorts. So the work I was doing on, you know, on race in that group fed into that very much. I was also involved in anti-racist educational politics and wrote an article about anti-racist teaching when I was doing my training at the Institute of Education.

Interviewer: Did you help start, did you help, you know, were you there when Paul helped start the race group or was that already there when you arrived at the centre?

Respondent: I was there from the beginning, I think, or near the beginning. I was doing my MA thesis on the political economy of racism. So from 1979 or 1980 and I joined then. I was working very much on that stuff from the beginning of my time in the centre, probably more on that than anything else. When I was training at the Institute as a teacher I was also doing the study parts of the training in that area. So I wrote an article on anti-racist education which was published in Jagdish Gundara's NAME journal in about 1981. It was the first thing I published, which was also, you know, tied in with what I was doing in Birmingham.

Interviewer: So what you're saying is that politics on the outside, like the ANL, Rock Against Racism and all that kind of stuff, directly came in to the interest that you and others had –

Respondent: It all tied together very much. So, you know, I was involved in teaching in multi-cultural classrooms, both young people and adults, so obviously the work on race, multi-culturalism, anti-racism was tying up with that, feeding into that. And then the more activist politics in the community with Rock Against Racism and Anti-Nazi League and so on, it all, it fed into that. And a lot of us at the Centre, we were involved in these movements anyway. So yes, it was all very tightly connected.

Interviewer: And what was the atmosphere within the race and politics group like, I mean, you know, as it went on was it very, very politicised? I mean –

Respondent: It was pretty political from the outset as I remember. It became quite embattled politically towards the end. Some of us, including some of the white members of the group like myself, came out of a broad anti-racist coalition type of politics, I suppose. The left's Black and White Unite and Fight type position. But the political relations between the white left and the black autonomy inclined movements became more strained later and that was reflected to some extent in the politics of the group and created some tensions I suppose. There were also the usual rivalries between individuals trying to establish themselves academically which got tied up with the politics. It led to some rather gratuitously aggressive attacking of some white anti-racist intellectuals, like John Rex and Sally Tomlinson. I don't think this was really leading anywhere politically.

Interviewer: How did that fit into the white, because I mean, in one sense the centre at that time was also a very much a melting pot for, kind of, left wing politics anyway, not just in terms of anti-racist politics but, of course, like, you know, like the Big Flame and IS and all that stuff.

Respondent: Yes, it was very diverse, yes. You had people like Stuart who was to me essentially speaking from a broad euro communist and anti-racist position which was trying to bring a new united vision to the left ...to counter Thatcherism. But there were also a lot of people involved in Trotskyist groups, there was the International Marxist Group which was probably still going by then, the IS was certainly still going, maybe as the SWP by then. A lot of them would have been in those groups. There was a very strong feminist movement there at the time which was growing in strength since, yes, since the '80s, and they had various organisations they were involved in. And I mean, they'd go along fairly well but I'm sure there were tensions, certainly there were tensions around gender politics.

Interviewer: Did you feel that as a man at the centre at the time?

Respondent: I wouldn't say I felt it strongly. I was aware, I think, that Stuart felt it to some extent. He was more associated with the socialist feminist politics of people like Sheila Rowbotham and Hilary Wainwright, if I remember, and probably got some stick from some of the more radical feminists at the Centre. The people who were involved then would tell the story, but I think there was a feeling that the cultural studies of the Paul Willis era was a bit macho and male dominated, which indeed it was in its focus, and this had to be changed, and various feminist academics at the Centre were seeking to do this.

Interviewer: So going back to the centre more broadly, was there any difference between the centre that you experienced as an MA student in 1979 to centre that you, kind of, obviously it's a different experience anyway doing the PhD, but did you note, because obviously Stuart had left by that point and it was Richard Johnson who was the head. Did you not, did you discern a difference in political atmosphere or intellectual atmosphere or did you still see it as very much a similar place?

