**File: Plenary\_02\_ClaireandAnoop1.mp3
Duration: 00:82:13
Date: 21/04/2016
Typist: 778**

START AUDIO

Facilitator: It’s my pleasure to announce our speakers for the second plenary; ‘Researching Race In and Out of the Academy’. On this panel is Professor Claire Alexander and Professor Anoop Nayak will consider the challenges confronting research on race and racism in this contemporary academy.

 A topic which has been widely discussed over the past day and a half and obviously, prior to this. Claire Alexander is Professor of Sociology at the University of Manchester, her publications include; ‘The Art of Being Black’, ‘The Asian Gang’, ‘The Bengal Diaspora’, ‘Rethinking Muslim Migration’.

 Professor Anoop Nayak is Professor of Social and Cultural Geography at Newcastle University and his publications include; ‘Race, Place and Globalisation’, ‘Youth Cultures in a Changing World’, ‘Gender, Youth, Culture and Global Masculinities and Femininities’ and ‘Geographical Thought’.

 First each speaker will talk for about 30 minutes and then we’ll have some time for questions and they’ll be a roving mic as well.

 So when that comes we’ll…Okay, you can start.

Clare Alexander: First I want to thank Aaron for his invitation to speak at this year’s BSA Conference.

And in case anyone was wondering how many academics of colour it takes to give a BSA Plenary, apparently, the answer’s two or one and a half if you want to get blood quantum about it. I know to some of you, these things matter.

 Okay, so our focus today is on ‘Researching Race In and Out of the Academy’ and given the rather unusual format of this session, Anoop and I have decided, almost completely arbitrarily to divide this session equally between us.

 So I will focus first on race in the academy and particularly in sociology, and Anoop will then look up and out, as it were, in the broader context for researching race.

 Now, of course we recognise that ideally, at least, these two arenas are connected but we do also, I think share concerns about the extent to which race research reflects broader societal changes and continuities, or doesn’t.

 So a theme which connects both halves of this presentation and which speaks to the themes of this year’s conference, are the ways in which race and ethnicity and the ways in which we understand these are increasingly fragmented and disconnected, intellectually and empirically.

 We want to stake a claim for the fact that race still matters, both in and out of the academy and to make a plea to reconnect race research across disciplines with our own disciplinary history, across increasingly fractured subfields and across methods.

 And we want to reconnect with a broader social, political, economic and cultural present, in which established and entrenched patterns of racial and ethnic disadvantage stand alongside newer forms of national, religious, legal and cultural exclusion.

 We argue that these patterns of exclusion and of resistance permeate all aspects and levels of society, from the global to the neighbourhood.

From the macro stage of the age of migration and the war on terror, to the moving borders of the national to the micro encounters of the street, the shopping mall or the lecture theatre.

 So let’s start with the lecture theatre- and this is a particularly interesting and challenging time for universities around issues of race equality.

 The 2011 census, showed that 20% of the population of England and Wales identified with a group other than White British. So 14% identified as BME. That’s about 8 million people.

 This demographic is younger than the average, so currently, around 17% of the 0-15 age group, which is our future students are BME. By 2051, it will have risen to over 30%.

 So one important factor, is the changing face of British higher education, physically and other institutional changes. Universities as public bodies have had a statutory duty, in the 2000 Race Amendment Act to promote race equality.

 The 2010 Equalities Act, has ethnicity as one of its protected characteristics. The ECU Race Charter Mark, is one example of the external pressures currently being exerted on universities, to demonstrate their commitment to race equality.

 Though frankly, all it’s shown so far, is a lack of any real institutional commitment with only 8 out of the 30 pilot institutions receiving a Bronze Award last year.

 It seems likely with the discussions around [TEF 00:04:33] that attainment and diversity will be factors in the way that institutions are being judged.

 And of course, we have David Cameron’s recent focus on race equality in prisons and universities, and we can pause to ponder that dichotomy for a moment if you like.

 And of course, there are reasons to be sceptical or cautious, particularly in the light of growing pressures on universities to survey students, both international, through the [draconian] interventions of the UKBA.

And of home grown Muslim students, through the demand for scrutiny of Islamic societies, students at risk of being radicalised, because god forbid we should do that. And the way in which this filters into extra-curricular and curricular activities.

 And I think it’s very important, that we don’t see those issues, the migration and religion issues as separate from the race equality issues.

 But more interesting and more possible, I think, is the impetus coming from within the institutions themselves, from staff and from students.

 There have been a number of high profile social media campaigns in recent years, most recently, ‘The Rhodes Must Fall Campaign’, which connects with a series of global campaigns, particularly in South Africa and the US.

 We’ve also seen recent student led campaigns around staffing, such as the ‘Why isn’t my professor black?’ campaign and around curriculum, such as the ‘Why is my curriculum white?’ initiative.

 The NUS are spearheading a campaign to liberate the curriculum and there’s been a number of more local campaigns at LSE, Kings, Oxford and elsewhere.

 Amongst academics, we’ve seen the emergence of Black academic networks and for a by sociologists, including the re-energised BSA Race Forum. And I think the kind of testament to the energy of this in the academies is seen in the number of streams and papers that we’ve had in this conference.

 So there is tremendous energy and pressure for change and there’s plenty of room for change. Figures from the ECU show that British born BME staff in higher education, stand at under 8% that’s around half what we might expect.

 And there’s massive underrepresentation of Black Caribbean and African academics. There are only 85 Black professors in the UK out of nearly 18,000. And there are only 16 Black women professors which is 1 per 4000 women students, compared to 1 to 60 White professors to White male students.

 Student numbers are barely more encouraging, we know that BME students from all groups enter HE at higher rates than White British students. However, they’re underrepresented at Russell Group institutions.

 While White students make up nearly 83% of students attending Russell Group institutions compared to about 805 in the population, only about 0.5% of Black Caribbean students are at Russell Group Universities.

They make up about 1.5%, so about a third of what we would expect for their proportion. Similar proportion for Pakistani and Bangladeshi students.

 By contrast, private school students account for 7% of British school children, they make up 42.5% of Oxbridge intake.

It used to be said that London had more Black students than all of the Russell Group combined.

 Since Queen Mary joined the Russell Group in 2012, that’s no longer the case, but I did check with London Met and they did tell me, they have more Black students than the five Russell Group institutions in total and more Black students than the top 11 universities in the 2016 Guardian League Tables combined.

 Of course, there are signs of change. The period between 2010 and 2015, showed the Russell Group had increased their Black student intake by 62%, Asian intake by 22% and mixed intake by 43%.

