

INTRODUCTION:

Redefining the political

THE POLITICAL ESSAY has a long and honourable history: indeed the essay as a literary form is peculiarly suited to politics. The essay is for-the-moment, composed to address a particular historical configuration, capturing emergent histories as they come into sight. Or, as Stuart Hall was fond of conceiving of his own essays, they are *interventions*, often with foes to be dispatched to the left and to the right. The political essay is seldom dispassionate. The essay-form is not an innocent medium. It is combative, working to organise intellectually its constituency of readers.

This is certainly true of the political essays in this collection. But the essay form was also ideally suited to Hall's more theoretical preoccupations, since one of his abiding concerns was to tease out the complex contours of significant political moments and to get a sense of what was shaping them. In most of the essays gathered here we can see him trying to identify the nature of the specific shifts and currents that have coalesced into the moment he is analysing. This is a clearly discernible characteristic of even his earliest essays, but, as we outline below, Hall later theorised this way of writing as 'conjunctural' analysis. The wide range of elements he draws on in his writing is central to Hall's unique contribution as a political theorist.

Hall's essays also embody a more philosophical or abstract purpose, which nevertheless remains focused on real-world concerns: they continually return to the question of what politics is and where it happens. This abstract question is worked into the interstices of his concrete political analyses. His work thus represents a striking refusal of the prevailing codifications of what politics entails and where it is to be located; his appropriation of Gramsci's conception of hegemony enlarged the conception of what constitutes class politics;¹ and he also contended that emergent political forces did not always look 'political'

in the orthodox manner. They might not traverse the landscape of conventional politics at all. Think of the dynamics of feminism, for example, with its insistence on the personal as political. From such a viewpoint the domain of what counts as ‘politics’ expands radically.

It has been suggested that Hall could be regarded as a Gramscian before he had ever read Gramsci. Many elements of what we think of as a Gramscian approach are present in some form in his work before his encounter with Gramsci ever took place: Hall wrote on the educative functions of the state (on ‘moral and intellectual leadership’); on the complexity of the networks that bind political society to civil society; on the material force of ‘philosophies’ (of various sorts) on the political stage, and on the embodiment of specific ideologies in the disparate figures of the intellectual (again of various sorts); on the political conception of the idea of the people as a necessarily contingent formation; and on his methodological commitment to a politics of the ‘concrete’. It is clear, though, that when – belatedly – Gramsci arrived, he was to prove a revelation.

Gramsci and conjunctural analysis

Hall’s encounter with Gramsci did much to crystallise his notion of conjunctural analysis. The promise of such an approach lay in its potential for identifying key elements in the movement of political forces, and for isolating the properties of emergent social forms. This engagement with the dynamics of particular conjunctures was strikingly apparent in his writing in *Policing the Crisis* and ‘The great moving right show’. In these texts he was seeking to identify the forces that were driving the unravelling of the social democratic settlement and its replacement by a populist authoritarianism.² Hall’s understanding of an emerging conjuncture was central to his analysis of the complexities of a political moment, which he saw as composed of, and constituted by, the complex interaction of condensed elements from competing historical times.

Hall arrived conceptually at the idea of conjuncture through Louis Althusser’s 1962 essay ‘Contradiction and Overdetermination’, which itself drew on Lenin and Gramsci.³ Althusser’s reading of Lenin alerted Hall to the theoretical usefulness of apprehending the displacements that lie at the heart of politics. It was Lenin’s

contention that the revolutionary situation in Russia had occurred not because the contending forces fell neatly into two opposing camps, in which the underlying class interests, immediately and transparently, determined the domain of politics. On the contrary, the revolutionary moment had only come about, in Lenin's mesmerising formulation because:

as a result of an extremely unique historical situation, *absolutely dissimilar currents, absolutely heterogeneous* class interests, *absolutely contrary* political and social strivings have *merged*, and in a strikingly 'harmonious' manner.⁴

Althusser, in his interpretation of this passage, named such a conjunctural situation as 'overdetermined'. Time and again Hall returned to Lenin's words and to Althusser's concept.

