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Included here is the lecture Stuart Hall gave at the International Communications Association (ICA) congress in 1980. In spite of the slightly passé title and implicit adversary, behaviourism, the text works on issues that are still discussed on the field. Venício Lima, professor at the University of Brasília and a pioneer of cultural studies in Brazil, has shown how Hall deals with different disciplinary questions that are still alive among us, like the search for “communication as such” or “in itself” (Hall in Lima, 2015: 121) and communication as constituting society (ibid.: 122).

A second lecture by Stuart Hall is included in this volume, his keynote address at the 7th Congress of the Brazilian Comparative Literature Association (ABRALIC), in Salvador in July 2000, on the theme “Lands & Peoples”. The theme was related to Hall’s concerns at the time, about cultural identity and difference, and the invitation emphasized the way in which Afro-Brazilian culture predominated, in the city of Salvador, even as a political currency used to create social cohesion without perturbing white domination. The invitation expressed that hope that at a time when Brazilian society discussed “race” and racism, the presence and ideas of Stuart Hall could stimulate academic debate on these issues and also have an impact on common sense notions about the place of Black intellectuals. Among other invited guests of the conference were Paul Gilroy, Gayatri Spivak, Robert Young and Catherine Hall. We are grateful to Catherine Hall for permission to publish the lecture, as yet unpublished in English, as well as to Evelina Hoisel and Eneida Leal Cunha, president and vice-president of ABRALIC at the time, for the interdisciplinary solidarity in seeing the lecture published in a communications journal.

Stuart Hall does not need another biographical presentation. The outline of his life as a migrant from the Caribbean to England in the early 1950s, as a scholarship student at Oxford, his role in the new British post-Stalinist Left and in the New Left Review, his role in founding the field of research and reflection called Cultural Studies because of the Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies of the University of Birmingham, which he directed between 1968 and 1979, his move to the Open University, where he stimulated the diffusion of Cultural Studies beyond Birmingham and London, including to the United States, the change of his focus to the arts (as chair of the boards of the Institute for International Visual Arts and the Autograph – Association of Black Photographers) and to the critique of neoliberalism (producing, with sociologist Mike Rustin, the geographer Doreen Massey and others, the Kilburn Manifesto) – this is all known or
easily accessible. What is less current is the history of Hall’s presence in Brazil, more specifically in the field of communication.

The of Hall’s work to arrive in Brazil in Portuguese came in 1980, with the publication of On Ideology, containing “The Hinterland of Science” and a coauthored chapter. The introduction said that “it was conceived as a contribution to the discussion about nature and theory of ‘ideology’, mainly within the Marxist tradition” (in Centre, 2007: 5). The book did not have much impact, according to Lima (2015: 103), but even so, this way Hall entered Brazil as a Marxist thinker in the first moments of redemocratization. During the 1970s and early 1980s, despite police informants in the classroom, press censorship until 1978 and the books censorship until a few years later, as well as various types of self-censorship throughout the dictatorship period (Suüssekind 1985: 20-24), the theoretical debate was very much alive. A central question for intellectuals was how to understand the coup of 1964 and the defeat of resistance to it, with a high cost of suffering. What had gone wrong? What had to be rethought?

A sign of the degree to which these questions were asked in light of the latest contemporary theory is that Michel Foucault visited Brazil to lecture at the Catholic university in Rio de Janeiro, PUC-Rio, between May 21 and 25, 1973, a time of severe political repression. His lectures, entitled A verdade e as formas jurídicas (2003), were published in a journal, Cadernos da PUC-Rio, the following year, although in France they only came out in the posthumous Dits et écrits (1994). In the lectures, Foucault directly addressed the Left intellectual’s dilemma with regard to the apparent objectivity of Marxism. Its certainties had guided much of the opposition to the regime, but they were inadequate to explain its failures. Foucault opened his lectures with the following criticism:

The question is this: there is a tendency we could call, somewhat ironically, academic Marxism, which consists of looking at how the economic conditions of existence are reflected and expressed in men’s consciousness. It seems to me that this form of analysis, traditional in university Marxism in France and Europe, has a serious flaw: it supposes, in the end, that the human subject, the subject of knowledge, the very forms of knowledge are, in a sense, already and definitively given, and that the economic, social, and political conditions of existence do nothing more than deposit or imprint themselves on this definitively given subject. (Foucault, 2003: 7-8)
In his lectures, Foucault’s aimed to address the “philosophically traditional conception” of the subject of academic Marxism (Ibid.: 10).

