



## Reflections on representing Black Britain

Sarita Malik

To cite this article: Sarita Malik (2024) Reflections on representing Black Britain, Journal of Cultural Economy, 17:5, 707-715, DOI: [10.1080/17530350.2022.2138502](https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2022.2138502)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350.2022.2138502>



© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group on behalf of Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences.



Published online: 13 Dec 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2393



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 2 View citing articles [↗](#)

## Reflections on representing Black Britain

Sarita Malik 

Social and Political Science, Brunel University London, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

### ABSTRACT

This short essay forms part of the special issue *What Was Cultural Economy?* The issue has its origins in a January 2020 symposium, held at City, University of London, marking two decades since Paul du Gay and Michael Pryke convened a ‘Workshop on Cultural Economy’ at the Open University in Milton Keynes. That earlier event culminated in the publication of the edited collection *Cultural Economy: Cultural Analysis and Commercial Life* [du Gay, P., and Pryke, M (eds.) 2002. *Cultural Economy: Cultural Analysis and Commercial Life*. London: Sage.]. *What Was Cultural Economy?* collects responses to these founding moments in the field from a number of key figures, who each reflect on the relationship between conceptual clarification and their own academic histories. Here Sarita Malik reflects on the early part of her journey towards academia, with a particular focus on the institutional contexts she encountered in the 1990s. As a former PhD student at the OU with Stuart Hall, and the author of the first book in the *Culture, Representation and Identity* series (ed. Hall and Du Gay), Sarita discusses the decisive shift, away from the associations with issues of ‘cultural identity’ that her early work on television focused on, to a growing awareness of the role of cultural economy in shaping social relations.

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 11 May 2022

Accepted 10 October 2022

### KEYWORDS

Culture; ethnicity; television; film; race

Stuart Hall’s last formal scholarly engagement with television<sup>1</sup> was through the British Film Institute’s (BFI) *Black and White in Colour* project which commenced in the mid-1980s. There were various parts of the project in which Stuart was heavily involved, including the BBC documentary *Black and White in Colour* (1992) directed by Isaac Julien and, subsequently, as principal supervisor of an Arts and Humanities Research Board (as it was then) collaborative doctoral studentship between the Open University (OU) and BFI. I had seen the advert for the studentship in *Guardian Education* and it seemed like a perfect fit, so I applied and got it. I submitted the final dissertation and was awarded my PhD a year before the New Labour regime came into office. The PhD was followed by the publication of *Representing Black Britain: Black and Asian Images on British Television* (Malik 2002), a monograph that was part of the *Culture, Representation and Identity* series that also included books by Sean Nixon (2003) on contemporary advertising cultures, Liz McFall (2004) on advertising history, and Paul du Gay and Pryke (2002) on cultural economy. In ‘Creative Britain’ (1998), New Labour’s first Culture Secretary, Chris Smith, announced the ‘re-branding UK’ cultural project. This was “designed to transform its image from a national heritage culture to what was now famously termed ‘Cool Britannia’” and “marked the monetisation of the UK’s creative sector and its hard wiring for neoliberal reformation towards an increasingly economic dimension in how culture

**CONTACT** Sarita Malik  [sarita.malik@brunel.ac.uk](mailto:sarita.malik@brunel.ac.uk)  Social and Political Science, Brunel University London, Kingston Lane, Uxbridge UB8 3PH, United Kingdom

This article has been republished with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group on behalf of Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

was to be valued and perceived” (Nwonka and Malik 2018, 1114, cf. Malik 2013)\*. Part of the agenda involved positioning culture in relation to ideas of education, access and excellence (Garnham 2005). ‘Diversity’ was also a key dimension and was to become an area that informed much of my subsequent work and pushed it beyond textual-oriented analysis.

## Biographical connections

Drawing the connections, especially in biographical and emotional narratives, can feel contrived. I am convinced though, that there are patterns that make sense when I look back. British-born to an Indian Kenyan-born activist-educator, my early political reference points were predicated on an awareness of the British education system as a site of struggle. My Mum taught in Inner London Education Authority schools, mainly in North Kensington. Daily racism was the lived reality for an Asian, sari-wearing woman who taught English. For many years in the early 1970s Mum was based at Fox Primary School in pre-gentrified Notting Hill, down the road from the then recently constructed Grenfell Tower. I would be dropped off *en route* to a nursery located on the dingy ground floor of the 31-storey Greater London Council-commissioned Trellick Tower, today Grade II listed and lauded for its Brutalist architectural style.<sup>2</sup> Beyond the memories those towers hold for me, they symbolised how land is entangled in material and symbolic divisions and a ‘much wider cartography of imperial and racial violence’ (Danewid 2020, 305).

