There is power in a good question

Vron Ware interviews Jo Littler

In *Left Feminisms: Conversations on the personal and the political*, published by Lawrence & Wishart in March 2023, Jo Littler interviews fourteen feminist academics, including Vron Ware. In this interview, Vron Ware turned the tables to interview Jo Littler about the book, the process of compiling it, and her other work. This other work includes the books *The Politics of Heritage: The legacies of 'race',* with Roshi Naidoo (Routledge, 2005); *Against Meritocracy: Culture, Power and Myths of Mobility* (Routledge 2018); and, with The Care Collective, *The Care Manifesto* (Verso, 2020).

Vron Ware: In the introduction to your new book, *Left Feminisms*, you say that you think you've always been a bit of a frustrated journalist.[1] Which I completely understand, as that's how I started out too. You've also written quite a lot for *The Guardian*. In the most recent article you drew attention to the number of women leading strikes at the moment, which is something that's not really been discussed very much, although it is very noticeable when you pay attention to it.[2] And you begin with a cultural reference to a film, *Enola Holmes 2,* that you clearly think is important. So the way you approach the issue and shape the argument in that article touches on a number of themes in your work. Can you say something more about why you think the visibility of women on strike is significant?

Jo Littler: I think it's part of a broader trend: of moving away from the complete dominance of a neoliberal feminist model. That model insisted that women should just lean in to the corporate norms of the workplace: and if they do that, and they work really, really hard, they will inevitably progress to the top of the social ladder. That 'post-feminist' idea - that sexism had been pretty much solved, or resolved, in society, and equality was now up to the individual - was really the dominant model when I was growing up. It was pretty much the same with dominant narratives

DOI: 10.3898/SOUN.83.08.2023

around 'race' and class: the messages that were beamed to me as a teenager were that racism has been solved, that class isn't really a problem anymore, and it's just up to the individual to sort themselves out by making the effort.

But that neoliberal meritocratic logic seems to have significantly fractured recently, as it becomes increasingly obvious that willpower alone cannot solve structural inequality. And it's both palpable and refreshing to see that shift being represented on screen, in academia and in unions. It was exciting to see the *Enola Holmes* film dramatise a slice of 'left feminist' activism and political revolt from the past. In its representation of the Matchgirls strike - or Matchwomen, as they're now often called - you see people agitating for better working conditions that don't destroy their faces and their bodies and their souls and their way of life. We are shown that that kind of agitation wasn't just something which belonged to white men: it's always been a series of diverse, and differentiated, struggles that a broad range of people have been involved in. So seeing the Matchgirls' strike on screen made me think once again about how feminism on the left now seems to be resurgent, and unabashed, in a way that it wasn't even ten years ago.

As a teacher, as opposed to a writer, don't you think that feminism has changed the possibilities for young women in your lifetime, and that is also part of this equation? Given that most of your students are female these days, do you think that the disproportionate number of women in certain areas of higher education - certainly in the Social Sciences and Humanities - means that actually it isn't only about what you call 'lean-in', corporate feminism - that something else has also been going on?

That's a good point. Yes, there has been a huge influx of women into higher education over the past few generations, as part of the massification of HE. Combined with the effects of second-wave feminism, that has meant that there are more women in varied roles in the workplace. Although another issue there is that whilst there has been a huge increase in the number of women in higher education as students, and they are dominant in the Social Sciences and Humanities, they aren't in STEM; and within employment overall there are not as many women in positions of power as men. But yes, by that logic it does follow, doesn't it, that feminism has had knock-on effects in mainstream positions of power, and in union representation more broadly, in education and beyond.

In the introduction to the interviews in this amazing book you talk about what you mean by

'the left' and 'left feminisms'. Can you say what you mean by that here?

In academic feminist theory this entire domain tends to primarily be talked about in terms of 'socialist feminism'. And I think the history of the word 'socialism' - how it's been positioned, and its currency - is very interesting and complicated for our generation. Because I grew up at a time when it moved from being a term that could be *valorised* - as an important part of the legacy of the welfare state and the NHS - to something that was rendered abject: which was thought of in a very narrow and reductive way as 'totalitarian', old-fashioned, and to be pushed out of the way. This was because of the context of the rise of neoliberalism with its credo that everything should be handed over to the private sector and marketised; with the message that this was our inevitable modern future. But attitudes have really changed over the past ten years since the financial crash. In the US more millennials now identify as 'socialist' than 'capitalist', for example.

