[0:00:00]

Kieran Connell: If it's alright with you I was going to ask about your arrival at the centre and whether or not the politics of the centre was something that you were aware of beforehand and that was an appeal, or that it fitted into your personal kind of being at Aston University and that was the main thing and doing something more interesting than what you were doing at Aston.

John Clarke: It's both. I certainly was aware of both the politics and some of the intellectual concerns at the centre, partly because I met somebody who took me to an open seminar in spring of the year before I applied, which fortunately for me was about management ideology, and I just sat there thinking, because that was my degree at Aston, so that meant I sat there thinking, "I know about all this. This is easy." But it was done elegantly by Stuart Lang and right at the end somebody was sitting at the back of the room said, "You've really dealt with this in terms of a sort of, I don't know, a sort arteserian(?) approach to it. What difference would it make if you use Gramsci?" And I turned to my friend who had brought me and said, "Who's that?" And she said, "Oh, that's Stuart Hall. He's just become the acting director of the centre." And I thought, "Cool."

Kieran Connell: That was early '70s then?

John Clarke: Let's see, that would be either late '71 or spring of '72 because I arrived in October '72. And so I knew something about the work and certainly knew something about the politics and it connected with the bits that had helped me survive my degree course at Aston, which were sort of emerging radical sociology, sociology of deviance, critical criminology. And the link to the person who took me there was that she had been a regular attender at something called a National Deviancy conference, which was in that period the home of alternative critical thinking. So I knew about it and was dead impressed to even meet somebody who had been. So those were little hooks that got me into it.

Kieran Connell: What was your politics at that point?

John Clarke: It's an interesting and difficult question. I guess I was in the cluster of non-party affiliated new lefties that got embroiled in student politics, so I'm proud to have been one of the recipients of the largest ever civil injunction issued in an English court to stop us occupying the Birmingham education offices.

Kieran Connell: When was that then?

John Clarke: That would have been '70, because it was a struggle over whether or not Birmingham, the student union, was in a struggle about whether Birmingham poly was going to be more separated from us, from the old College of Commerce campus which is sort of in the middle of Aston. And when I left for my industrial placement year we were embraced and by the time I came back a split was being forced. So I think if I remember correctly the activist wing occupied the Birmingham education authorities on Charlotte Street, can't remember, back of the town hall, and we were forcibly removed.

Kieran Connell: Was '68 itself an influence for you in that kind of general ethos?

John Clarke: Absolutely. Both and influence and sort of an inspiration and an enormous frustration in the sense that I arrived at university in October '68 with a rather desperate sense of, ah, six months earlier would have been good. But it was certainly part of the political culture, climate that I thought I was in. Even at Aston, let's put it that way, even at Aston it had its effects, and it did hook us up to Birmingham so I had been over to student (inaudible 00:04:52) in Birmingham during my time. I mean not many times but a couple of times. So all of those things meant I was I think sort of ready for the centre, and the centre then rescued me from...

Kieran Connell: From something entirely different.

John Clarke: Something. My degree should have made me into the human face of British capitalism, so it was a good rescue.

[0:05:21]

Kieran Connell: Did you go to Birmingham for the actual sit in, because that was late ’68, wasn’t it?

John Clarke: It was, and we were over there for that.

Kieran Connell: So you remember presumably... I mean you might not have known who at the time.

John Clarke: I certainly didn’t know who they were but we reminisced afterwards we must have met, but by the time I got to see people in the centre in ’72 they were older and wiser. Not much, but...

Kieran Connell: I was going to ask you about, I suppose it’s a difficult question in a sense but the myths that have developed about the centre. We could perhaps talk about them subsequently, how they’ve developed in the last 20 years but what I wanted to ask first was, were there myths around the centre even whilst you were studying there?

John Clarke: I think there were, though I think they’re by no means as big and substantial as the stuff that came later. So certainly the sit in is a sort of critical thing for marking the centre as a, oh what’s the nicer word for it, troublesome place for the university, and both in terms of what it thought and in terms of how people acted. So there’s certainly a bit of that. The moment when I arrive is, I mean ’72, is the moment at which Hoggart(?) has just gone, Stuart is just taking over. And I don't know that there’s a myth about it but it certainly, I think, felt to most of the people that I talked to when I arrived as a really rather significant moment and nothing was going to be the same again, which of course turned out to be true but it was still uncertain whether Hoggart would ever come back, whether Stuart would ever move from being acting, and I think always with a certain sense of whether the place would survive. I mean Hoggart was a particular sort of protector and shield. Stuart had to work quite hard to be an alternative one. But we might or might not talk about the subsequent mythologies of the Birmingham school and all those things that –

Kieran Connell: In a piece I’ve been reading of yours quite recently you’re one of the people who we’re tried to refute that label of the Birmingham school, but it’s interesting how it’s still become...