 Nevertheless, the research shows and even David Cameron agrees, so it must be true, that all BME groups are less likely to be offered places, even when they have the same grades as their White peers.

 And in case you’re wondering about sociology. Sociology across the sector has 22% BME students, which is not too bad. However, the Russell Group as a whole only has 12% and there’s a very unequal distribution between these institutions.

 There’s a sociology degree attainment gap of just under 20% between the White and BME students. So clearly, when we get them, we’re failing them.

The Russell Group has an attainment gap over the last 5 years, ranging from between just under 4%, which is Sheffield, to nearly 16% here in Birmingham.

The 11 Russell Group institutions that have sociology students, so just under half of the number of Russell Group institutions that have sociology students have such small numbers of BME students, there were no statistics to even register for analysis. There were not enough BME students to count. So that seems to me to be quite statistically significant.

Numbers aside, the place of race research in sociology is an ambiguous one. It’s probably fair to say that British Sociology has a better history around researching race than other social sciences, but although honestly, the bar’s not a high one.

It’s also true that the broad church of sociology has long provided a refuge for many race researchers and scholars of colour like myself, who were excluded from other disciplines in which race and racism, were not considered valid subjects for study.

Of course, we also have a long history of losing scholars of colour overseas, particularly to the US and recent years have seen movement from an increasingly restrictive sociology to humanities and to other social sciences.

There have been very many important and valid critiques of the institutionalisation of white sociology in the US and here, which have challenged the invisibility of race and the very problematic ways in which race is made visible.

And these have argued rightly and powerfully to the way in which race stands at the heart of social life and the discipline that purports to study it.

They’ve argued against the marginalisation of scholars of colour and their white counterparts, calling for what \_\_\_[00:10:16] ‘A sociological reconstruction for a de-segregated sociological imagination’

And I don’t intend to rehearse these arguments here but I would point to recent work by my other half Anoop,

Nasar Meer, Gargi Bhattacharya and [Corinne Mergy], Barner Hesse and [Govinda Bamborough] which continues the struggle.

However, I wanted, rather unusually for me, to be slightly more positive and track some moments in an alternative history, one which acknowledges and celebrates the fundamental ways in which British Sociology in particular has been transformed, through the work on race, and by scholars of colour.

And Birmingham of course, is a particular apposite starting point, from which to colour in the history of sociology.

I would argue that British Sociology today is unimaginable without the work of the CCCS or of the irreplaceable Stuart Hall.

Without ‘Policing the Crisis’, which argued for the centrality of race to the imagination of the nation and of national crisis and which critiques the new racism, authoritarian populism and moral panics are as relevant today as they were, nearly 40 years ago.

All Hall’s work on the historical and social location of the meanings of race, all his work on the media or on Gramsci or on \_\_\_[00:11:29].

Or his later works on identities and subjectivities, from minimal self to new ethnicities to cultural identity and diaspora, to the multi-cultural question, which underpinned the cultural turn in sociology and which launched a whole new global discipline.

Or without the work of the CCCS and ‘The Empire Strikes Back’ with its searing analysis of the role of the state in shaping racial ideologies or the power of common sense.

Or the inseparability of race and gender, sociology can surely never be the same again after [Errol Lawrence’s 00:11:58] excoriating account of racial common sense and culturalism in the disciplines foundations.

Or after the work of Paul Gilroy who has transformed the discipline from ‘There ain’t no black’, through ‘The Black Atlantic’ to ‘After Empire, three times and counting’

Or through John Solomos who perhaps more than any other person has shaped the field of race and ethnicity in the UK. Or Hazel Carby or their fellow travellers; [Afta Bra], Heidi Mirza, Anne Phoenix.

Now these for me are the foundational figures of British sociology and they deal with issues that lie at the core of sociological theory. Around structure and agency, power and resistance, discourse and representation, nation and community, the state, culture and economy, society and the individual, equality, class, gender, sexuality, youth.

More than this, however, they encapsulate scholarly research which looks across disciplines and across methods, although Errol Lawrence wasn’t very keen on ethnographers, I seem to recall.

But it’s work that employs theory as a toolbox to open up important issues, that isn’t afraid to link academic work to politics, that unflinchingly addresses social inequalities and seeks to change the terms of engagement within and without the academy,

These are ap0ople and works who transformed what it means to think and do sociology. They opened up new spaces theoretically and often literally, leaving doors open within he academy for others to follow.

I consider myself very fortunate to have been part of the generation that benefitted from those struggles and sacrifices and who built on this legacy, legitimating the study of race and ethnicity in Britain.

Here I’m thinking of my contemporaries, my colleague Virinder Kaln, who’s study of Oldham was historically and empirically textured and sociologically prescient of Anoop’s work on race, class, place and globalisation which challenged our understandings of race, class and place and burst the bounds of what race research by people of colour could and should be.

Ashwani and Sanjay Sharma’s ‘Disorienting Rhythms Collection’ after which Asian identities and culture could simply never be the same and which transformed studies of the South Asian diaspora globally.

Of Sara Ahmed’s work that interrogated institutional structures and the race bodies that inhabit them. Or Gargi Bhattacharya’s work on gender and sexuality. Or Satnam Virdee’s research on class and trade union movements.

Or Chetan Bhatt’s exploration of new religious fundamentalisms. Barnor Hesse and Sayyid’s furious interrogation of white society and post-colonial knowledges who in addition to their sociological imagination retained a sense of collective politics, of scholarly generosity, of the transformative potential of alternative knowledges.

Of the inextricable link between culture and structure and some of whom dipped our toes back into the murky ethnographic waters in an attempt to reclaim that empirical field for ourselves.

But I think that making this history visible is important, not only as a way of staking a claim for the importance of race research in British sociology as a whole, but also as a measure of how far we’ve come and where we are now.

And it gives us a chance to reflect on where we might go from here. So as to where we are.

In my view the place of race research has become extremely precarious in recent times. And I worry that the door has snapped shut behind my generation of scholars of colour.

And in many ways this reflects the lack of political traction around race equality more generally and certainly since the war on terror moved centre stage.

This has had consequences of the kind of work that gets funded, the ways in which this increasingly reflects government impact agendas, as well as constraints around the ref as to what counts as ‘real work’ and what is ‘commentary’. Which is increasingly how theoretical work gets characterised these days.

It’s telling, for example, that most of Stuart Hall’s body of work, probably wouldn’t be counted as referable or of having impact in the way that it’s currently defined.

It reflects view that the dominant view of the academy, that a token race person per department is enough and that doesn’t’ always mean a token Black person.