Thus, when Hall’s work arrived in Brazil, it was received by at least two sides of a debate: academic intellectuals who took the post-structuralist path and those who remained Marxist, many of them eventually becoming interested in Gramsci. Hall was then read in retrospect, by the post-structuralist and postmodern side, as having been useful in trying to save the Marxism of radical opposition to the regime from facing its inevitable defeat not only by the military regime but also by the distractions of consumer culture. Hall’s wrestling with Marxism was and often still is read as affiliation, even as it is read as high theory. When, for example, he considered ideology a term still useful to describe culture “harnessed to particular positions of power” (Hall, in press), or reclaims Althusser (Hall, 2003: 160-198), Hall has been thought to rather simple-mindedly disregard post-Marxist theoretical advances, perhaps Foucault’s post-structuralism itself, and in any case Jean Baudrillard’s acute apprehension of the sliding surfaces of contemporary social life (Marcondes Filho, 2008: 32). If, for some people, Hall represented a less complex or even anti-postmodern view, for others he was a pioneer in seeking to combine reflection with politics, breaking down barriers between intellectual thinking and political activism without confusing “understanding the politics of intellectual work and substituting intellectual work for politics.” (in Morley and Chen, 1996: 275). Hall’s thought comes as a stranger, bursting into a debate that already existed. Was he really simplistic, or did he bear other parameters – misunderstood or considered insufficient by local people – to think the Brazilian reality? We argue in favor of this second understanding, but for reasons that differ from the criticism cited so far, focused on contemporary theory and Marxism, as will be clear further in this paper.

For Venício Lima (2015: 104), only in 1993 did Hall’s work have much impact, with the publication of the chapter of Policing the Crisis (Hall et al., 1978) on “The social production of news”, in a collection on journalism edited by Nelson Traquina for a Portuguese publisher (Traquina, 1993). In the beginning of the 1990s, too, translations into Spanish began to circulate, including “Encoding/decoding”, seminal for reception studies, although this text was already known in the original, in Brazil, before this translation. “Cultural identity and diaspora”, “The centrality of culture”, “Who needs identity?” and “The question of cultural identity”, which became A identidade cultural na pós-modernidade, came out between 1996 and 1997.
The latter was a huge publishing success, with 40,000 copies sold, according to an estimate by its current publisher, Lamparina, in 2014.

Another important publication for Communication research in Brazil was Resistance Through Rituals (1976), which has yet to be translated, but nevertheless marked the studies of juvenile subcultures. The reading of Hall through reception theory was consolidated through the association of British Cultural Studies with Latin American Cultural Studies and the work of Jesús Martín-Barbero and Néstor García Canclini. If, in the 1990s, Hall’s best-known texts in the field of communication in Brazil were still focused on issues involving reception, over time, and especially after the publication of “The question of cultural identity”, Hall’s thinking about the concept of identity as relational and provisional had a more impact. Da diáspora: identidades e mediações culturais was published in 2003. Roughly half of the pieces included were already much referred to, and half relatively new and recommended by Hall himself. Several were on media and ideology, others on culture and politics. However, despite the titles of the book and the biographical interview published as the last chapter, “The formation of a diasporic intellectual”, and even though the collection has been widely read in other disciplinary areas such as Literature, History, Anthropology and Sociology precisely because of what Hall had to say about diasporic societies, in the field of Communication this aspect of Hall’s work is still not much analyzed or commented on. There are many possible reasons. One may be that in communication studies, it seems obligatory to choose between the diasporic Hall or the Hall that thinks about the media. This seems to be the argument of Venício Lima, who regrets that race issues have priority in Da diáspora, at the expense of media studies (2015: 105) and says that Liv Sovik’s introduction in Da diáspora “fails to note the possible contribution that reading Stuart Hall could offer to the public debate at the time [over Lula’s election and the hope of social movements committed to the democratization of the media] and to media studies” (ibid). For Lima, Policing the Crisis (1978) is from the forgotten period in which Hall did media studies, before beginning to work on issues of ethnicity and multiculturalism. For us, the way this choice is organized as a binary reveals a common misunderstanding in communication studies, that the Hall who theorizes the diaspora leaves the scene when one chooses Hall, theorist of the media. This becomes clear with a closer look at Policing the Crisis.