Gramsci saw the political as a live, decentred, disorderly domain, composed of myths and passions as much as of rational doctrines. For him, Machiavelli's gift was his ability to craft a formal philosophy that could grasp these dimensions of political reality. According to Gramsci, Machiavelli's philosophy 'gives political passions a more concrete form'. Neither formally systematised nor made up of 'pedantic classification', it sees politics as an arena for the making of a 'concrete phantasy'.⁵ To think in these terms adds a further layer of meaning to the idea of 'the concrete', for it alerts us to the relations between politics and the subjective forces of human passion. It endeavours to hold together, in a single moment, the objective and the subjective in their mutual constitution of 'the political'.⁶ This, too, marked a necessary component of conjunctural analysis.

Hall was convinced that any social analysis of value would recognise the centrality of *difference* in the making of social life. This is what underlies the deconstructive drive in his political essays. In order to grasp the endless movements of difference in the social world, the overarching meta-theories that have been devised to bring societies within the orbit of human thought need themselves to be deconstructed, to ensure that they do not also – in the very instant that they set out to explain the world – override and obliterate difference. A principle of deconstructive thought, for Hall, was precisely the need to recognise difference and to provide difference with the analytical weight it requires. In this sense Lenin's formulations cited above – '*absolutely dissimilar currents, absolutely*

heterogeneous class interests, *absolutely contrary* political and social strivings' – are of the greatest significance.

Yet in order to think politically there is an inevitable moment when the practice of deconstruction has to be halted, at least temporarily. This was not, for Hall, a matter of formal logic, or of a paramount conceptual consistency. It was, rather, the moment when politics intruded onto the terrain of theory, driven by the need to mobilise abstraction in order to grasp the unpredictabilities of the historical world. For Hall politics was never only a question of contingency or of a chaos of spiralling indeterminacy. Emergent historical forces, even when radically unpredictable, were never without their social determinations. Indeed they gave them shape, and enabled them to enter the historical stage. It was in this sense that Hall never finally vacated the theoretical terrain of Marxism.

It was through Gramsci that Hall was able to alight upon this theoretical movement that enables an understanding (and deconstruction) of the ways in which contrary social forces could, through political practice, 'merge'. Conjuncture provided a methodological means to hold deconstruction at bay. (In a different dimension of his theoretical vocabulary, articulation plays this same role.) Deconstruction is intrinsic to the work of theory, but politics has to pause and inquire how the 'absolutely dissimilar' can be brought into a provisional, practical unity.⁷

Combating orthodoxy

From the 1950s onwards Hall's work had broadly two orthodoxies in his sights, and they remained with him, in varying forms, throughout his life.

The first masqueraded – and still masquerades – as no orthodoxy at all: it presents itself, *sotto voce*, as the reasonable, sensible acknowledgement of how in Britain politics just *is*. This is a mentality disciplined by the institutional horizons of Westminster, as if these provide all that needs to be known about how politics operates. Such sentiments can be heard from representatives of the political parties; from accredited figures in the academy; and, often in most concentrated form, in the utterances of the media commentators.

For Hall the fundamental fault-line was between a politics that

was constrained by the norms of Westminster and one capable of embracing the breadth and complexities of human life as it was lived day by day. The dominating concern was with the deeper forms and presuppositions of politics rather than its institutional content; with how the field of politics was to operate rather than with the instrumental objectives enshrined in the party manifestos; with ensuring that the relation between state and citizen was perpetually regarded as a contingent, open-ended *question*, rather than focused on the choices dictated by the constitutional-electoral system – placing your cross against candidate X or Y. This is not to say that it did not matter to Hall who voted for whom. It did of course. But the problem that continually remained in the foreground of his field of political vision was the broader question of *the terms* on which the relations between people and state were organised.