Mum studied for a Diploma in Anti-Racist Education at the Institute of Education (IoE) in the early 1980s. This opened for me a new space of intellectual thought and cognisance of race and class-based scholarship – the radical critique underpinning anti-racist education in the 1970s and early 1980s – that began to seep into everyday conversations at home. Many of the now seminal texts addressing the relationship between racial structures and educational processes, such as Rex and Tomlinson’s *Colonial Immigrants in a British City* (1979) and Sivanandan’s *A Different Hunger* (1981) were familiar at a fairly young age. This idea of society as unsettled, of the radical possibilities of how inequalities might be challenged, and of legal and policy-based interventions (from Swann to Scarman) as open for critique, taught me that ‘winners and losers’ are socially constructed. The emergent collective anti-racist action of Britain’s Black and Asian communities was a key aspect of political struggle, often taking the form of cultural activism including through film, music and visual arts as part of a wider social movement that was to converge in the 1980s into what became known as the Black Arts movement. The Creation for Liberation and the Asian Youth Movements, Rock Against Racism, and emergent anti-racist politics, shared across geographical and cultural contexts, reverberating the sounds of artists who supported their liberation movements.<sup>3</sup>

This all seems relevant, because of the deep connection that I now recognise between my biographical experience and scholarly curiosity, the present embedded in the past. The relationship between cultural identity and social inequality whether in my virtually all-White school classroom, slowly developing friendships or in the reading of books my Mum brought home from the school library, were the lens through which I was making sense of the world. That and of course television, my preoccupation from a very young age and what went on to be, much to my family’s amusement, the focus of my PhD.

Television and more specifically British television (for that’s all there was for so long), was central to my cultural life. I came to understand that it was the materiality and ordinariness of television in terms of visibility and everyday practices of engagement, that located it at the heart of the pervasive, slow-creeping and *subtle* contestations of how cultural difference is produced. An easy example of this would be a comedy programme such as *Mind Your Language* (LWT/ITV, 1977), but I was also intrigued by the on and off-screen (racialised) structures of representation and

---

\*I have discussed elsewhere the long-running significance of Smith’s ‘Creative Britain’ for the new cultural (and later creative) diversity agenda, from the instrumentalisation underpinning New Labour’s diversity approach (Malik 2013) through to recent productions such as the film *Bullet Boy* (Nwonka and Malik 2018).

absences of representation that I started to gradually register. This showed me, again, that culture is selective and cultural power is socially constructed not fixed. A few years later, I was excited to be brought home a (signed) copy of a still rather obscure publication edited by John Twitchin, *The Black and White Media Book: Handbook for the study of Racism and Television* (Trentham 1986), gifted to Mum at an ‘intercultural education’ seminar at the IoE. It helped me to overcome a period of early angst – that may still be familiar to those who experience the precarious location of Television Studies within the academy – because it took seriously the cultural value of television as an object and medium in shaping (racialised) meaning.

## Television and PhD conversations

In 1993, I completed an MA in Film and Television Studies at Warwick where I was part of an otherwise all-White, almost all male cohort. I was taught by Charlotte Brunsdon and Richard Dyer who had both completed their PhDs at Birmingham’s Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS). Our term 1 module started with Griffiths’ *The Birth of a Nation* and ended with Black Audio Film Collective’s *Twilight City*, a seminal film within the Black Arts Movement. I was previously an undergraduate in English and Media at the University of Sussex where my introductory seminar was led by the radical, former BBC controller of television Stuart Hood. Our first reading was Part 4 of a report to UNESCO on ‘Innovation and Decline in the Treatment of Culture on British Television.’ The paper was titled ‘Television as a Medium and its Relation to Culture: Some Provisional Notes’ (1971) written by Stuart (Hall) whilst he was at CCCS. I still think this is one of the ‘purest’ Television Studies writings by Stuart, providing an early forensic examination of the formal properties of the medium and professional practice, and how these relate to the social and political (though not obviously economic in this particular analysis) realm. It hints at inequalities within cultural production (‘the few address the many’, p. 27) and is an early cue to Stuart’s later work on the cultural reception/production dialectic, most famously ‘Encoding, Decoding’.<sup>4</sup> Stuart’s writings on media at the time (1970s and 1980s), primarily focused on questions of cultural representation and identity, rather than on the relationship between culture and political economy.