Some extremely successful departments don’t even think they need either, probably because they don’t have any Black students and therefore think it doesn’t matter to them.

Institutional racisms aside, we’ve also seen an increasing fragmentation of the field internally. Of course, all sociology has been a feeder discipline, which is seen as splintering and separation into Cultural Studies, Criminology, Media Studies. Migration into Social Geography, Social Psychology, English Literature, History and so on and as [Les Batt 00:16:21] pointed out yesterday, that’s been a two way traffic.

Recent years have seen the manning of the sociological barricades, in an attempt to reclaim what sociology is. And what has resulted in a very American led, top down, [quants-driven] version of what literally counts as sociology.

At the same time, we’ve seen the growth of intra and inter disciplinary sub fields, with their own journals, study groups, conferences, forums and which increasingly speak only to each other.

Racial and ethnic studies is one of these, but it’s been increasingly under erasure from the growth of new areas of research, which no longer speak across issues of shared concern.

So we have the explosion of work on migration, which seems to believe, with UKIP, that it’s possible to talk about migration without talking about race.

On religion and islamophobia, which with the notable exception of [Nasar Meer 00:17:07], sees it as distinct from racism.

The empty empiricisms of super diversity, growth of human rights, urban studies, none of which really deal centrally with questions of race.

And of course, we have the resurrection of inequality research which is actually class research and if it appears at all, race and ethnicity is an inconvenient complication.

There’s been some excellent work coming from the race field on the intersection of race and class; [Gargi’s] work on Racial Capitalism and [Satnam’s] ongoing work on Worker’s movements are good examples. But this traffic is definitely one way.

And let me just state for the record, simply adding ‘white’ onto your discussion of the working class, does not mean you’re taking account of race.

So we have a hollowing out of race research substantially, theoretically and methodologically which raises a question of “What remains?”

Sue Benson, 20 years ago, characterised the field of Race and Ethnicity in Britain as divided between anthropologists who focus on Asian cultures and sociologist who focus on African- Caribbean problems.

I later argued in my article ‘Beyond Black’, that in light of the cultural turn, these boundaries have been reformulated within sociology into a division between old and new ethnicities, with Asians being seen as the inheritors of traditional culture and African-Caribbeans as the purveyors as the kind of globalised, commodified fashionable cultures of desire.

Unless you’re in the Oscars or the Brits, possibly the BAFTAs maybe, if you’re Idris Elba but otherwise…

Since 2001, there’s been a further shift in which ‘the Muslim problem’ has moved into the academic and political spotlight while other Asian cultures have along with Black culture, pretty much fallen off the sociological map completely.

At the same time, the earlier hierarchy between theoretical and empirical research has been inverted. Race theory has largely deadened, after new ethnicities or it’s been hand-maidened into the service of an increasingly inward looking empirical field.

And accordingly stripped of much of its transformative and unsettling potential. So I’m thinking here of some versions of post-race, of conviviality, of affect which have been thinned out and narrowed down to the most micro of analysis of encounters and interactions. Which focus on multiplicity, contingency and complexity without what Neil Brenner has termed ‘the context of context’.

So let’s add a bit of context. We know that half of Pakistani and Bangladeshi households, and over two thirds of their children, live below the poverty line.

The average household wealth of a Bangladeshi family is around £15,000, compared to £200,000 of White British households. That’s about an eighth.

The Black young men are three times as likely to be unemployed as Whites. Amongst teenagers, the sis a bigger gap than we had in the 1980s.

We’ve already talked about HE, but if you could add to that the fact that a Chinese graduate will earn, on graduation 25% less than his White classmate. And somebody with an identifiably ethnic surname will have to send twice as many applications for a job, just to get an interview.

Then if they get a job, they’ll most likely fall foul of the continued ethnic penalty amongst the workforce. Bangladeshi men earn 21% less than their White male counterparts, even hyper successful Chinese graduates earn 11% less across the course of their career.

We know that the disproportionality of Black men in prison is even larger than it is in the US. The Black young men are seven times more likely and Asian men twice as likely to be stopped and searched than White.

That the disproportionality of being stopped by police when driving when Black, that even Teresa May has noticed. (Laughter) Although she’s apparently okay with offense of [googling while Muslim 00:20:47] that one she’s keen on.

That Black young men represent a staggering 18% of deaths in custody. That one third of BME citizens are not on the electoral register and therefore ineligible to vote.

So what does sociology have to say about this? Absolutely nothing, well not much. At the same time as questions of race have been largely consigned to the molecular level, issues of racism have pretty much been expunged from a sociological lexicon.

So we have data without explanation, we know it’s there, we don’t know why, we probably don’t really care. Sociology has effectively outsourced its concern with social problems, at least as far as racism goes. Ethnicity and identity is all.

So within Ethnic and Race Studies specifically, I worry that we’re following the American route, in which we see an increasingly stark division between structural and cultural accounts of racial and ethnic identities which don’t speak to each other at all.

Worse than this, we don’t actually have a strong structural narrative to counterbalance the overwhelmingly culturalist accounts. So we’re seemingly excavating the various sociological pitfalls, that Errol Lawrence, so powerfully warned us about, reflected by and reflecting, the convenient culturalist narratives of policy and politics in an endlessly vicious cycle which [rarefies 00:22:06] ethnic and racial difference and disadvantage as simple questions of culture.

So, what’s a sociologist to do?

Firstly, we need to take race seriously and think about how race and racism not only feature as aspects of our increasingly fragmented social world globally and locally, but how it features in the academy and our own departments, in our curriculum and teaching and in our interactions with students.

Secondly, we need to reengage sociological theory and practice, connect our obsession with questions of culture and identities, back to questions of social structure, inequality and importantly power. Inequality doesn’t just happen, it’s made.

Thirdly, we need to reconnect to history, especially the history of our own discipline and avoid what [Engliss 00:22:51] has termed ‘Sociological presentism’.

And I think, you know, connecting back to some of the early race scholarship, would be a good starting point and not just for race researchers.

Fourthly, we need to reconnect across related fields of work, across race, migration, religion, class, gender, nationalism and think about connection, not just intersection.

Fifthly we need to look up and out at the world around us, to bring the social back into sociology, in a meaningful way. We need to think about how we reengage with sociological publics, with a more equal fashion and contribute to what [Bhattacharya and Mergy] have termed ‘critical race public scholarship’. So we’ve got impact, let’s make an impact and let’s make impact count.

And finally, and I’m probably structurally and possibly culturally obliged to say this, but let’s think about how we do research, and particularly, I would suggest the possibility that ethnography offers in deepening our engagement across all of these dimensions.