The second orthodoxy Hall held in his sights was a redundant and lost version of Marxism. In Britain in the years before 1956 this cut deeper in political life than is, in our own times, easily recognised. There were always dazzlingly talented intellectuals working inside the political world of Marxism, and it is these thinkers that register most readily in the collective memory. But the reflexes of a mechanical orthodoxy ran deep in some sections of the pre-1956 left. From the very beginning Hall understood his encounters with Marxism to be conducted in the slipstream of a necessary but unprogrammed, and yet-to-be worked out, revisionism: in a bid, in other words, to rejuvenate Marxism in order that it could work for the historical imperatives of the mid-twentieth century. 1956 brought Khrushchev's denunciations of Stalinism, followed by the Soviet invasion of Hungary. These events generated a momentous fracture in the international Communist movement and there followed substantial collateral damage for the authority of official, state-sanctioned Marxisms. From this point on Hall located himself historically as of the political generation of '56: as a principled, self-styled, unapologetic revisionist. In this story Marxism had a constant if uneasy role to play, as it continued to do until the end of his life. Hall's engagement with politics cannot be fathomed without acknowledging this long presence of Marxism in his thought.⁸

But such affiliations proved anything but straightforward. As he was later to explain, he found himself 'dragged backwards into Marxism, against the tanks in Budapest'.⁹ He embraced a (contrary) version of

Marxism just as the dominant, most conspicuously visible codifications were being universally vilified – properly so – for transmogrifying into a vehicle for the justification of Soviet colonialism. So, to imagine himself as having been ‘dragged backwards into Marxism’ depended on a vision of history in which political events were formed by their own – chaotic, unpredictable, asymmetrical, multiple – determinations. Abstract categorisations, such as the relations of production, the class struggle, the falling rate of profit, while they might be potentially appropriate conceptual tools, could not in themselves begin to explain the complex, contradictory and contingent terrain of politics, which was always the consequence of many determinations.

The limitations of both the forms of orthodoxy outlined above were apparent in their response to Hall’s reading of Margaret Thatcher’s Conservatism: the leading commentators of the day derided the thought that Thatcherism was in the business of pursuing an ideological or cultural programme, with its own underlying philosophies, let alone that it could be construed as a historic bid for hegemony. It was therefore revealing that in the run of obituaries which followed Hall’s death in 2014 such views had silently disappeared from the media landscape. The notion that there had once existed a Thatcherite project, driven by a new generation of Tory *philosophes*, had emerged – by default – as uncontroversial. It had become, belatedly, the new common sense.

An expanded view of politics

This collection reflects Hall’s engagement with shifting political conjunctures over a long period of time, from the ‘First New Left’ of the post-1956 period to the contemporary epoch of the ascendancy and ‘crisis’ of the neoliberal project. The essays collected here give a sense of the extraordinary range of political interventions made by Hall, but also point to some of the important continuities in his work – in analytical approach, political commitment, sensibility and tone.

His attention to diverse articulations of the political is a central feature of these essays. But committing himself to an expanded idea of what politics comprises did not mean that he supposed that ‘everything *is* politics’, always and in perpetuity. This would be to signal an unwarranted inflation of the domain, whereby any social

act could be deemed 'political', allowing for the invocation of too easy an alibi for radical political activity. It is not that everything always is politics. The ground keeps shifting. That is the point. The crucial issue is that any site in the social formation, in any particular moment, *can become* the condensation of political antagonisms; the site of evolving, potential political forces; and the terrain on which political allegiances are made or unmade. How this occurs, or where the terrain is to be located, is a contingent matter that no formal theory of politics can stipulate or anticipate. In this sense, the place of politics is frequently *displaced*, meaning that what is significant politically may not inhabit, or only partially inhabit, the institutional arrangements of formal politics.

It is of course apparent, as Michael Rustin points out in his afterword to this collection, that if any social practice, in any sphere of social life, has the potential for becoming the site for political rupture, to segregate a portion of Hall's writings under the rubric 'political' may at first sight seem a perilous endeavour. Our aim, however, is to showcase the richness and diversity of Hall's articulations of the political in his interventions on key issues within the public arena of politics – and his constant endeavours to expand what we might think of as belonging in this arena.¹⁰ This means that the writings collected here are primarily rooted in engagements with British political contexts, developments and relations, but, as with the work of other major intellectuals, for example Gramsci's writings on Italy, they speak to broader political issues and problematics. They were intended as, and should be read as, part of an ongoing intellectual endeavour to expand our notions of what constitutes the political, in which studying a specific context produces insights that in turn feed back into new forms of theoretical understanding.