When being interviewed for the OU/BFI studentship place by Stuart, June Givanni (Head of the BFI’s African-Caribbean Unit) and Richard Paterson (Head of Research and Scholarship at the BFI) in a small office at the BFI’s main Stephen Street site in London’s Fitzrovia in early 1994, I was struck by the relaxed and convivial tone of the discussion. Unexpectedly, there was an ability to speak with candour and seriousness about the programmes we were watching. This carried through into our regular PhD meetings where we engaged in more ‘intellectually-framed’ dialogue about how ‘race’ was being discursively constructed on screen, something that we were also acutely aware was still marginal within critical scholarship of television. By this point it was also possible to reflect on the radical and aesthetic possibilities that had been laid open by 1980s texts such as *My Beautiful Laundrette*, *Handsworth Songs* and *King of the Ghetto* and the specific institutional contexts of their making, whether Channel 4, the independent film workshop sector or the BBC, and how this related to conditions of production, ownership, funding and commissioning.

We would discuss what we had watched since our last meeting; there was plenty to say about dramas such as *The Buddha of Suburbia* (BBC, 1993) and *This Life* (BBC, 1996–97) if I recall correctly. Although formally schooled in textual analysis, informal deconstructions of what and how we were each watching was a new source of pleasure and there was a comfort and recognition in the subjectivities at play. We talked about how genre linked to racialised regimes of representation, noting the pervasive White ‘lad culture’ that framed the previous night’s Euro 1996 football coverage, which suggested to us the ease in which the colonial past permeates into present and everyday narratives. It was always text and context, including contexts of production and reception.

Stuart had already managed to productively navigate a certain level of visibility of his own in the mainstream media, even alongside his sharp social critique of it. He called out British television, a

medium of which he was so clearly fond, for its powerful racialising logics. Importantly, he also found a way of addressing different audiences with this critique. His commentary landed in different spaces, whether in a book chapter such as *The Whites of Their Eyes* (1981) or on television itself, as was the case with the Campaign Against Racism in the Media's 'It Ain't Half Racist Mum' (the 1979, part of the BBC's 'Open Door' series), much to the BBC's nervousness at the time.

## Theoretical framings

The theoretical impetus of the PhD was to put history at the centre of Sociology, and race at the centre of Television studies. The aim was to assemble a history of Black and Asian representation on television since its inception in 1936, building explanatory understandings and historical interpretation through Media and Cultural studies and theories of race, racism and identity. Specifically, what was the role of television, as technological form, in shaping meanings of post-imperial Britain? The 'representation problem' that was so brilliantly foregrounded at the Institute of Contemporary Arts 1988 conference 'Black Film, British Cinema' where Stuart had delivered the 'New Ethnicities' keynote, was incredibly generative. Those debates around cultural identity and its relationship to cultural production ultimately carried through into the ideas and empirical topics themselves such as new Black cinema and Multicultural programming. Questions of cultural representation and identity were at the fore of the doctoral research, though a reconsideration of television's (dis)pleasures as more than a broad intellectual, symbolic activity embedded in social life was required. In that 1971 paper I read in Hood's seminar at Sussex, Hall had explicitly pointed out television's 'social and political qualities' (Hall 1971, 28).

As a history forged through the concept of national Public Service Broadcasting (PSB), understanding the specificities of television required grappling with the very idea of cultural citizenship and national identity in relation to representation. This connected to the ways in which the political conception of 'citizenship' had been central to those debates around participation, access and belonging in education. The ideology of 'educational nationalism' that Tomlinson (1990, 36) referred to when discussing the New Right's emphasis on a monolithic, White culture and heritage under threat from ethnic minorities with alien cultures related to the story of UK PSB and its handling of race and ethnic difference that we were now trying to tell. Television (and the media more broadly) also depended on notions of cultural inclusion and exclusion, mirroring education as a site of struggle. In any case, there was an intimacy between debates around race, culture and multiculturalism in Education and studies of Media, that Stuart was connected to, both as a teacher in London in the 1960s and in his subsequent work with James Donald and Ali Rattansi (1992).