Historical, structural and cultural and I’m now going to pass to my other half, who’s going to show us how that’s done. Thank you.

[Applause and background noise 00:23:53- 00:24:14]

Anoop Nayak: It’s early morning and I’m strolling along Armstrong Bridge, along wrought iron construction that stretches across the \_\_\_ River and surrounding parks.

 At the other end, somewhere in the distance, I spot three teenage boys on BMX bikes ,they’re cycling towards me and something about their manner and movement makes me wary.

 Almost unconsciously, I alter my posture, try to make myself look bigger and purposefully stride forward. As I attempt to pre-figure their actions, time slows and I find myself focusing on the face of a single young man.

 Eye to eye, our gazes lock together, as his mouth opens for a brief moment, I wonder if I’m going to be spat at, and I’ve angled my body in such a way, to avoid a direct hit.

 “Suicide bomber” he screeches, whizzing past in a kinetic blur of arms, legs and hoody. “Bin laden” shouts another, “Islamic terrorist” shouts a third and the rest I don’t recall.

 Instead, I’m relieved that the passing encounter is actually of a low key nature. It seems no more than an everyday event, of seemingly banal inconsequence.

 Now, what I want to do today in this talk, is to build upon some of the framework that Clare’s provided us with, but also to think, not so much about these micro-encounters as individual molecular instances of happenings.

 But to actually think about what they might mean at a larger scale and in doing so, I want to think about, in particular, the body and the way in which race is brought to life and summoned to life through particular emotions and feelings.

 And these can be unspoken emotions, around grievances, senses of loss, nostalgia and often things that are not palpably communicated.

 So, what I’m interested in, is the anatomy and distribution of felt intensities. And we’ve felt these continually, when they’re aimed towards Muslims, migrants, asylum seekers or even a more generally notion of multi-culturalism.

 And I want to argue, it is through these techniques, through these means that race is summoned to life. Okay, summoned to life, but with grave effect for very particular people.

 So, I ‘m arguing today, that the micro-politics of race hate that occurs in everyday encounters at a local scale, can perform as a bigger means of purging the nation. A means of exerting White territoriality.

 Now, the purge is a means of installing and projecting what Ghassan Hage has called ‘The paranoid fantasies of a White nation’ that situate it within a very particular framework, located through whiteness.

 And if we think about how that operates at governmental levels, how we might think about citizenship, what something like belonging might mean.

 These are all figured, through notions of nationalism and White nationalism. So I’m interested, then in the way in which these emotions actually slide over political and legalistic rhetoric, but actually have an incredibly important part to play in everyday life.

 So we might have legislation on race equality, on human rights etc. but nevertheless, these emotions burst forth and create forms of disorder.

 So, taking up Clare’s challenge, I actually want to think about those things at a bigger scale, but also not in such a way that overwrites the body and overwrites the kind of idea of emotions that feminists have made central to academic and sociological enquiry.

 So, throughout this talk, I’m going to place it within, what we might call a ‘Turn to conviviality’ which Gilroy, amongst many others has sort of brought us.

 And for Gilroy, conviviality, I think is a very productive phrase and he talks about it basically as a kind of means in which people come to rub along against one another, in a kind of multi-cultural, cosmopolitan society.

 So a very pluralistic way of living and being, and actually it becomes a way in which difference no longer matters. So difference becomes the new norm.

 And I think that’s a very encouraging and hopeful message. But at the same time, I’d like to stretch this concept, and also offer some critique. Particularly how it’s filtered into debates on super-diversity.

 So Clare was pointing out, how some of these debates, perhaps overlook race. Where is race in those debates? The notions of diversity can be celebrated, but race and race inequality kind of remain.

So I’m figuring this presentation, really within that broader convivial turn. And here I’m very much inspired by the number of feminist and race scholars, who’ve been talking about the centrality of the body.

Notions of embodiment, emotions and this idea of the ‘White Nation’, that Hage, in the Australian context has talked about and I think it’s got relevance for thinking about the British context.

So, there’s been a lot of work by urban scholars, sociologists and anthropologists working around the convivial turn, and I suppose really sort of being inspired by, what Doreen Massey calls ‘The thrown togetherness of place’.

But I want to say, that it’s important not to overlook the structural unevenness that pervades in particular places. SO for example, in the North East, where I live, the kind of diverse areas, and it’s a mainly White region, but the diverse areas are those that are most impoverished.

They are also those where asylum seekers are moved into. So it’s very easy, if you’re living in a middle class neighbourhood, to be multi-cultural, to be pro-multicultural because you don’t actually have to live amongst the dirt, the grime, the thrown togetherness of place.

So, as I’m trying to work my way through this, I’d like to really think about a particular metaphor and I want to suggest, that like a long playing vinyl record, the sonic melody of multi-culturalism as advanced through the convivial turn, can risk deafening us out to some of the scratchiness, bumpiness that lies in the grooves of many encounters with difference.

And it’s these atonal infractions, scratches, bumps, crackles and hisses that I seek to pay attention to.

For not only are these auditory interruptions part of the relational and embodied emotional aspects of these encounters, but they are actually central to how multiculturalism, difference and diversity is lived.

And importantly, I think those crackles, hisses, are exactly is what is being muted out from some of the contemporary scholarship around conviviality and super-diversity.

So I want to kind of return, back to the old discourses of race and some of the earlier work that Clare talked about and realise that that also has an important part to play when we think about globalisation, cosmopolitanism, super-diversity etc.

Race remains a stratifying and structuring and powerful sociological force in society today.

So, if we think about maybe what’s changed? Clearly, we can think about the way in which some of the sliding signifiers of race have shifted perhaps, from the moral panic that surrounded African-Caribbean bodies in the 1980s and they’ve come to encompass Asian and particularly Muslim bodies.

And we know that there’s a geo-political context for how that’s happen, a context of terrorism and the way in which governance, state security etc. has played a role in that.

And in many ways, Islamic youth have been described as the ‘ultimate other’, by Louise Archer and seen as a source of a new moral panic.

And I think Clare put it very well, when she wryly remarked, back in 2000 that ‘Brown is the new Black’.

But in thinking about what has changed and what is different, I think that notion of moral panic, back in the 80s was very much fixed and tied to the nation state.

And I think that the current moral panic, exceeds the nation state, it leaks out, its borders are endless. So we encounter that and the effect of these emotions when we pass through passport control.

When technologies are produced to regulate fear, when we have to have our fingerprints checked or our eyeballs scanned, these are ways in which technology is pushed upon bodies and we’ve all experienced that.

