Feeling together:
Emotion, heritage, conviviality and politics in a changing city

Alida Payson
School of Journalism, Media and Culture
Cardiff University

A thesis submitted to Cardiff University for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
January 2018
Feeling together: emotion, heritage, conviviality and politics in a changing city

Abstract

This thesis explores how feelings affect the politics of living together in a de-industrialized, post-colonial city. Over the past few decades, Cardiff, a former coal port marked by generations of migration, has stuttered through redevelopment, entrenching inequalities and moulting unevenly into a future as a cosmopolitan capital. In places like Cardiff marked by troubled pasts, a recent body of research has turned to how moods – melancholia, hurt, anxiety, and nostalgia – stick around in the present and move people in ways that are not well understood. I argue that to explore these questions, and to understand the chimeric ways power moves in the present, requires a turn away from discourse and particularly from the vexed ethics of ‘voice’, to emotions, affects, and how bodies move and are moved. This thesis therefore addresses a resurgent interest in politics, conviviality and emotion. It does so through a study of four community-based cultural heritage projects and archives. It follows three groups of girls and women ages 11-82 who took part in arts and heritage projects about women’s history around Cardiff’s former docklands, along with a collection of popular documentary photographs of life in the area, shot in the 1950s and 1980s, and recently recovered. In this thesis, taking all four sites as performative, I trace emotion in feeling words, materials, and patterns, from textiles to photographs to oral histories, in order to understand how feelings about the past and the imaginary of community – the conceptual possibilities that emerge for living together – might move in them. In particular, I chart four themes: 1) how to labour at the care, mixing and shared ‘sweet’ feelings necessary to stick collectivities together; 2) how to turn fury into fight, putting to use ‘ugly feelings’ (Ngai 2007) dredged up by violence past and present; 3) how to relish and set alight feelings of melancholy and loss; and 4) how to model or recoil from a certain kind of ‘becoming young woman’ (McRobbie 2007), and ‘becoming’ future. In a rapidly transfiguring present, the thesis argues that it is by tuning into emotion – emotional labour to move others, affective labour on the self, and collective work on mood – that we might better understand the politics of living together.
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Chapter 1: Introduction: conviviality, heritage, politics, and emotion

1.1 Introduction

Walking down to Cardiff’s former docklands neighbourhood through the city centre, I left the bright shopping arcades and passed under the damp railway bridge, where in 1919 Butetown and docks residents had barricaded themselves against mobs of white rioters and police (Evans 1980, 15; 1983; 2015; Jenkinson 2009; Jordan 2005, 64; Tabili 2009). My route took me over relict canals long since filled in, past the Salvation Army hostel on the street where in the 1930s protesters marched with signs reading ‘Black and White Unite You Have the Same Oppressor’ (Tiger Bay is my Home 1984). I walked under young trees by St Mary’s Church, which local historian Neil Sinclair (2003, vii) writes ‘is filled to the rafters’ for the funerals of elderly neighbours so often he feels like a ‘professional mourner’. I passed the old Loudon Square, the bustling new pharmacy, chip shop, café, computer repair shop and several small halal grocers. I walked under tower blocks and along rows of 1960s maisonettes with calla lilies and climbing roses in their narrow front gardens. I skirted the gates of new luxury condominiums, the crumbling Victorian tram station, and the boarded-up Coal Exchange sprouting with ferns and weedy purple Buddleia. I cut through parks and paused on street corners I had seen captured in photographs of everyday life here in the 1950s and 1980s. Stopping short of the redeveloped waterfront with its back to Butetown and its face to the bay, I ducked into a community centres on the fringe to join a group of women who were reimagining the heritage of the past for the purposes of the present.

I walked through those spaces regularly for two years, and over time was drawn into local, popular archives and meetings with three different groups of women involved in cultural heritage projects. Everywhere, the past moved in complex forms. Pasted on the wall of a shop near where I lived, for example, a set of black and white photographs from the 1980s drew the comment, ‘brilliant idea to make people stop for a few minutes to feel some nostalgia wash over them and even make them smile X’ (2015)\(^1\). But the same places were also thick with other, uglier feelings (Ngai 2007) about the past and present, too. In a 1984 documentary called Tiger Bay is my Home, Gaynor Legall, an activist recently

---

\(^1\) The comment appeared on the Cardiff before Cardiff public Facebook page, in response to a photo by the artist Jon Pountney of the process of installing the posters on the wall of a Tesco supermarket on a busy neighbourhood road. See Figure 6a.
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celebrated for her achievements in Welsh Government (BBC 2017a), described ‘a lingering fear’ for people in the area, one not easily articulated, because ‘although they can’t say to you well I remember such and such a thing, it is there at the back of their minds’.

A rich strain of research over the past two decades has explored how people live together in difference, especially in postcolonial, deindustrializing, and changing places (Back and Sinha 2016; Brah 1996; Gilroy 1987; 2005; Back 1994; Wise and Noble 2016). Some of this research queries how history matters for living together, particularly when that history is contested, as a history of damage, a ‘history that hurts’ (Ahmed 2007, 135; Winant 2015: 111-112). These scholars have pointed out that conviviality, or the ‘local relations of living together’ (Wise and Noble 2016, 423) requires tracking how such histories pattern the present. The possibility of a ‘habitable multiculture’ (Gilroy 2006, 27) in Britain, for example, hinges on ‘a reckoning with the ruins of Empire’ lingering in the present (Back and Sinha 2016, 522). Changing retrenched inequalities in school for working class young people in Britain means facing what Diane Reay calls a ‘zombie’: the monstrous, undead history of class oppression (Reay 2006).

These scholars describe the way history is felt in the present as a mood, an atmosphere, or a thick, palpable ‘structure of feeling’ (Williams 1977). Paul Gilroy describes a feeling of ‘postcolonial melancholia’ for lost imperial potency that suffuses British culture and politics in the present, for example (Gilroy 2004; 2005). Others describe a pathological ‘paranoid nationalism’ (Hage 1998); a haunting, pressing reminder of the everyday presence of the past (Gordon 1997; 2011); and a mood of ‘white unease’ and anxiety (Ahmed 2004; 2008; 2014; Bigo 2002; Fortier 2007; 2010; I. Tyler 2013; Gill and Tyler 2013; Jones and Jackson 2014). What Sara Ahmed calls the ‘sociality of emotion’ makes emotion ‘stick’ to certain figures, marked by history, such that they become figures of threat and terror (Ahmed 2004; 2010). Or histories might whip forward into the present as ‘ordinary affects’, the sensible but hard-to-name things that move bodies, creating ‘a scene of immanent force’ that dodges our attempts to systematize it as the mechanism of neoliberalism, or imperialism, or racism (Stewart 2007, 1; 2011; Carlson and Stewart 2014). Patterns laid down over time might unfold in the present as an orientation or way of attaching to the world that hurts even as it lures us in (Berlant 2011).

What these different scholars share is a conviction that power moves not (or at least not only) through discourse and symbols, but through affect and feeling; it is not only known, but felt.2 They share a sense

---

2 Williams is careful to point out knowing and feeling are not mutually opposed: he uses feeling ‘not... against thought, but thought as felt and feeling as thought: practical consciousness of a present kind’ (Williams 1977: 132). While the relationship between the affective and the conceptual, the emotional and the discursive, has
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of the poverty of describing the felt phenomena of power in terms of settled explanations. As ‘social experiences in solution’, pulling and pressing on us even as they defy articulation, they ‘do not have to await definition, classification, or rationalization before they exert palpable pressures and set effective limits on experience and on action’ (Williams 1977, 132-133). For Williams and many of these scholars, living, breathing social life should be taken as unsettled, ‘forming and formative processes’ rather than as a clutch of settled, ‘formed wholes’ (Williams 1977, 128). Yet while considerable attention has been paid to the way public feeling moves at the scale of the nation, more intimate politics of emotion – how patterns of feeling come to make themselves felt in a local way and on the body, how feelings saturate imagined communities, and how living together compels affective and emotional labours unevenly from different bodies – is less well understood.

Cardiff, whose once-booming port drew migration from all over the world over more than 150 years, has long been a site of multiculturalism (Runnymede 2012; Jordan 2001). Sunk by slumping coal, steel, and iron industries, the surrounding South Wales Valleys have also been long been sites of economic redevelopment (Dicks 2008, 960). Over the past few decades, Cardiff has jolted out of postindustrial decline. It has stumbled through massive but uneven redevelopment, with new migration, to redefine itself as a ‘cosmopolitan, “world-becoming”’ city (Gonçalves 2008, 1; 2017; see also Cardiff Council 2016; Cowell and Thomas 2002; Threadgold et al. 2008). Even with all of this change, inherited patterns of inequality seem only more entrenched. The once-industrial southern arc of the city, for example, curves around the former docklands and mouth of the Taff river to the east and west. People living in the formerly are more likely to be poor, to be out of work, to struggle with disabling health problems, and to die more than a decade earlier than those in the wealthier northern part of the city (Elliott, Hatrop and Williams 2010; Jivraj 2013; Cardiff Council 2011; 2016; Jivraj 2013; Threadgold et al. 2008). Even with recent changes in migration and movement within the city, these neighbourhoods are also where people of colour and new migrants still most likely to live (Threadgold et al. 2008; Jivraj 2013).

been tensely contested (Felski and Fraiman 2012; Leys 2010, 2011, 2012; Wetherell 2012), like Williams I take them to be entangled. Because the discursive politics around history and community seem to me to be relatively well-understood compared to how moods and feelings move subjects and publics, the latter is the subject of this thesis (see also Chapter 3). Like Sianne Ngai (2007: 27), I use the terms ‘more or less interchangeably’, with emotion or feeling and affect as stops on a spectrum of intelligibility or embodiment. As she puts it, orienting herself slant to affect theorists such as Brian Massumi, ‘my assumption is that affects are less formed and structured than emotions, but not lacking form or structure altogether; less “sociolinguistically fixed”, but by no means code-free or meaningless; less “organized in response to our interpretations of situations,” but by no means entirely devoid of organization or diagnostic powers’ (Ngai 2007: 27). I am therefore, interested in this thesis in those points in being together with others ‘whereby affects acquire the semantic density and narrative complexity of emotions, and emotions conversely denature into affects’. It is this clotting, forming and dissolving of feeling that is interesting because it does not quite presume normative concepts, but tunes into their becoming (Ingold 2014).
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The ‘pattern of deprivation’ in Cardiff’s southern arc is historical (Hooper and Punter 2006, 64). It is part of the history people here inherit. As researchers into multiform imaginations of community in Cardiff take note, ‘class, gendered, and racial, inequalities inherited from [a] common history’ (Threadgold 2008, 2) pattern the present. Iterated dispossessions mark this history. Postcolonial gendered histories play in and across it, affecting which bodies are seen to belong where, or to be fit for what kind of labour (Weedon and Jordan 2010). Further, ‘symbolic losses’ (Ray, Hudson and Phillips 2008, 119) and feelings of loss imbricate with the physical losses of deindustrialization and change. The emotional power of history and cultural heritage in places marked like Cardiff by deindustrialization should not be ignored. People involved in heritage projects in working class neighbourhoods in Yarmouth, England, for example, ‘feel a strong need for history, [and] intense emotional ties to the industrial landscape’ (Wedgwood 2009: 277). The past circulates in a diffuse, affective mode, moving people in ways they might not be able to articulate outright, but which nevertheless stick around.

Asking how the past is imagined matters for understanding how a community forms. Cultural heritage and history serve as a means to craft the ‘biography’ of any community: a sense of identity takes shape ‘through the stories/histories/heritage texts told about itself’ (Dicks 1999, 370). As Michel-Rolph Trouillot puts it in *Silencing the Past* (1995, 16), there is no collectivity without a story about its past, as ‘the constructed past itself is constitutive of the collectivity’. Museums and sites of cultural heritage help to tell those stories, and therefore become sites for imagining and constituting individual and collective identities (Anderson 1991; Dicks 1999; 2003; Hall 2005; Littler and Naidoo 2005; Tolia-Kelly 2006; 2008; 2010; 2016). Yet these identities may be not fixed but mobile, not coherent but fractured and contested, not wholly sweet but also bitter, however. Local archives, photographs, exhibitions, and oral histories, among other cultural productions, form and reform ‘imagined communities’ at the scale of the neighbourhood group, the local area, the city, and beyond. This thesis therefore takes cultural heritage as a ‘social practice, not object’ (Dicks 2007, 59). Highly performative, the spaces and occasions of heritage-making explored in this thesis in fact, I argue, stage the complex making of selves and collectivities.

Meanwhile, much public heritage continues to celebrate ‘the “great” and the “good” of white British history’ – as a font of good feelings about the past (Littler and Naidoo 2005; Hall 2005; Waterton and Smith 2010, 13). Even as people have been invited in to tell counter-histories, the spaces of telling have been wrought by liberal, white desires (Waterton and Smith 2010, 13; Ahmed 2012; Naidoo 2016). Yet although set at the margins, even as they might be celebrated, those ‘histories that in many ways could be
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coded as “black”, “ethnic” or “feminine”, co-constitute the shape of the present (Waterton and Smith 2010, 13; for more on this idea, see Naidoo 2016, 508). As Stuart Hall (1991, 48-49) puts it pointedly, this all is ‘the outside history that is inside the history of the English’ – and the Welsh (Stuart Hall 1991, 48-49; see also Williams, 2003; Williams, Evans and O’Leary 2015). This thesis works to show something of how these inside-out histories form each other, and the present.

These ‘outside histories...inside the history’ of the British are not only conceptual: heritage bonds and coheres an imagined community together with emotion, ‘as a form of affective glue’ (Schwartz 2015, 25-29). But cultural productions about the past, of course, may also move with feelings around the upset, furious, ‘ugly’ (Ngai 2007; Ahmed 2007, 135) or sour reminders of the complicated legacies of these histories. Such affects may be difficult to track or name, hovering at ‘the very edge of the effable’ (Bright 2012, 144). Thus situated ‘at the very edge of the effable’, this thesis examines how the imaginary of community forms – what it is possible for living together to be and mean – through patterns and labours of feeling. I argue that ‘structures of feeling’ (Williams 1977) animate political possibilities and sensibilities, set out a mood in which some things seem possible to say, think and do, and others impossible and even unthinkable. They shape the kinds of subjectivity that feel liveable, and unliveable. This thesis explores how the objects and things of a constructed past come not just to mean but to move people as they become clotted and sedimented with affect.

To develop methods that track affective and emotional patterns and tune into practices and processes of becoming, this work draws on the work of feminists thinking along lines of race, queer and postcolonial politics (Ahmed 2000; 2007; 2010; 2012; 2014; Brah 1996; 2012; Gunaratnam and Lewis 2001; Gunaratnam 2014; hooks 1990; 1991; Lorde 1981; Mirza 2006, 2009, 2015). I frame emotional labours here as a performative pedagogy or inheritance, often rich with everyday and cultural politics. I argue that the sites of analysis for this project – three women’s cultural heritage projects and a collection of photographic archives – offer a unique site to interrogate how this all happens because of their performativity. As community ‘in drag’, I argue heritage projects like this are sites of ‘a performance (a conscious enactment) and performative (a reiterated practice)’ (Skeggs 2001, 299). As performative occasions (Butler 1993; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998; Littler and Naidoo 2005), I argue that they therefore unsettle the given-ness of norms carved in by histories of empire, corroded economies, local dispossessions, and new diaspora movements. This thesis therefore works at the boundaries of normative concepts like good convivial multiculture, community, and heritage, and of forms of celebrated or failed subjectivity.
Feeling together: emotion, heritage, conviviality and politics in a changing city

Next, this introduction will track a number of active debates in the literature on affect and emotion, community and conviviality, cultural heritage and histories of both slow and vivid violence. From here, the introduction proceeds in three parts. The first part organises the discourses regarding how feelings about complex cultural histories and pasts have been described as moving in the present, particularly in Britain. I also address the politics of making and researching cultural heritage, and introduce my rationale for choosing the case studies at the heart of this work. The second part sets up debates and contentions surrounding heritage projects, the politicization of heritage, and emerging heritage discourses. The third part offers a brief account of relevant strands of Cardiff’s history of migration, mixing, multiculture, as well as lines of racist violence, deindustrialization, and dispossession, on which later chapters elaborate.

1.2 Community, conviviality and the politics of living together

This research takes place in a handful of neighbourhoods around the mouth of Cardiff’s former docklands. It is set in Butetown, in part, but not only there. Instead, Butetown only loosely knots all the sites of study together. How to choose the boundaries of analysis for the study of forms of convivial multiculture and community remains an open question. A focus on a ‘locality’ instead of an ethnic or religious group does avoid reifying race, religion or other marked differences as ‘self-evident’, bounded, or coherent (Parker and Karner 2010, 358). This particularly suits Cardiff because the history and extent of migration and economic change here makes for a heterogeneity that defies easy categorization.

Different parts of this work touch down in Butetown, the Docks, or the Bay, with spokes that reach across the city to other neighbourhoods and farther afield – to London and Birmingham, for example, and to diaspora spaces associated with Barbados, Hungary, Madeira, Somalia, China, and Ghana, among many others.