The intellectual task involved formulating an analysis in relationship to different areas of study across Sociology, Media Studies and Television Studies bringing together political economy, cultural studies and postcolonial theoretical approaches. This was done using a critical methodological approach that retained textual analysis in order to trace the discursive constructions of racialised identity, but always alongside a consideration of its interconnectedness to wider formations. This was part of a multi-layered method of sociohistorical analysis, that also included capturing direct testimonies through interviews with several key players such as industry personnel and Black cultural producers. The influence of Cultural Studies, as an interdisciplinary and heterogeneous practice, was an essential component in trying to interrogate the culture, society, text paradigm. Cultural Studies can help us to see cultural forms, where cultural objects retain a value in themselves (beyond economic outcomes), as well as how encoding 'the social' in materials can shape political and economic spaces. Cultural Studies, as much as probably Media Studies, provided a route to engage, for example, with how cultural production linked to cultural inequality. This was captured in the testimonies of those that I interviewed about how they accessed and produced cultural work, often in what was located as 'the margins'. Implicit in this task of assembling a cultural history of Black Britain, was a probing of the relationship between culture, economy and the social and between texts, people and technological form.

The temporal basis of the doctoral study, in which the dual histories of Black Britain and television were being charted, served as a powerful distraction from the emergent and fast tactics that were now being designed to embed culture in the economic life of industrial capitalism. Moreover, the intervening decades since the forms of cultural resistance that were most apparent in the 1970s and 1980s, had been marked by a displacement of political and racial struggle in the 1990s. As mentioned, the research was conducted on the cusp of the New Labour win and the soporific policy framings of ‘cultural diversity’ and ‘social cohesion’ were starting to emerge against the forms of anti-racist struggle previously witnessed. The BFI collaboration meant we were all involved in – though each of us in different ways – these shifts, from within the fabric of that landmark national cultural institution in the 1990s. These included initial routes towards what I was to later recognise as the ‘diversity economy’. The BFI’s African-Caribbean Unit, led by June Givanni, was one of the few institutional spaces specifically geared towards supporting the exhibition and critical momentum around Black British and diaspora moving image culture, and yet was in the process of being closed (late 1996). The argument from some BFI management was that a dedicated space for Black film was no longer needed. This was a kind of loss that characterised a broader politics of cultural assimilation as part of a surfacing neoliberal and post-racial ideal of ‘social cohesion’. Within the cultural terrain, this involved shifting funding models, new kinds of auditing regimes and a vision of cultural institutions as tools of governance; the closure of the African-Caribbean Unit was an example of a bureaucratic re-organisation of cultural difference. Underpinned by an assumption of cultural meritocracy and assimilation, it was marked by an end to ‘special treatment’, and ran concurrent to an accumulative process of disavowing (the history of) left, feminist, and anti-racist work. At the same time, a critical neglect of questions of race and racialisation within Media Studies (never mind British screen histories!), made it feel even more vital for the project to slowly historicise and carefully archive the everyday ways in which Black Britain was represented. And whilst the Cultural Economy approach at the time took up the challenge to connect cultural analysis with economic developments, it rarely considered the relations between culture and forms of stratification, including the logics of racialisation, representation and forms of resistance.

### **Cultural economy – and the drive towards ‘mainstreaming’ around us**

In stark ways, and through the duration of this period, television was a key and symbolic site of reconstruction for economic outcomes. For the terrestrial television channels, shifting modes and conditions of production, marketing and regulation, the rethinking of formats, craft and scheduling, all pertained to the new economic transformation and largely resisted claims for the protection of an ‘exception culturelle’ (Baer 2003). The everyday encounters, modes of practice, and emotional labour that so-called ‘minority producers’ increasingly had to collide with – or indeed collude with – was becoming a requirement from the paradigmatic ‘creative economy’ that has forcefully come to characterise culture itself. These developments correspondingly altered the spaces of resistance, decolonial forms of practice, and the political and theoretical creative approaches of the kind that we had seen with the British Black Arts Movement.