So fear becomes uncontainable, it circulates globally and it no longer can be restricted within the borders of the nation state.

So I think, along with continuities that were there in earlier forms of racism, there are some moments of change.

Now some of the recent work that I’ve been doing, has been focusing upon young Bangladeshis and today, I’m going to say something about some of the Bangladeshi young women that I’ve been working with.

And the reason why I’m interested in this cohort, Clare presented some very clear statistics for us…Is that nearly half of Bangladeshi women, and two fifths of Bangladeshi men hold no educational qualifications.

They experience the highest rates of unemployment of any ethnic group, but we are looking for a hopeful sign- well they are a very young population.

So the average age is 18 years, compared to the UK population where the average is 37. And policy has pointed out that there’s been a lack of research of knowledge, particularly on young Bangladeshi women.

Now, I’ve put up these rather bald statistics there, but I want to go beyond them. So two questions that I’m asking today; one is, ‘What about geography?’ and one is, ‘What about ethnography?’

And the first one; ‘What about geography?’ is really a question about place.

Nearly all the work that’s been done on Bangladeshis has taken place in Southern England and particularly in London in Tower Hamlets. Are the findings going to be the same regarding education, employment, etc. if we shift that geographical gaze?

So that is part of the project that I’m currently working on. And I’m very interested to go and find that out. I don’t know the answer to that, as of yet but I think it’s an important and valid question to ask.

Because it also might take us beyond the simple look that particular people are oppressed in particular ways and so on.

Also the question about ethnography, that Clare finished with and I think it’s a very important question to ask. I mean, we have all these statistics but as sociologists, where is the ethnographic enquiry?

What different stories might ethnographic be able to tell? And importantly, I would argue that for example, the statistics cannot pick up upon things like aspiration.

What are the feelings of the new generation? What careers do they want to go into? Do they have aspirations?

So ethnography, I think is vital, in being able to tease out the important human stories, that lie behind the statistics and actually pick up on change and I think that is what is missing from some of the statistical data that’s out there. And I think as sociologists, these are important gaps that we can begin to fill.

So, the work that I’ve been doing has been, basically it’s been a series of projects that I’ve been doing up in the North East, for some time.

Today I’m going to focus in particular, upon some work that I’ve been doing in Sunderland. Now for those of you that don’t know, Sunderland is basically a post-industrial city that was once famous for coal mining and glass making and in particular now, its main industry is the automobile industry.

So there’s a Nissan car plant there, that provides most of the jobs, so it’s foreign direct investment that comes in. it employs people, but that wealth doesn’t stay in the region, it leaves.

Also, the North East, after Wales is the whitest region in the UK, and Sunderland just has a mere 0.8% of Bangladeshi communities. These are situated within three wards in Sunderland and it’s within these three wards that I’ve been conducting long term ethnographic research. That’s been with a team of ethnographers, Muslim researchers and also those from the Bangladeshi community.

So, in this work, one of the things that was impossible to avoid, was a centrality of race, to young peoples’ lives. And it was impossible to look beyond that, and so it’s really that element that I really wanted to bring to the table today.

Because for all the talk of cosmopolitanism, post-race ideas and notions of super-diversity, race remained a continuum that shaped their lives and was constantly being evoked in various ways.

So this is [Shabeem 00:40:15] “The boys from the neighbourhood, particularly the eastern side, they call you names, they say “Go back to your own country, get back to the jungle” and everything. From coming back from school, from going to school when the teacher’s not there”

Miriam; “One of my friends got physically abused, what happened was she called back at an English girl. There were five of us and everywhere we went it was blocked, they were blocking our way. Suddenly they were pulling our hair and you don’t want to know what happened”

And she goes on, that she reported this to the head teacher whole then said “Well, I can’t do anything about it, because it was after school it wasn’t in school” so they can’t do anything about it. And we said, “Look it was a journey from school to home”

So again, I think this touches upon some of what Clare said about the Race Relations Amendment Act which said that institutions have a responsibility, a duty of care to the community, around race equality.

But what happens when that happens outside of the institutional forum? So it raises very kind of important questions.

So as I began to ponder over some of what’s happening in this exert, it’s very clear that this notion of being blocked can be seen as a micro account but actually is much more powerful than that.

If we think about how blocking is about people being stopped and searched in the street, it’s about mobility and having that curtailed. It’s about people that are seeking asylum on a boat that are impeded when it comes to passport control.

So blocking is then a way of regulating and producing the white nation. It is not simply a micro encounter, but a statement of intent. “Go back to your own country”

It also carries with it, the common features of modernity “Get back to the jungle” suggests still that race is a powerful force and that people are somehow primitive and left behind and uncivilised.

So this notion of blocking then I would argue, has a lot to tell us, not only about the micro-politics of daily life and the thrown togetherness of place, but also about the nation state itself and how it operates. How it regulates and how it produces race It’s that notion of producing race that I think is critical to how we might think about these everyday encounters.

So as I said, race is a continuum in young peoples’ lives, it was something that they continually mentioned to us, we didn’t have to ask about it, and they documented it in a number of different ways.

There were several encounters that are very similar to this. In many ways the encounters are an enactment of purification, a way of cleansing or distilling ‘the white nation’.

So Miriam and her friends are subjected to a form of social segregation where their daily routes and pathways are blocked. We also see the ways in which an individual incident, being called by an English girl, can result in a bigger form of racialisation.

“So the whole school come after us” or particular lines are drawn, particular race lines are summoned to life and become palpable and real in the daily environment.

So, in considering some of the atonal infractions, scratches and skirmishes that interrupt the melody of mutli-cultural conviviality, it seems that respondents had no choice but to put up with a degree of white noise.

Speaking out about racism, invariably meant that it was the victims that were seen to disrupt conviviality.

As Shabeeb explained, “It feels crap but then again, we have to put up with it” Miriam continues “Well we just shout back, the worst bit’s where they’re spitting at you, I hate that, after I used to feel disgusted” And another student talked about “Having her hair burnt”

So the burning of hair, being spat at and other hostile activities are inter-corporeal means of purging the nation and cleansing the national body politic. Through such visceral embodied acts, Bangladeshi Muslim youth are marked out as ‘Out of place’.

They are subjected to a form of spatial apartheid, that much be violently maintained. As Sarah Ahmed fittingly reminds us, ‘It is here on the skin surface that histories are made’

So the post 911 moment then, which we might think about at a large scale, can also be brought down to the body. We can think about the very palpable way in which race is brought to life and its effects around mobility and the everydayness of the ethnographic experience.