I've always been interested and invested in the rich, diverse history of socialist feminism, which itself is both highly debated and much more than those two words. As Barbara Ehrenreich said in the 1970s, hardly any socialist feminists like the term and it's too short for what is really 'socialist internationalist, anti-racist, anti-heterosexist feminism'.[3] Around eight years ago I co-organised an event called 'Feminism and the S-word' with Alison Winch, because socialist feminism didn't seem to be something that you could talk about much in public, and now it does.[4] But there is also the legacy of that set of meanings, which means that, to lots of people, socialist feminism isn't something they would necessarily gravitate towards even though they are interested in left issues, in issues of egalitarianism and justice. They wouldn't necessarily think of themselves as socialists, in other words, but they would think themselves as 'on the left'. So I thought 'left feminisms' would be a more capacious term for the book, as there is a range of left perspectives and politics in there, from communist through socialist to social democratic.

I wanted to ask you about your idea of 'the conjuncture', because even in what you've just said, you refer to 'now' and 'historically' and 'my generation'. And I know that you were very influenced by cultural studies as an approach, and at the centre of that is the idea, coming from Stuart Hall and the work he developed in Birmingham, of the conjuncture. And this is something I have puzzled over a lot in my own work, particularly as I've got older. I first engaged with your work through your writing on heritage and the colonial past. In fact, the first thing I read of yours was actually about the Festival of Britain in

1951 - you wrote a really interesting piece about the end of Empire, of Empire unravelling alongside the beginning of a sort of socialist dawn in this country.[5] I've recently gone back to 1951, which was just before I was born, and I'm discovering it in a way that is absolutely fascinating - and it's not that long ago. So for me, as I get older, I'm actually finding it harder to understand 'the conjuncture' as a tool for understanding where we are now. Could you say something about how you think of that word and how you use it in your own approach?

I like that you found that piece - I don't think many people have read it! 'The conjuncture' is an interesting concept, because it seems to me that, whilst it's the formative MO of cultural studies, it's also probably its least discussed aspect. I was drawn to cultural studies because it offered a way of thinking about the political and social and cultural forces and dynamics of the present, and what that might mean; and because it enabled an exploration of that question in an expansive and interdisciplinary way, one that wasn't necessarily bounded by one academic zone of study. The creativity and experimentalism and joy of that was - and is - really exciting and liberating and generative. But yes, that term is also maddeningly elusive as well. 'Structures of feeling' is similar, isn't it? They're both theoretical terms of reference which are extremely generative - almost poetically so - and at the same time really difficult to pin down. I did once write a piece trying to set out how I understood 'the conjuncture', although foolishly I didn't put the word in the title. It was for an interdisciplinary book on consumer culture - I contributed the chapter outlining the contribution of cultural studies. To outline what the conjuncture involved, I went back and looked at Stuart Hall's use of Gramsci's ideas about the social forces and power relations of a particular moment, and how cultural studies at Birmingham infused that idea with a transdisciplinary, experimental approach, drawing on different theoretical resources, from psychoanalysis and semiotics to history and philosophy.[6]

What about the word 'contemporary'? How do you understand that?

'The conjuncture' tends to get used in terms of shifts happening over several decades, but it can also sometimes refer to much shorter timeframes. It's the same with 'contemporary,' although of course it also indicates the 'now'. But neither term is that precise. Conjuncture indicates the structure of feeling of an era with its particular social, economic, political and cultural logics; and a contemporary

conjuncture can be in transformation as events crystallise and roll into view and social logics change. So when everyone is primarily using digital media and the NHS is crumbling and migrants are being scapegoated, there's a set of economic and social logics at work, and power dynamics, and repeated patterns, that fuse together in a way that can be used to understand and define how this conjunctural moment is contemporary.

But then when you use the example of Enola Holmes and the Matchgirls' strike you bring the past into the present, don't you, and you make it meaningful: women did this then, young women did this then. There's a connection between the past, and what's happening right now. So is it the representation of that particular historical period that's important; or is it the fact that it really happened, more than 130 years ago?