The sense of community gathered by these projects is therefore unstable, on the move. While there are moments when a sense of community develops, this often then dissolves, reconfiguring into new shapes. The locus of coalescence is Butetown, which is itself a place of unstable boundaries in-the-making, but not only Butetown. It extends out to mobile elsewhere: across the river to the streets and alleys of Grangetown, over the tracks to the neat terraces of Adamsdown and Splott, out to Ely and Llandaff and Llanrhymney and other neighbourhoods in Cardiff where people lived and travelled, and out to other places, sometimes in the present, sometimes remembered, like London, Hargeisa, Kingston, Demerara, Utrecht. Thus, the choice of site in this research recognizes the impossibility ‘of things being essentially and only local’ (Massey 2006, 35) when they wheel out into and across diaspora space (Brah 1996).
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Figure 1a. Mapping Cardiff. Left, top: Map of United Kingdom By NordNordWest. © CC BY-SA 3.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0), via Wikimedia Commons. Right, top: Map of Cardiff, © OpenStreetMap contributors, Open Data Commons Open Database License (ODbL). Bottom: Photographs of Cardiff by the author 2013-2015.
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Part of what people do in these heritage projects, of course, is articulate the relationship of community to place, and make a sense or story of place. A place then gathers meaning as ‘collections of those stories [stories-so-far], articulations of the wider power-geometries of space’ (Massey 2005, 130 in Pink 2012, 24-25). The projects studied in this thesis join an efflorescence of archival and creative projects to map and tell the story of Cardiff as a place as it changes. Such placemaking projects include Peter Finch’s Real Cardiff 1,2, and 3, the blog We Are Cardiff, the Wales Online ‘nostalgia’ section, or the many books of historian Neil Sinclair (1997; 2003; 2013), for example. They include black and white portraits made for Representing Butetown 2017 on the railway wall opposite Loudon Square in Butetown; or photographs of characters in white face paint installed in buildings in the Bay by artist Adeola Dewis (O’Connell 2016); and a leaflet on a bulletin board advertising a ‘CARDIFF Pride of Place Project’, which calls for people to take part and ‘make your mark on our Cardiff map!’ In this, the thesis deepens a recent line of research into how emotion, as public or collective and not individual feeling, connects with ‘the stories that make spaces into places’ (Jones and Jackson 2014, 4).

At the same time, the local matters in a material way: banal, everyday forms of governance, the physical landscape of architecture, road, river, and train lines, for example, along with inherited place stigma, follow local logics (Davies et al. 2011; Wacquant 2007; Byrne, Elliott and Williams 2016). This local place matters, as geographer David Mitchell writes, because ‘landscape is … ideology made solid: a produced space that does more than represent. It guides.’ (Mitchell 2008, 43-44). Not only do places articulate power through their maps, materials, and proper ways-of-doing in place, but also in how they are imagined, and then direct, often invisibly, what is then possible to do in those places. As feminist community activist Grace Lee Boggs suggests, ‘place consciousness... encourages us to come together around common, local experiences and organize around our hopes for the future’ (Boggs 2000, 19 in Mohanty, 2003, 515). While not without its troubles, locality offers one form of what may or may not be held in common, one node for the formation of a collectivity. The choice of scale for this research therefore works to tune into both the micro and the macro, the neighbourhood doings and the more global patterns, the intimate relationships and the structural forces (Mohanty 2003, 501).

1.3 Community

Community, however contested, lies at the centre of this research. The word comes up in the everyday language of the research as a word to describe a feeling of living together. People described ‘a community spirit’ and a ‘real sense of community’ in the Butetown of the past, or the way ‘everybody joined in as a community’. While Butetown was sometimes drawn as the apotheosis of a community
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ideal, community in this form seemed to be invoked as fragile and always-already lost. Local historian Neil Sinclair (2003, 35) in *Endangered Tiger: A Community Under Threat*, writes that ‘Tiger Bay’ has long been an iconographic example of ‘the traditional idea of a village or working-class community, where everyone lives as an extended family and knows everyone else intimately’. Community in this form is a tangible feeling, something that can felt and passed around, and that can be damaged: ‘there was a community there and once they started demolishing they split the community up’ and ‘there was a good community spirit, you know, but when they started to demolish it, it all went’ (DS in Gilliat-Ray and Mellor 2010, 472). The community in this sense means the other people to whom you feel like you belong, but it can also more generally mean ‘with people’, as in ‘working with the community’ or doing ‘community development work’ as Annie, a community worker in her 50s used it. Often community seemed to be understood in terms of an everyday intimate geography of people linked together by the rhythms of living and doing together.

This is not to imply consensus around the idea of community, nor a uniformly positive feeling. One writer in the creative writing group, when prompted to write on the theme of community, wondered wryly whether community was ‘a common goal or a common hole to grow out of?’ (FN 2014). While sometimes people used the word to describe, for example, ‘the Somali community’ in Cardiff, these ‘communities’ were often also described as internal heterogeneous and even divided by generation, neighbourhood, beliefs or political orientations. The usage of community suggests that the community of the present was both diffuse and precise, blurry and layered with cultural memory, and in the making.

Despite new terms and new governments, policy in the UK continues to frame ‘community’ within the nation as threatened by minority others, and to place the burden of responsibility for soothing that threat on migrants and people of colour in particular (Alexander 2014; Alexander and James 2011; Emejulu and Bassel 2015; Fortier 2010; James, Kim and Redclift 2015; Nayak 2012; Tyler 2013). In diagnosing the political mood in the UK and its effects on state and local social policy, Anne-Marie Fortier (2010, 17-21) describes a national story of ‘feelings of “white unease”’ (Bigo 2002), in which white comfort has been disturbed by ‘immigration, diversity, fears of extremism and perceptions of unfair treatment’. This story of white comfort threatened by the presence of racialized, postcolonial others has an old history, one perhaps best exemplified by Enoch Powell’s inflammatory anti-immigrant ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech (2007[1968]). At the scale of the moody nation, Paul Gilroy (2005, 38) diagnoses a ‘postcolonial melancholia’ in Britain, a ‘neurotic and even pathological’ relationship to a sense of the lost imperial past that – not incidentally – takes British and particularly English ‘heritage’ and ‘identity’ as its obsessions.
On a slightly different tack, Gassan Hage (1998) diagnoses a related, haunted ‘paranoid nationalism’ in Australia. This mood, ‘a current anxious, disaffected mood of the British public – a “neurotic public”’ (Isin 2004 in Fortier 2010, 21) – of course centres certain feelings as the feelings that must be soothed.

Uneasy, anxious whiteness justifies policies like ‘community cohesion’, policies which put the brunt of the labour to produce good feelings onto the bodies of those marked as threatening. Devised after the disturbances in 2001 cast as race riots, policies of community cohesion mix dreams of good community in which people ‘stick together’ with fears of community’s other forms. This fear manifests as anxious ‘strategies of managing diversity’ (Fortier 2010, 17). In the heritage sector, along this line, community became something of a liberal ‘obsession’ (Waterton and Smith 2010, 5). State cultural policy has ‘use[d] “community” as if it were an aerosol can, to be sprayed on to any social programme, giving it a more progressive and sympathetic cachet’ (Cochrane 1986, 51 in Pollock and Sharp 2012, 3064). Many have critiqued the way such policies romanticise and reify community as a settled, coherent social object (Waterton and Smith 2010, 8). As community becomes a coded term for all who are not the mainstream, middle class, white British majority, too, it is also framed an object to be both feared and desired.

Even in left-leaning Labour Wales, the Welsh Government’s community cohesion policy attests that ‘challenges’ to ‘living alongside each other with mutual understanding and respect’ rise up from the fact that ‘we live in increasingly diverse communities’ (Welsh Government 2016a). The foremost threats they name are all too familiar: ‘economic migration, intergenerational differences, the impact of poverty and the growing influence of extremism’ (Welsh Government 2016a). Despite warnings against collapsing such disparate phenomena (Threadgold et al. 2008, vii-viii), the social problems have been named and framed. They are understood to be migration, intergenerational differences, poverty, and extremism. Meanwhile, over the course of this research the British state has shifted from a liberal ethic of inclusion and diversity, however problematic in practice, to ‘an authoritarian stance focused on securitization, risk and terror’ (Nayak 2012, 454). It has moved from a rhetoric of reducing inequality through inclusion, however feeble, to one of relentless austerity and even hostility (Tyler 2013; Emejulu and Bassel 2015).

Community in this thesis therefore is not a fixed, stable or static object, but a kind of forging. Like family, community is ‘a doing word and a word for doing’ (Ahmed 2004, 153; Waterton and Smith 2010, 8). Indeed, community in the context of social policy or institutions might best be conceived of as a ‘complex and messy object’ or object of study – a kind of ‘fire object’ (Law and Singleton 2005, 331). Using the metaphor of a brushfire that jumps, Law and Singleton (2005, 348) propose the ‘fire object’ as
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a category of object of study that is here one thing and there another at the same time. As both one thing and another in different contexts, the object ‘cannot be narrated smoothly from a single location’. Here I do not develop a fully-fleshed Actor Network Theory identity for community, as that would be another project, but cite the idea of the ‘fire object’ as useful to disturb the way community is thought of as a settled object rather than something on the move, active, even combustible. Like the fraught disease Law and Singleton study in the context of a hospital, community in the context of a postcolonial, deindustrialized and transforming city like Cardiff is all over the place: it ‘subsists in, and participates in the enactment of, entirely different spatial logics or realities, and those spatial realities have complex relations with one another’ (Law and Singleton 2005, 348). It is here a feeling of being together; it is there a utopian collectivity; it is there a community police officer, or a health visitor, or a court-ordered punishment, among many other forms.

Thinking of community as a ‘fire object’ helps to get around the problematic ‘epistemological obstacle’ of taking a community as ‘an explanation rather than something to be explained’ (Alleyne 2002, 608). Instead, as Alleyne (2002, 608) argues, community needs to be understood in terms of the labours that go into making it coherent and imaginable in the first place. Considering community as fire object gets at the way that community is constructed not brick by brick, producing a solid structure, but something that is both destructive and, like the ‘unbounded otherness of undomesticated fire’, ‘generative’ and ‘productive’, because ‘it depends on and creates the unknowable and the unexpected’ (Law and Singleton 2005, 349). Community conceived in this way stops being a fixed, romantic, or distasteful object, ‘something that can be lost and found’, adopted as politically sweet or discarded as sour, but instead something made and remade (Waterton and Smith 2010, 8). Instead of taking community as a given, therefore, this thesis takes up the plural, emotionally-laden making of ‘imagined community’ (Anderson 1991) – and the imaginary of good community – as it contours everyday boundaries, politics and horizons of possibility for living together (Brandel 2016).

1.4 Conviviality

Most recently, as part perhaps of a turn away from the ‘dystopic aspects of diversity’ (Wise and Velayutham 2014, 406-407), there has been rising critical interest in conviviality to understand the patterns of contemporary social life. Conviviality presents a turn on ‘how we think about human modes of togetherness’ (Nowicka and Vertovec 2013, 342). Some might argue that practices of conviviality and community are different, even mutually exclusive. While community involves creating some kind of common, uniting bond, and therefore boundaries between those who share in this bond and those who
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don’t, conviviality is ‘a fugitive hinterland’ of lived multiculture made ordinary in a hostile public scene. Conviviality is not about bonds but about lived difference in proximity: ‘an unruly, spontaneous social pattern produced by metropolitan social groups living in close proximity with each other’ (Back and Sinha 2016, 522). I connect conviviality, however, to older investigations of ‘how communities/cultures/societies/nations “stick together”’ (Wise and Noble 2016, 423; Walkerdine 2010). Nevertheless, even as I take the terms to be entangled, conviviality figures in this thesis for several reasons. First, it emphasizes ‘the affective side of the social’, an idea held in ‘the Spanish words *convivir* (to live together/to share the same life) and *convivencia* (a joint/shared life)’ (Wise and Velayutham 2014, 407). Conviviality has been described as an atmosphere, a mood, where forms of being together aren’t settled but emergent. This mood is ‘intimately related to a sense of becoming, and “becoming” occurs inter-subjectively’ (Wise 2005 in Wise and Velayutham 2013, 407). In its affective richness, conviviality relates closely, I argue, to what people mean when they describe a ‘sense’ or ‘feeling’ or ‘spirit’ of community.

Second, conviviality is about multiculture made ordinary, and is not so much about vivid moments of display, but instead ‘something more sustained and resilient, embedded in disposition and social practice’ (Gilroy 2005; Wise and Velayutham 2014, 407). Conviviality does not promise that racism or other forms of entrenched oppression have been resolved (Gilroy 2005; Back and Sinha 2016, 522). In this space of ordinariness, however, how people live together is in process, on the move, and ‘always-unpredictable’ (Gilroy 2004, xi). Third, while the spaces, rhythms and materials of a place might create a mood or shared atmosphere, I agree with other critics that convivial multiculture does not just arise organically: it takes labour (Back and Sinha 2016, 524; Noble 2009; Wise and Noble 2016; Wise and Velayutham 2014, 14). Everyday living, of course, depends on ‘powerful labour’ (Wise and Noble 2016, 424). This perspective invites a shift from community as object to lived community or conviviality as practice. An attunement to conviviality therefore demands thinking about both its affective labours of the self (to cultivate dispositions of openness, for example) and emotional labour to move others (Hardt 1999; Schulz 2006; Fadil 2011; 2015; Hochschild 1983; 2003).3

---

3 I use both ‘affective labour’ and ‘emotional labour’, and affect and emotion, throughout this thesis, as ends of a spectrum rather than distinct categories (Ngai 2007: 27). Preserving emotional labour as a term serves as a reminder of the significant feminist genealogy and undercurrents of the idea that embodied feelings or shared moods might be labours at all. Schulz (2006), for example, critiques Negri and Hardt’s emphasis on immaterial and affective labour in *Empire* (2000) for losing touch with the way these labours come laden with gendered, raced and colonial histories. That is, some bodies have been and continue to be called on to bear such labours to move others, produce feelings, and orientate themselves to a mood more than others (Ahmed 2014).
This thesis takes account of how the affective and emotional labours of conviviality and community might be distributed unevenly over different bodies. Certain bodies and groups, after all, get marked out as the source of white anxiety or bad feeling (see also Ahmed 2010); the ‘melancholic migrant’ as Sara Ahmed (2007; 2010; 2012) writes, is the ‘unhappy’ figure who spoils the good feeling of diversity because she cannot get over the losses worked by racism, for example. To be a good citizen and subject in this context requires a subject to dissolve and discipline ‘ill-feelings’ and ‘draw on her capacity for positive feelings and mobilise them in the public space’ (Fortier 2010, 22-23). ‘White unease’ calls on minority people to reassure the majority of their love for and gratitude to the nation, for example (Ahmed 2004, 137); we might think of how Nadiya Hussein, winner of 2015’s hit amateur baking competition *The Great British Bake Off*, developed her recipe for the perfect, and aptly named, *Victoria sponge*, or decorated her final ‘showstopper’ cake in Bangladeshi jewellery set in Union Jack coloured icing. She is, as Shelina Janmohamed (2015) put it in *The Telegraph*, ‘the face of today’s Britain: authentic, honest, creative, emotional, heartfelt and honest’. As a figure, Hussein literally and emotionally sweetens the multiculture. More generally, of course, minority women must labour ‘to occupy the place of a “clean” subject—humble, disciplined, “invisible”’ (Eva Hoffman 1989 in Marciniak 2006, 34), and loving and grateful (Ahmed 2000; 2004). In this context, ‘the feel-good politics of cohesion discounts any form of adversarial politics or interaction’ (Fortier 2010, 20). All this ‘governing through affect’ loads the everyday emotional labour of migrant and racialized people with political meaning.

1.5 The politics of living together

In considering living together in sites forged and scarred by imperial and industrial histories, this thesis develops interdisciplinary, interlacing debates about how the past, thick with feeling, sticks around in the present. In Chapter 3, for example, I unpack how legacies of class oppression have been described as ‘sedimenting’ (Reay 2009) down in the bodies of working class people as layered, multigenerational memories, and as churned-up feelings around present struggle. Thinking about the emotional legacies of histories of class loss and oppression, both Valerie Walkerdine and Beverly Skeggs describe the way people ‘inherit histories of precarity, as affects of fear and insecurity shape the present’, and carry those histories with them (Walkerdine 2011 in Skeggs 2011, 506). For Sara Ahmed (2015: 95), it is ‘race [that is] sedimented history’, as certain differences become marked over time, and ‘differences become sediment, heavy histories that weigh us down’. Sedimented affects need not be named to move bodies. As Bright points out of English coalfield communities, an ‘affective residue of conflict’ (Bright 2012, 229) stuck around among local young people even though they did not know the local history of strike and struggle. The word ‘sedimented’ describes the slow, accretive process through which these experiences settle into
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the body’s habits and ways of doing. The metaphor describes the silty, muddy, affective weight of how social power takes its form.