But it’s not only bodies that can be the kind of canvas for race hatred. So again this is the young women, and one of the things that they speak about here, is public celebrations. Which might be seen as forms of national bonding, but actually can be forms of estrangement for those that are seen not to belong.

So Miriam says “It was especially at Christmas time or Halloween or Bonfire Night, we used to be scared, we used to have to sellotape our letterboxes. They did used to you know, y cousin that lived down the road there, they used to throw fire through the letterboxes”

Shabeeb; “They tried to hit us with stones and everything, but I never got hurt properly”

Miriam; “Well my Dad did, when he was in the takeaway because he had fights there with English guys who would come in and they’d break the windows but my Mum she stays at home”

So again, mobility, and being fixed in place is kind of critical here.

Rupa; “We suffered from numerous racial attacks, whilst living in the neighbourhood. This was from eggs being thrown, washing being burnt, windows smashed numerous times, vehicles vandalised, verbal abuse on numerous occasions”

So throughout our presentation, we’ve seen the intimate ways in which racism is pressed upon the bodies of others, the extent to which it regulates mobility and comes to displace people ‘back to the jungle’.

And in doing so, acts as this kind of purging act, that I’ve argued is a way of making the white nation. The white nation is also made, through forms of rituals, of commemoration, be that Christmas, Halloween, Bonfire Night, etc. where the staging of national events and a carnival atmosphere of these celebrations allows certain activities to go unseen.

Muslims are particularly likely to stand out if they don’t participate and can become seen as different through those acts of non-participation.

Now the racist harassment that Rupa describes above, eventually resulted in her family vacating the neighbourhood as they were displaced from a predominantly white area.

Although racism is a thoroughly embodied act where material objects such as clothes, windows, cars can operate at surrogates for the doing of race hatred and how it might be enacted.

Through such acts, wordless objects are animated and come to stand in for Muslims themselves. Communicating that they don’t belong and legitimately can be egged, burnt, smashed and abused in the scouring of the nation.

Now, while that might seem quite a powerful and sobering account, nevertheless, the young women also talked about more convivial relations but importantly, these took time to happen.

They weren’t the light brush encounters that just occurred day to day, they were about real bonds that took time to manage and really kind of had to be worked at, and often they were the people that had to put that work in to allow that to happen.

So many of them spoke about developing good relations in school, but this was after having to undergo quite a lot of abuse. So conviviality was the burden that was carried by migrant communities.

Nevertheless, it was possible for openings to happen. So here Miriam decides to assert rights to the city, when she decides not to run away in the end from some perpetrators that were chasing her.

She says; “Well, once a boy asked me …I stopped there and asked him “Why are you chasing me? Why are you bullying me?” and he said “Are you going to run?” and I said “No, I just want to know why you’re doing it?” and he says “Because you’re taking over our country” and I said “Look, we’re not”

Sayeda; “Yes they said “Go back to your own country” Miriam; “I told him I was bored in this country and he was shocked” and she says “Some things are better now, after 9:00 we didn’t used to walk on the streets and now you can see Bangladeshi people out walking”

So we said “So racism doesn’t impact on where you go?”

Sayeda; “No, it’s because we’ve left school now. Even now we actually meet some of the same people, some of the perpetrators in town who used to pick on us, but they’re more mature”

Miriam; “I think they’re getting used to it. Our population’s been increasing and I think they’re getting used to it”

So here, we really get to see that conviviality is not a quick fix, it’s not something that emerges out of thin air but it’s something that has to be worked at, it’s something that has to be rigorously applied through repetitive and deep encounters.

So certainly in the North East of England, this was not about a kind of everyday multiculturalism and everyday cosmopolitanism.

So I really wanted to kind of emphasise, that the kind of easy conviviality that might be talked about, actually there’s a lot of hard work going on underneath that to allow it to appear.

So, I thought it was very interesting here that Miriam asserts kind of a new urban citizenship here, you know, locating herself within the city, pointing out, through birth rights. “I was born in this country” and how these kind of multiple attachments can serve to hollow out and corrode the fantasy of the white nation.

Kind of corroding it from eh inside out. And perhaps it’s able to do so, because it is a fantasy and a fantasy that is unachievable. Built as it is upon fictive, or imagined communities to use Benedict Anderson’s phrase.

Now I began this paper with a relatively innocuous encounter, and reconsidering this episode, it’s apparent that it cannot be read outside of its immediate geopolitical context.

Here, global events, conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan, post 911 fears and securitisation, the hunt for Osama Bin Laden and so on, stick together and come to become charged with an effective quality and they come to resonate at a national and local scales.

Now if we consider Judith Butler’s insights on injurious speech, she makes an important distinction between wording and wounding. And I think in this essay, she talks about how wording can actually be a form of wounding.

We can think, in many ways, to use her metaphor, here she’s talking in very legalistic terms, but she describes, particular terms as being ‘Burning acts’.

And I think what we’ve seen today is certainly how racist language can actually become a ‘burning act’ an act that seeks to extinguish the other.

Now, throughout I’ve engaged with some of the more creative and celebratory work on convivial encounters, hopefully extending this debate, by addressing typographies of power and the inequality that’s woven through that.

In recognising multiple forms of oppression, British Bangladeshi youth, negotiate what Derek Gregory calls ‘The colonial present’. And here I’ve tried to situate this account very much within these asymmetrical relations.

In doing so, I’ve pointed out how the fantasy of the white nation can be produced and reproduced and is sustained through this act of purging.

Surprisingly, we’ve seen how young women, might on occasion actually confront perpetrators of violence. People they’ve attended school with, and here tolerance can be a kind of base line for something else to happen.

Interestingly enough, I think tolerance really is a baseline but nevertheless, it can be a starting point. We think of tolerance as something that we hold out to toddlers or something, and you know, something we bestow on others but nevertheless, I think in particular contexts it can allow us to think about what it might take as a starting point for bringing about difference.

So, I’ve tried to present these combustible race encounters to you today to kind of remind us that race doesn’t’ disappear, it doesn’t go away and it is palpable.

It might become amplified through various acts and the kind of acts of blocking that we’ve seen, and at its most extreme it’s about being beaten, bullied and involve the burning of hair.

I’ve explored how emotions are central to the purge, fear, anxiety, suspicion, hatred and grievances become distilled into these acts.

So in many ways, these acts are also a means of spatially ordering the nation, they also speak about entitlements to white rights, where the process of purging that as I’ve discussed, it akin to a form of ethnic cleansing.

Muslims and minorities are bleached from the local vicinity and the nation state must be wiped clean again. So I want to finish here, just with thinking about what Clare and I have tried to do.