I think it's both. It's about what histories are made available, and *where* histories are made available, and how and why they are taught to us as being 'important'. And those histories are always being written and re-written, or obscured, as the case of the Colston statue shows. How the past is being represented around us and what stories are being activated, and for what ends, is what Roshi Naidoo and I brought together writers and practitioners to talk about in *The Politics of Heritage: The Legacies of 'Race'*.[7] It was also something I got more interested in during my PhD, which was about exhibitions and consumer culture. I was very interested in the idea of a museum or gallery as a public space that was, on the one hand, free for people who didn't necessarily have a lot of cultural capital or resources (like me growing up). And, on the other hand, I was interested in how those spaces also functioned as imperial 'civilising missions' and as intensely marketised spaces that were and are used to prop up the power of the rich. So that's what the Festival of Britain piece came out of. It was a pretty eclectic PhD, but it helped me get interested in some of the zones I hadn't learned so much about, and decolonisation and display was one of those areas. It seemed important to think about how monuments and spaces like the Festival of Britain, which were presented as being very future-oriented and forward-looking and modern, were also trying to reactivate specific ideas about Britain's greatness and place in the world - to dress neo-imperialism up in more modern clothing, and adjust to Britain's diminishing power, at the same time as trying to stake out new claims for what the nation could be, and to create a social-democratic settlement at home.

We've talked a bit about cultural studies, and I'm thinking that now you're teaching gender studies - actually wasn't gender studies also a radical intervention in academia? Wasn't it a sort of academic intellectual wing of the women's movement - what we used to call the Women's Liberation Movement, or second-wave feminism as you've called it? Feminism and gender studies was also a place where disciplinary boundaries could be transgressed, or done away with. And there was a lot more scope for being bold and provocative and just following the questions that you had. Years ago, at the turn of the century, Wendy Brown wrote a piece saying that gender studies had pretty much done its job in terms of placing gender at the centre of intellectual inquiry - or at least as being impossible to ignore. Now you're responsible for teaching gender studies and heading a departmental centre, what do you think of gender studies as an academic framework for investigating contemporary problems?

That's a good way of framing it. Yes, it definitely played that role for me. I came to gender studies through interdisciplinary means, as part of a group of PhD students who had a reading group about gender - the 'feminist theory reading group' - which introduced me to all kinds of work from geography and history and politics that I wouldn't have known about otherwise. And that kind of interdisciplinary questioning was carried on in my teaching as well. When I started teaching at Sussex it was on an experimental programme called 'The Arts/Science module'. I think this was part of C.P. Snow's legacy - his ideas were taken up by Sussex in that science students had to do one arts module and all arts students had to do a science module, and so they had this whole department or area, for a while, called 'Arts/Science', which they tended to deliver through Sussex PhD students. My friend Kay took me along to the person who ran the department, and he pretty much said to me, 'What course would you like to teach?' and I said 'oh, I think I could perhaps do an introduction to gender studies'. And he said, 'okay, go away and invent that course, come back and show me what you've got, and then if it works you can roll it out'. That was my first experience of teaching. It was wonderful and deeply educational to just be able to invent a module from scratch - having that much control and autonomy as a novice tutor is not something you would ever get now.

And it did exactly what you were talking about, in that it was it was a deliberately interdisciplinary frame for teaching and learning - and even more so, in fact, because of the arts/science context. I sat there with a bunch of biology and chemistry and physics students, talking with them about the work of bell hooks, Lynne Segal, Judith

Butler and Kate Bornstein, about masculinity and global feminisms and 'nature' and 'nurture'. It was really amazing to be able to do that - it enabled a kind of capacious, interdisciplinary form of questioning over the meanings of 'sex' and gender in different times and places. So yes, I think gender studies has that legacy, role and function, and it's still used in that expansive way. Although at the same time it can be such a difficult and fraught zone right now. It is an increasingly fractious space, which sometimes makes it very hard as well as generative.

I want to ask you a very old-school question - one I hesitated about - and then I asked myself why I was hesitating exactly, as you were precisely the kind of person I can ask this question to. How has your experience of, and your work, changed as a result of being a mother and a carer? - in relation to what you've just told me about gender studies, and thinking about it through abstract theory as well as the practice of 'the personal is political'?

Motherhood changed my relationship to work. My experience of it altered. I know I'm hardly unusual there. I was fortunate enough to have a full-time job and access to maternity leave - even though maternity and paternity leave then was not quite as egalitarian as it is now in the UK. It's so good today to see colleagues who can share parental leave in a much more equitable way because they've been enabled to do that by changes in the law. (I also spent a fair bit of time in the 1990s campaigning for improved parental leave as part of a local feminist group, and handing out leaflets in shopping centres, so it makes me happy on that level too.) I'm also aware that I am, and was then, very privileged comparatively speaking, given that increasing numbers of people in academia don't have full-time jobs, and are casualised, precarious, on zero hours contracts and without access to better rates of maternity/paternity leave. And then also that the overwork culture means that we all have to work more than we should, when it would be much healthier to have a four-day week. All of those issues are true at the same time.