Given the ways in which culture was now heavily implicated in processes of economic change, a reckoning with how television culture connected not just to revolutionary struggles in a Black British context, but also to economic activity and analysis – and beyond the nation-state – was needed. Communication flows, assisted by global capitalism, were becoming increasingly international by the early-mid 1990s. The proliferation of cable and satellite channels, supported by processes of deregulation, were proving to be successful in their appeal to new (diasporic) audiences. In the UK context that the doctoral study was focused on, some of the old ITV companies had lost their franchises (1993), Zee TV started full-day broadcasting (1993) and BSkyB had begun digital TV transmissions (1998). These techno-cultural developments were impacting on cultural consumption and preferences as well as on ethnic formations and notions of cultural identity, for example in terms of viewing practices and in how audiences were being built but also segmented,

targeted and marketed to. The increasing forms of media concentration and commercialisation and a revisiting of the cultural imperialism thesis (Boyd-Barrett 1998, for example) co-existed with a diversification of modes of cultural engagement in this new television environment.

Cultural Studies was much debated and embattled at the time. Stuart later spoke about the lack of 'grubby worldliness' in some Cultural Studies approaches, notably through the 'academicisation of cultural studies' (Hall in MacCabe 2007, 28) that was especially rife in the US. Therefore, the conditions of the *Representing Black Britain* studentship were important because it allowed me to work within a hybrid intellectual-cultural space (the BFI), linking me at least to a sense of the 'real world' in which the representations I was analysing were produced.

My experience as a doctoral student was animated and textured by the people, the conversations, as well as by the space in which I worked. Our monthly meetings were mostly held at the BFI Stephen Street office. My workspace was in the progressively over-crowded mezz located behind the main office, where I sat alongside some of the other BFI postgraduate students. Connoisseur Video was based there, the Centenary of Cinema (1994/5) was a big focal point, and various BFI personnel and freelancers were working in areas as diverse as Animation and IT. This was still the era of the fax machine and landline phone, with technology in the workplace very much in its infancy. The research process was embedded in the physical materiality of this encounter. This reminds me, I got away without needing a laptop until the writing stage of the PhD when I switched to a matt-grey clunky PowerBook 160 using ClarisWorks 1.0. I would put my latest slowly typed chapter in the post, and feedback from Stuart and June was always handwritten and posted back to me in good time for our next meeting. Towards the later stages closer to Stuart's formal retirement in 1997 there were some meetings at Stuart's house in North-West London. We never met at Walton Hall where the OU is based, and I have to say that it felt solely like an administrative connection to me.

On reflection, mine was an extremely collaborative, dynamic, and privileged way to do a PhD and this helped sustain my interest. The BFI was a buzzy space at the time, the home of *Sight and Sound* magazine and highly practical in being able to access the basement 'viewing cubicles'. I remember bell hooks delivering a talk one lunchtime in a BFI boardroom and Global Majority scholars such as Homi Bhabha, Henry Louis Gates Jnr and Paul Gilroy would give presentations at open seminars at the various universities down the road. I had the chance to write articles for the BFI's *Black Film Bulletin* which June Givanni had founded in 1993, help out at conferences and festivals, see a lot of films at the National Film Theatre and spend evenings at the London Film-Makers' Co-Op where I also taught. Within BFI Education there were important industry-led studies being conducted to gather data on conditions of cultural production and labour, for example the Television Industry Tracking Study, a longitudinal study of creative workers in television (1994-1998). This environment felt more generative to me than a more conventionally academic space. Through various interactions, I could engage with the ways in which cultural theory intersected with practice, for example Black cultural production. I valued Stuart's 'embodied pedagogy', described by Clarke (2015, 275) as his 'art of listening combined with the practice of the-oring'. The intellectual and personal generosity of my supervisory team led to a fairly seamless transition from doctoral thesis to book in the form of *Representing Black Britain* (Sage, 2002). Stuart facilitated that process, co-ordinating meetings with Sage, writing the Foreword of the book, and giving a speech at its launch.