Hall's work was characterised by an ever increasing attention to the displacements which operated in the field of politics. A reading of politics emerged in which the 'subjects' addressed by political forces were seen as operating through an unsteady amalgam of psychic investments, which conventional politics was unsuited to explain. This is an interpretation which locates the displaced elements of political life at the centre of things. This approach is perhaps most directly expressed in this collection by a 1966 essay on 'Political commitment', which is a less well-known essay and works at a relatively higher level of abstraction than the other articles collected here. It is in this essay

that Hall was most explicit in his critique of the reduction of politics to its technological and institutional practices and to its attendant discursive forms: the absolutism of opinion polls, for example, or of the more elaborate intellectual apparatus of psephology. This is what he had in mind when he invoked politics ‘in the narrow sense’.

As he shows in an extraordinarily prescient aside, in 1960s Britain the privatisation of politics was already underway and could be named as such. Connected to this was his apprehension that a peculiar quality of the established political system was its capacity to *depoliticize* politics itself, an argument which has striking resonances with contemporary debates about ‘post-politics’. Hall writes of a constitutional arrangement which sought to elevate, in place of ‘the people’, an electoral calculus in which ‘the electorate’, as a malleable and passive force, subsumed the forces of the unruly, unpredictable multitude.

In order to counter and to recast such conceptions of politics Hall was persuaded that the relations of political representation should be understood as ‘active and transformative’. They were of the *first* importance. For significant structural change to occur, mass popular support was the precondition. ‘The people’ needed to be mobilised. ‘Political consciousness’, wrote Hall, ‘is closely linked with the sense which a society makes of its own life, actions, experiences, history: with social consciousness, and with the dominant structure of feeling and attitude which prevails at any particular time.’ The dynamic by which latent human needs were expressed in political terms had to be brought out into the open and integrated in the daily practices of political struggle.

Hall indicates two instances from his own experience when such moments of ‘political creativity’ had been realised: the launch of the New Left in 1956 and – connected but distinct – the early years of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND). Underwriting each was not only the making of a new radicalism, but the expansion of the domain of politics: of what counts as ‘politics’. As Hall writes in his reflections on ‘The First New Left’ (the only non-contemporaneous piece in this collection), ‘the New Left’ itself had a project to broaden the politics of CND: ‘to “educate”, in Gramsci’s sense, the moral impulse which brought most people to the peace movement into a wider politics of the left’.

A distinctive element in Hall’s political disposition was his commitment to a radical populism. This was a practice informed by,

but not reducible to, class politics. It is a way of imagining politics that is instinctively suspicious of the imperatives of class reductionism, in which every dimension of political life was perceived through the exclusive optic of class.¹¹ Thinking in terms of populism – in terms of the people rather than in terms of a class – gave scope for the emergence of a broader, more expansive conception of the range of social groups which could act as agents for democratic change.

It was an unwelcome ruse of history that, from Hall's view, in the 1970s and 1980s it was the *Thatcherites* who moved most confidently onto the terrain of 'the popular' and actively sought to create a popular dimension to the pre-existing norms of constitutional politics.

This is Hall reflecting on the populist elements of Thatcherism, in 'The empire strikes back' (see p203):

By 'populism' I mean something more than the ability to secure electoral support for a political programme, a quality all politicians in formal democracies must possess. I mean the project, central to the politics of Thatcherism, to ground neo-liberal policies directly in an appeal to 'the people'; to root them in the essentialist categories of commonsense experience and practical moralism – and thus to construct, not simply awaken, classes, groups and interests into a particular definition of 'the people'.