Having children also made me very aware of time. I felt that I couldn't waste time any longer, and in particular that there was really *no point* in wasting any time worrying any more. I had spent far too much time early on as an academic doing that. Now I just had these little parcels of time in which I had to work in a very focused way. When I started a full-time job I spent the vast majority of my time doing teaching and administration (as well as worrying). And so after I'd had kids I think I did perhaps produce more bits of research in the nooks and crannies,

because that's what these focused slices of time enabled me to do. In addition, when the kids were little I did a lot of collaborative work - which I still do. Because time was tight, it became easier and more generative and fun to produce work in collaboration with other people. If a collaboration works, it's wonderful: it extends you and supports you and makes something new.

Then, as I said earlier, the main reason I like cultural studies is because it enables you to look around at what's going on and think about it in a capacious and detailed way: to think about what the politics of the situation, and the conjuncture is. So I also did that with motherhood. I was interested in the kind of maternal milieus that I was being flung into, or defined against. The idea of the 'yummy mummy' was, for instance, very dominant in the media when I had my eldest.

Did anyone ever call you that?

Ha-ha! I don't think so. It's not often a label given to people to people in everyday life unless it's said as a joke. It's used in much more varied registers as a media term. The yummy mummy was one route through which maternal subjectivity was being reconfigured: mothers were suddenly being positioned as being permitted to be sexual, but only in very narrow ways, and only for certain types of women - white and wealthy. And of course that ideal was commercialised. Nearly three years later, when I had my second child, what I noticed were all these media representations of women who were just losing their mind: who were incredibly strung out because of the demands of the overwork culture and the cost of living crisis. And that was represented, in films like *Bad Moms* and sitcoms like *Motherland*, by mothers partying very hard in very short periods of time and behaving in many ways like the 'new lads' of the 1990s, only in shorter, more temporary bursts. So I wrote an article called *Mothers Behaving Badly* about that.

I remember that. Also you wrote about MumsNet, which was a phenomenon that somehow emerged quite quickly and became a potent voice for politicians to take account of. I wonder whether your sensitivity to the things you've just been talking about made you more aware of that potential?

I co-wrote that piece on MumsNet with my colleague Ros Gill and our PhD student Yvonne Erhstein, the lead author. Ros, who I've co-supervised a lot of PhD students with, has a very good practice of trying to cowrite an article with PhD students in

which they are first author, and we work with them, contributing roughly a third each, and that was one such collaborative piece, driven by Yvonne's great work on the topic. So yes, it engaged with those issues - of how MumsNet was creating a social media chamber - or pressure valve - for mothers to talk about the frustrations and issues around 'work-life balance', and employment, and all of their current impossibilities.

That brings us to equality and inequality. But it also brings us to the concept of care. Equality and care have become very important throughout your work. I'm interested in how you take these everyday words that are obviously very normative, and that everyone understands; but at the same time you've really challenged the meaning of those words and tried to make them mean something much more important and radical. So for example both your sense of 'equality' and 'care' have a very strong ecological component: of caring for the Earth, caring for each other, caring for the Earth together, and 'equality' means access to the resources that allow people to live equitably on this planet. And just now you used the word 'egalitarian'. So the concept of equality is very important to you, as a projection of where we want to be, and what it might mean, even though most of the time you disagree with how that word's used today - 'equality of opportunity' being the most heinous. So that's one thing I wanted to ask you: when did you make the connection with ecological principles? There's the social, political and economic dimension, and then there's the ecological, which is contained in all these concepts. So I wanted to ask you about that.

Yes. That makes me think about how, when I did the spate of writing on motherhood when I had two small kids, I also wrote a piece on environmentalism and motherhood. I don't know if it was hugely successful … I think it's one of those embryonic pieces that get foisted upon the world. But it was called 'Good Housekeeping': about mothers, consumerism, nappies and ecology.