John Clarke: I was asked to write for a criminology encyclopaedia a piece about the Birmingham school, and I said, “I will, but only if I’m allowed in the first two sentences to say there isn’t one, right?” Because it’s partly that it never was like that but it’s also never felt like it. It was a place for picking fights, having disagreements of more or less academic kinds. But I think a lot of people that I talk to were of my generation so I think it is that what we remember is no coherent single position that might vaguely resemble a school. But yeah, I mean you were working stuff out, making stuff up and having fights about it. That felt alright most of the time.

Kieran Connell: But why do you think it’s become, in spite (inaudible 00:08:58) it why do you think Birmingham as almost like a label or even a brand, I mean to use that contemporary phase.

John Clarke: No, indeed, I think that’s right and I think there’s at least three different currents in it. One is all of us, even in the moment of denial, nevertheless have a certain romance about how important and wonderful and special it was, and I can’t escape that, I don't see why anybody else should be expected to. So I think we operate at least in a relationship of ambivalence with how you talk about the centre. The second is that I think it was critical for sort of travelling branding, especially in the states. It gave it a sort of location, a fixed point, an easy reference, but any time that you prod any of those accounts of the history the different things that get counted as Birmingham cultural studies are interesting. So sometimes it’s the media group, sometimes it’s subcultures, sometimes it’s literature, but the visibilities are different even if they all appear to stand for Birmingham. So that’s the second, and I think the third is I just think that the point at which you start, one starts, people start to codify cultural studies as a field to be taught, it provides an anchor point. And then you get the romanticism creeping back in, so my friend Marie Grosberg(?) always celebrates Birmingham as a sort of authentic cultural studies from which many have fallen away.

Kieran Connell: You mentioned the branding. In a sense do you think the centre was in some ways doing that itself in the '70s,

[0:11:21]

John Clarke: Yeah.

Kieran Connell: Even the later Hutchinson books, they've all got like an introduction, haven't they, and it says how...

John Clarke: How important and different and weird the centre is.

Kieran Connell: Yeah.

John Clarke: And it certainly was, and I mean it's where you have trouble telling the difference between politics and branding. It was always important to mark it as different because it was clear to those of us there that if you went somewhere else you didn't get that combination of orientations and experiences, and so it meant saying something about not just the work, although it was important, but the way the work was done. So yeah, it was a way of marking a certain strangeness, a certain uniqueness, and it was done with a really, I think, strange assertiveness and confidence. I have memories of going in a transit van with some of my colleagues to conferences around the country, and it was something like a sort of groups tour bus, which is we would arrive there, turn out, announce the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies line on things and then we'd plough back into the random line back to Birmingham. So it had all those sort of strange cultural forms I guess that meant that we did celebrate it and branded it, you know. I'm proud of it.

Kieran Connell: From talking to other people it seems like there wasn't an overt academic kind of careerism, it wasn't about becoming a this, that or the other.

John Clarke: No.

Kieran Connell: So what were the motivations? Was it a political thing?

John Clarke: Well if that strange attempt to politicise the academy or to reveal, lay bare the politics of academic work, I don't think it was particularly careerism, because I don't think anybody thought there were any careers in cultural studies. I mean we're in the only place in the world where it happens, you know, this mid '70s, there are only one and a half members of staff employed in this institution, so the notion that you were going to go on and develop a career in cultural studies was a bit... I think my friends would have laughed at me if I'd had that thought. But I do think it was a way of marking terrain, disrupting established institutional arrangements in a rather, I have used the word arrogance when writing about this in the past, I think we were reasonably arrogant, I think we drove people crazy and I remember Ken Roberts the big sociologist of leisure talking at some conference and shouting at us I think it's probably fair to say. "I don't believe you can have a class theory of leisure. It is impossible." So part of what we did was to take great pleasure in saying, "Oh yes we can," and because we were nasty the book that I did with Chaz about leisure begins with the quotation from Ken Roberts, because it was a transcribed conference. And I think if you were not part of the cultural studies movement we were probably quite irritating, if not unbearable. I mean we had friends, don't get me wrong, the centre was I think very good at building networky connections to all sorts of people. So it wasn't just a tiny, isolated little space, but I think we were quite clear about marking it as something different and distinctive that disrupted most of the formalised academic arrangements that you might bump into, whatever the subject was. So it wasn't media studies, it was cultural studies. It wasn't sociology of youth, it was cultural studies, etc, etc.