Prompted by the intersectional, plural context of Butetown as within Cardiff’s southern arc, this thesis brings together debates on ‘sedimented’ affect to consider how the past moves in the present in a new way. In particular, I do this (see Chapter 3) through the work of Lauren Berlant (2008; 2011) on affective genres and patterns, Sianne Ngai (2007) on ‘ugly feelings’, and Sara Ahmed (2000; 2004; 2010; 2014, 8, 15) on the ‘sociality’ and ‘stickiness’ of emotion. Instead, it is informed by Ahmed’s (2014, 10) argument that ‘emotions create the very surfaces and boundaries that allow all kinds of objects to be delineated’, especially an ‘I’, or subject, and the ‘we’ of a collective. My analysis draws out the labours and practices that people positioned as the constitutive other, touched and affected by these broader historical moods, undertake. While these legacies of the past in the present may be bitterly affective, with them also come tactics, practices, and tools from deep genealogies of class struggle, black, queer and postcolonial feminism and organizing in particular. Finding themselves ‘held responsible for an inheritance over which they have no control’, working class people articulate ‘ugly feelings’ (Ngai 2007) of anger and bitterness toward legacies of injustice (Skeggs and Loveday 2012, 472). Ahmed (2012; 2010) focuses on ‘affect aliens’ and ‘killjoys’ who refuse to get over the harms of the past in the present, such as the ‘melancholic migrant’ who does not get over the hurts of empire. She argues for a grip or a return to the ‘histories that hurt’, a return that is not pathological but necessary:

a concern with histories that hurt is not then a backward orientation: to move on, you must make this return. If anything, we might want to reread the melancholic subject, the one who refuses to let go of suffering, and who is even prepared to kill some forms of joy, as offering an alternative social promise. (Ahmed 2007, 135; 2010)

This thesis tracks practices of setting alight and circulating melancholia as a ‘return’ that invites politically reckoning with history (see Chapter 6). But in bringing Ahmed and Berlant’s formal projects to bear on some intimate and material practices of social life, even as these practices are also performative, fragmentary, and episodic, I also map out a more extended repertoire of affective and feeling labours (noted in the chapter outlines at the end of this introduction). This extended repertoire offers new insights into what kind of practices – and whose labour – underwrite more convivial futures, and how.

1.6 Regarding habitus and collective memory

While it draws on related themes, this thesis is not about habitus or collective memory, two significant strands in critical debates about how the past sticks around in the present. While the concept of habitus has become a portable shorthand for how ‘the past becomes carried forward, flexibly but inexorably,
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into the future’ (Wetherell 2012, 105), it may be too ‘over-deterministic’ to explain the charged ways that the past moves in and through the plural present, or what people do with the past (Sayer 2005; Probyn 2004 in Wetherell 2012, 117). As I elaborate in the chapters that follow, the concept of habitus did not fully fit either the precarity or the plurality of ways of being or doing in this thesis. My critique extends those of other researchers that not only does habitus seem to offer no viable position but to be ‘stuck’ for working class subjects (Skeggs 2011; Rancière 2004; Pelletier 2009), but it doesn’t offer a satisfactory explanation of the varied, complex forms of subjectivity and social practice of convivial belonging in plural neighbourhoods, either (Parker and Karner 2010, 367). Instead, the thesis picks up a new injunction to move on from habitus ‘to re-consider solidifying affective patterns in ways that also focus on sites, scenes, actual practices and contexts of use, and the messiness of social life’ (Wetherell 2012, 119). Moving from the rigidity of habitus to the mess of how patterns become or form opens new critical space to understand liminal subjectivities and forms of collectivity as they take shape (Ingold 2014).

Likewise, while many of the moments in the research in this thesis might be described as moments of memory practice, both individual and collective, where memory practice invokes ‘creativity, process, the everyday and the plural’ (Billig 1995 in James 2014, 654), memory practice does not quite capture what interests me in what is going on in my four research sites. While the sites I study here involve collective memory practices of weaving together memories with objects from archives, official histories and other material culture from the past (Weedon and Jordan 2012, 145), in this thesis, it is clear that the collectivity of collective memory does not exist prior to these practices but is given shape through them. These shapes are fungible and unstable. Imagination brings memory to meet the present in conflicted, unruly ways, as ‘a site of struggle’ (Pickering and Keightley 2012, 123). Moreover, all this doing brings up – or at least might bring up – bad feeling in the unbidden, spoiling reminders of histories of damage. The past shivers with intensity (or drifts with barely-registered banality), or does something else to a group. Moving at a slant from studies of the phenomenon or practice of memory itself, therefore, this thesis tracks the affect that saturate and shape memory. It focuses, too, on the feeling labours that come forward as part of the occasion of remembering, performing and doing community.

1.7 The relevance of affect

This thesis therefore expands debates about public moods, emotions, feelings and affects and their relevance to any study of the past and collectivity. Other recent research has begun to explore the affective politics moving in and through everyday social life (Bright 2012a, 2012b, 2016; Skeggs 2010;
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Skeggs and Loveday 2012; Carabelli and Lyon 2016; Walkerdine 2010; 2015; S. Ahmed 2004). In particular, some work takes up how history and memory of de-industrial class loss, post-colonial melancholia, or other inherited violence and collective hurt, move in and pattern the lives of people who live in places shaped by these events (Bright 2016; James 2014; 2012).

For these writers, affect is profoundly social and dynamic. Affect describes ‘those forces that can make us ‘do things’, move us, connect us to things, but which can also overwhelm us’ (Skeggs and Wood 2012, 134 in K. Tyler 2015, 1173). Affects move, but also ‘stick’ (Ahmed 2004) and constitute the edges of a collective. Further, by bringing in the material scholarship of postcolonial archivists to consider the sensory, material qualities of objects and their grain or genre, this method allows for tuning into patterns of feeling and affective practices including how histories of damage create what Ngai calls ‘ugly feelings’, ‘affective gaps and illegibilities, dysphoric feelings’ (Ngai 2007, 1-3). The performative context of a community heritage project may indeed be brim-full of bad feelings like ‘boredom, fear, happiness, loneliness, frustration, envy, wonder and a range of either motivating or disruptive energies’ including the ‘desire’ of facilitators or researchers (Waterton and Smith 2010, 8). While immersive observation and sensory ethnography have been critiqued for a naïve inattention to power, attending to ‘ugly feelings’ (Ngai 2007; Skeggs 2011) and moments of discord and antagonism as well as sweet feelings and closeness or attunement offsets this problem. In my construction, feeling doesn’t happen: it is laboured over, set alight, set down, put on the move. There’s a politics and a pedagogy to it. People do this, but so do materials, textures, tones, and scenes.

1.8 Heritage debates: cultural heritage and the collective

Over the past thirty years, research on cultural heritage – as people’s history, collective memory, and practices of making the past in the present, as institution, as industry – has fiercely debated whose heritage and whose past counts. Broadly, ‘the past, turned into heritage’ has become a ubiquitous part of ‘the creation and management of collective identities’ at different scales (Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge 2007, 1). Called on to simultaneously draw in visitors and their money, to connect people to a sense of shared identity or to a sense of place, to teach about and address the silenced harms of the past, and to inculcate certain feelings about the nation, heritage is of course tensely contested (Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge 2007, 2). In Britain, these debates have had particular saliency because, even as heritage ‘is what Britain sells’ (Morley and Robins 2001, 8 in Littler 2005, 4), its nasty, unsellable colonial and industrial histories still surge through the politics of the present (B. Byrne 2007; Hall 2005; Harrison 2010; Tolia-Kelly 2006). Indeed, critics have contended that 19th century museums and heritage
institutions effloresced as an integral part of the colonial imagination, while 20th century heritage institutions and public interest, brimming with ‘wilful nostalgia’ (Nairn 1988), bloomed as a substitute for colonial ‘withering’ (Hewison 1987, 47; see also B. Byrne 2007; 2011; Dicks 2000, 60; Samuel 1988). The 1970s ‘heritage revival’ and 1980 National Heritage Act offered an aspirational fantasy of period houses and BBC costume drama closely associated with Thatcherism (Vincendau 2001 in Littler and Naidoo 2005, 4). This is the stuff of Authorized Heritage Discourse, ‘the old, the great, the beautiful, the comfortable, the consensual and iconic parts of the story about the Nation’ (Lagerqvist 2015, 289), which still reverberate through British popular culture.

More recently, many have called for a reimagining of the many living and entwined histories of Britain (Hall 2005; Weedon 2004, 23). Stuart Hall, wryly mocking ‘The Heritage’, advocated for attention for example to the fragile, ignored archives of generations of black British artists and activists and those making culture in the present. This shift in how to imagine and practice making heritage turned to ‘intangible attachments’ (Smith 2006; Smith and Akawaga 2008) and to the contentious, challenging and multiple (Kidd et al. 2014). A British heritage industry of the people or the folk has also unfolded at this time that included smallholding farms, smithies and chapels as well as palaces, ‘washtubs as well as gilt-edged paintings, back-to-back houses as well as stately homes’ (Littler and Naidoo 2005, 3).

Along with the folk, some of the heritage sector in the UK has taken on the task of telling the histories of empire and class oppression, with mixed results. In Wales, heritage museums from the Big Pit National Coal Museum to the Blaenavon Ironworks tell the stories of working class lives and political struggle (Dicks 1999; 2008). Critics have argued over whether this heritage warrants critique for offering culture ‘mines’ instead of coal pits (Dicks 2008), or deserves celebration as a ‘populist challenge’ to official and conservative history (Hewison 1987; Corner and Harvey 1991; Samuel 1998, 3 in Littler and Naidoo 2005, 4). Community, in all its complex politics, lies at the heart of many of these efforts. In her study of the ‘biography of community’ offered by a coalfield heritage site in South Wales, Bella Dicks has argued that this imagination of ‘community’ has two faces. It is on one side and in some ways community lost, rare, a kind of “vanishing other” (Dicks 1999, 362); on the other, community figures ‘as a resource for future-oriented political action’, a collective of and for the people. The latter, in a utopian mode, ‘calls for the founding, or the refounding, of the “good community” as a social and cultural ideal’ (Dicks 1999, 362).

Cardiff itself, while host to national museums of art and natural history, exhibits the city’s history on a
relatively modest scale. Within striking distance of Cardiff, both the Rhondda Heritage Park in the neighbouring Valleys and nearby St Fagans National Museum of History present the everyday materials, workspaces, buildings and smells – from coal dust to cold slate and smoky peat fire – of the past. More locally, Butetown History and Arts Centre, for example, a partner in the research for this thesis, began as a people’s history project in Butetown in the late 1980s. With Glenn Jordan and Chris Weedon, the group has collected hundreds of oral histories and thousands of photographs of life in the area (Jordan and Weedon 2000; Weedon and Jordan 2015). While the space closed in 2016, the Butetown History and Arts Centre galleries and meeting rooms regularly hosted exhibitions, talks, screenings and performances by local artists and about life in the area. The organisation also published books – memoirs, histories, poetry, graphic novellas, and other genres – about the past in the area (see, for example, Chappell 1994; Johnson 1993; Manning, Flynn and Jordan 2003; Sinclair 1993; 2003). The Cardiff Story Museum, another partner in the research for this thesis, opened only in 2011, with galleries that feature workboots, seafarers’ Norwegian heart-shaped waffled irons and Somali incense burners, along with rotating exhibition spaces dedicated to ‘community’ exhibitions (Gonçalves 2017).

Rising interest in cultural heritage about and for community in various forms reached deep into cultural policy and funding practices (Waterton 2009). In practice, over the past two decades, aspiration toward making heritage a more democratic project at a variety of scales has entangled with government cultural policy (Waterton 2009; Naidoo 2016; Lagerqvist 2015, 290). Indeed, New Labour (1997-2010) adopted a rhetoric of ending ‘social exclusion, inequality and diminished solidarity’ through cultural policy. With goals and plans to revivify and regenerate economically depressed places, and to bring certain groups ‘in’ to museums, New Labour set off ‘a wave of inclusion initiatives across government departments’ (Hewison 2014; Waterton 2009, 39; Waterton and Smith 2010). This more recent heritage policy charges museums, exhibitions and programmes with affecting profound social change. Critics have pointed out that despite the efforts of artists, educators and curators to change the frameworks and the surfaces of heritage spaces, such policies have left most institutional and structural powers-that-be firmly in place (Naidoo 2016).

This contentious new iteration of heritage discourse has centred ‘inclusion, participation and cohesive communities’ (Waterton 2009, 39-40) in institutional language and objectives. According to these policies, cultural heritage funding became contingent on meeting targets for bringing in, consulting with or recruiting participants from particular groups framed as marginalized or excluded from heritage spaces. These included ‘black and ethnic minorities, women, lower socio-economic groups and people with mental and/or physical disabilities’ (Waterton 2009, 39-40). Critics have pointed out, as I will
elaborate in Chapter 2, that policies of inclusion can solidify institutional patterns of power (Ahmed 2017; 2012; Naidoo 2016). As part of these changes, heritage has found itself ‘re-branded’ (Waterton and Smith 2010, 210) with a liberal and sometimes progressive ethos, such that institutions now also celebrate “new” or “worthy” heritage, but only in carefully proscribed modes (Cubitt 2009; Waterton and Smith 2010; Littler and Naidoo 2014 in Naidoo 2016, 506).

Such efforts to embed public engagement and participation at the heart of museums in Britain often relegate it to the ‘periphery’ instead (Lynch 2011, 5). As Roshi Naidoo (2016, 504) explains, ‘which outsider narratives are invited in and which are contained’ tend to follow liberal desires for visible diversity and repeat entrenched institutional logics of othering. The institutional practice has therefore been to include ‘communities’, as marginalized others, as addendums within the unruffled institution or its ‘consensual’ spaces (Naidoo 2016). From within, practitioners and critics have questioned the ‘tyranny’ of participation that inclusion policies have often produced (Cooke and Kothari 2001; Hickey and Mohan 2004; Finch 2011). Indeed, there is broad awareness of tensions of heritage ‘collaborations’ – tensions that pit ‘professional knowledge versus local knowledge, morally “good” grassroots participation versus morally “bad” top-down programming, the powerful versus the powerless, “the institution” versus “the community”, and activity versus passivity’ (Kidd et al. 2014, 11). How to address the troubled politics of participation and how to tell troubled or challenging pasts both remain open questions, which this thesis explores. Such pasts are often only invited in only when there is no risk that the ‘ritual remembrance’ might result in ‘direct demands for intervention, restitution or retribution’ (Segal in Massey 2004, 120; see also Cameron and Kelly 2010).

This context refracts through the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF), the UK funding body that supported all three intergenerational women’s heritage projects considered in this thesis. The HLF has a wide remit to support ‘projects that delve into our diverse cultures and memories’ as these ‘can bring people closer together, help them discover each other’s heritage and create a sense of local pride’ (Our Heritage 2017). As a response to the elitist, colonialist history of heritage institutions in Britain, the HLF works in part to involve people in gathering and producing what they identify as their own heritage. The Fund has ambitious plans for the ‘outcomes for community’ of funded projects, directly related to a desire for more equal participation (and more visible diversity) and even to reparative possibilities: ‘heritage projects can re-energise neglected areas, creating vibrant places to live and work. And they can foster a real sense of community’ (Our Heritage 2017). In part, of course, the discourse of the HLF is a discourse of survival. In a neoliberal scene that values the instrumental, the HLF offers an argument for its instrumental economic and social value that is politically expedient. In this context ‘history serves as an
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instrument to realize social or policy objectives, from community cohesion to competence in new skills’ (Lloyd and Moore 2015, 238). These narrow, pre-set objectives, then set the stage of the projects funded, delimiting the imaginative contours of what history and heritage may be created on that stage.

Further, because Cardiff has been transforming itself into a capital of culture, art and ‘creativity’, local heritage and history projects get drafted into much larger efforts to use heritage as ‘an economic, social or cultural resource in urban regeneration, rural development, place promotion, memory politics and tourism’ (Graham et al. 2000; Negussie 2004; McManus 2005; Till 2005 in Lagerqvist 2015, 290; Hewison 2014). Cardiff itself made an unsuccessful bid to be the 2008 European Capital of Culture, and found itself “being reshaped at a vertiginous pace’ to shift into a “world-class European capital city’” (Gonçalves 2008: 1). Culture – arts venues, galleries, heritage attractions, filmmaking, music, and a thriving cultural and creative industry – has been seized as an instrument to turn a divided, post-industrial nation into a prosperous, cosmopolitan centre (Hewison 2014). Yet culture and creativity as a resource for economic renewal might work quite differently at the scale of a neighbourhood or a life.

Heritage get worked on as part of ‘a dynamic process, in which the past furnishes the resources for conflicts and disagreements about what should be valued and how’ (Dicks 2007, 58; Pollock and Sharpe 2007; 2012, 3067). In this context, the past, as heritage, also involves investment in a collective orientation to the future.

Again, in particular, this thesis focuses on the emotional politics of these questions. It explores how moods move in the materials and atmospheres of public heritage projects about histories of damage and resistance. It examines the politics of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ feelings in the context of making and performing community-based heritage, and the power of white, liberal desires for certain kinds of diversity and being together. Finally, it drafts off generations of black and post-colonial feminists’ work to examine the uneven pressure on different bodies to do the emotional and affective labour of, for example, mixing and mingling to create a convivial occasion, or to soothe white fragility on the subject of race (DiAngelo 2011), or to modulate unruly emotions in a context of struggle (Lorde 1981; hooks 1992).