The book opens with a discussion of assault with intent to rob, crime statistics and press reports about them, as a context for the incident that triggered a moral panic in Britain in 1972. The authors say that
what was new was the term “mugging” and that “Labels are important, especially when applied to dramatic public events” (Hall et al., 1978: 19). The term, imported from the United States, connoted a whole series of social themes. “These themes included: the involvement of blacks and drug addicts in crime; The expansion of the black ghettos, coupled with the growth of black social and political militancy; The threatened crisis and collapse of the cities [...] “(Ibid.: 19). The list of themes is vast and varied and is not reduced to “black problems”, but they top the list. This is the same Policing the Crisis that Angela Davis, who dispenses epithets, claims to have been profoundly influenced her thinking (Davis, 2014). But the intent here is not to appropriate Policing the Crisis as a book about race. Hall himself and his co-authors, white graduate students, understood that the issue of “race and crime” was not just a “black issue” but a “prism for a much larger social crisis” seen in historical perspective (Drew, 1999: 234-235).

The point here is that Stuart Hall, the black thinker about the diaspora, is not distinguishable from Stuart Hall, the communication theorist. The same man who recalls having been “‘hailed’ or interpurred as ‘colored’, ‘West Indian’, ‘negro’, ‘black’, and ‘immigrant’” (Hall, 1985: 108) does so to explain “Signification, representation, ideology: Althusser and the post-structuralist debates.” He also studied, early on, the involuntary perpetuation of social hierarchies by media operators, as in “Encoding/decoding.” Hall talked about being “dislocated” from his origins in a British colony, about the Jamaican “pigmentocracy” in which he was raised, about never feeling entirely at home and how that marked his thinking, in “The formation of a diasporic intellectual” (Morley and Chen, 1996: 484-503). The Hall that studied the media is the same that helps us understand social communication and culture in complex contexts where racism structures the exercise of power in the media and in other aspects of life, as do social class and gender. Hall does not seem to have believed that race would always be the most productive prism for understanding larger social crises (see Hall and Back, 2009: 685), but for the time and place of Policing the Crisis, it was. And in our time and place? Hall readers in our field who do not opt exclusively for the Hall of the media and in a more permanent way recognize the diasporic Hall (which is also the feminist Hall, Hall of Arts, and Marxist Hall), might take better advantage of the complexity and concreteness of his critical and political perspectives. The misunderstanding about who Hall is, whether Marxist or not, simplistic or not, is less important today, in our view, than a view of him that includes the consideration
of racial issues as part of the conjuncture in which we do research, even when they are not the main point of a project.

Alongside the circulation of this work, the attempts to consolidate cultural studies as part of communication studies in Brazil deserve to be remembered. At Universidade de Brasilia, several attempts were made to make the influence of cultural studies more permanent. In the 1980s, a line of research in communication and cultural studies was instituted in the postgraduate program and a discipline of the same name was offered. There was also an attempt to articulate a multidisciplinary doctorate in contemporary cultural studies in the years 1989-1990 (Lima, 2014). In the 2000s, there were projects to create undergraduate and postgraduate courses in cultural studies and even an Interdisciplinary Institute of Culture Studies, and courses in different disciplines included work by Hall in their bibliographies. But only in 2014 was a course offered in the Postgraduate Program in Communication, by two of the editors of this issue of MATRIZes, with specific purpose of discussing the influence of Stuart Hall’s thought in communication studies.

At Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Cultural Studies were introduced by Heloisa Buarque de Hollanda, who taught at the School of Communication. She got to know cultural studies while doing postdoctoral work in the United States in the mid-1980s. There is no mention in her intellectual memoirs of Stuart Hall, but on her return to Brazil in 1986, in collaboration with Carlos Alberto Messeder Pereira, she created the CIEC – Interdisciplinary Coordination of Cultural Studies, which “somehow continued my studies of cultural movements of resistance to the military regime post-1964” (Hollanda, 2009: 76).