Kieran Connell: You're talking about the relationship between this kind of odd place shall we say and then other colleagues having to fund yourself by teaching at FE colleges in and around the West Midlands. Do you have any reflections of what that was like?

John Clarke: I do have reflections of what it was like. It was both hard and wonderful but not necessarily at the same time. So I mean let me back up for a minute. I think one of the things that shocked me when I went to Birmingham to cultural studies was the existence of a network which tried to get people bits

of part-time teaching. So into the FE colleges, even into the local polys, I mean in my time I taught both at Birmingham Poly and at Wolverhampton Poly, and it allowed a much wider range of people to subsist at the centre. Not enough grants around to keep the whole of the people doing theses or PhDs, couldn't sustain the number of people that were involved but there was this other economy that did. I thought it was amazing. The hard bit was, okay, so lots of the bits of those teaching activities involved doing what were then called either liberal studies or related studies, day release apprentices. I need to phrase this delicately. The thing that they most wanted was not liberal or related struggles, studies, but struggles is the word, because I think all of us tried to find ways of making it interesting, relevant if you're lucky, but something that stopped them all going home really. And for me it taught me all sort of things about how to teach in spaces where people are not particularly disposed to want to learn things. So like all my friends I drew on all sort of bits of cultural studies work, music, media analysis. I remember doing classes on The Archers for heaven's sake.

[0:19:00]

Kieran Connell: So what was the point, what was liberal studies supposed... you were bringing in other things but what was it supposed to be?

John Clarke: Well liberal studies was supposed to be anything that would humanise the instrumental education that day release apprentices would get. I had gas fitters for a while, right? So most of their day in college was spent learning theory and practice of how to deal with gas safely in all sorts of ways. But, in that period, and it is a significant period because both the apprenticeships and the liberal education disappear later, it was a view that they should be humanised. Right? They should be exposed to liberal impulses, to arts, culture. That's how the cultural studies connection works you see. They should be exposed to improving, humanising things. They were not keen, and, you know, I don't think any of us thought they should have been keen, but it made the classroom an interesting place to be. And so, that's the hard side of it, but it was also wonderful. I mean I have abiding memories of at least two particular experiences. One was a class that I inherited from Paul Willis at Birmingham Poly which was teaching private secretaries two components of an advanced diploma, one part of which was use of English in communications. Why would you let me lose on that? But the other part was key management concepts so that they would be able to appreciate the male supreme elements that they were working for. And it was wonderful, we had such a great time and embarrassingly if you go to the university library and find my Master's thesis you will find that it was typed on 10 different keyboards, because they said, "We'll do it for you," and so they took a chapter each, they were all entirely different. But they were great and it was a really interesting thing to do for me, but the other one was I taught for a year I think with Dick Hebdidge(?) on a related studies programme at Wolverhampton College of Art, and they were amazing, difficult, demanding, fun, and the best worst bit was we'd been talking about participation in art and the department had arranged a trip to the Everyman Theatre in Liverpool on coaches from Wolverhampton for an evening, and the play was being performed was about Northern Ireland, and the Troubles, and I have to say that I think our students took the idea of participation very seriously, to the extent that the management came out and said, look, the cast are willing to talk to you afterwards about this but they cannot go on in the face of constant interventions and commentary. And the reason I remember it is that we did the conversation afterwards which was brilliant, and engaged and exciting. We were incredibly late back so that I'd missed the last bus back from Wolverhampton to Birmingham. I have a deeply physical memory of walking back from Wolverhampton. So it was materially important to us then, it was an interesting set of spaces to operate in, and sometimes it was just sort of thrilling.

Kieran Connell: Did you see yourself as doing cultural studies?

John Clarke: Yeah.

Kieran Connell: Because I mean I guess it's interesting the centre's commitment to being informed by and taking part in the outside world beyond the academy.

John Clarke: Yeah.

Kieran Connell: I suppose that was quite a constant link for many of you.