1.9 Lines of history: industry, migration, multicultural and violence

1.10 Cardiff’s complicated past

Cardiff has long been a city of boom and bust, have and have not. A fort town in a watery fen at the sea’s edge for several millennia (Finch 2003, 2009), the city burst into an industrial, cosmopolitan
powerhouse in the 19th century, its rapid growth powered by rich coal mined from the South Wales valleys. Maps of the city over the 19th and early 20th century show workers’ terraced housing unfurling block by block as the city’s population multiplied 30-fold from 1801-1914 (Gonçalves 2017; Hartwig 2016). Industrial Cardiff was already city of wild economic extremes: workers’ housing without basic sanitation abutted the flowering 400-acre private gardens of Bute castle, for example. The Bute Marquises, fabulously enriched by their investments in coal and the docks, owned much of the city (Gonçalves 2017, 1822). The prosperous Victorian city, rivalling only London and New York for migration in 1910 (Evans 2015a, 26), was according to a 1905 letter to the editor, ‘both ancient and modern; Celtic and Cosmopolitan; progressive, wealthy; enterprising, and centre of learning’ (Gonçalves 2017, 1840).

Then, almost as rapidly, the city’s fortunes shifted to industrial decline. The 1920s and 1930s in Wales generally were a period of ‘devastating emigration’, as nearly a quarter of the population left, only rebounding in 1961 (Evans 2015a, 34, 39). While the second World War brought a fresh flush of industrial jobs to Cardiff – at the textile and garment factory Currans, for example, and the continuing East Moors Steelworks – the city’s industrial character slumped over several generations. The loss of ‘heavy industry, and the wages it produced, [which] was once a defining feature of Welshness’ (Evans, 2003, 103) deeply affected the city. When the steelworks closed in 1978, the 1980s brought more emigration and unemployment. Along with and after the strikes of the 1980s, deindustrialization brought jobs in the service sector that were lower-waged, part-time, and more precarious (Pilcher 1994; Walkerdine, Lucey and Melody 2001, 1; Parken 2011; 2016; Lloyd 2016). The coal-smoke port city, like many other dockland cities, plunged into urban renewal. Just as industrialization built a divided city, however, liberal redevelopment has created a city split along lines of wealth and poverty (Gonçalves 2017, 1539-1540). In its retrenched patterns of inequality, it ‘remains a city of extremes’ (Hooper and Punter 2006, 67). Cardiff Council has referred to the city of the present as a Dickensian ‘tale of two cities’ (Cardiff Council 2016).

Drawn by the city’s dramatic expansion and the routes of empire, the history of Cardiff is also a story of migration (Jordan 2005). Welsh, English, and Irish workers dominated migration in the 19th century, such that in 1861 a third of Cardiff’s population was Irish (Evans 2015a, 25-35), but people from as far away as Cape Verde came to Tiger Bay as early as the 17th century (Runnymede 2012, 4). Seafarers and dockworkers in particular came from all over the world: research from the 1950s records people from more than fifty nations in Butetown, from Norway to Panama, Cyprus to Trinidad, across West Africa and the West Indies, China to Latvia, Italy to Chile, among many others (Jordan 2005, 60; 2001). Early
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migration and everyday life ‘followed ethnically-laid tracks’ (Evans 2003, 25), as across South Wales, white Welsh men protected the best seafaring, shipbuilding, manufacturing and mining positions in this new industrial economy for themselves (Evans, 2003, 15-16). Colonial black and Arab seamen, by contrast, ‘worked within a structured hierarchy of difference’, confined to jobs ‘in the engine room, as donkeymen, firemen and greasers, or … in the kitchen’ (Jordan 2005, 60; Wemyss 2011, 40). On shore in Cardiff during the boom years a bustling, cosmopolitan neighbourhood rose up in Butetown and around the Docks, with boarding houses, cafes, clubs, and pubs, and homes for seamen and dockworkers and their families.

With this migration, the Bay neighbourhoods of the city – called variously ‘Tiger Bay’ (Sinclair 1993; 2003), Butetown or the Docks (Dewis 2015) – became sites of ‘mixing’, misrepresentation, and multiculture. As seafarers from all over the British Empire and the world settled and raised families with Welsh, Irish and English women (Jordan 2001; 2005; Weedon and Jordan 2010), the area developed a uniquely ‘mixed’, close-knit community and a lively convivial multiculture. Drawing on over 25 years of people’s history work and scholarship in the area, professors Chris Weedon and Glenn Jordan explain, ‘refusing binary categories such as white and black, the community promotes an image as itself as quintessentially mixed – racially, ethnically and culturally’ (Weedon and Jordan 2000, 175). The boundaries of railway, canal and docks created for this mixed community a unique place of sanctuary (Jordan and Weedon 1995, 136). Butetown or the Bay was a “safe haven in a racist city”, “where unity was forged in the face of a city’s hostility and fear” (Thomas 2004, 276–277 in Gonçalves and Thomas 2012, 332). Within its boundaries, people formed close networks of mutual support and care (Mellor and Gilliat-Ray 2013; Weedon and Jordan 2010). Women in particular have been credited with the ‘atmosphere of sociability, trust, and mutual assistance [that] characterized Butetown’ (Sherwood 1988, 67 in Gilliat-Ray and Mellor 2010, 471-472). Yemeni seafaring men far from home, however, also organized diasporic networks to build places of worship and support those injured or out of work, as they were not eligible for union membership (Gilliat-Ray and Mellor 2010; Mellor and Gilliat-Ray 2013; Tabili 1994; Wemyss 2011). Somali seafarers often did the same (Jordan 2008).4

This area of the city also inspired reams of salacious and often racist popular misrepresentation, including from Cardiff police and officials, but also from journalists (Cameron 1997; Jordan 2001) and other researchers (see for example Collins 1951, 1952). According to historian Glenn Jordan, the Bay was either figured in three ways: first, as ‘dirty, violent, diseased and immoral’, a place of prostitution,

4 For a novel based in historical research and her father’s life, see Nadifa Mohamed’s 2009 Black Mamba Boy.
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poverty, and crime; second, as exotic and salaciously ‘other’ and dangerously mixed (Collins 1951; Collins 1952 in Jordan 2001; 2005); and third, particularly after the second World War, as a ‘romantic’ vision of ‘racial harmony’ (Jordan 2001, 10). The area was also characterized by strong political organizing and struggle, from anti-racist worker organizing in the 1930s (Featherstone 2016; OCR 2016) to protests, organizing, counter-movements and community work from the 1960s, to the 1980s Cardiff Black Alliance (Tiger Bay is my Home 1984; Tabili 1994) and beginnings of the Butetown History and Arts Centre (Jordan and Weedon 2000; Weedon and Jordan 2015), among many others then and on into the present (see Chapter 5).

Cardiff’s Butetown in particular – but not exclusively – has also been a site of cultural production, where music, dance, poetry and politics met and mixed in the jazz clubs and cafes, the street festivals and holiday parades, the pubs and informal dance halls and young people’s clubs of the area. It is a place of cosmopolitan multiculture with an emphasis on creative, syncretic culture (James 2012, 24-5) rather than something fixed to ethnicity. In Butetown and the Docks, forms of music, dance, poetry, writing, food, performance, photography and art followed unexpected, syncretic ‘roots and routes’ (Gilroy 1993; Bhabha 1994; Sheller 2012). This is the Butetown of singer Dame Shirley Bassey, but also of Paul Robeson’s visit to his friend Aaron Mossell, ‘a black Communist activist who’d fled the USE, and an uncle by marriage’ (Branston 2005, 155); where local singer Mahala Davis was ‘the first black female artist to sing on television in Welsh during the early 1960s’ (Sinclair 2003, 70), and where a band called ‘Bissmallah’ featured on a 1984 episode of the BBC2 music series ‘Ebony’. This is the Butetown of parades for religious holidays and carnival (Dewis 2015), a place where ‘that was our life, dancing’ (Vera Johnson in Branston 2005, 157), and local performers played on London’s West End, or toured over Britain in dance troops like Stefani’s Silver Songsters and the ‘all-black Harlem Pages’ (Sinclair 2003, 54). It’s the Butetown of local legends in boxing, football and rugby (Sinclair 2003; Evans, O’Leary and Williams 2015). It’s the Butetown in which people not only went to the movies, but were in the movies (Branston 2005), and where choirs sang in the annual celebration of Welsh poetry and song, the Eisteddfod (Sinclair 2003, 53). It’s the Butetown where Somali spoken poetry mixed with the poetry of Welsh bards (Matthews 2013). This creative, syncretic multiculture – even as it is appropriated by new efforts to rebrand the city as ‘world-becoming’ (Gonçalves 2008, 1) and cosmopolitan – continues to shape the cultural fabric of the city and country with lines in diaspora space.

More recent migration, from the 1990s to the present, continues to shift the demographics of Butetown, nearby neighbourhoods, and Cardiff more widely. Since the 1960s, more and more women have
migrated to the UK (Dubuc 2012). In Cardiff specifically, in the 1990s, several thousand people fleeing Somalia’s civil war, mostly women and children, moved to the city, drawn by links with the settled Somali community (Osman 2015; Payson 2015b; Robinson 2003, 187; Save the Children 1994). Between 2004 and 2015, the number of people born outside of the UK in Wales rose from 100,000 to 172,000, mostly from EU accession countries and Asia (Markaki 2017, 3), with Poland, India, Germany, the Republic of Ireland as the most common countries of origin (Crawley 2013, 1; Markaki 2017). At the same time, migrants come along ever more heterogeneous paths: Cardiff itself has a term-time university student population of more than 50,000 people, for example, many of whom come from elsewhere in the UK or are international students (Cardiff Council 2015, 57). In 2009-10, 19,050 foreign students from more than 70 countries were studying across Wales (Crawley 2013, 6). Other forms of migration also affect Cardiff and Britain generally. Osman (2016: 66) reports, for example, that an estimated 24,000 Somali people left the Netherlands and Denmark for Britain between 2000-2005. In addition, since 1999, Cardiff has also been a ‘dispersal’ site where the UK Government places people seeking asylum and in need of housing (Payson 2015b; Crawley 2013; 2014); in 2016, 2,871 people were actively receiving asylum support in Wales, almost half of whom in Cardiff, mostly from China, Iran, Pakistan, Nigeria, Eritrea, Afghanistan, Iraq, Albania, Sri Lanka, and Sudan (Home Office 2016 in Markaki 2017, 11). An increasingly hostile immigration regime (Jackson et al. 2017; Tyler 2013) extends over a century of immigration law patterned on exclusionary, racist lines. As Les Back and Shamser Sinha (2016, 520-521) remind us, the links ‘between the legacy of empire and racism, and the newer racist hierarchies that have emerged’ still structure lived experiences for migrants in the city (Payson 2015a; Saltus 2017).

Even as people move around within the city, and as certain areas of Cardiff might reflect ‘super-diversity’ (Vertovec 2007), it is important to note a prevailing context of whiteness (Garner 2010). The everyday and national politics of autochthony, being ‘proper Welsh’, and whiteness shape movements and settlements in the present: to be Welsh is still assumed to be white (Scourfield and Davis 2005; Williams 2003; 2015). While the ‘ethnic minority population’ in Cardiff increased by 31,800 people from 1991-2011 (Jivraj 2013), to about 51,900 people in the city altogether (Gateway 2016), more than 80 per cent of the city identifies as white. In South Wales, in addition to the whiteness of the British state and institutions, whiteness is inflected by a sense of a ‘distinctively (industrial) south Walian way of life which is egalitarian, patriarchal and socially conservative’ (Cowell and Thomas 2002, 1245). This is also interwoven with a sense that Cardiff is more ‘English’ than the rest of Wales (Threadgold et al. 2008), and by government policies to promote Welsh language and culture.
1.11 Racism, violence and discrimination

The borders of belonging in Cardiff have been harshly re-inscribed by moments of acute mob violence, imperial legacies, and also systematic local racism and discrimination, in ways that continue to reverberate in the present. The most dramatic and significant of these were the violent disturbances of 1919, which flared across Britain’s ports and the ‘Black Atlantic’ after the First World War, saw white mobs attack black and Arab seamen and their families, fuelled and abetted by the police (Evans 2003, 98; 1980, 15; 1983; 1994; 2015a; 2015b; Gilroy 1993; Jenkinson, 2009; Jordan 2005, 64). During the riots six men were killed, all of whom were Arab, and a disproportionate number of black and Arab men were arrested: more than 600 people subsequently deported (Tabili, 2009; Halliday 1992, 26 in Gilliat-Ray & Mellor 2010, 455; Jenkinson 2009). White rioters also targeted white women in interracial relationships (WalesOnline 2009). The riots had a profound and lasting effect on the racialized borders in the city, as ‘forced to leave their homes’, the violence ‘redrew the boundaries the black community to their pre-war shape’ (Evans 2003, 99). In *Tiger Bay is my Home* (1984), resident activist Nino Abdi noted wryly that when the anti-immigrant acts of 1968 and 1971 came out, pushed forward by the likes of Enoch Powell, ‘And I think there was a feeling, or I had a feeling, and a lot of other people, that we were being put in the same position as the people in 1919!’.

These early relationships between the police, immigration law and policy in Cardiff track through the cultural and collective memory of the area into the 21st century. Laws like the 1920 Aliens Order and the 1925 Aliens Order explicitly ‘denied unemployment benefit to black alien seamen’ and required ‘all coloured seamen…to be registered with the police’ even as many were British subjects (Cameron 1997: 80). Cardiff police not only followed these laws but actively manipulated them to deny men their rights, shut down their businesses, impoverish, imprison and deport them (Cameron 1997; Jenkins 2016, 928). Between the two wars, ‘out of the 690 unemployed seamen on the Cardiff Dock Register, on 1st June 1936, 599 were “colored”’ (Ansari 2004, 44). In the 1960s, 70s, and 1980s, ‘the colour bar’, racist immigration law and over-policing all inflected the lives of black Welsh people, as political activism and resistance also blazed in new forms across the UK (Gilroy 1987).

Legacies of race and gender also intersect in these histories. Black British feminists suggest the post-war UK government recruited workers in industries like nursing, catering, cleaning, clothing and food factory work according to a racialized map of who was considered suitable for what kinds of jobs (Mama 1984; Brah 1996). Amina Mama writes that Black women in particular were recruited to occupations that were
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the lowest ranked, most physically demanding, least paid, and which required the longest and most antisocial hours (Mama, 1984 [1997], 37; Brah 1996; Carby 1982). Even within racialized and gendered fields like social care, some women have fared worse than others in pay and status because of racial hierarchies (Mama, 1984 [1997], 37). These national patterns bear out locally. As Weedon and Jordan point out, historically in Butetown, ‘access to a gendered labour market was racialized, and even within the area black and mixed-race women found themselves consigned to the dirtiest and least desirable jobs’ (Weedon and Jordan 2010, 227). Not only then were the skilled, best paid jobs the domain of white men, rigorously segregated by gender, but women’s employment in Cardiff was also structured by racism in explicit and subtle ways.

Legacies of intersectional discrimination mark the present: some bodies are still seen to be ‘more or less appropriate’ (McDowell, Batnitzky and Dyer 2009, 5) for certain kinds of jobs, and not appropriate for others (Chwarae Teg 2015). In the UK in general, women of colour are significantly overrepresented in the public sector and ‘caring professions’, more likely to be employed by the state in fields of social care ‘as teachers, nurses, social workers, etc. …[and] as care workers, cleaners, caterers, etc.’ (Bassel and Emejulu 2014, 132). These fields are the most affected by austerity measures that cut social services. More than half of all women in work in Wales work in public administration, education and health, sectors especially hurt by cuts, while just two per cent work in the tech and construction industries of economic development schemes (Chwarae Teg 2015). Current conditions defy what Heidi Safia Mirza calls black British women’s ‘educational desire’ (Mirza 2008; 2006, 145), as while the number of women of colour with qualifications and degrees has climbed steadily, employment and wage parity has not (Davies et al. 2011; Chwarae Teg 2015). Indeed, less than half of minority ethnic women in Wales are and are expected to be in work ‘throughout 2012–2022’ (Owen et al. 2015 in Nicholl, Johnes and Holtom 2016, 11). This evidence of course does not reflect either the heterogeneity among women of colour in Wales, nor the significance of other factors in employment in particular. Yet at a range of different scales, what the evidence above suggests is that gendered postcolonial legacies persist in the present. When women theorize their own experiences with observations like ‘when you apply for a job and people say, “Oh, the job’s gone, really”, when you know it hasn’t’ (Annie, 50s, community worker), or that ‘people will always struggle’, they register some of these legacies.

Finally, Cardiff’s religious diversity belies the way being Muslim here is symbolically, politically and economically charged. There are more than 200 faith communities in Cardiff – most of which are Christian, along with ten mosques and two Islamic schools, four Hindu Temples, three Sikh Gurdwaras,
two Synagogues, and six Buddhist centres (Gonçalves 2017, 2836-2839). Muslims in Britain, however, especially migrant Muslims, have come to ‘occupy the space of the abject, the racialized slot of the “suspect other” ... at the limits of citizenship’ (Humphreys 2009, 137 in Gunaratnam 2013, 251). While this surveillance and stigma may be much worse since 2001, it is not new. Historically in the UK, Muslims have been isolated in poorer neighbourhoods and then blamed for the poverty in those neighbourhoods (Ansari 2004, 107; Gilliat-Ray 2010, 187). Most Muslim people in Cardiff continue to live in the poorest areas of the city (Gilliat-Ray 2010, 187-188), although my research suggests movement and heterogeneity within these broad trends. Inequality maps in geographic grooves (Hopkins and Gale 2009: 8).