I was to be part of the last cohort of doctoral students supported by the BFI as part of its Education programme which was by now experiencing its own sense of transformation, including from the Charity's roots in the appreciation of film as a form of education. The BFI, 'reputedly Margaret Thatcher's favourite state "charity"' (Caughie and Frith 1990, 27) whilst private investment was being wooed, stated in its Annual Review of 1997-1998 that its Museum of Moving Image (MOMI) was to become, 'the world's most comprehensive moving image museum and educational facility'. Embarrassingly short-lived, MOMI was an example of a move toward 'museum like' education in the form of large capital projects. The social argument here was that the remit for BFI Education needed to be

more oriented towards widespread engagement for ‘ordinary people’. This narrative of mainstreaming in the name of public good and social progress reverberated across the cultural sector and coincided with the Thatcherite leanings towards a combined nationalist/free market logic. Within PSB there was an assumption that ‘minorities’ had now been assimilated fully enough to inform more universalist modes of programming and structures (for example, an end to specialist Multicultural Programming and Departments). Driving these social arguments was the economic push that resituated culture as a pro-creative site, now to be more commonly termed the ‘creative industries’, in which culture was oriented towards the accumulation of capital.

In *The Multicultural Question*, a lecture delivered at the Political Economy Research Centre in Sheffield in 2000, Stuart Hall talked about the political possibilities and ambiguities of that current moment in Britain’s multicultural history. Hall’s analysis interrupted any easy idea of an unobtrusive multicultural state or comfortable response to what he termed ‘*multicultural drift*’. In drawing a distinction between different forms of multiculturalism – pluralist, corporate, managerial – Hall asserted how difference is managed as well as how ‘the multiculturalism question’ complicates traditional notions of race and ethnicity. In one of his later interviews, Hall told us that, for him, ‘the cultural and the economic-political were just never separated out’ (Hall in MacCabe, p.20). This is perhaps best captured in his work on the media, and specifically on television, which he located as a primary ‘ambivalent cultural’ site where capitalist logics resided. The relevance of Chris Smith’s ‘Creative Britain’ is that it was under New Labour, according to Hall (Hall in MacCabe 2007), that the forms of managerialism seeded under Thatcherism, were now being ‘craftily’ adapted in accessible and palatable (neo-liberal) ways for a wider set of publics. Hall explained the relevance of capital both for television, as one of those primary cultural sites, and for the governance of Britain’s lived multicultural.

I think Stuart’s commentary around this time laid the foundations for how we might now understand why ‘diversity’ came to be constructed as a primary site of economic growth in the cultural sector and, furthermore, how diversity-industrialised discourse and what we might term ‘diversity opportunism’ oversees the management of culture and difference in the cultural industries today. This thread that links the cultural to the economic, is the value of racial difference for economic gain as part of a diversity complex. Although he did not describe it as such, Stuart set in motion – through his analysis of the cultural/economic-political complex – the conceptual foundations of ‘racial capitalism’; an example of which is how the diversity agenda actively commodifies racial identity. Diversity, as a form of racial capitalism, accrues both economic and social value. The diversity economy situates cultural difference in relation to economic outcomes and is part of a broader set of manoeuvres towards the economic value of culture. The discursive mechanisms of the new politics of diversity, which we can trace back to the period in which I was conducting my doctoral research, was not only linked to wider transformations in the cultural economy but also to how racial difference, or ‘race relations’, was starting to be managed. Diversity became the primary – coded – way in which the national conversation around ‘race’ was, and still is, being constructed.

## Concluding reflection

This background has helped to connect my interest in cultural representation with my interest in cultural institutions, including the language and techniques used, which I would suggest remains disconnected from lived experiences. A recent project I have been involved in, ‘Creative Interruptions: grassroots culture, state structures and disconnection as space for ‘radical openness’’, has considered how seemingly immovable structures are being challenged by grassroots, decolonial and radical interventions through creative means; back to that idea of cultural activism that was so fertile in the 1970s and 1980s.

Television has become something else for me but it remains such a dynamic space: whether in terms of its utility as a site for political interference through ongoing threats of privatisation (as I write, it is being targeted at Channel 4); or as a prime target for those stoking the so-called ‘culture

wars'. Take for example how it has positioned racism as a form of debate on-screen, or how it has both facilitated and contained the rise of the 'diversity-industrialist' within its operational structures. I have been writing about the standardisation of institutionalised diversity as a pernicious example of commodified organisational culture that also governs cultural difference (Malik 2013). Even the Black Lives Matter movement shows us how easily anti-racism (imitating the recent techniques of 'diversity' of which I am so critical) can itself be co-opted and caught up in the manoeuvres of late-stage capitalism as corporations *need to be seen to check themselves*. Whilst race and class-based inequalities deepen, and in spite of the displacement of struggle in the intervening years that I referred to, so too does the strength of resurgent forms of grassroots, often creative, forms of anti-racism. So, it does again feel like a moment where radical hope is necessary. The fascination for me is always with regards to the medium's interconnectedness with these wider formations. What is the space between all of this and the experiences of those who are seldom heard in ways of their own making?