[0:23:20]

John Clarke: I think it was, and I think it's one which was important in making us think individually and sometimes collectively about the politics of pedagogy, both in terms of the substance but also the practices. Because it's not like the process of going and teaching the introductory programme for a university course where people are, I mean in some forms self-selecting, and to some extent want to be their instrumentally or emotionally or politically, dealing with groups of people who don't want to be there tells you something about the struggles of engagement and persuasion and the limits of the good commitments that you've got. I thought it was great. I went off to my first teaching job with I think an entirely different skill set than if I'd just gone into university level teaching straightaway, it's wonderful.

Kieran Connell: And I guess the interesting thing as well is that of course Hoggert and EP Thompson people also came up with a similar... they were also engaging with similar kinds of issues I guess.

John Clarke: Yeah.

Kieran Connell: I don't know. I guess at the time you may not have been... you've not seen yourself in (inaudible 00:24:54) but...

John Clarke: I doubt whether we did because they always seemed better at it. And that's, if you're doing it in the margins and so on, you don't necessarily reflect on it very much, but I do think there are important connections and I do think even now, and it has something to do with why I've stayed at the Open University so long, that the non-traditional, non-conventional settings, tell you things about knowledge and power and engagement that actually, well I've taught at universities, I've taught at polys, I've even taught for one fleeting period at the University of Cambridge. But the combination of FE, predominantly non-traditional students in polys, the Open University are, it seems to me, the contemporary echoes of the sort of adult education WEA things, and it's not accidental that they were there and that that experience shaped them in significant ways. I'm glad I got it.

Kieran Connell: Yeah. I was going to move on to ask about class and about class in the centre. How did class function in terms of relations at the centre and the politics of the centre?

John Clarke: Ooh, it's such a difficult question, and it's such a difficult question because I think the key to it is that it moves between invisibility and visibility in entirely, not entirely, but rather unpredictable ways. And so a lot of the time it would not have been visible. Might have been audible, you get things where you place people by how they speak and accents and trajectories like that, but it wasn't very often formally aligned with anything, not very often, though I remember grumbly bits about middle-class students arriving at the centre and swanning in with all their privilege, it's not unnoticed, but it didn't often manifest itself in the public life of the centre. Sometimes it did. I can remember one where it absolutely aligned personality, trajectory, educational route, and theoretical, political –

Kieran Connell: Was that the humanism and structuralism debate?

John Clarke: Yes. Absolutely those. And for me they always have all those bits threaded into them, they were never simply either intellectual or just a political position, they were embedded in difficult personal trajectories and modes of engagement in the centre. I mean, I don't know how to say this nicely, we inhabited the centre differently I think is the best way of putting it, and the screen debate then crystalised that. So it's not that it came out of it but that once it began to take shape you could see the way all those things condensed into one moment. And so it did that, but it wasn't –

Kieran Connell: Can you just give us a bit of a context around the screen debate? And that's Ros...

John Clarke: That's Ros Canno(?), John Ellis, and it's about humanism versus a certain structuralist mode. It came out of a series of debates between working groups in the centre about... see, I'm lucky if I can remember now, but about language, about representation, about politics and about different theoretical modes. Tedious, sad old working class boys were lumbering around with Gramsci which Ros and John thought was wrong, passé, and missed both the excitements and the possibilities that we'd never get to grips with. And they appeared in the centre at a particular moment as golden

children, and I do remember saying, because I'm a bitter person, "They've got really good hair and good teeth." And class is embodied in certain forms, and the acrimonious past, it was a particular moment, but it was a moment at which there were certain sorts of crystalisations of those things. But it wasn't the only thing that got in the way. So, I mean, you and I have talked before the recording was on, about feminism.

[0:30:57]

Kieran Connell: That's what I was going to ask next, how identity politics relate to these class aspects.

John Clarke: Well, in complicated ways, because they cut across some of the alignments, they reinforce some of the others, so because of the layered nature of the centre's work there were critical things about where, feminism and feminist analyses and the visibility of the category of gender emerged. So I was in the subcultures group and the disagreements, conversations, conflicts, temporary resolutions, all of those things crystalised around the boyishness of subcultural studies, and it drove, and I suspect drove isn't emphatic enough for it, Angela Mackrobby(?), Jenny Garber(?) into trying to unlock the boyishness of subcultural studies. And I guess each of the working groups had its own crux where it became visible, was rejected, refused, changed things or not, but that's not quite the same as the collective break in the centre around Women Take Issue, and what a great title, and it was, not the renunciation of the devil and all his works but the insistence that cultural studies could not work without that break being made, in the long, wise, mature development that I have undergone since, of course, but God, they must have gone through hell to... I mean both to think it and find the moment through which you might pull things around politically, persuasively. Really important moment for the centre that I'm sure even now generates echoes of bad feelings of the time.