In addition, new developments following the disturbances of 2001 (Fortier 2010) and the attacks of 7/7 have led to policies of surveillance, over-policing and state hostility toward Muslims, too (Puar 2007; Nayak 2012). Recent state ‘PREVENT’ policy has been widely critiqued. In a letter to The Independent, a group of academics warned that not only were PREVENT policies counterproductive and based on a ‘mistaken’ premise linking ‘religious ideology’ and ‘terrorism’, but ‘PREVENT reinforces an “us” and “them” view of the world, divides communities, and sows mistrust of Muslims’ (PREVENT 2015). Across Europe, new forms of state and public racism have proliferated. This struggle is gendered in that Muslim women are regularly positioned as in need of ‘rescue’ by British policy from religious beliefs and cultures of origin framed as backward and patriarchal (Rashid 2014). Despite a public discourse of and desire for historic tolerance in Wales, Muslim people in Cardiff have faced and continue to face ‘considerable prejudice and racism’ here (Gilliat-Ray 2010, 192). Muslim people here therefore make their lives in context both of deep histories of discrimination and social injustice and recent turns in political mood and state surveillance.

Marginalization intersects in complex ways. Muslims in the city do not share a monolithic ethnic background or sectarian majority: on the contrary, the broad strokes of religious identity defy internal heterogeneity and diversity. Muslims in Wales may of course be ethnically white Welsh or British, may trace migration trajectories to dozens of different countries and regions, speak different languages, and practice their faith differently. Ethnicity, race, and poverty, however, intersect with Muslim religious identity in stubborn ways. Pakistani or Bangladeshi Muslims in Cardiff face high rates of poverty and unemployment, for example, while Muslim men generally in Cardiff are generally half as likely and Muslim women 76 per cent less likely to be employed than Christian men and women, respectively (Davies et al. 2011, 65). Somali people in Cardiff, who are overwhelmingly Muslim, also report high rates
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of discrimination and racism, particularly in finding work (Threadgold et al. 2008, 219). Discrimination reverberates through generations, making employment that matches degrees and education feel all but impossible, such that young people (according to one respondent in 2008 research) seem to say, “They end up driving taxis so there’s no point studying and going to university” (Threadgold et al. 2008, 220). Indeed, researchers measure a distinct ‘ethnic penalty’ in employment rates and wages for Muslims in Britain (Bowlby and Lloyd-Evans 2009: 38). While stories and statistics do not indicate that Muslims in Cardiff share a sealed fate by any means, they do trouble the liberal promise of meritocracy and mobility, at least for some, as Chapter 7 will address further.

1.12 Dispossession and redevelopment

In addition to the historical legacies of mixing, migration, multiculture, and explicit and systematic racial violence and discrimination, the history and social fabric of the area has been marked by repeated dispossessions. Butetown has seen generations of city demolition, forced dispossesssion and redevelopment, from 1950s and 1960s ‘slum clearances’, to 1980s ‘re-homing’, to the Cardiff Bay Redevelopment Corporation’s recent, massive transfiguration of the landscape of the area. In 1948, the Bute family turned over much of its property to Cardiff Council (Mortimer 2014, 82 in Gonçalves 2017, 1975-1976). The Council plunged into wholesale demolition of many of the buildings around the docks, especially those around Loudon Square. The ‘slum clearances’ evicted residents and replaced the stately Victorian buildings with social housing in the form of controversial ‘maisonettes’ and a ‘Le Corbusier’ style tower blocks (Sinclair 2003, 2016; Gonçalves 2017). A resident in the 1984 documentary Tiger Bay is my Home takes the camera on a tour of these maisonettes: ‘Look around you, look at those ugly flats. They are the biggest, the most horrible thing that has happened to me in the past twenty years’, because for her they ‘robb[ed] people of something, which is quite a few senses of community life’. Again, in the 1980s, the Council moved people out of Butetown to newly built social housing estates on the outskirts of Cardiff. In Tiger Bay is my Home (1984) resident activists observed that people had no choice but to leave. Further, many residents were ‘re-homed in other deprived neighbourhoods’ like Riverside and Grangeton with similar structural problems to Butetown but without ‘the intense neighbourly social networks that once helped to sustain a sense of “community” and belonging’ (Gilliat-Ray and Mellor 2010, 472). In the 1970s, other unpopular redevelopment plans for other neighbourhoods were scrapped in response to public protest. The protests of Butetown residents over generations went unheard (Coop and Thomas 2007, 181 in Gonçalves 2017, 2041-2042; Evans 2003; 2015; Mgadzah 1995). Dispossession and feelings of loss seem to stick around (see Chapter 6; Jordan 2001; Sinclair 2003).
While the redevelopment of Cardiff Bay from ‘Wasteland to Wonderland’ promised an urban ‘renaissance’ for the whole city, critics note that the £2 billion scheme ‘failed to address the city’s entrenched social and spatial inequalities’ (Hooper and Punter 2006, 67; Gonçalves 2017, 1539-1540; Cowell and Thomas 2002; Cowell and Gonçalves 2012). Blocking the tides with a massive barrage and creating a freshwater lake around the former docklands, the project demolished warehouses, Victorian merchant buildings and industrial spaces, and, of course, housing, in order to make space for new private apartment buildings, shopping malls, concert and theatre venues, exhibition spaces, and government halls, as well as restaurants and luxury hotels (Jordan 2003; Cowell and Thomas 2002; Gonçalves 2017). The Cardiff Bay Development Corporation promised ‘revitalisation’ and ‘renewal’, ‘reuniting’ the docks with the centre of the city, with a campaign slogan of ‘Wasteland to Wonderland’ (Cowell and Thomas 2002, 1251; Jordan 2003). Like many other gentrification efforts, the most recent ‘involve[d] dispossession—taking, both materially and symbolically, places and spaces from those who have enjoyed them to date’ (Cowell and Thomas 2002, 1243). As with similar plans in Liverpool, or Baltimore Inner Harbor, in this context the unfolding of the redevelopment of Cardiff Bay looks like ‘[cultural] policy is a mop for deindustrialized “waste”, with gentrification assisted by government’ (Miller and Yudice 2002, 24; Oakley 2004). Even as it promised jobs, by constructing the area as a ‘wasteland’, and in other rhetoric, the re-development process stigmatized inhabitants of the place as part of the ‘waste’ to clear out (Cowell and Thomas 2002). Many residents concurred. As David Commander, the retired owner of the Paddle Steamer café in Butetown, put it, ‘whoever is putting the money in is going to get the benefit. This community will go, it will all be flattened’ (Mgadzah 1995). In this context, ironically, the Docks’ past gets transformed into consumable ‘cultural heritage’ as part of the marketing of place as full of a distinctive history available to consume (Mukhtar-Landgren 2008, 62; Jordan 2001).

1.13 Inherited history and cultural heritage

Historic patterns of inequalities persist in the present. Like many others, Cardiff is a ‘dual city’ facing deep and increasing spatial and ‘social polarization’ (Cardiff Council 2015; Mukhtar-Landgren 2008, 56-57). Social justice troubles lie deep in the bones of the city. The ‘pattern of deprivation’ in Cardiff’s southern arc is historical (Hooper and Punter 2006, 64); it is part of the history people here inherit. Over and over again, researchers describe these phenomena as ‘patterns’ that have become ‘well established’, a ‘depressingly familiar picture’ (Hooper and Punter 2006, 64) and ‘entrenched’ (Davies et al. 2011, ix). Researchers cite ‘causes and consequences [that are] complex, long-term and entrenched’ and which appear to be getting worse (Cardiff Council 2015b, 8). The average person in Radyr, for example,
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Cardiff’s wealthiest Northern neighbourhood, can expect to live almost 12 years longer than someone in Butetown, ‘Cardiff’s most deprived ward’ (Cardiff Council 2015b, 20). That the state of housing, streets, mould, parks, traffic infrastructure, food shops, pollution and other features of a place would affect people’s health in complex ways has been confirmed by social epidemiological research (Popay et al. 2003a; Paradies et al. 2015). People who live in these places, too, often know how and why this might be true, even as telling the story that way – where I live makes me and my family sick – creates uncomfortable ‘moral dilemmas’ (Popay et al. 2003b: 1).

Here as more generally, poverty, ethnicity and place do not map neatly together, but do knot together in troubling ways (Garner and Bhattacharyya 2011). The southern arc contains all of Cardiff’s historically working class, deindustrialized neighbourhoods, and those places where migrant and black and minority ethnic people are also more likely to live (Threadgold et al. 2008; Cardiff Council 2015a). Yet even as ethnicity and poverty are linked in Wales, heterogeneity from place to place and heterogeneity within ethnic groups suggests links between ethnicity and poverty can and do change in different contexts (Nicholl, Johnes and Holtom 2016: 3-4).

These patterns of hardship do not appear to be changing generally for the better. Policies in response have tended to ‘target poor neighbourhoods’ with activities around healthy eating or job training, while not touching deeper economic problems, or the loss of secure, skilled manual jobs (Dicks 2014, 961, 973). Moreover, the period of this research, between 2013-2015, coincided with dramatic cuts to all welfare and social services. Locally, Cardiff Council has made cuts of almost £100 million since 2012, and seeks to cut another £46 million from its annual operating budget for 2016/17 (Cardiff Council 2016). Libraries, recreation centres, youth and community centres and provision, job training centres, legal advocacy centres, and more, have all been closed. Basic income for people out of work, with disabilities, and on low incomes, has all been cut across Britain (Bassel and Emejulu 2014; Emejulu and Bassel 2015). The cuts have caused ‘prosaic and routine hardships’ for many. Researchers have documented concerns that ‘gender equality in the UK will be seriously affected’ by the cuts (Chwarae Teg 2015; Emejulu and Bassel, 2013; Vacchelli, Kathrecha and Gyte 2015: 181). Austerity has also created ‘both material and discursive obstacles’ for those affected by it to organise and to mobilise around their concerns, even as it has also galvanised many to speak up (Emejulu and Bassel 2015, 88-89).
I bring some critical wariness to the way statistics can all too quickly move from being an instrument to register ‘the arbitrary distribution of wealth and power’ (Pelletier 2009, 144) to explaining that distribution. People’s experiences do not necessarily follow official maps (Davies et al. 2011). Yet where the stark divisions of the southern and northern arc laid down over time in Cardiff are useful, however – divisions in health, in jobs that pay a ‘decent wage’ and ‘allow you to keep a family’, as Mary, in her 80s, put it – is as a reminder that the past continues to matter, even if how the present reproduces the past is not well understood. As Connerton proposes of the city and collective memory, patterns traced in the material city remind us ‘this space is a violently practiced place’, ‘a palimpsest of histories and temporalities’ (Connerton 1989, 37 in Taylor 2003, 82).

Noting these patterns helps to show, as other critics have pointed out, how in ‘poor places’ (Byrne, Elliott and Williams 2016) for example “class inequality is – literally – marked on the body” (Bottero 2009, 9 in Bright 2011, 505). One evocative term to describe how these different forces converge on the
bodies of people who live in one place or another is ‘structural violence’, a term to which I turn periodically in this thesis. While the term has its critics, it gets at the way small, repetitive harms – cuts to disability or housing benefit under austerity, or patterns of over-policing in a predominately Muslim area, or the systemic damp of poor housing, or the untreated, residual pollution in an industrial neighbourhood – hurt people over time. Forms of harm proliferate and register in everyday ways in the body. While its imbrication in everyday experience means ‘people tend to overlook [structural violence] as ordinary difficulties that they encounter in the course of life’, over time, small moments add up to major harms. Whittle et al. (2015, 155) argue that thinking about violence structurally helps us to see how policies and discourse get ‘transcribed onto the bodies of the vulnerable’. Thinking about banal patterns of governmentality as violence (Crenshaw 1991) then offers ‘an analytical language to think about poverty as a form of violence’ – indeed, ‘as a form of *killing*’ (Gupta 2013, 689). Even as of these statistics imbricate subtly in people's lives through school catchments, postcodes, and other subtle markers, they show the different lifeways and livelihoods offered to different people as they are situated differently by a shared and complex history.

1.14 Chapter outlines: ethics and methods, emotion, and four directions

Chapter 2 traces the methodological route taken through the vexed politics of representation that can beset research into places or people marked as ‘other’. All of Cardiff’s deindustrialized, ‘deprived’ wards, but especially Butetown, inherit long, vexed histories of surveillance and stigma. This historical stigma mixes with a pervasive political mood of white anxiety and hostility in the present that manifests as yet more surveillance (Fortier 2007, 2010; Ahmed 2004, 2010). This chapter outlines the ways that many studies of forms of community in deindustrialized, diaspora spaces marked by stigma and surveillance tend to suffer from some drawbacks. Framing a research problem within a coherent, already-existing community, for example, and then tracking ‘cohesion’, or ‘integration’, or mixing (Worley 2005; Singh Gill and Worley 2013; Nayak 2012) within that community, can reify the concept of community rather than querying its particular formation (Waterton and Smith 2010). Such framing may also pathologize people living in these spaces as the problem, rather than turning our attention to structures and habits of power that shape how the problem is imagined in the first place (see K. Tyler 2015 and Rashid 2014 for critiques). By tracking concrete movements rather than feelings and affects, too, such methods sometimes also miss out on how community formations come to matter through how emotion ‘sticks’ to them, and makes them stick around (Ahmed 2004, 4).
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Further, some methods often unwittingly repeat patterns of colonial, police and popular surveillance (Fernando 2014; Jordan and Weedon 2000). The best method for this investigation, therefore, was one that would track how normative concepts like ‘community feeling’ come to be practiced and imagined. This chapter argues that the three heritage projects and local photographic archives as sites of research open up opportunities to track these processes because they are ‘in drag’: performative sites of making community, culture, and history, always already on stage. All of the projects and archives function as performative occasions for doing: nodes for the work of doing community and dreaming community, of doing and fashioning selves, of turning to the past and knitting up sometimes momentary, sometimes durable collectivities. The chapter concludes with a description of the research sites and my role and approach to each.

While Chapter 2 explains the problems of ethics and method at the heart of the research, Chapter 3 explains my response to these problems, including my approach to analysing such heterogeneous and profuse materials, from photographs to fieldnotes, memoirs, garments, poetry, exhibitions and films. To do this required bringing together two particular theoretical approaches in a new way. First, the research involved immersive participant observation (Ingold 2009; 2014), engaged in over time, in heritage projects that were themselves occasions for being together as well as for making intergenerational histories. Part of this participation involved attending to and tuning into what people were working at and doing. Part also involved tuning into the moments of awkwardness, antagonism (Knowles 2005) and ‘ugly feelings’ (Ngai 2007) running through and dragging in its scenes.

The second theoretical approach extends the work of postcolonial historians and photography scholars (Stoler 2002; 2008; 2010; Edwards 2008; 2009; 2012; Caraffa and Serena 2015) to develop new tactics for tracing patterns of feeling. It traces feeling in cultural productions made about these histories through their materiality, haptics and poetics. The chief advantages of this mixed theoretical approach are that it allows for a process of sustained engagement over time, that it focuses attention on the performative occasions in which the collectivity takes shape rather than on reified community, and that it tunes into the material moods, affective attachments and patterns of feeling in these processes that make them politically and socially charged. The method opens new insights into how a charged imaginary of a collective past contours what is imaginable for the politics of the future.

The next four chapters that comprise the body of this thesis chart four patterns of feeling drawn from the materials of the fieldwork and archival work with the photographs:
Chapter 4 draws largely from the pedagogic, performative moments of memoir writing and the oral histories, in which groups of young women asked older women about their lives. In these accounts, a pedagogy for how to create convivial community comes forward. With it come arguments for why the labours of making community might be seen as worth doing, and as the cultural inheritance (and ambivalent duty) of young women of colour in the area. The accounts describe how to live well with others as a kind of tactics for collective survival and political solidarity. These tactics involve sharing ‘sweets’ and hardship, cultivating good feelings of care, pride, loyalty, and respect, making shared spaces of sanctuary and joy, and mixing with others. While these labours are also critiqued as problematic by some, the accounts also document a tradition of quiet but forceful black feminist ‘real citizenship’ (Mirza 2015).