Respondent: No, I don't think I did actually. So there was at least a two year gap when I wasn't visiting, so I was going back two years later. As you say, in the interim Stuart had left and Richard had taken over as Director. I think Richard carried the thing on in the same way pretty much. Well, I'm sure he made changes of his own, but I mean, the spirit, what was good about the place was still very evident then. It was still extremely vibrant, still very politically committed, extremely productive in the output of books and research papers. I think it was going just fine. I mean, I think the place was, you know the later history better than me, but I think the place was killed off later by the political changes in the academic environment. When I was doing my PhD it was still absolutely booming, no signs of it running into the ground as far as I could see. And, indeed, its reputation, you know, internationally was growing all the time because all these, you know, very talented alumni who were beginning to

establish their careers and they were taking cultural studies all over the world. So, I mean, cultural studies centre were appearing in Denmark and various countries, it was becoming really deeply implanted. So, in a way, the reputation of the place was growing far and wide. And, you know, then individual academics graduating from the Centre were becoming better and better known. So it wasn't just Stuart and Richard, and Paul Willis, you know, there was Ros Brunt, and Greg was publishing and Paul's book came out, all sorts of people published quite major books, John Clarke, who'd done so already. So, yes, by the '80s it was still very well established, I didn't sense that it was in any way running into the ground. Other people may have a different recollection.

[00:46:59]

Interviewer: You didn't have a sense of its, as a student you didn't have a sense of its relationship with the broader university?

Respondent: No, that's very interesting, not at all really. To me the Centre was its own little island in the University, but then I was only visiting once a fortnight from London so I wasn't very aware of any university politics around it. I was registered at the University of Birmingham but, I mean, I didn't have any contact with the of the university anyway. So no, totally unaware of that, so you tell me, when did it start becoming problematic, the relationship between –

Interviewer: I mean, into the, I mean, when Stuart left I think there was increasing pressure for it become to, to stop becoming a centre, which is was, an independent centre, and became a department in 1986 and started to accept undergraduates and do undergraduate courses in cultural studies.

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Which then of course had impact on the, kind of, the tangibility of the project because it became so big.

Respondent: It was doing that already in '86?

Interviewer: No, already, that just started taking undergraduate student some time, a couple of years before then, but '86 it was beginning to be rolled out as a major department in itself. I think from that point onwards –

Respondent: Was this under Jorge Lorraine or still under Richard? When did Richard –

Interviewer: Richard was still there, Richard was there until the early '90s, he left in, I think, '93.

Respondent: He was there that long?

Interviewer: Yes.

Respondent: Okay. Well, then I don't basically know what was going on during that period. I was going up there for a tutorial every couple of months with Richard and just had my head stuck into my PhD. So I didn't meet too many other people probably when I went up there, I was still involved with the history group but, no, frankly, I obviously didn't know what was going on. (Laughter)

[00:48:39]

Respondent: I didn't realise this movement started so early. I can remember a change in leadership, when did Lorraine take over it then?

Interviewer: I think when it became a department in '86 Lorraine –

Respondent: I do vaguely remember that.

Interviewer: I think Lorraine became the head of it for a couple years, because he was from sociology that was sympathetic to the cultural, but then Richard was still there. And then that's when it became, and then Maureen was obviously still there, Maureen McNeil was still there as well.

Respondent: Yeah. She examined my thesis.

Interviewer: Right.

Respondent: I knew her a bit, not terribly well.

Interviewer: I mean, that's just to end with really, because I don't want to take up too much more of your time, but I was going to ask what do you think, given you've worked in higher education for, I don't know how long, a very long time, and you've got insight into the way things are now. What do you think the structures were, what do you think are the key structures that made that kind of work that the centre was doing intellectually, politically, you know, all those kinds of experimentations in terms of group work, what were the structures within the university and also more broadly that made that possible, do you think?