Kieran Connell: You personally, how did it affect you? Had you encountered feminism previously to that, or outside of academia?

John Clarke: I'd encountered feminism both outside and inside academia. I was a founding member of Aston University Women's Liberation Group before it was suggested that my membership might be inappropriate. About which I think they were wrong. So I'd had political and intellectual encounters with it. I am not sure that you could say that it had transformed my politics or my practice in a grand scale so I think I am part of the dead weight of the masculine hegemony of the centre that Women Take Issue had to dislodge, break open. So I'd love to tell you a story which made me a nice person but I don't think it'll work in this context. I think I was in their terms part of the old guard. Right? I had long, lovely, difficult conversations with Angela in the subcultures work but I think she was clear and probably right that getting round that lump was a big struggle. I think, I hope, that it's been profoundly influential on me since through all sorts of personal and political and intellectual means, but I was the old guard. That's what I mean about you can't imagine a Birmingham school. Right?

Kieran Connell: Yeah.

John Clarke: Something which is riven at that depth and at that intensity is a pretty weird school.

Kieran Connell: I guess there were lots of different feminist moments.

John Clarke: Yeah.

Kieran Connell: But there was also lots of different race moments as well, and there was a race moment in the late '70s.

John Clarke: Yeah.

Kieran Connell: Were you there for that and do you have any reflections on that as well?

John Clarke: That's the one where I think inadvertently I got to be on the right side. And I do mean inadvertently. But that for me is condensed in the mugging issues. And that came out of a bit about the centre that's not visible which is sometimes unevenly it had local connections to Birmingham, and in

particular Chaz Crutcher(?) linked Hansworth and the centre, because he was nominally doing a PhD a the centre and –

[0:36:25]

Kieran Connell: But Hall Road.

John Clarke: Hall Road (inaudible 00:36:27) centre. And so the fact of the Hansworth muggings produced a set of links between some of us who had been working on use of cultures, Chaz's mediating, translating role between cultural studies and local action politics, and race, as the defining, organising, ordering category, and that's what delivered in the end... no, first it delivered the strange little pamphlet on 20 years which we wrote as the (inaudible 00:37:20) support body. But then longer-term it produced Policing the Crisis and it does seem to me that's the point at which race becomes centrally articulated in cultural studies. I don't think it was. I don't mean it wasn't there, but as something that was part of how you understood a social formation, particularly a social formation in crisis, how you understood it as a mode of history, conjunctional analysis and political trope.

Kieran Connell: Intellectually?

John Clarke: Intellectually it was critical.

Kieran Connell: But it's interesting that race came onto the cultural studies agenda intellectually with that Policing the Crisis work which was written by Stuart and four white post-grad students.

John Clarke: Yeah. Four white boys.

Kieran Connell: And then the laster Paul Gilroy and the Relating Politics subgroup, was that responding to Policing the Crisis, influenced by it, inspired by it?

John Clarke: All of those things I think. I mean that started just after I'd left, but I remember being invited back by that group to talk about Policing the Crisis and to think about what we had done with race and what they wanted to do and the differences, similarities, what they can build on, what they wouldn't want to build on, and, and, and, including, I have to say, the gender in Policing the Crisis, it's before the break in that sense. But what was great then is that you get what appears first off as a sort of one off Policing the Crisis moment is then overtaken by the Empire Strikes Back which is a much more centre-style publication and way of working. I mean Policing the Crisis is odd because it's a side project. It's a fairly important side project, for me at least, but it wasn't the production of a centre text like either Women Takes Issue or the Empire Strikes Back, or all those others. And the Empire Strikes Back it seems to me developed and lodged the question of race as if you're going to do cultural studies you'll probably want to get to grips with this. It's like all practices, never works out perfectly but it was important.

Kieran Connell: I was going to ask you a bit more about the staff student relations. I guess in one sense the conventional boundaries were very much broken down partly as a legacy of '68, the ethos of '68.

John Clarke: Yeah.

Kieran Connell: But I wanted to ask you a bit more about how that actually worked in practice because given you were involved in two subgroups with...