The passage makes explicit Hall's deepening allegiance to a discursive understanding of political struggle. It presupposes that on the political terrain 'the people' – or indeed, the working class, or women, or any number of such social groupings – has no prescribed collective identity, ready and waiting to be summoned into action. 'The people' is not an already-existing, integral and unified social entity. It is a discursive construct, coming into being *in the process of political activity* itself.¹²

'The political', as a noun, increasingly came to assume a greater analytical presence for Hall. The term conveyed the expansive arena of political practice, as opposed to a narrow focus on the dominant institutions of political society. 'The political' is the arena where collective identifications are made, or not; where they accrue political leverage, or not; where political forces are made and unmade. The discursive work of politics is to discover a means by which such shared identifications can come into conscious political life, and sustain social agents in embarking upon the pursuit of the historic tasks which have

befallen them. Or, as Hall has it, the strategic objective of politics is not to 'awaken' social actors, as if they are dormant and only awaiting the summons from on high, but to create the contexts in which they can discursively 'construct' themselves as a collective political force – in which they can become political agents of their own making. In Hall's reading this long and complex process, often working at some remove from the conventional terrains of political life, is how politics happens.

Hall saw the time of CND's first surge of radicalism, from 1958 to 1964, as one such significant point of political rupture. In his own political life there occurred a further two movements that required a wholesale reconsideration of how politics was constituted. These were the mobilisations which exploded around feminism, and sexual politics more generally, and around 'race'.

Hall frequently despaired of mainstream politics: he was puzzled by the depth of the insulation of the bulk of professional politicians, even those of radical temperaments, from what was new or emergent in British life. What was especially striking for him was the profound incomprehension of the nation's leaders at what was happening before their very eyes in terms of sexual and black politics from the late 1960s onwards. For Hall, however, the speed with which the inherited practices of everyday life were in the process of being turned inside out, and exposed to incessant scrutiny, was something to applaud, take solace from, and marvel at.

The seriousness of these interventions as politics derived in part from their insistence that difficult, exacting questions – uncomfortable questions about the deepest dynamics of one's own selfhood – should be placed on the political agenda.

We publish here the lecture which took for its title 'Racism and reaction', and we include also an extract from *Policing the Crisis*, that extraordinary account of the deepening reflexes of authoritarianism which from the 1970s came to infiltrate both political and civil society.¹³ What remains remarkable about both these texts is the degree to which 'race' works as the decisive explanatory concept that gives form and meaning to Hall's readings of authoritarian populism and the exceptional state. Without *Policing the Crisis* there could have been no analysis of Thatcherism in 'The great moving right show'. There was virtually no other figure at the time who was centrally reading the crisis of the British state, in its most general manifestations, through the lens of 'race'. It is instructive to remember that *Policing the Crisis*

began life in the backstreets of Handsworth in Birmingham, a place radically removed from the established locales of British political business. It is in this sense a vindication of the decision to read the transformations in the state at an angle and at some distance from the dominant institutions where power was most concentrated.

Mapping the shifts

Hall's 'The great moving right show', which develops the arguments about authoritarian populism first made in *Policing the Crisis*, stands as a model of conjunctural analysis. It was an interpretation of the making of the new conjuncture *as it was happening*. That this was so underwrites the degree of uncertainty which occurs at one point in the essay. 'There is still some debate', he noted, 'as to whether [Thatcherism] is likely to be short-lived or long-term, a movement of the surface or something more deeply lodged in the body politic'. At the start of 1979 he couldn't be sure. By the time he died, in 2014, he was in a position to see more clearly the deeper reach of the historical movements. By then it was apparent that Thatcherism had marked the first stirrings of something larger, and more deeply globalised, than had been visible at the end of the 1970s. In retrospect it could be seen as signalling the making of a new political order which was to have epochal consequences. In it were the lineaments of what can now be named as the neoliberal revolution. It is this globalised order which inescapably defines our own historical present.

The essays from the 1980s are unflinching in their assessment of the Thatcherite facility for moulding popular conceptions of politics and common sense, but they are equally as tough-minded in their engagement with the deficits of left strategy. Essays such as 'The crisis of Labourism', for example, reflect on the longstanding limitations of the Labour Party's conception of politics. Hall argues, for example, that Neil Kinnock, the UK Labour Party's leader from 1983 to 1992, had 'no feel for the language and concerns of the new social movements', and that was dangerous for the party. The failure of the Labour leadership during the 1984-85 miners' strike to generalise at the national level the issues of class that the party claimed to represent significantly contributed to the failure of the strike, and doomed it 'to be fought and lost as an old rather than as a new form of politics'.