As a goal, I tried to understand cultural studies not as an issue of disciplines but as a new field of relations for intellectual activity. I was trying out an idea for academic politics, politics within the university. That was the sense of the open format of the CIEC seminar, a course offering in the postgraduate program of the School of Communication, the project to train black researchers, critical insertion in the feminist debates, intervention through an intensive program of seminars and publications. (Ibid.: 79-80)

With her cultural studies project, Heloisa Buarque de Hollanda, wanted to “refunctionalize” university research and production of knowledge (Ibid.: 76), at the waning moment of the military regime. CIEC’s targets were the graduate program, black students, the feminist debate and as me-
method, seminars and publications. In a way, early cultural studies at CIEC echo Hall’s project at the Open University, with its focus on mature and first-generation university students, discussions of the currents that were making British society more diverse, and production of courses and textbooks.

With the critic and writer Silviano Santiago and Marisa Cassim, an expert in information and management, Heloisa also founded PACC, the Advanced Program on Contemporary Culture, whose focus was also to be “democracy as a field of knowledge” (Ibid.: 106). It was planned to be a postgraduate program that would bring together professors from different universities while escaping bureaucratic red tape. It did not obtain the necessary formal recognition by the Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro and eventually became a transdisciplinary postdoctoral program no longer closely tied to communication studies.

More recent institutional moves in cultural studies include the Department of Cultural Studies and Media at UFF, which is now known as the Department of Media Studies, evidence, perhaps, of the same discussion to which this issue of MATRIZes is partly addressed: of understanding culture, as opposed to media, as part of communication studies’s object of research. In the mid-2000s, the Postgraduate Program in Culture and Society, another possible translation of cultural studies, was founded by professors of communication and other disciplines at the Universidade Federal da Bahia. Over all these years in which communications researchers were interested in cultural studies, some of them dialogued with and attended conferences of other disciplines, such as education, literature (Brazilian Association of Comparative Literature was particularly related to the topic) and anthropology, precisely in search of new understandings about culture.

This issue of MATRIZes presents an overview of the impact of Stuart Hall’s thinking in the field of communication studies, in Brazil. It is the result of a joint effort by professors from different Brazilian universities and authors from many others, researchers who have mapped out the theoretical influences of Hall in multiple aspects of communications research. When we set out to accomplish the task, our idea was to identify whether and how important themes developed by Stuart Hall, such as identity, representation, ideology, racism, were theoretically present in contemporary thinking in the field. We then sought to understand and problematize Hall’s contributions in the Brazilian context, establishing connections between Hall and other authors from here and other parts of and Latin America.
Although many scholars develop research projects, write books or take initiatives to consolidate the perspectives proposed by Hall, he is known, but not a name in the field of communication. In a search in the CNPq Research Groups database in November 2016, we found 334 groups working with Cultural Studies. There were 148 lines of research registered to different groups, in such fields as education, literature and communication, but also curiously in agronomy, physical education and nutrition.

If, on the one hand, the influence of cultural studies spreads through multiple paths of research, on the other hand, it did not establish itself in any specific area in the Communication. This, for two reasons: Hall himself was a critic of the unbridled epistemological quest to establish a pure or detached field of communication, conceived as detached from sociological knowledge, struggles for power, ideological questions, and subalternity/otherness. This has influenced its acceptance since the tendency in communications studies in Brazil in recent years has been the specialization – that is, the often uncritical search for a defining essence of the field. The second point results from the first. Cultural studies’ influence on a variety of different approaches is consistent with Hall’s theoretical proposal. His proposal of shifting gazes and the political implications of his ideas lead to new theoretical configurations, particularly linked to social and symbolic transformations.

Based on the contributions to this issue, we were able to identify the authors’ intellectual influences and relations with studies on cinema, feminism, culture and national identity, community communication, politics and citizenship, studies on relations between religion and the media, cultural studies and the political economy of communication, with reception studies and, finally, studies on diaspora, migration and social mobilization. In all these cases, we observe how the discussion between identity and the productive forces of culture initiated by Hall illuminates the current moment of deep social and political transformations in our country, evidencing a new arrangement in the studies of Communication and intellectual production that expands this field and make it more complex.

In Stuart Hall: film studies and the cinema, Angela Prysthon discusses how Hall provides insights into cinema, even though he did not specifically devoted himself to the formulation of a theoretical and analytical body of work on film. Prysthon chooses three ways to think this relation. The first is a reflection on the modes of appropriation of the concepts of alterity and identity in Hall by film studies; the second is a discussion of the impact of Hall’s thinking about the 1980s cinema, especially films focusing on ethnic
and multicultural issues; and the third, presented as an “epilogue” by the author, addresses the more direct connection between Hall and the cinema, recalling his relationship to the British Film Institute (BFI), links with British black cinema, and the production of The Stuart Hall Project, a film by John Akomfrah that portrays Hall from the perspective of his work, but also through his relationship with music, family memories and a series of statements by him on academic, political and personal themes.