I wrote a piece like that in 1989! Anyway, go on …

The 'Good Housekeeping' article came from the strand of work I did on consumer culture early on. My first single authored book, *Radical Consumption: Shopping for Change in Contemporary Culture*, attempted to pick apart some of the problems and possibilities of ethical consumption.[8] I was wrestling with the idea that these practices were both important, because we need to find ways of making products more sustainable and less heinously polluting; and also that they were clearly being used as forms of corporate greenwashing - and that the expansion of the *volume*

of green products often means that it does the opposite of what it says on the tin. So I was grappling with these fairly complex issues around environmentalism and consumption. I very much wanted the title of the book *Radical Consumption?* to have a question mark in it, because the book was about posing questions; looking at the radical potential as well as the corporate abuses of products that claim to be ethical or green, and at the potential of actions that are 'anti-consumerist'. The publisher argued against it and won, but the title does very much have a question mark in my mind.

So that's one ecological strand of my work. Then in *The Care Manifesto* we discussed the problems of what we term 'social carelessness' on multiple levels, and suggested how we might adopt different solutions on various scales, showing examples of progressive possibilities both from the past and from the present across different geographical zones.[9] So yes, similarly, that project is engaged in that double move of diagnosing what's wrong, whilst not falling into that trap that we're often encouraged to in academia - of just saying how terrible everything is, and we can only point out complexity, implying that we're inevitably doomed to damnation - and instead trying to think about what the 'resources of hope' might be, as Raymond Williams put it. Which is another important strand of cultural studies, isn't it? To look at what the potential solutions might be, the routes through which we might make things better for all of us, rather than to assume or acquiesce or participate in fatalism.

I'm going to bring you back to a more prosaic definition of care. Last week there was a scandal about a care workers agency in which employees were calling on a number of older people with Alzheimer's and spending less than five minutes with each of them. And obviously I don't know the circumstances, but I imagine that they're under pressure in terms of time management and what they're expected to do. So I wondered whether you had written a critique of the idea of care as being commodified in the same way that equality has been. In your very important work on meritocracy, which we haven't discussed yet, you show how the word 'equality' has been eviscerated through the idea of equality of opportunity. What about 'care', have you discussed how that is commodified?'

Absolutely. In *The Care Manifesto* we start by talking about the numerous contemporary problems with care and carelessness. One of those problems is the dominance of the idea of self-care: how we are repeatedly encouraged to pamper ourselves and buy contained, experiential slices of self-care. 'Self-care' does have

important alternative and radical histories - Audre Lorde, for instance, talks about how self-care is something that you have to do if you're going to be a politically engaged activist, so you don't burn out. But over the past few decades self-care has largely become something which has been used to sell us smelly candles and spa retreats whilst not caring for other people or the world or the institutions of social democracy. It's become bound up with possessive individualism and not caring about others. So in *The Care Manifesto* we write about that, for instance, as well as about how care work has been a job foisted on women, people of colour, the working class and migrants in particular: it's these groups who have historically been exploited, overburdened and left to do the 'dirty work' of care. Care is not always fluffy and full of candles: it's often painful and difficult and hard.

We also discuss the neoliberalisation of care; how social infrastructures of care have been marketised and outsourced to the extent that 'care jobs' are often now structurally unable to offer care. When care is run on a for-profit basis by large corporations, it does now, as you say, often involve having unrealistic, squeezed schedules that don't take into account transportation for care workers, and which don't take into account the complexities of human interaction, or the varied needs that people have when they need to be cared for - which reduce care to a Taylorist assembly line which simply doesn't work. We don't go into the kind of depth that Emma Dowling does in her book *The Care Crisis*, though, where she interviews people at length.

So we start with those problems and then think about other ways of envisaging care, and of its centrality to life. There was a stage where we were encouraged to call the book *The Care Manifesto: The politics of compassion*. But we were very keen on it *not* being 'compassion', because the moralistic and individualistic associations of that term can reduce it to a private ethical practice. We wanted very much to draw attention to how caring is about *interdependence*, about us all being interconnected in multiple myriad ways and forms.

Did you address the difference that the pandemic has made to the idea of care?

Well, we had just finished it when the pandemic broke out, so we hastily added some sentences to the introduction and conclusion.

It was a good test of your theoretical position because our interdependence became very stark and the question of who the carers were was also highlighted.

Yes, exactly. Suddenly 'care' was being talked about a lot and very much flung on the public agenda. Bev Skeggs and Helen Wood described some of these contradictions around care during Covid really well in an article they wrote on how we were being encouraged to clap for carers and give them 'care gratitude' but not 'care justice'.[10] And that's what was, and still is, needed: care justice. During the height of the Covid crisis nurses weren't given a pay rise, humane working conditions or essential PPE; they were just given a pat on the back. We were encouraged to clap for them whilst they worked in terrible conditions that had been eroded through decades of marketisation.