This was ‘doubly unbearable’ because, in ‘the solidarity it displayed, the gigantic levels of support it engendered, the unparalleled involvement of the women in the mining communities, the feminist presence in the strike [and] the breaking down of different social interests which it presaged’, the miners’ strike ‘was instinctually with the politics of the new’. Hall lamented Labour’s failure to adopt the strategy of a ‘war of position’ – the struggle ‘for leadership and mastery over a whole number of different fronts in the course of making itself the focal point of popular aspirations, the leading popular political force’.

The expansive imagination of the left envisioned by Hall here should caution against a reading of Hall’s writings as in any sense responsible for the way his insights were taken up by New Labour and Blairism.¹⁴ The *New Times* project, as it was elaborated by Hall and other colleagues at *Marxism Today*, sought to engage with a terrain that had been changed by the fundamental political, economic and cultural restructuring of the 1980s, including Hall’s essay on ‘The meaning of new times’. In this the project was undeniably influential on New Labour trajectory. But Hall himself drew very different conclusions from this analysis. He was committed to a ‘modernising’ project for the Labour Party and the wider left, but on very different terms from those adopted by Blair and New Labour.

In ‘The state: socialism’s old caretaker’, he sees how Ken Livingstone’s Greater London Council (GLC) is ‘so exciting, so prefigurative for the left’: ‘one begins to see here and there a glimmer of a local state transforming the ways in which it “represents” society politically; being more dependent on the passage of power into the state from constituencies outside it than on monopolising power’. He welcomed this pluralism – a phenomenon that was very different from the party management of New Labour – and hoped that it would become a permanent feature of the socialist scene. But, as Doreen Massey recalls, the ‘sneering’ attitude towards this left project, which was ‘feminist, anti-racist and anti-homophobic as well as challenging to capital’, came as much from traditional elements within the Parliamentary Labour Party as from the Conservatives.¹⁵

One of Hall’s enduring contributions was his engagement with the political articulations of multiculturalism(s). Rather than seeing multiculturalism as a state strategy, operating from above, he adopted a more open understanding of how multiculturalism worked, and

how it was reconfiguring political and social relations. But he was also keenly aware of political efforts to mobilise opposition to pluralism and difference. As he argues in 'Our mongrel selves': 'In the face of the proliferation of cultural difference, and the multi-ethnic character of the new Britain, and threatened on the other side by ... an emerging European identity, we have seen over the past decade a particularly defensive, closed and exclusive definition of "Englishness" being advanced as a way of warding off or refusing to live with difference'. He engaged consistently with such exclusivism and later what he termed the 'multi-cultural drift' that characterised New Labour.¹⁶

Hall's antipathy to Blairism and the New Labour project is made clear in the final essays collected here. 'The great moving nowhere show', published in 1998, argued that the Blair project was still 'essentially framed by and moving on terrain defined by Thatcherism'. As Michael Rustin notes in his afterword here, Hall regarded the 1997 election victory for Labour as a huge missed opportunity, and was profoundly critical of the intellectual underpinning of the Blair project, especially its notion of the 'Third Way', which he saw as 'hot on the responsibilities of individuals', while 'those of business are passed over with a slippery evasiveness'.

The final two essays in the collection come from *Soundings*, the journal which Hall co-founded with Doreen Massey and Michael Rustin in 1995, with the aim of continuing the analysis and questioning of left politics that had been associated with *Marxism Today*. Its positioning statement, 'Uncomfortable times', made clear that the project sought to continue the expansive understanding of the political that had shaped Hall's work; it argued that 'change can be achieved in many social spaces besides that which is normally designated as political'.¹⁷

'New Labour's double shuffle' takes as its problematic the failure of New Labour to offer a radical alternative to Thatcherism despite the huge electoral mandate it had received in 1997. Hall traces the way that New Labour had adapted to rather than challenged the neoliberal terrain, as well as analysing the significant and distinctive terms on which it made this adaption. 'The neoliberal revolution' offers an assessment of the 2010-15 Coalition project, and the dynamics of the post financial crisis conjuncture more generally, and engages with the mutations and articulations of neoliberalism as they had been negotiated and refracted through political debate. Hall contended

that this was ‘arguably the best prepared, most wide-ranging, radical and ambitious of the three regimes which since the 1970s have been maturing the neoliberal project’. He laments neoliberalism’s ability to reproduce itself in the wake of the 2008 crisis, noting that ‘in terms of laying foundations and staging the future on favourable ground, the neoliberal project is several stages further on’.