## Notes

1. Stuart's last published work on television was *Black and White in Television*, 1995 (June Givanni's *Remote Control*) – full reference. His first was *Television as a Medium and its Relation to Culture* (1971, mixed source).
2. Trellick Tower was a Utopian project for its architects who hoped it would build community spirit. It was labelled the 'Tower of Terror' by the tabloids and provided the inspiration for JG Ballard's 1975 novel, *High Rise*.
3. One issue around which these alliances were built, was the anti-apartheid movement. The links between creativity and political struggle are further explored in the edited collection, *Creativity in a Hostile World*, MUP, 2021.
4. This paper briefly comments on how television has 'revolutionised the basic triadic relationship between communicator-message-audience' (Hall 1971, 26).

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

## Notes on contributor

**Sarita Malik** is Professor of Media and Culture at Brunel University London.

## ORCID

Sarita Malik  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0985-5246>

## References

- Baer, J-M, 2003. "L'exception culturelle, une règle en quête de contenus." *En temps reel*, Cahier 11.
- Boyd-Barrett, 1988. Media imperialism reformulated. In: D Thussu, ed. *Electronic empires: Global media and local resistance*. London: Arnold, 157–176.
- Caughie, J, and Frith, S, 1990. Reports and debates: The British Film Institute: re-tooling the culture industry. *Screen*, 31 (2), 214–222.
- Clarke, J, 2015. Stuart Hall and the theory and practice of articulation. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 36 (2), 275–286.
- Danewid, I, 2020. The fire this time: Grenfell, racial capitalism and the urbanisation of empire. *European Journal of International Relations*, 26 (1), 289–313.
- Donald, J., and Rattansi, A, 1992. *Race, Culture, Difference*. London: Sage.
- du Gay, P., and Pryke, M (eds.) 2002. *Cultural Economy: Cultural Analysis and Commercial Life*. London: Sage.
- Garnham, N, 2005. From cultural to creative industries. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11 (1), 15–29.
- Givanni, J., 1995. *Remote Control: Dilemmas of Black intervention in British TV and film*. London: BFI Publishing.

- Hall, S, 1981. The Whites of Their Eyes. In: G. Bridges, and R Brunt, eds. *Silver Linings: Some strategies for the Eighties*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hall, S., 1971. "Television as a Medium, and its Relation to Culture, Some Provisional Notes." Accessed September 20, 2021. <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/history/cccs/stencilled-occasional-papers/9and25to37/SOP34.pdf>.
- MacCabe, C, 2007. An Interview with Stuart Hall December 2007. *Critical Quarterly*, 50 (1-2), 12–42.
- Malik, S, 2002. *Representing Black Britain: A History of Black and Asian Images on British Television*. London: Sage.
- Malik, S, 2013. "Creative Diversity": UK Public Service Broadcasting After Multiculturalism. *Popular Communication*, 11 (3), 227–241.
- Malik, S., Mahn, C., Pierse, M., and Rogaly, B (eds). 2021. *Creativity and Resistance in a Hostile World*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- McFall, L, 2004. *Advertising: A Cultural Economy*. London: Sage.
- Nixon, S, 2003. *Advertising Cultures: Gender, Commerce, Creativity*. London: Sage.
- Nwonka, C.J., and Malik, S., 2018. Cultural discourses and practices of institutionalised diversity in the UK film sector: 'Just get something black made.' *The Sociological Review*, 66 (6), 1111–1127.
- Rex, J., and Tomlinson, S, 1979. *Colonial Immigrants in a British City: A Class Analysis*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Sivanandan, A, 1981. *A Different Hunger: Writings on Black Resistance*. London: Pluto.
- Smith, C, 1998. *Creative Britain*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Tomlinson, S, 1990. *Multicultural Education in White Schools*. London: Batsford.
- Twitchin, J, 1986. *Black and White Media Show: Handbook for the study of Racism and Television*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Broadcasts:
- Black and White in Colour (1992).
- 'It Ain't Half Racist Mum' (1979).
- Mind Your Language 1977.
- The Buddha of Suburbia (BBC, 1993).
- This Life (BBC, 1996–97).