Ana Carolina Escosteguy shows us that the relationship between feminism and cultural studies has been a tense dialogue since the beginning. The change of agenda provided, even in Brazil – despite the lack of records and more detailed narratives – a new way of thinking feminism itself. Escosteguy identifies and analyses four periods in this relationship: the first dates back to the 1970s, and deals with the intersection between feminism and cultural studies; the second focuses on the 1980s, and discusses links between Stuart Hall and feminist theory; the third is in the 1990s, more specifically the affinities between Hall and feminism, based on the understanding that there is a relational variable that defines identities and constitutes them in a more complex form than the female-male binary is able to convey; and the fourth is at the turn of the century, marked by the context of post-feminist studies that seek to establish a consensus around conservative values such as traditional family values, as a basis for an attempt to erase feminism and feminist struggles hitherto.

In a different context, but one that shares the dispute for the recognition of singularities, Maria Ataide Malcher, Agenor Sarraf Pacheco and Fernanda Chocron Miranda show us that the Postgraduate Program in Communication, Culture and the Amazon of the Universidade Federal do Pará was inspired by the perspective of cultural studies since its foundation and has the objective of producing knowledge capable of demonstrating the particularities of Amazonian communicational processes in connection with geo-historical, local, political, economic, ethno-racial and socio-cultural issues that constitute the ways of life of the different social groups that inhabit rural and urban territories of the region. Thus, the authors say, since its creation in 2010, one of the epistemological positions that guided and grounded research developed under the program is anchored in Stuart Hall, especially in the perspective of the inseparability of communication practices as cultural practices. In this way, numerous research projects were carried out in the program under the theoretical influence of Hall.

Adilson Vaz Cabral Filho and Marco Schneider work on points of contact between Stuart Hall’s work and research on community communica-
tion in Brazil and Latin America, as well as this research’s more specific relationship with critical cultural studies and dialogue with Latin American theoretical reflection on concepts such as reception and mediation. An important point in this work is that the authors show the scarce reference to Hall’s work in the research on community communication in Latin America, fundamentally with a focus related to communication for development and social change, having a participative and engaged nature. With this focus, they seek to understand an audience directly or indirectly influenced by themes, concepts and authors whose identification with the work of Stuart Hall is very strong, such as Paulo Freire, Armand Mattelart, Antonio Pasquali, Alfonso Gumucio-Dagron, even though Hall was not cited by these authors.

Drawing on Hall’s discussion of national culture and the perspective of a “nationalist revival”, Eduardo Yuji Yamamoto discusses how Brazilian identity emerges in political events, especially from the protests of 2013, but also in demands for rights by social movements. On this horizon, Derrida’s concept of *différance*, also used by Hall, is central to reflect about difference as language and discourse, and how it materializes as practice. The author points out how conservative movements emerge in Brazil and appropriate the theme of citizens’ rights by building an up-to-date discourse in defense of democracy from a very particular perspective, sometimes cool and hip, that mobilizes a significant contingent of young people (although this update is only superficial, since these movements are historically segregationist in political practice). As a counterpoint, Yamamoto also discusses the mobilization in favor of minority causes, especially those that are organized through social media and have repercussions in the wider social universe.

Luís Mauro Sá Martino discusses the construction of identities from the perspective of the mediatization of religion. Although the problems of religious phenomena are not among his main objects of reflection, Hall’s ideas concerning the problems of culture, postcolonial and diasporic identities are fundamental to think about the variety of the religious expressions in contemporary society. According to Martino, Hall’s work on identities is of fundamental importance in understanding the contemporary religious-media phenomenon in its many dynamics. For him, in a multicultural society in which diverse religious matrices coexist in a complex relationship that goes from the syncretic hybridism to the mutual rejection, the questions related to the cultural identity seem to gain special relevance. Belonging to one religion or another is not only a matter of choosing a
belief, but of connecting to a whole symbolic system of cultural representations and practices, establishing boundaries and differences, especially in a religious field marked by the continuous process of articulation with the media. Martino also points out that thinking about the religious, using Hall, means imagining it as a space in constant reconfiguration due to its dynamics of hegemonies and resistance among religious matrices from the center, with legitimate cultural practices and linked to specific groups – in the Brazilian case, Catholicism and Protestantism – and matrices linked to the African diaspora and indigenous thought, generally relegated to marginal spaces. In this tense relationship, Hall offers ways of thinking about the articulation of symbols, codes, and practices among diverse matrices.