In Chapter 5, which also draws largely on the oral histories, life writing, and fieldnotes from the weekly meetings of the projects, I track very different patterns and labours of feeling to the ‘shared sweets’ of the first chapter. First, the chapter outlines some of the intersecting histories of struggle which the projects reference and in which the work of women of colour in the area for social justice in a variety of forms has thus far been left out and uncounted. Next, the chapter explores how women in the projects manage the ‘ugly feelings’ (Ngai 2007) charged by experiences of racism in particular. The stories and writing offer a pedagogy of what to do with the bad feelings that threaten to boil over, to turn them into forms of fight. The chapter theorizes this practice as political through the work of Audre Lorde (1981) on ‘orchestrating the furies’ of racism and sexism into a ‘symphony of anger’ that fuels her politics. In the spaces of the projects, people name bad feelings together, as ‘it is only when the affects produced through injustice are connected to an idea, to a cause, source or object, that the suffering is made understandable as a social problem’ (Skeggs and Loveday 2012, 483). They articulate how to turn fury into fight, sometimes literal fights while protecting yourself as untouchable, sometimes institutional fights through advocacy, loyalty with others, and winning the love of white allies. They also recount tactics for managing white feelings and the potential threat of ‘white fragility’ (DiAngelo 2011). Finally, as part of this repertoire of labours for struggle, the accounts offer tactics of venting, tricking and escape to dreamplaces where life might be otherwise.

Chapter 6 moves from pedagogy to pattern, tracing how loss circulates in the photographic archives and reverberates through the heritage projects. I argue against pathologizing loss – whether as nostalgia, melancholia, hiraeth for a lost Welsh place – because of its ubiquity and because it might be a way of, as Sara Ahmed puts it, ‘staying sore’ with the damage and lingering hurt of history. In particular, I argue
that the photographs and memories in the heritage projects ‘stay sore’ about histories of dispossession, economic hardship and racist violence. They set alight a sense of loss for specific places, livelihoods or a liveable ‘good life’ (Berlant 2011), and kinship and closeness. The chapter draws on the material haptics and poetics of the photographs to develop an argument for how they move the intimate publics who encounter them.

Chapter 7 turns from the pedagogy of older women or the politics of lost generations of photographs to the experiences of the young women in the heritage projects. In particular, the chapter takes up the fashion components of the projects, in which the young women researched, designed, stitched and modelled garments. I suggest that the young people taking part were thrown up against the figure of the ‘becoming young woman’ (McRobbie 2007) of neoliberal promise. This figure took the specific shapes either of the hijabi entrepreneur, freshly escaped from working class precarity to stardom with the perfect ‘mix’ of cultures, or the postfeminist ‘global girl’ (Tyler and Gill 2013) who aspires to the acquisitive liberal self, shedding both abject blackness and working class ‘hyper-whiteness’ along the way. The chapter tracks how young women laboured to manage the new, alluring affective pressures of whiteness and a liberal ‘becoming’ self, which they did by both modelling that ideal self and dropping out, by cultivating the liberal self and recoiling from her. I argue that through the slippery materiality of the fabrics used in the garments, and the presence of bored or hurt ‘affect aliens’ (Ahmed 2010) and haunting failures, the promise of the ‘becoming young woman’ was exposed as in fact already foreclosed. The chapter closes with some of the repertoires of critique, refusal and relationality young people opposed to this model self.

Finally, the thesis concludes with a brief return to ethics and politics in the context of living together, emotion and the past. In addition to collective histories, the past here sticks around through how it is sedimented and clotted with feeling. Understanding the politics of living together, from convivial multiculture to collective organizing, demands tuning into how shared feelings and moods take labour, and labour that drags unevenly across different bodies. While the connection between emotions, affects and the politics of everyday living together remains unsettled, this thesis suggests new directions for connecting affect and politics.
Chapter 2: Vexed ethics, voice troubles, moods and methodological “mess”

2.1 Introduction

It has become a commonplace in research seeking to tell stories ‘from below’ that such projects give clear voice to silenced others. Research methodologies set forth a journey of securing access to these others, gaining their trust, helping to break the conditions of their silence and then re-presenting their clear voices. Writing this journey, peppered with reflexivity, grants researchers ethical license and secures the authority of their accounts (Clifford and Marcus 1986, 1). It also smooths over the prickly ethical dilemmas of the politics of representation, and may leave the other still as othered as ever. As method parses, orders and represents lived reality, after all, it arranges and imagines a political order of things: it ‘make[s] certain (political) arrangements more probable, stronger, more real, whilst eroding others and making them less real’ (Law 2004, 149). There is therefore an ethical imperative at the heart of this chapter on method. That imperative is to start from a premise of equality, and to unsettle and ‘unthink’ (Trouillot 2003) rather than reinforce the guiding ‘common sense’ boundaries around community and the proper subject of community a place marked by history (Yuval-Davis 2011; Tolia-Kelly 2010). This imperative required a turn away from a narrative of voice, and indeed from an approach focused on discourse (Wetherell 2012), to one that registered feeling and affect.

In giving an account of the research process, this chapter confronts the intractable tensions of the politics of researching what has been configured as ‘other’. These tensions play out even in arts-based and community-based participatory methods that seek to unsettle representational politics in research, to draw in other ways of being, and to tune into fuller ways of knowing (Barone and Eisner 2011; Tolia-Kelly 2010; Byrne, Elliott and Williams 2015; Pink 2009; 2011; Ingold 2014). There has been a groundswell of interest in collaborative, co-produced, participatory research methods in recent years (Pink 2009; 2012; Rose 2012; Holland, Renold, Ross and Hillman 2010; Tolia-Kelly 2010). Community-based and arts-based research methods have been celebrated not only for their sensory, open qualities, but also as ways to speak back to power (Byrne, Elliott and Williams 2016, 80). Yet while participatory or community-based research projects are intended to shake up the halls of power, they can feel like fashionable accessories to it (Myers and Thornham 2012; Thornham 2013; Bragg 2007; Lynch 2011). Such methods sometimes thereby reinforce ‘the persistence and subtlety of patterns of white authority
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and class domination’ (Naidoo 2016, 504; Ahmed 2012; Hall 2005; Laurie and Khan 2017) that run through the institutions framing participation. They leave ‘the political order itself’ unquestioned and undisturbed (Biesta 2007, 9 in Pelletier 2009: 148).

There has been a tendency to describe such projects as ‘voices from below’, and as vehicles that ‘give voice’. Yet methods that invite participants to share their voices, too, may seem to call on people to participate in their own capture (Cooke and Kothari 2002; Hickey and Mohan 2005; Lynch 2011). Participation has been described as a kind of ‘tyranny’ (Cooke and Kothari 2002, 4-5) that conscribes the participant into the political order even as it purports to redraft that order. Research that aims to give voice to or include voices positioned as outside the norm, therefore, may in fact find itself reproducing normative patterns (Naidoo 2016; Ahmed 2012; Waterton and Smith 2010). Participation often happens in a certain frame, on a certain set of topics. The ‘categories of difference’ that matter have been long settled in advance by those in authority (Cooke and Kothari 2002, 6). This ethical problematic cannot be resolved by self-reflexivity on the part of the researcher, as ‘reflexivity and self-critique’ is part of the ‘orthodoxy’ of doing such research (Cooke and Kothari 2002, 4-5). Even resistant experiences may be lured in, appropriated and assigned their proper place in the order of things, because power is relentlessly productive and adaptable.

Power, of course, likes ‘to convert, recode, make transparent, and thus represent even those experiences that resist it’ (Foucault 1990; Chow 1993, 38). Its force, as affect theory suggests, is subtle but sensible: it moves us (Stewart 2007; Jones and Jackson 2014). Although the urgency of inequalities feels acute, therefore, how to do research that unsettles rather than extends inequality is less clear, not only because of the chimeric, relentless capacity of power to perpetuate itself in new forms, but because registering and describing these forms proves to be a challenge (Foucault 1990; Stewart 2007; Stoler 1995). Such are the vexed politics that beset my research.

This chapter therefore begins with a story. It tells a story of tuning into an atmosphere – a sense that there is ‘some way of feeling that is proper to this place’ (Winant 2015, 112) – in a city with a long, rough history. It describes the messy stops and starts that tangled my process and led to a change of research object and approach (Cook 2009; Trouillot 1995; 2003; Fernando 2014). It unpacks the troubled politics of voice. It describes instead learning to sense how histories of power reverberate in the way certain objects and people come to be figured as problems and proper objects of study (Fernando 2014; Fadil and Fernando 2015; Trouillot 1995; 2003).

Second, I sketch out responding to these vexed ethical questions by finding my way to research sites in which community, cultural heritage and subjects were already ‘on stage’, as it were. Developing literature
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that frames cultural heritage as performative (Butler 1993; 1997; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998; Littler and Naidoo 2005), I argue that cultural heritage, like gender, is ‘produced, or performed, through a sequence of acts which are, at the same time, old (i.e. recognizable) and new (i.e. contributing to the development of the “reality” of gender)’ (Zylinska 2005, 5). Cultural heritage, like gender, is therefore always in an iterative state of ‘becoming’ (Ingold 2014). I argue that because cultural heritage is performative, the four sites of my research offer particularly rich, active sites for how ‘imagined community’ (Anderson 1991) and collectivities, and their proper and improper subjects, form.

Third, I describe all four sites of research. The three intergenerational women’s groups, in projects funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund, all focused on women’s lives and histories in the area. Two sites involved young women in making art, collages, music, garments, films, exhibitions and fashion shows about local women’s cultural heritage, particularly experiences of racism, discrimination and resistance. The third brought together a group of older women for more than a year of creative life writing to produce a book for young people. The writers treated themes of memory, belief, loss, identity and community, among others. The fourth site enfolds three archives of documentary photographs of ordinary life in the area, all recently reclaimed, reprinted and exhibited to warm popular response. All four sites map overlapping neighbourhoods and the ‘stories-so-far’ that make them places (Massey 2005, 130 in Pink 2012, 24-25). All four involve overlapping, intergenerational knots of people. All four explore and move feelings about the past for the purposes of the present. Staged in community centres and museums, they are simultaneously public performances of how community, identity and culture might be imagined, close, ‘parochial’ sites of making conviviality in practice, and nodes in diaspora space (Brah 1996).

The selection of sites for the research, however, only half addresses the vexed ethical and methodological quandaries I introduce here. How to research in practice, and in particular to practice what Lauren Berlant calls ‘radical ethnographic historiographies of the present’, outlining concepts ‘from tracking patterns, following the coming-into-form of activity’ (Berlant 2011, 13) required more careful theorizing. This chapter, therefore, is only the first part of a two-part argument. Chapter 2 tells a story and unspools the problem. Chapter 3 will elaborate my response through some of the literature on the politics of affect and emotion.

5 The photographic collections are: 1) Bert Hardy’s 1950s *Picture Post* photographs, restored and reprinted by Glenn Jordan (2001) and the Butetown History and Arts Centre; 2) Simon and Anthony Campbell’s 1970s-1980s photographs reprinted and also exhibited at the Butetown History and Arts Centre in *Inside Out: Reflections of the Tiger Bay Community* (Campbell and Campbell 2013); and Keith Robertson long-lost 1980s photographs mixed with Jon Pountney’s 2011-2012 photographs in *Cardiff before Cardiff* (Gibbard, Pountney and Robertson 2012).
2.2 Feelings out of place

When first drafting ideas for this thesis, as a new migrant to the UK, I volunteered a few days a week with a women’s centre, helping out with English and IT classes, and a local gardening project. While as a youth worker in the United States I had felt a deep familiarity and fluency with place and my place in it, here I couldn’t seem to understand simple words. At a shared allotment plot, after a few hours picking enormous slugs off of comfrey leaves in exchange for a handful of muddy carrots, a man with a warm Cardiff accent joked that it was dark enough ‘you’d have to twitch on a torch to have your tea’. I spent the walk home murmuring what he had said to grasp its sense.

And this: at the women’s centre, one of the staff asked if I had any qualifications. I assumed she was asking if I held a specific qualification to teach ESOL to adults, and said no. In my ‘no’, she heard me to say I had left school at 16 without any qualifications, that is, without successfully passing any exams in any subject, and enrolled me in job training programmes accordingly as a participant. I dutifully attended these trainings with other women who found themselves transplanted to Cardiff – brilliant, funny former teachers, engineers, social workers and IT managers, housewives and mothers from Zimbabwe, Pakistan, Iraq, Somalia. We practiced answering questions about a difficult situation we once handled, how many pieces of jewellery were advisable for a job interview, our objectives for a future that seemed to elude our imaginations.

I moved through the city trying to tune into its moods. The newspapers seemed to scream about ‘swarms’ of refugees, while at the refugee drop in centre down the road from where I lived, tidy rows of donated donuts with loops of pink frosting welcomed people in to warm up from the rainiest year in more than a century. At the Islamic Relief Fund charity shop on City Road around the corner from where I lived, as I browsed for cardigans against the Welsh damp, I watched the shop staff follow around mums in big earrings and tight jeans and their prams. A woman with a thick Cardiff accent, bright eyes and a black niqab joked with me about council budget cuts. At one point, I job-shadowed social workers, driving across the city to appointments in Chinese and Czech and Arabic, where advocates translated to other officials to help with water bill debt, missing curtains, bank account refusals, an emergency house with no heat and no furniture for a large family, and rafts and rafts of paperwork. I took an Arabic class at the local community centre from a formidable teacher who seemed to know everyone in the city, spending 50p in the breaks for cup of weak tea, a Welsh cake. There were moments of translation and cross-translation. At an international women’s day event in March, under
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cajoling from the volunteer coordinator where I helped with English classes, I wore a cultural costume of a plaid shirt, my gardening Carharts and L.L. Bean boots, and sang an Appalachian folk song into a tinny microphone. There was an awkward rawness to most of my efforts to connect. I think of this dislocation, this sensory recalibration, as part of the research problem of locating moods of community in place.

My thesis research was funded under the theme of ‘(Re)-constructing Multiculturalism’ as part of a small cohort (see Dewis 2014; Moraru 2016; Rhys 2016). I joked that we would have multiculturalism dusted off and put back together in no time. Our research theme drafted off a debate about the uses of multiculturalism as a form of state policy, a debate perhaps inflamed by a Daily Mail claim on July 7, 2006, the first anniversary of the London bombings, that ‘multiculturalism is dead’ (Vertovec and Wessendorf 2010: 1). The ‘ism of course relates explicitly to a narrow set of policies, but multicultural as a lived reality and multiculturalism as a policy seemed to blur together in the popular imagination (Gilroy 2012; Lentin and Titley 2011; Vertovec and Wessendorf 2010). Marie Macey (2009) had recently published a book that troubled me organised around the question ‘is multiculturalism bad for women?’.

In my research proposal, I intended to conduct research into migrant and minority women’s practices of making a sense of home or belonging in Cardiff through arts-based participant action research groups that I led (Armstrong and Moore 2004; Kindon, Pain and Kesby 2010; Tolia-Kelly 2010). These groups would be structured, short, the topics set at least loosely ahead of time by me. As the research process unfolded, however, the flaws in this approach – for me as a researcher, for my questions, and for the context in which I was working – made themselves sensible as a kind of awkwardness, uneasiness or drag. These ‘ugly feelings’ (Ngai 2007) suggested I needed a way to learn by doing. My research plan ignored projects and activities already under way, and demanded time and resources from overstretched youth and community workers. Instead, the research needed to be slower, more immersive, and more responsive.

2.3 Voice troubles

Conversations and encounters with people working in these communities made their saturation and exasperation with surveillance clear – whether by interested public officials at various levels of government, journalists and media, or bright-eyed foreign researchers. The neighbourhoods around Cardiff Bay, like many other sites of migration and multiculture, have long been the object of oppressive stigma, public fascination and surveillance (James 2012; 2014; Jordan 2001; 2012; Weedon and Jordan 2010). So have the people who have lived here. In oral histories conducted by young women with older
women and a poem from the heritage projects I followed, speakers express a gridlock of frustrations about how both the area has been represented in the past and how they have been positioned:

I don’t think the media have ever shown the true Butetown. I, um, I think it’s either sensationalised, or it’s underplayed the amount of community spirit there is in Butetown. Or it’s misunderstood. … So, there’s a lot of myths and misunderstandings. And I think that’s why, I think it’s because a lot of people read a lot about Butetown, and not necessarily experience Butetown through the eyes of the people, or by coming and visiting the area. It’s about what they read in the paper. Or what somebody else has experienced.  

(Annie, community worker, 50s)

‘They only ever want to put Butetown on the news when there’s something bad happening anyway. …’ Because they said, with all the good that Butetown does, you only want to turn up and film, film the worst things. … Why don’t you want to come and see when they’re doing things for the veterans? Why don’t you want to come and see when the young people are doing stuff and achieving stuff? Why do you want to just come and see…? It makes Butetown look like – don’t want to go down there, you’re going to get killed.  

(Nura, youth worker, 50s)

Nura and Annie both critique the way Butetown in particular is figured unjustly, as a place ‘misunderstood’ and ‘sensationalised’, a place that outsiders only read about; the area is imagined as a place not to go because ‘you’re going to get killed’, where ‘not much good’ comes from. Further, not only does the area attract ‘sensationalised’ negative attention and stigma, but any positive care or achievement seems to be invisible.