John Clarke: Yeah.

Kieran Connell: Well one, the state subgroup was that Policing the Crisis and the subcultures subgroup, Resistance to Rituals, both of which Stuart was very active in.

John Clarke: Indeed.

Kieran Connell: So what are your reflections as a post-grad there of those relations?

[0:40:43]

John Clarke: I mean it starts from, I mean this is a bit embarrassing but I'm immensely privileged to have been a post-graduate student in a place where post-graduate students were taken seriously. So I got to the centre in '72 and it had 1.5 members of staff, and a secretary. There's no way to run a research centre of that scale and complexity on 1.5 members of staff. So I think our collective memories of cultural studies are always really good about collaborative work, but part of what the centre ran on was collaborative administration. Students were involved in almost every bit of making the centre run. We were members of intellectual subgroups but we were members of functional subgroups as well, and that sense of the necessary organisational labour, which we now call management, of making places work, for practical and political reasons was about engaging everybody into the business. So there was a weekly business meet at which we talked about what needed to be done, what was going on, relationships with the university featured regularly, but then people were in groups, publications group, journal groups, which were not just about the intellectual work but they were about who was going to put all those things onto the stencil machine. Who was going to cut and paste all the... and possibility, and I'm going to say it's most important and I don't know whether it's actually true, but we were also the recruitment group. So I was interviewed by a panel of people one of whom was a member of staff, the others were other post-graduate students. Two years later I was on a panel that interviewed the next year's lot. And you think, this is progressive, correct, and unimaginable. The accountability managerial modes just make that look really strange, if not wrong, but it did collectivise responsibility in really important ways. And I thought it was brilliant in a way that I know that I bang on about how great it was to work collaboratively and collectively and it changed my life, but it also changed my life by giving me a view about how you might organise collectively and collaboratively as well rather than the contemporary struggles against managerialism require you to have a reference point. For a lot of people it's Spanish cooperatives, for me it's we managed to do that, it didn't fall apart, it didn't go badly wrong, and I doubt whether we made any more stupid decisions than senior managers do currently, at least.

Kieran Connell: Just finally then, looking back at this time, I wanted to ask about whether you had an emotional attachment, how would you describe that attachment?

John Clarke: Oh yes. I have a deep, profound, ongoing emotional attachment to it, and I mean which starts from the amazing sense that it rescued me. I cannot believe how fortunate I was to be inadvertently connected to that place at that time when I needed things that I had no idea what they would be. So I am who I am because the centre rescued me. And it's just difficult not to sound romantic about it. It transformed my life, it made it possible for me to become some sort of intellectual academic with certain sorts of commitments that I think I still hold. And that's about the place, you know, it was an astonishing place for the reasons that we've been talking about about how it was run, how it worked, what it wanted to do. It was for the people. I am still profoundly attached to the people who were part of that for me. And it's about the strangeness of appearing in public in odd places as an embodiment of cultural studies. And somebody once came up to me, very nice man, came up to me at a conference in Canada and looked at my name badge and said, "Excuse me, did you used to be the John Clarke?" And it's true, you carry this astonishing weight of symbolism around with you because it's cultural studies, and it's Birmingham. So the branding and the mythologies linger and the hard bit is about telling people how they might do it now without just romanticising how we did it then.

Kieran Connell: Has that fondness increased over time? Have you always been fond or has it got more stronger the more time has elapsed?

John Clarke: Well, that's a really good question. I think probably there was a period in my life where I was not sure that I wanted to over-identify myself with cultural studies, and that's not particularly because of Birmingham but it was because of the proliferation of forms of cultural studies not all of which I thought were as interesting as they ought to be. Judgemental, I am. And so that got more personalised in terms of the people who carried the connections. I think for about the last decade or more, possibly because I move in different circles, it's become easier to think about it, and I have to say that the closure is a critical moment for that because it says to me that what I mainly want to do is to stand up and shout, "I'm cultural studies and I'm loud and proud. You shouldn't have taken that

away from me, or from the rest of the world." So I think it has gone through phases, I feel now for all sorts of reasons, one of which is Stuart's age, one of which is the bizarre experience of re-issuing Policing the Crisis, I am unashamedly a cultural studies product, or if you want it harder than that a cultural studies boy with all the contradictions that that might imply.

[0:48:41]

Kieran Connell: Well John, thanks very much.

John Clarke: My pleasure.

[End of Transcript]