These essays represent the final instalments of Hall’s charting of the shifting formations of neoliberalism, to be read alongside the *Soundings* Kilburn Manifesto project, which he co-edited and contributed to, though he died before it was completed.¹⁸ The way this Manifesto has inspired and engaged new audiences demonstrates the continued relevance of the style of political engagement and analysis that Hall developed.

The publisher and editors are grateful to the estate of Stuart Hall for permission to republish the essays contained here. We would like to thank for Nick Beech for allowing us to consult his invaluable bibliography of Stuart Hall’s writings. We are particularly grateful to Catherine Hall.

Sally Davison, David Featherstone and Bill Schwarz

Notes

1. Gramsci’s work was very important to Hall. For an introduction to Gramsci’s work, including the concept of hegemony, see Roger Simon, *Gramsci’s Political Thought: An Introduction*, third edition, Lawrence & Wishart 2015.
2. See in particular chapter 9 in this book, ‘1970: Birth of the law and order society’, which is an extract from Hall et al, *Policing the Crisis: ‘Mugging’, the State and Law and Order*, Macmillan 1978; and chapter 10, ‘The great moving right show’.
3. See Louis Althusser, ‘Contradiction and Over-determination’, in *For Marx*, Penguin 1969. See also, in this book, pp257–8 in ‘The Meaning of New Times’, and p346–7 in Afterword.
4. V.I. Lenin, ‘Letters from Afar’ in Lenin, *Collected Works, Vol 23*, Progress Publishers 1964, p306.
5. Antonio Gramsci, *Selections From the Prison Notebooks*, Lawrence and Wishart 1971, p126.

6. In his final labours Hall was much preoccupied with the question of how the objective and the subjective played out within the domain of politics. He returned to Freud and Foucault in order to establish a degree of clarification on the issue of subjectivity. For earlier formulations, see particularly Stuart Hall, 'Fantasy, Identity, Politics', in Erica Carter, James Donald and Judith Squires (eds), *Cultural Remix. Theories of Politics and the Popular*, Lawrence and Wishart 1995. And a text crucial for him in these matters was Judith Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*, Stanford University Press 1997.
7. We draw here from observations by Wendy Brown at a roundtable on Stuart Hall at the Townsend Center for the Humanities at Berkeley in March 2016.
8. See also Afterword, p342–7.
9. Stuart Hall, 'Cultural Studies and its theoretical legacies', in David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen (eds), *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, Routledge 1996, p264.
10. Other collections of Hall's work are planned in the near future that are organised around other themes.
11. Important for Hall here was the publication of Ernesto Laclau, *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory: Capitalism, Fascism, Populism*, Verso 1977.
12. These sentences are based on an unpublished manuscript of Hall's.
13. See chapter 9, '1970: Birth of the law and order society', extracted from *Policing the Crisis*, and chapter 8, 'Racism and reaction'.
14. For Hall as critic of New Labour, see chapter 19, 'The great moving nowhere show' and chapter 20, 'New Labour's double-shuffle'.
15. Doreen Massey, *World City*, Polity 2007.
16. Stuart Hall, 'Conclusion: the multi-cultural question', in B. Hesse (ed), *Unsettled Multiculturalisms: Diasporas, Entanglements, Transruptions*, Zed Books 2000, p231.
17. Stuart Hall, Doreen Massey and Michael Rustin, 'Uncomfortable times', *Soundings* 1, November 1995.
18. Stuart Hall, Doreen Massey and Michael Rustin (ed), *After neoliberalism: The Kilburn manifesto*, Lawrence & Wishart 2015 (download for free at <https://www.lwbooks.co.uk/book/after-neoliberalism-kilburn-manifesto>).