What is it like to now be on the other end of the interview?

It feels healthy to be done to as I did unto others! Thank you for doing this. It's very generous of you. It's generative, it's making me think, as well as making me worry and feel squeamish about what I'm saying. I am enjoying hearing what you think is interesting and mulling over how I might answer that line of inquiry. And, as with most interviews, it's nice when the questions linger on and you can't necessarily answer them straight away, but then return to them later. There is power in a good question.

Now I'm wishing I'd secretly asked everybody in your book what one question they would like to ask you, but it's too late for that. But I will just say it was a huge honour to be part of that group of amazing people that you've interviewed, and to be included in the book. It certainly made me think a lot about a project I was working on at the time. It was very helpful as part of that process of thinking through. And going back to the idea of the conjuncture and what is the present, what is contemporary … we are in a moment, we are absolutely in a moment - and, although I don't think you can fully understand the moment in *the moment, very often, when you go back to something later, you realise what else was going on that made that moment special.*

Do you want to say anything more about the act of initiating conversations as a form of politics? Is it something you might do again? Is it something you'll keep doing, do you think, having these recorded conversations?

Well I do want to continue having conversations. But I don't know if I'm going to do a lot more recorded conversations in this form, partly because they do end up being so time-consuming to edit. I'm not going to rule it out, but I'm not sure … they could take other forms.

Especially now the podcast is such a popular format … ?

Podcasts are ubiquitous - at times it seems that everyone has a podcast. We were interviewed for quite a lot of them about *The Care Manifesto* in lockdown, as well as other online events … it was a great way to connect, particularly at that time. And there was also a stage halfway through the book, which I write about in the introduction, where I was asking myself, *why am I doing these interviews in written form?* - given that technologies and the ability to post interviews easily online have improved so much since I started.

But I do think reading an interview is a still a useful and different kind of experience. Many people still like to read, and the written interview is more relaxed than a formal article, a different kind of 'reading-feeling'. And I also have really liked the kind of meditative editing of interviews, thinking about the way in which people talk, and what they're saying. It involves paying a particular type of close attention to what interesting people think, and to the conversation form, which I really enjoy. But I'm going to pause my work on that form for now. Although I do think about all the people I would still really like to interview. It's the never-ending project.

Vron Ware is a writer and photographer, currently a visiting professor at the Department of Gender Studies, LSE. Her most recent book is *Return of a Native: Learning from the Land*, Repeater Books 2022.

Jo Littler is a member of the *Soundings* editorial collective. Her most recent book is *Left Feminisms: Conversations on the Personal and the Political*, Lawrence & Wishart 2023.

Notes

1. Jo Littler, *Left Feminisms: Conversations on the personal and the political*, Lawrence & Wishart 2023.

2. Jo Littler, 'From Enola Holmes on Netflix to Britain's union leaders: Why feminism for the 99% is thriving', *Guardian*, 27 December 2022: https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2022/dec/27/enola-holmes-union-leaders-feminism-99-economic-gender-inequality.

3. Barbara Ehrenreich, 'What is Socialist Feminism', Working Papers on Socialism and Feminism, The New American Movement 1976.

4. Jo Littler, 'Feminism and the S Word', roundtable with Deborah Grayson, Mandy Merck, Nira Yuval-Davis and Hilary Wainwright, *Soundings* 61, November 2015:

https://journals.lwbooks.co.uk/soundings/vol-2015-issue-61/article-7488/.

5. Jo Littler, '"Festering Britain": The 1951 Festival of Britain, national identity and the representation of the Commonwealth', in Simon Faulkner and Anandi Ramamurthy (eds), *Visual Culture and Decolonisation In Britain*, Ashgate 2006.

6. Jo Littler 'Consumer culture and cultural studies' in Deirdre Shaw et al (ed), *Ethics and Morality in Consumption: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Routledge 2016. See also Jeremy Gilbert, 'This Conjuncture: For Stuart Hall', *New Formations*, Nos 96-7, 2019, pp5-37.

7. Jo Littler and Roshi Naidoo (eds), *The Politics of Heritage: The Legacies of Race*, Routledge 2005.

8. Jo Littler, *Radical Consumption: Shopping for Change in Contemporary Culture*, Open University Press 2008.

9. The Care Collective, *The Care Manifesto: The Politics of Interdependence*, Verso 2020.

10. Bev Skeggs and Helen Wood, 'Clap for carers? From care gratitude to care justice', *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, Vol 23 No 4, 2020, pp641-647.