As historian Glenn Jordan has pointed out of the area, following Stuart Hall, power in this context must be understood ‘in broader cultural or symbolic terms, including the power to represent someone or something in a certain way – within a certain “regime of representation”’ (Hall 1997, 259 in Jordan 2005, 66). Recasting misrepresentations, reimagining and reworking them has been a project of many residents and artists, journalists and researchers.6 These interventions mark only a few of the artistic, journalistic and research efforts over the past few years to reimagine Butetown in particular, but there have been many others in adjoining neighbourhoods, from Made in Roath to the Grangetown Hub, to a leaflet I found mapping beautiful spots and things to do in ‘deprived’ Adamsdown. Yet all this representation is about tone and mood as well as optics: a ‘sensational’ and threatening atmosphere seems to have little to

---

6 The Butetown History and Arts Centre (Weedon and Jordan 2012; Jordan and Weedon 2012: 151), for example, worked over thirty years to document and curate visions of the area ‘through the eyes of the people’. A 2013-2017 project called Representing Butetown has brought together artists and researchers in order to, as artist-researcher Adeola Dewis puts it, ‘explore notions of (re)presentation, stories of resistance and spaces of belonging’ (2015) in the area, particularly for Caribbean people in Cardiff (Dewis and Saltus 2015). So, too, unfolds the work of Anthony and Simon Campbell, two artists, documentary filmmakers and educators, brothers born and raised in Butetown who have produced films such as Tiger Brides: Memories of Love and War from GI Brides from Tiger Bay (2013) and a book called Inside Out: Reflections of the Tiger Bay Community (Campbell and Campbell 2013), as well as a social media group called Bay Life Archive.6
do with a counter-mood of ‘all the good that Butetown does’, a sense of the ‘community spirit’ of the area.

The critiques above reiterate the mood I felt when first setting out in my research. The sense of longstanding injustice was sharp (see also Weedon and Jordan 2010; Gilliat-Ray and Mellor 2010). Sharp, was a sense of frustration at being harassed by policing, sensationalizing attention on one hand and called to account for oneself again and again on the other. As a poet in the life writing project put it, a British Muslim woman who grew up in England, ‘I've been told to “get the hell out”/which I can't do before I “get the hell in”/ so you can see what quandary I'm in!’ (Writing Our Lives 2015, 48-50). There was frustration, too, at being called on to translate oneself. As Donna Kate Rushin (1983, xxi) puts it in This Bridge Called My Back: Writings of Radical Women of Colour, ‘I'm sick of filling in your gaps’. Feeling ‘sick’ of being the object of so much attention became one of the central problems for my research methodology, because rather than an antidote, research has been part of the problem.

These questions vexed my first possible site of research, a stitching and crafting programme for women seeking asylum. After a long, reflective ethics review process, and going along as a volunteer for a few weeks, I decided not to pursue my research with this group from sense of the acute vulnerability of the participants. Their visibility, both from surveillance from the police and immigration authorities, even from the program funder, and from the many journalists, volunteers and researchers coming in and out, compounded their exposure.

At the same time, I was looking carefully at locally-produced art and protest media about asylum. The politics of its emotional rhetoric struck me. I explored how feeling and feeling for others worked in violent, intimate testimonies of women asylum-seekers, in raw protest videos and campaigns against the deportation of a local family, and in a museum installation of a ‘Refugee House’, a bare, nondescript flat with a kitchen table covered in Home Office paperwork (Payson 2015a). Introducing Seeking Sanctuary: Stories of Despair and Hope, for example, the editor describes the accounts within it as ‘intimate accounts that reveal’ (WSSAG 2011, 4) the experience of being an asylum-seeking woman in Cardiff.

While the women writing these accounts occupy ‘a social context that has traditionally left them invisible and inaudible’, the editor claims that the book offers a way into audibility and visibility (WSSAG 2011, 4). To move its readers, the stories in the book of testimonies use vivid descriptions of beatings, rapes, forced sex work, hunger, boredom, despair, and desperation, and a speaking ‘I’ full of feeling, all follow the generic, performative shape of asylum testimony (Kea 2013).
These took place in a context not only of caustic public hostility toward people seeking asylum, but also of activism ranging from staging plays like the ‘Asylum Monologues’ to developing cities of sanctuary (Moore 2010; Nyers 2003; 2010; Squire 2010). Asylum seekers had become ‘revolting subjects’ (Tyler 2013), ‘constitutive outsiders’ to liberal Britain’s sense of itself (Tyler 2013; Zylinska 2006, 523). Every element of their lives and comportment – how deserving they might seem, how they speak, how they seem to feel about the nation – has been pulled under surveillance (Payson and Moraru 2017). I read and learned about the long history of refugees in Wales and the racist history of British immigration law, unpacking the mythology of Wales as a nation of sanctuary while documenting local efforts to care for refugees and to resist the worst harms caused by new British policies of dispersal, detention, deportation, and forced deprivation (Ahmed, Castañeda, Fortier and Sheller 2003; Crawley and Crimes 2009; Payson 2015b; I. Tyler 2013; Schuster 2005; Solomos and Schuster 2004). This context then shaped the kinds of narratives and voices that would ‘work’: women’s testimonies of torture and refuge made cultures of origin into backward sites of patriarchy and Britain a destination of liberal sanctuary, for example. Their testimonies often framed subjects who were dutiful, deserving citizens, ‘hygienic migrants’ grateful for liberal charity and state admittance, regardless of its harms (Kea 2013; Marciniak 2006; Tyler and Marciniak 2013; Payson 2015a). The present causes of suffering and violence – primarily the state’s migration regime – recede from view (Hubbard, Payton and Robinson 2013).

As the research unfolded, I therefore became suspicious of practices that claimed to ‘give voice’ to silenced others. As my understanding of the political context deepened, it became clear that although academic and policy research often calls on minority women to speak, for example, and seeks to include them, it is too often only in narrow genres. Naaz Rashid outlines how British consultations – for example, for anti-extremism PREVENT policy – have been framed as giving “the silent majority [among Muslims] a stronger voice” (Winnett 2008, 1 in Rashid 2014, 590). The mythology of the silenced voice continues in the present. Sara Khan (2015), founder of the UK NGO ‘Inspire’, explained in a column in *The Observer* that on her tour around the UK, she tried ‘to find out why those opposing radicalism struggle to find a voice’. Contesting that the majority was ever ‘silent’ in the first place, Rashid explains: ‘efforts at “giving voice” only permitted certain voices, speaking about certain things, in certain ways, to be heard’ (Rashid 2014, 601). The certain things welcomed often fit nicely into a story in which ‘white men sav[e] brown women from brown men’, (Spivak 1988, 296; Fernando 2013). Suitable topics include Islamic extremism, honour killings, female genital mutilation/cutting, and forced marriage. On issues such as university fees, early childhood education, the economic crisis, employment discrimination, or
housing problems, for example, women in Rashid’s research report that their views were neither solicited nor welcome.

This emphasis is also reflected in the Welsh context. Over a similar period to Rashid’s research, for example, consultations with the Welsh Government and The Henna Foundation covered: “Extinguishing the fire: ‘Our’ war on terrorism”, ”A Question of Honour”, ”Muslim Marriages & Divorces in Britain”, and ‘Rising Phenomena Of ‘Honour’ Based Violence”: Challenges for Public & Voluntary Sector Services’. In Wales, while one consultation document, She who disputes: Muslim Women Shape the Debate (Muslim Research Council 2006), emphasizes the diversity of views and issues at stake, Rashid’s in-depth analysis of women’s experiences of doing these consultations refracts how, as Foucault (1995[1975]: 200) puts it, ‘visibility is a trap’.

Narrow voices, lifted up from silence, displace the source of violence from white, liberal institutions and desires, and onto other bodies – asylum seekers, migrants, Muslims, particularly Muslim women. As Rey Chow argues, in testimonial styles of ‘giving voice’, there are only two options: ‘either… the subaltern’s protection (as object) from her own kind or her achievement as a voice assimilable to the project of imperialism’ (Chow 1993, 35). This displacement buries the profound, everyday violence of damp housing and redundancies, police surveillance and coal lanes choked with rubbish, postcode stigma and racist abuse. It buries inequality. It mistakes not only the source of the problem, but the very status as problem in the first place.

2.4 Community cohesion and embodying problems

Among the concepts framing social problems in Cardiff was ‘community cohesion’. The term, according to the Welsh Government (2016a), describes ‘how everyone in a geographical area lives alongside each other with mutual understanding and respect’, and in turn directs government strategy and funding for ‘Getting On Together’ (Welsh Government 2012). As Anne-Marie Fortier’s (2007; 2008; 2010; 2016) incisive historical critiques of the policy point out, ‘community cohesion’ and good citizenship as a member of a coherent, cohered community is saturated with affect. Community cohesion aims explicitly to work on ‘fear, suspicion, distrust’, as the British Department for Communities and Local Government puts it (2009a, 14 in Fortier 2010, 18; Nayak 2011). It implicitly locates the problem as a lack of stuck-togetherness and ‘getting on together’, as a social incoherence, tension or segregation that needs design.

---

7 See their events page: http://www.hennafoundation.org/events.html.
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and policy to fix it. It also situates the problem in those felt to threaten the natural, normative coherence of the (national) community. Fortier unpacks how the policy moves desire for ‘mixing’ over other political access or praxis, and for multiculture that feels ‘good’, or at least feels good for some (Fortier 2010, 18-19).

In Cardiff, a substantial piece of research into how ‘community cohesion’ might be imagined and practiced in everyday ways also addresses the entanglement of public affect and feeling around it. Through focus groups and interviews with people living in very demographically different areas of Cardiff, including administrators, officials, and community workers, the research interrogated how ‘community cohesion’ seemed to skim over the surface of complex communities ‘constantly reconstituted through diversity and difference’ (Threadgold et al. 2008, 3). Their research invokes Sara Ahmed (2004) to argue that terms like ‘community cohesion’ are ‘performative (reproducing the realities they put into words) and ‘sticky’ and hard to shift, as the effects of power insinuate themselves into the very fibres of people’s being and become part of embodied everyday practice’ (Threadgold et al. 2008, 11). The trouble, of course, is that this insinuation means that problems around ‘community’ get repeatedly framed in a certain way, and as lying in particular bodies and not others. My research practice therefore involved feeling out the rails of some of these common-sense, implicit rules.

Policing, policy and academic research, storytelling and mythmaking can also mark particular places and the people who live there as other (Byrne, Elliott and Williams 2016; Jordan 2001; 2003; Jordan and Weedon 2000; 2012; Dewis 2015). Researchers working in an area of the South Wales valleys, which like the working class neighbourhoods around the Bay has suffered a layered history of economic loss, write about the complex ways that stigma attaches to people’s sense of place, themselves, and others. They describe how, in a climate of hostility and disgust, being researched as ‘one of “those” communities’, marked by stigma, can uncomfortably reproduce that stigma even as the research works to unpack its formation and intervene in its worst effects (Byrne, Elliott and Williams 2016, 78). As older ‘collective forms of expression and action’ have been eroded, moreover, and ‘despair becomes privatised’, it is difficult for researchers to unstick stigma from individual people and trace ‘the structural issues that reinforce stigma, rather than the personal “troubles” these circumstances are generating’ (Chakrabortty, 2015; Shildrick & MacDonald, 2013 in Byrne, Elliott and Williams 2016, 78).

These quandaries pressed me to interrogate ‘the conditions of possibility that make certain phenomena into problems or questions’ (Fernando 2014, 237) in the first place. Searching for a vocabulary for my
discomfort, I was applying the methodological innovations of postcolonial and feminist anthropologists to my project. For these researchers, ethical research involves ‘distinguishing between one’s object of study and object of observation’ (Fernando 2014, 237). As Fernando explained of her own ethical dilemmas around researching Muslims in France, observing complex ‘forms of Muslim French religiosity and political praxis’, instead of directing her to talk about how that religiosity and political praxis was a problem, ‘re-directed me to the contradictions and force of secular power that Muslim French life reflects and refracts’ (Fernando 2014, 239-240). Fernando explains that ‘although Muslim French life remained my object of observation, republican secularism—and its contradictions, contingencies, and anxieties—became my object of study’ (Fernando 2014, 239-240). To take another example, in Michel-Rolph Trouillot’s *Silencing the Past* (1995), one thread of analysis follows fragments in the archives to trace the paths of Haitian revolutionaries such as Colonel Jean-Baptiste Sans Souci, while a second thread tracks the history written on revolutions to ask why Sans Souci and his contemporaries might have been missing from the canon (Fernando 2014, 239). Along a parallel line, a description of secular Belgian Muslim women’s not-veiling rather than veiling works ‘to denaturalize a perspective on the body that views not-veiling as a “natural” state of being’ (Fadil 2011, 86). Thus, ‘good subaltern history and ethnography’, as Fernando puts it, isn’t just about telling stories ‘from below’ or making voices heard. For these anthropologists, while such a method does not guarantee its own ethics, research involves interpolating both, because one exposes the other; the missing revolutionary exposes the archive and historiography that fails to consider him a revolutionary; the description of not-veiling as an ethical practice works ‘to denaturalise a perspective on the body that views not-veiling as a ‘natural’ state of being’ (Fadil 2011, 86).

Such a practice traces how certain formations come to be, and come to be resonant and ‘sticky’ (Ahmed 2004) with emotion and social, political and cultural meaning. I was still interested in emotion, power and collectivity. But my object of study shifted to the performativity and structure of the institutional modes through which these were articulated, to the patterning of archive and stories ‘sedimented down’ in local memory and history through time, and to the way feeling – and labours to work on feelings – moved unevenly over different bodies. This turn also involves a move to take seriously what Haitian historian Michel-Rolph Trouillot calls the “epistemology of the native voice” as “as knowledge, as affect, or as project” (Trouillot 2003, 133 in Fernando 2014, 238). For my purposes, this means taking people seriously as makers of art and media, and as theorists and historians, and in how they perform, grapple with and answer questions.
In my research, I felt my way into these questions by going along to events, meeting people for tea at the warm but often slightly shabby offices of third sector organisations, or the new Portuguese bakery on Clifton Street. This first thread of volunteering at the women’s centre and researching the history of and local response to people seeking asylum and sanctuary helped to re-direct my research focus. As I went along to events at the Butetown History and Arts Centre, a later partner in two of the heritage projects, as I read more and talked to people, elements of the history of the place started to come into focus. I talked with youth workers, trained in working with vulnerable adults and children, cleared my background check, and went along to more events. I wrote every day, reams of stories and descriptions, often drafting from the exercises we had done in the life writing workshop. I took pictures, noting the way daylight dilated wildly from February to midsummer, calling people out, and clamped down in October, driving people inside. Slowly, I connected with some people and not with others, and it became clear where I was wanted or might fit.

This kind of research required relationships that could only develop over time. At the East London youth centres where he conducted his research, Malcolm James described this as the importance of ‘clocking time’ (James 2012, 49-50), building familiarity and relationships, and getting a sense of the rhythms and patterns of how things happened and what people liked to do there. Sometimes the fact of my being somewhere, whether with cameras and other art supplies, as another well-meaning adult, or as a white woman, seemed to spoil things. One evening, for example, as part of a youth filmmaking project not part of my research, a youth worker and I showed up at an unfamiliar youth centre where most of the young people were busy playing football, pool or listening to music. Despite the enthusiasm of the youth workers who ran the centre and who introduced us, the group that night took one look at our cameras and thought we were working for the police. The rapid turnaround on funding for the project had meant not enough time to get to know each other. We abandoned the project at that site altogether, moving to another where we had more established relationships. As an uncomfortable mistake, this experience confirmed for me the importance of slow, steady engagement and showing up through the many transitions and seasons.  

---

8 For a detailed account of the ethics review process, consent process and forms, and ethical considerations in writing up the fieldwork, please see Appendix A.
2.5 Cultural heritage is community in drag

The choice of four cultural heritage projects and archives helped to address these concerns in several ways, but first and foremost because they are performative. With films, staged readings, fashion shows, exhibitions, books and book readings, the four sites studied here were full of explicit performance, but also a destabilizing performativity. Cultural heritage spaces and productions have of course been widely recognized as performative (Kidd 2013; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998; Littler and Naidoo 2005; Naidoo 2016; Tolia-Kelly 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012). In Gender Trouble (1990), to explain performativity, Judith Butler uses the example of drag as an exaggerated, glittery performance of gender norms on stage. Drag as a practice doesn’t necessarily subvert gender norms in itself, but its staged, exaggerated performance of norms does shiver the stability and apparent naturalness of gender. The performative repeats, makes again and makes new. The shiver suggests that no way of being gendered is natural, as it might seem to be, but instead all gender is imitative, constructed, made (and deconstructed, unmade) (Zylinska 2005, 5).

Archaeologist Michael Herzfeld argues that this argument of performative, ontological instability extends to ‘the uses of archaeology’ (in Byrne 2011, 150), and therefore to cultural heritage. The many-layered archaeology of even an imperial site like the Roman forum, for example, as it is cut through by Mussolini’s avenue, makes history sensible as ‘social’, and therefore friable, contested, and made. If history is obviously made, it is, perhaps, re-makeable. The heritage projects I studied, in their many-layered cultural productions of the history and heritage of the Bay, make visible the ‘imagined community’ of the locality sensible as something equally friable, contested and made. While the individual accounts and collective mythologies about community offered in the projects might not destabilize the myth of the ‘good community’ (Dicks 1997; 1999; 2000), just as a drag performer might not subvert feminine or masculine norms but in fact amp them up, their performativity disturbs the given-ness of such concepts.