Respondent: Well, broadly, it was a particular conjuncture of, you know, the product of the political climate of the time, with the left still quite strong as an intellectual and cultural force, with the growing feminist and black political movements. I mean, I don't know how far back you'd take it, obviously it goes back to the politics of the sixties, the growing youth culture, the revival of a kind of marxist thought, particularly through New Left Review in the early days. But it was still, even in the mid to late '70s, a politically committed kind of left intellectual work which was still a very prominent feature of academic life, although it was beginning to change soon after that, probably with the advent of Thatcherism. But still in the late '70s it was still very prominent. And I mean, that, the kind of theoretical debates and the kind of work that the Centre was doing was pretty central in sociology, anthropology departments across the country, I would think, still throughout the '70s. It doesn't begin to shift, probably until mid-80s, perhaps. So it was a particular political intellectual conjuncture in which, you know, the Centre really flourished. And I mean, the kind of practices the centre adopted were partly driven by its notion of praxis and it's, kind of, Gramscian ideas of, you know, (inaudible 00:50:58) intellectuals combining research, theoretical work and political activism. So there was a, kind of, model which was out there in the politics of the left which made it possible. At the Centre there was also the intellectual leadership provided by Richard Hoggart and then Stuart, as well as Richard and others. It could not have happened without them. But the university environment then also made it possible, which is I think what you are pointing to. You weren't forced to get research funding, your research outputs weren't being minutely weighed and measured, you could publish in any format and were not forced to focus on getting things in top ranking academic journals, as you are now with the REF. There wasn't so much pressure to bring in cash and to take on more and more students, although the Centre was highly productive in terms of postgraduates. I mean, Richard was supervising about 25 PhDs at one point, as I remember. But they weren't under the kind of financial pressure you have now which has probably reduced the freedom to do the kind of creative and politically engaged work which was done at CCCS. You weren't always worrying where the next grant was going to come from or whether you could achieve your 'impact' targets by getting your work taken up by Government policy-makers and so. Academics on the left probably felt less constrained. Well, apart from the odd right wing witch-hunt against left intellectuals, but that didn't hurt the Centre much at the time I was there as far as I remember. It hurt North London Polytechnic and few other places they focused on.

[00:52:51]

Interviewer: The Gould, the Gould Report.

Respondent: Yes, all that stuff, yes, but I don't think, you could probably tell me, but I don't think the centre was ever knocked off its stride by that in my time there (overspeaking 00:53:00).

Interviewer: I think, I think, as far as I know, some people were named in it.

Respondent: Were they?

Interviewer: But I don't think it –

Respondent: When did the Gould Report –

Interviewer: I think it was in the late '70s actually.

Respondent: Late '70s?

Interviewer: Yeah.

Respondent: Well, they were probably having a few pokes at that centre –

Interviewer: It seems it almost about time, I think, people saw it as, to be named in the Gould Report.

Respondent: Yes, quite. And I would have thought, you know, with somebody of Stuart's influence, yes, while he was there the place was, the university was not going to touch it. Okay, a bit later, obviously the climate changed, the political climate changed, that, kind of, version of intellectual work as practice was going a bit out of fashion, the left was on the defensive. But particularly, universities were being re-structured and it became a lot more difficult to do that kind of work. You couldn't survive in research, from the '90s onwards, if you weren't getting in much research income, and the centre was never getting much research income, as far as I recall – apart from few PhD scholarships. So it was the change in the culture and governance of universities which, I suppose killed off the Centre, along with the general demoralisation of the Left as Thatcherism got set in. But that quite an indictment really of the way the university system has developed. Because this was a quite exceptional place. It produced a huge volume of immensely influential research, some landmark books and a large number of graduates who went on to distinguished academic careers and spread cultural studies as a field right around the world. I don't know how the Centre will come to be seen by historians in the longer term – and your project will no doubt have some influence on that. To me, the CCCS was quite exceptional. A Centre which became almost an intellectual movement, like the Frankfurt school before it if you like, or perhaps, in a different, from my point of view, lamentable, way, like the Chicago University Economics department, which later gave us monetarism and the ideology of neo-liberalism. The Centre influenced a whole generation of social thinkers, particularly in relation to the study of youth and youth cultures. But then young people had the historical wind behind them and were more of a political force than they are in today's ageing world with its geriatric politics. Also, ironically, what has endured perhaps more than the politics has been the Centre's commitment to inter-disciplinary work which it also pioneered and which has had an abiding influence on me.

Interviewer: So do you still, I mean, do you still draw on that, kind of, particular kind of approach to openness across the disciplines?

Respondent: Yes, absolutely, I mean, it's quite an irony because, you know, the centre went out of fashion but actually they were pioneering a kind of inter-disciplinary work –

Interviewer: That's in fashion.

[00:55:45]

Respondent: Inter-disciplinary work now is now amongst the top strategic priorities of the ERSC and the other funding agencies. One of the reasons why my Centre has been funded for ten years is probably that we're extremely inter-disciplinary. My part in that owes largely to what I learnt from CCCS.

Interviewer: Yes. Thanks very much.

[End of Transcript]