We’ve hopefully exposed race as a structural force that remains strangely solid in liquid times. And here we’ve pointed to the stickiness of race, both in the academy and outside. Its viscosity still remains.

We value the lively and grounded intimacy of ethnographic accounts and particular the usefulness of speaking back to more celebratory work on encounters, super-diversity and cosmopolitanism. And finally we’ve suggested that as sociologists, we have a commitment to work on race, ethnicity and migration and a duty to think critically about what Black and anti-racist scholars might do and how we might refigure the discipline from the inside out. So I’ll finish on that note.

[Applause 00:57:33 - 00:57:43]

Facilitator: Thank you very much to our speakers. Now we have about 20 minutes, for questions. What we’ll do is, we’ll take a couple in a row and then we’ll answer them.

 If you could, anyone who has questions, put up your hand, I will direct people with the mics to you and please don’t start asking the question until the mic arrives.

 Would anyone like to start? Okay we have got two down here. Right there, behind you.

Female: Thank you very much, Louise Ryan. Two very inspiring and though provoking presentations. Anoop I was particularly drawn to the ethnography, I think that really captivated me. I wanted to ask you about your use of the term ‘Conviviality’, I just want to be clear, because it’s a concept that I just come across continually in the literature now. It’s grown and grown in its usage.

 You were introducing a critique, a very valid critique of conviviality, but I think you were also continuing to use the term. And so I would really like to know, for you, whether you think there is any value in this term ‘conviviality’ or all the things that you said about it, which I completely agree with, would suggest to me that it’s not particularly useful. So I was surprised that you seemed to be still applying it. So I’d just like to hear a bit more about that. But thank you again for two wonderful presentations.

Male: Yes, my question is to Anoop, so I’ve lived and studied and worked in the North East for the last 15 years and you talked very powerfully about the operation of racism in the North East and I was just wondering if you could just say a bit about what you’ve identified in terms of the current state of anti-racism in the region. Because there’s a lot of history of racism in the North East but there’s also a lot of history of resistance and I just wondered what the current situation is?

Facilitator: \_\_\_[00:59:58]

Female: I think thought they were very thought provoking, wonderful papers and thanks. But I was also \_\_\_ about the specificity of place in Anoop’s talk and how that then refracts through ideas of nation, but also ideas of class.

 And how as ethnographers, this localism then and if we’re kind of tracking the tracking the complexities of reality in the context as you have done, how does that then become configured through specific place in diverse ways? And what you mentioned about ideas of nation \_\_\_.

 [Silence 01:00:51 - 01:05:22]

Facilitator: There’ one up front here and then the person in the grey, sorry.

Female: Hi, my name is [Greta], thank you for an interesting presentation. My question is to Anoop again, I guess my question is; is there something insurmountable about the \_\_\_ of race in these encounters? Or is there any improvement incorporating other embodied identities like children, or class that you saw also playing a role? Or are we being evoked by both Bangladeshi men and women and by perpetrators or was there something so solid and sticky about the racialisation of the encounters that overtook everything else?

Facilitator: Here in the middle, and then I think that’s \_\_\_[01:06:16].

Male: I would like to see \_\_\_, she said something about the displacement of the issue of structure by the issue of culture in accounts of racism and she emphasised the importance of structure as the important of looking at the issues of \_\_\_. Where we think about racism, but she was a bit general by saying that issues of structure are issues of equality and power. Could you be a bit more specific, saying what does it mean, \_\_\_ when we analyse racism or through the political economy of contemporary racism or if you which contemporary racism?

Facilitator: And the gentleman right next to you had his hand up \_\_\_[01:07:58].

Male: Thank you for the opportunity, my question is quite simple regarding one particular sentence that you mentioned., you said that “Inequality doesn’t happen, but it’s made” and \_\_\_ if it is made, what mechanism are the basis for that to happen, and what embedded in that \_\_\_?

Facilitator: We take those three, then we’ll have another round.

Anoop Nayak: Okay, so I’ll do the first one and then Clare if you want to take on those other ones.

 Yes, so you asked me “Is race as insurmountable and issues about intersectionality”

 I suppose the important thing was, the young people that I spoke with, saw race as the kind of formative aspect of their identity when it came to encounters, that is.

 But I certainly don’t think it’s insurmountable and I think we saw, and I’ve got other examples of some quite positive relations opening up as well.

 And maybe an illustration of that, was the English Defence League came to the North East, came to Newcastle and one of the local mosques actually opened its doors to them and let them in.

 And a number of people that were there, came in and had a look round and everything, it was actually very peaceful and a number of the local people that they might have thought would be potentially recruited, were not.

 So a kind of dialogue happened here, that was quite productive and interesting. It was about letting people in, even those that we might see as ‘other ‘in that instance.

 But yes, I think for the young women, colour and the body was integral and I think for young people, they are their bodies in many ways, so yes.

Clare Alexander: Yes, I’m kind of regretting say that now. (Laughter) okay I mean, yes I was deliberately being very, very broad and what I was thinking about was specifically work largely in sociology about race and ethnic identities and the way in which increasingly, and I’ve been as guilty as this as the next person.

 The question on culture, is increasing focused on questions of inward looking questions of identity, norms, values and they’re seen as being distinct from different kinds of structures.

 And the way that’s fed into very kind of convenient political policy, media, ideas about ‘What creates people’s identities?’

 So why are Pakistani’s and Bangladeshis poor? Because they don’t send their wives and their daughters out to work or they don’t educate their daughters.

 And so they are very kind of simplistic, kinds of analysis which are focused around ideas of culture which are seen as autonomous and internal.

 My argument would be, that questions of culture and always bound up with questions of kind of social positioning, political positioning, economic positioning, so actually those questions might be questions of…

 I mean, you raised that question about education in the North East. So for example, If you look at Bangladeshi young women in particular, and also young men, they’ve done very well, in terms of educational attainment in London, largely because London put a huge amount of money into the schools in Tower Hamlets, to increase the quality of those schools. So educational attainment has gone up massively.

 So my suspicion would be that actually in the North East, where they haven’t done that, the educational attainment would be much worse.

 So that’s not about gender and identity, that’s not about ethnic identities, it’s not about religious identities in that kind of inward looking way, but the way those things encounter and interact with broader structural, largely economic or political forms of positioning and disadvantage.

 I’m always interested in questions of representation and discourse, so for me, I guess it’s a question of the way in which what people think from the outside, impact on the way in which you’re able to live your life in particular ways.