When proposing, based on Hall’s work, that economics and politics are inseparable from culture, Luiz Felipe Ferreira Stevanim presents possible points of contact between cultural studies and the political economy of communication. The author situates this debate “under erasure,” Derridian expression often used by Hall, and then discusses the importance of overcoming theoretical impasses and work together on common agendas. Stevanim discusses the relations between these two fields, especially the particularities of this relationship in the Brazilian scenario, including the political role of culture in the exercise of citizenship and work social change.

In a survey conceived in the south of the country, but which expands to all Brazilian regions, Nilda Jacks and Laura Hastenpflug Wottrich present us with Stuart Hall’s legacy in reception studies in Brazil, based on the analysis of theses and dissertations developed in the area over the last decade. Among the 209 papers on reception processes and practices that the authors identified, 31, or 15% of the total, use Hall’s work and he is one of the three main authors. Of these, the predominant part is research that observes the process of reception in its social and cultural logics. Hall’s contribution, according to Jacks and Wottrich, focuses especially on three perspectives: 1) cultural identities; 2) social representations; And 3) theoretical-methodological proposal with the Encoding/Decoding model. Hall becomes the main author cited in the works on the subject of identities, which draw on his reflections about cultural and diasporic identities.

Finally, we highlight two relevant contributions from the point of view of Hall’s influence in the studies of migration and social mobilization. In From diaspora to ethnoscapes: diversity and belongingness in transnational migrations, Sofia Zanforlin puts Hall in dialogue with Robin Cohen and Arjun Appadurai, articulating an epistemological discussion about the
concept of diaspora with a field survey conducted with migrants in different Brazilian cities, such as Brasilia, São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro and Manaus, between 2011 and 2015. By doing what is simultaneously an investigation of the urban space and life trajectories, ethnoscapes are unveiled, such as Praça Kantuta in São Paulo, stronghold of Latin American migrant populations; the former corridor at Rio de Janeiro Central Station, where groups of Angolan and Congolese migrants meet; in addition to Manaus with its population of Haitian migrants and the region of Samambaia, on the outskirts of Brasilia, where Ghanaian and Pakistani migrants are concentrated. Placing herself alongside Hall, Zanforlin points out that these contemporary diasporas create multicultural flows of meanings that counteract the homogenizing logic of neoliberal globalization.

In a different proposal, Juliana César Nunes and Dione Oliveira Moura identify how Hall’s thinking, especially with regard to the centrality of culture and a reimagined Africa in the Americas, can be incorporated into the lived practice of social processes by analyzing the mobilization of the quilombola community Rio dos Macacos using some of Hall’s definitions and ideas as a key to understanding it.

This edition brings together research from various parts of Brazil and from different generations of researchers, and highlights thought that has borne fruit in often unexpected places. In the midst of the multiplicity of themes and perspectives discussed by the authors, cultural studies emerges in the field of communication as resource, strategy, pedagogy and also as resistance. The link between communication and culture, that for so long seemed natural – as expressed in the names of postgraduate programs and their lines of research – is updated and expanded. If reception studies have been a fertile ground for the influence of Hall’s thought thus far, other perspectives now appear alongside. How this influence will be established in the coming years is difficult to measure. If Hall’s thought, upon his arrival in Brazilian lands, found a vibrant academic and cultural environment, despite the civil-military dictatorship, it remains to see how Hall will help us to think the country that emerges from the experience of political instability and democratic rupture of the post-Impeachment moment of Dilma Rousseff. The conjuncture is of successive victories by antidemocratic forces, stimulated and endorsed by the mainstream media. The police State that exists in certain urban territories with a black majority population is extended to peaceful demonstrators in public squares. High rates of violence against women and against those who are seen as deviating from gender norms coexist with the reemergence of feminism.
and the growing popularity of patriarchal discourse. These are times to think with Stuart Hall.
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