 I think what worries me, is the way in which we reach for very easy cultural explanations for everything; gangs, educational underachievement, sexual preferences, whatever is happens to be, without looking at those kind of broader places in which people live and encounter on a much broader social rather than cultural analysis.

 So for example, Runnymede have been doing some very interesting work on the impact of austerity. And austerity impacts more on BME communities because there are more of them in poorer communities and the retraction of public services impact, particularly on Black communities because that’s where a lot of people were employed and so on.

 So these things are not distinct and discrete and that’s an obvious statement to make but a lot of the work that’s done recently, in the light of the new ethnicities stuff, is that it tends to focus on identities as much more inward looking down at the micro, “Let’s look at how people interact in school, let’s think about how they think about themselves, how they feel about their identities”

 Whereas, we need to be able to link that up, which I think is the point that Anoop made very powerfully, with the broader context within which identities take shape. I hope that answers both of your questions.

Facilitator: Did you want to add something?

Male: No.

Facilitator: A few people already had their hands up. Down there, third row, one in and right here.

Female: I’m 01:13:48 from \_\_\_ University. My question is to Clare, you mentioned that it’s better to talk about \_\_\_, rather than to say…I’m wondering whether you’re placing or situating connection as intersections\_\_\_ theory, intersections are points of connections between social connections and social positioning.

 So I wondered whether you could ..?

Female: Hi, thanks very much for that, both of you, but this is for Clare. I thought you made some really telling points about sociology, about research funding and about the academy. And I wondered if you had any thoughts about what we do, basically?

Facilitator: We do have time for one more. Okay, right here.

Male: You both referred to the defences between Tower Hamlets and Sunderland, I don’t know if you’re in a position to comment on any differences you’ve observed? Tower Hamlets is very well documented.

Clare Alexander: Yes, connection and the intersections it was a nice sound bit wasn’t’ it? But I find intersectionality…again the sis the difference between and it’s the same thing with the questions about conviviality and a lot of these theoretical framings.

 They’re potentially really powerful, but that’s not always how they get used and when people use them, they tend to use them as, you take them off the peg and say “I’m going to take an intersectional approach”

 Which actually means that all you’re doing is narrowing down and down and down on what the experiences might be, at the very particular. So it becomes fragmenting.

 That’s clearly never been the intention of what intersectionality was, particularly in the kind of \_\_\_[01:16:02] thing and I think there is something about recognising specificity but also being able to recognise solidarity. So what worries me, politically if you could use that frame in this context, is that you get a kind of fragmentation.

 So I’m old enough to remember when we were all Black, just about and then we were Black and Asian and then we were African Caribbean and Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi and then we were Muslim and non-Muslim.

 All those things kind of get more and more and more fragmented and there’s a point at which we no longer speak to each other about those connections.

 So one of the things that I’ve been doing some work on with some of my PhD students is the emergence of Muslim identities and the extent to which islamophobia is or isn’t a form of racism.

 I think we can argue it both ways, but if we don’t join those things back up, so we’re speaking across what might be seen as distinct or discrete experiences, then I think we’re pretty much doomed.

 But I think intersectionality gets wielded in a slightly lazy way, rather than coming back to what its actual potential might be for creating alliances, while recognising the specificities.

 In terms of the academy, we had a quite interesting session, on the sociology of education yesterday, where it was kind of slightly doom laden and perhaps with good reason actually.

 But there are things that I think can be done. So people were talking yesterday about looking at your curriculum and seeing if you can diversify it.

 So there are those kind of very everyday things. Impact agenda is a very interesting one. Because I think it’s clearly not how we would potentially want to frame the kind of work we do.

 But clearly, sociologists want to make an impact, because what would be the point otherwise right, we’d all just sit and examine our own navels which would be really boring.

 So it’s a question of; can we take that incentive to take your work out to different audiences and change something? There must be ways in which we can do that, which is not necessarily about falling into a kind of government agenda.

 I think Les Back was talking very powerfully about the way in which we think about our own practices, the way in which we deal with each other, the competitiveness, the Ref and whoever has generated and how we might push back productively against that.

 So I think there are things we can do in our everyday encounters, supporting each other, certainly in a spirit of generosity.

 What I say to a number of my PhD students is that the ref on one level is a nightmare right, but it gives you very clear guidance on what it is you’re supposed to be doing.

 So if you’re a scholar of colour coming into the academy, you know what you’ve got to do, so you’ve got a very clear marker against what’s going on, what’s keeping you out, what s excluding you.

 You can, to some extent in various constraints, turn those markers to something which can be used potentially productively, not always but potentially.

 And Tower Hamlets and Sunderland. I just published this terrible Bengal Diaspora curse book and one of the things we looked at there was the differences between Tower Hamlets and Oldham.

 Now Oldham is much more famous and a big Bangladeshi community, but not one that’s been studied as much. One of the things that was very interesting, was looking at the way in which the local structure, so the local government structures in Tower Hamlets and in Oldham were quite different.

 Some of the histories of work in the areas were quite different. And so how that impacted on certain kinds of community formation, so I’m assuming that would probably be true of Sunderland as well, but I don’ know anything about the North East, other than there’s probably Bangladeshi restaurants because Bengalis are everywhere.

Anoop Nayak: Okay, I’ll try and wrap up some of what you’ve said there and re-package it in some way.

 Intersectionality, I mean is a very useful concept and has been, but it’s interesting, it seems to be plundered and used so much by my PhD students for a long time now.

 But I think there is this danger that Clare talked about that it can end up watering down certain things. So for example, race equality is now being subsumed within a broader equities agenda.

 Now that can be a good thing, in terms of intersectionality, but it can also be at a loss for particular groups that have campaigned and manoeuvred politically around that notion of race.

 Also intersectionality, it’s only every really a starting point and perhaps one of the problems that there might be with it, again, is that it actually starts with categories and clearly we want to move beyond that.

 I think there’s some important work that’s there through it and Martin’s questions about Tower Hamlets and Sunderland, I genuinely don’t know the answer to that, which is why I am researching this.

 So this is exactly what I’m trying to find out and it’s quite good to be in that positon. I think too often we do work that we actually know half the answers to or we think we know and I genuinely don’t know and that’s why I’m doing it.

 I want to present this very much as work in progress ideas that I’m working with. So I’ll be interested to see if the data set ends up actually replicating what we think we know about Bangladeshi Muslims or actually tells a very different place based story.

Facilitator: Alright, I want to think the speakers. Please, no one leave we have the \_\_\_[ 1:21:52] prize as well coming up next, but thank you very much, some great speakers.

 [Applause and background noise 01:21:56 - 01:22:13]

END AUDIO
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