Methodologically, then, the first part of the move is to treat the local heritage project, like a museum, as a performative ‘space of knowledge production about cultural difference’ (Dewdney et al. 2011 in Naidoo 2016, 507). Treated this way, the community centre or museum fabricates concepts and categories of difference, unsettling cultural difference as something natural or normal. After all, what critics call the ‘museum gaze’ has focused on representing, curating and exhibiting the other’s many shifting forms. Even refracted through more democratic heritage projects, the museum has preferred the other as its object: “foreign” places and their “fragile” or “vanishing” cultures’ as well as a variety of ‘lost domestic
“other[s]” (Dicks 2003, 146). A method that focuses on the performativity of heritage emphasizes the way a concept like modernity is created by its entanglement with the ‘other’. As an example, Roshi Naidoo cites the efforts of Rasheed Araeen (2010) and Richard Appignanesi (2010) to write black British artists like Aubrey Williams back into the story of modern art. The innovations of black British artists were not ‘some side project[,] but … part of the development of the visual language of modernism’ (Naidoo 2016, 508; see also Gilroy [1987; 1994] and Hall [2005]). The work of these artists and the framing of modernity can’t be untangled from each other. That is, ‘the territories and heritage of Britishness are international, and the spaces and times of diasporic identity are about both heritage and modernity, simultaneously’ (Tolia-Kelly 2010, 41). Moments of intimate, performative cultural heritage open up ‘the outside history that is inside the history of the English’ (Stuart Hall 1991, 48-49). Like the turn advocated by post-colonial anthropologists and historians and discussed above, thinking about the spaces of cultural heritage can unsettle the processes that naturalize normative contours and boundaries.

The choice of performative heritage projects as sites of research make practices of memory, subject and community formation, more ‘sensible’. If ‘Butler’s analysis of drag (the imitation of heterosexual norms) makes gender “sensible” as a kind of doing’ (Pelletier 2009, 145), I argue that the performativity of local, participatory, community heritage does the same for a range of normative concepts: it makes community, among other objects, “sensible” as a kind of doing’ (Pelletier 2009, 145). They unsettle the naturalness of the ‘community’, but also of the proper ‘becoming’ (McRobbie 2007) subjects of that community. In her research about cinema cultures around Butetown and the Bay in the 1930s-1950s, for example, Gill Branston describes the many-layered, self-aware, performative aspects of community history. In the oral histories she gathered, ‘personal memories…seemed to be put in play with and take on the lustre of a more elaborated historical self-awareness’ (Branston 2005, 147). Some of the stories recounted ‘seem to have sedimented down, told already, and then solicited again and again in funded oral history work operating over 15 years’ (Branston 2005, 148). Local heritage projects in this thesis are places where imaginations of community get ‘sedimented down’, as archives generally are sites where knowledge and feeling about the past ‘is sedimented’ (Caraffa 2015, vii). They are places, to use a metaphor I will return to later, where the ‘social experience in solution’ that Raymond Williams describes as ‘structures of feeling’ sediment, ‘stick’ (Ahmed 2004) and clot. While there are innumerable other occasions of ‘doing’ community and becoming a subject, of course, heritage making presents one particular place where affects clot around the past and the future.
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Community-based cultural heritage, like that funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund and evinced by these four sites of heritage making, is a fruitful site for research because it is community in ‘drag’. This is both ‘drag’ as in the gender performance, and drag as a temporal quality. Elizabeth Freeman, working from Butler, uses the term “temporal drag” to describe the way staying attached to the past involves stepping out of the time of progress, acquisitiveness, and the heteronormative family, and instead ‘lovingly, sadistically, even masochistically bring[ing] back dominant culture’s junk’ (Freeman 2010, 63 in Bradway 2011, no pn). This queer time of drag is political because ‘can unleash the “interesting threat that the genuine past-ness of the past... sometimes makes to the political present” (Freeman 2010, 63 in Bradway 2011, no pn). This theorizing of the past leaves space for history and historiography that is full of feeling (Bradway 2011, no pn), as the rest of the thesis will develop.

2.6 Sites of heritage: voices, mothers, writing, archives

i. 16-60 A Woman’s Voice

16-60 A Woman’s Voice involved 50 young women ages 13-22 who met at a weekly girls-only drop-in night at a youth centre. I found out about the first women’s cultural heritage project as it was already underway, through a conversation with a curator for the community exhibition space at a local museum called The Cardiff Story, fresh off its opening in 2011 (Gonçalves 2017). The project was a collaboration between a small arts charity, People Around Here, the Cardiff Story Museum, and the Cardiff Council Youth Service. As a Young Roots project within the Heritage Lottery Fund, the project was also part of a concerted effort by The Cardiff Story to focus ‘on the intangible elements of culture, sport and leisure which create the unique identity of the city’, and to in so doing ‘confront stereotypes and describe contrasting views and experiences through museum collections and individual stories’ (The Cardiff Story 2011, 6 in Gonçalves 2017, 2663-2667). These broader goals framed the project.

A small group of young women helped design the project: they wanted to interview older women about how life in Butetown had changed over the past 60 years, focusing on school and education, representations of the area in the media, ‘fashion, food, and family life,’ all with a specific focus as the project developed on ‘the role of women in the community and experiences of prejudice’ (People Around Here 2013, 2). The 18-month project was divided into shorter sections: how to conduct and record oral histories, filmmaking, song-writing and production, visual art and theatrical set design, and fashion design and fabrication. Youth workers led the projects from start to finish. An eclectic mix of
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tutors, themselves practitioners in oral histories, film, art, music and fashion led relevant sections. During the project, young people filmed three 1-2hr interviews with older women from the area. All were leaders in education, youth work or community work. With footage shot one twilit evening recording with flip-cams around Butetown and the Bay, many made short autobiographical films. Some designed and painted a theatre set, others wrote and recorded a song, and others created mood boards and designed and stitched garments for two fashion history exhibitions and runway shows. The group hosted an exhibition at the Cardiff Story Museum in the city centre Old Library building, and collaborated on an additional final fashion show and exhibition in City Hall for a crowd of 400 Cardiff women to celebrate Eid and raise money for Islamic charities.

The core group of participants numbered about 25. More than 50 young women ages 13-22 in total joined in some part, however, because the project met during a weekly ‘girls only’ drop-in night at a new youth centre. Almost exclusively Muslim girls gathered at the youth centre on these evenings, some to lounge on the couches with friends, play basketball, take an exercise class in the new studio, talk to the youth workers, work on their Duke of Edinburgh awards, and/or take part in the heritage project. The whole place was bright with fresh paint, and the heritage project met upstairs in the new IT suite and art room, outfitted with four Apple computers.

This girls-only set up was deliberate, to open access to young women who according to the project evaluation ‘cannot participate in mixed gender activities for cultural and religious reasons’ (People Around Here 2014, 2). The heterogeneity of the group was nevertheless striking. Many participants had been born in or spent most of their lives in Cardiff. Yet they traced family ‘migratory trajectories’ (James 2014, 658) across Wales and Britain, Yemen, Somalia, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Greece, Sudan, Lebanon, the Emirates, China, the Netherlands, and the United States, among others. Staff, too, came from different parts of Wales and Britain, some from the immediate neighbourhood, although all but two were white and non-Muslim.

The young women who took part had different ways of being, of course, and at different phases of the project: soft-spoken, diligent girls who delved into the music and filmmaking at the computers; energetic girls who raced each other up and down the halls, laughing, only to be scolded and corralled in by youth workers to a chorus of ‘sorry, Auntie’; girls who huddled in the toilets to talk; girls who declared strong opinions and argued warmly with the tutors; girls who sprawled enthusiastically on the floor to paint. They went to different schools, colleges, and a handful to university; some had left school. Their ways of
speaking varied, as while most of the young women spoke with a local Cardiff accent, others had an English accent I would describe as gentle or suburban London. Engagement with formal education also varied, as while some were devoted to school or headed to or in university, others had left compulsory education without looking back. They lived in very different neighbourhoods in the city, from Grangetown to Cyncoed, joking with each other about the social meanings of these places: ‘excuse me, I live in Llandaff’, Rukia joked, pronouncing the ‘Ll’ in a proper, exaggerated Welsh way, as if to wind-up her own poshness. Llandaff is a middle class, mostly white suburban neighbourhood of Cardiff, where many Welsh speakers live (Threadgold et al. 2008). As with all three projects, attendance was inconsistent and variable, as exams, holidays, the dark and rainy winter, other commitments and simply getting bored and losing interest drew young women away. Nevertheless, the celebratory events, particularly the Eid event, drew people together again.

The young people wore different styles of dress and veiling, some of which were more or less ‘legible’ (Lewis 2015, 20) to me: from the ubiquitous dark school uniforms, or brighter holiday leggings, jeans, rainbow-hued chucks and tunic dresses on the younger girls, to the gleaming shoes and bags of the older young women. Some wore black pinned veils to match their school uniforms, others braids or long dark hair bleached to a fashionable ombré blonde, others neutral khimar, others dramatic make up and voluminous printed veils. I include these descriptions because they show something of ‘how messy, slippery, and fragile “racial” differences actually are, how porous cultural boundaries can be, how fluid cultural practices are’ (Lewis 2004, 112 in Fortier 2007, 117). These details intentionally emphasize the ‘complexity and dynamism of Britain’s Muslim communities, with their multiplicity of identities, stories, ethnicities and migration histories’ (Lewis 2007, 1 in Weedon 2016, 110; Lewis 2015; Gilliat-Ray 2010; Mirza 2009). Rather than a unifying or even definitional identity, Muslim femininities were very much in the making in the space of the project.

My primarily role on the project was as a volunteer. I joined in with the project when it was already underway. After meeting with the project leaders and clearing my background check, I began to go along to the youth centre for the weekly sessions. This first project, as it unfolded, became a pilot for my evolving research methodology. Going to Butetown and the Bay, spending time with the group, I began to get a more embodied sense of unspoken rhythms and the questions that interested me. Simultaneously, I reflected on the ethics of my plans in context, and moved through the ethics review
and research consent process. Over the course of the nearly a year I was involved in the project, I checked in regularly about the research. Often the moments in which people asked me what I was up to sparked particularly impassioned conversations about discrimination, safety, the perils of unpaid internships, how much Cardiff had changed, or how young people from the area seemed to struggle to get on.

My role was to join in and help out where I could with the activity for that evening. As there were usually several other youth workers and arts tutors running activities, in any given session, I helped with setting up and clearing up supplies, or with online research and video editing, stitching fabric and unjamming sewing machines, or even spelling questions. As we glued, stitched, painted, or edited, I tried to be present to the lively flow of conversation, joking, debate and storytelling that moved over a range of topics from Beyoncé to the stress of exams. My Americanness in this context brought out talk about visiting family in places like Florida and Michigan, pop culture, and wistful comparisons that portrayed Cardiff as a backwater people both ‘hated and loved at the same time’. For this group, at the end of the project itself, I also developed a pilot 1-hour arts-based workshop to explore themes of cultural identity. In the workshop, people drew and collaged life stories, made maps of places where they felt they belonged, and discussed questions around ‘home’ and ‘identity’. I also volunteered at the two final exhibitions and public events for the project in the Cardiff Story Museum and City Hall. Finally, I helped with an interactive evaluation, conducted by a visiting youth worker, listening to people in the group discuss what they had liked and hadn’t liked about the project as whole. During this project, because of the quality of observation it invited, I also began to keep a journal of fieldnotes, a practice I continued throughout the rest of the research.

**ii. Mothers Then and Now**

The second project, Mothers Then and Now, was a collaboration with a women’s charity called the Women’s Workshop and the Butetown History and Arts Centre (BHAC). The project caught both organisations at a hinge point of budget stricture and change, as both subsequently closed or were folded...
into other organisations after more than 30 years of work in the community. In this project, 10 young women ages 11-16 took part, meeting weekly at the Women’s Workshop’s stately if slightly run-down building just across the river from Grangetown, where many of the participants lived. According to the project evaluation report, which I wrote at the conclusion of the project, the aims of this project also developed out of consultation with young people and were: ‘1) For young women to examine the change of women’s role in society across cultures and generations; 2) to promote active and positive intergenerational activity; 3) to provide opportunities for young women to gain new skills and accreditation’ (Women’s Workshop 2014, 4).

As part of the project, which ended up stretching over about 18 months also, the young women visited local archives at the Glamorgan Archives, visited, conducted oral history training and exhibited their work at the Butetown History and Arts Centre, the Butetown Education and Arts Training Centre (BEAT), Cardiff Central Library, and travelled to the V&A Museum in London. They trained in how to conduct oral history interviews and formally interviewed four of their mothers and grandmothers. They made fashions, films, webpages and brochures. They devised and acted in a film about women and Butetown during the war, advised by Betty Campbell, OBE and produced professionally by 15th Floor Productions.

Significantly, as in 16-60: A Woman’s Voice, fashion made up an integral part of both projects. The young people researched local fashion history online, at libraries, archives and museums; they made collages and mood boards from fashion magazines, and then designed and stitched garments. These garments, modelled by participants in a fashion show, then featured in the exhibitions that concluded each project. The Mothers Then and Now project culminated in three public events and exhibitions: one for Mother’s Day in the Women’s Workshop building in the Docks area, just across the river from Grangetown, one at Butetown History and Arts Centre, and a final exhibition at the Wales Millennium Centre.

In contrast to 16-60: A Woman’s Voice, the Mothers Then and Now group was smaller, younger and more tightly-knit. Most had already known each other for several years. Because it was a smaller group, and both projects had to navigate attrition for exams, Ramadan, school holidays, lost interest, and other events, sometimes only a few girls met at any one time. Most of the girls had been born in Cardiff and were Somali and Muslim, from families of Somali seamen who had settled in Cardiff generations back. The others all identified as ‘mixed race’, some with white Welsh family members, and as different denominations of Christian. This apparent simplicity, however, belies the way their family migration histories ranged across Wales, Madeira, Jamaica, London, Birmingham, Barbados, Bangladesh, Iraq, Malaysia, the Netherlands, Somalia and Ghana, among other places. About half the staff identified as
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Black, and half as white, and none as Muslim, with migration trajectories from just down the street, the Welsh countryside, England, Barbados, Italy and the United States.

My role in this project was also as a volunteer youth worker and researcher. Part of the project from its beginning, I introduced myself to the young people at an introductory picnic and went to the closing celebration for an earlier project to introduce myself and my research to parents. As in the previous project, I generally followed along with the activity of the day – helping with online research for the websites, for example, or with cutting out a pattern, supplying snacks, helping to tidy up – and joined in whatever was going on. We often worked and talked at the same time. As the project wound on through multiple staffing and institutional changes, moreover, I became a through-line, and tried to make myself useful. I facilitated the oral history interviews, transcribing them as part of the exhibitions; I designed and led some revised arts-based mapping activities; I had one-on-one and small group interviews with staff and young people toward the end of the project. At the end of the project, I was asked to take on a few hours of paid work to write up the evaluation report to the Heritage Lottery Fund for the project.

iii. Writing Our Lives

The third women’s heritage project, a partnership between Butetown History and Arts Centre and the Hayaat Women’s Trust, brought together 11 women ages 30-70ish for a year of Sunday afternoon creative writing workshops. Writing tutors guided the sessions with readings, structured exercises, discussions, and sharing writing. Bookended by public readings by published, professional women writers Nadifa Mohamed (Black Mamba Boy 2009 and The Orchard of Lost Souls 2014) and Shelina Zahra Janmohamed (Love in a Headscarf 2009), the group produced a book of their own writing and a final celebratory reading and event. This group embarked on a writing retreat to the 16th century Brecon Beacons mountain farm of one of the tutors.

Most of the group members arrived with an interest in writing, particularly memoir and life writing: some had joined in other writing classes and groups before. Others hoped to write their own life stories and memoirs in books. Many were community activists and leaders. A notable number in such a small group struggled with disabling health problems. Again, more than half of the group had been born in Butetown or Grangetown or had long, multi-generational connections to the place; most of the rest had grown up in England. Their family migration paths wound across England and Wales, Iraq, Hungary, the United States, Somalia, Ghana, and Barbados, among others, tracing paths of ‘mixing, movement and migration’ (James 2014, 655) as well as rooted, assertive Welshness. Group leaders were also participants, and
helped with organizing, while two paid writing tutors structured the sessions with readings and writing prompts.

From the beginning, the writing process was directed toward a collaboratively published, edited book, imagined in large part as a teaching tool for young people. Writing tutors set exercises to explore different writing techniques and themes such as place, family, being a woman, beliefs, moves and migrations, experiences of race and racism, and loss, among others. Levels of experience differed widely, as did style and voice, from poetry influenced by theology to playful couplets, short memoirs, more dreamy imaginings. My role in this project moved between participant, volunteer and researcher. I was often responsible for picking up the biscuits on my way down, for helping to set up and clear up – sometimes carrying heavy boxes of books, once memorably spilling the milk for tea, sometimes washing up the cups and biscuit plates – and for contacting people with the schedule and plan for the project.

In this project, however, I stepped into the role of participant observer as a fellow creative writer, rather than in the clear role of volunteer youth worker. I wrote along with the group, following the exercises set by the writing tutors, reading aloud what I had written with my heart in my mouth. Around the writing table the vulnerability of and interest in writing made for something of a community of practice. Along this line, the writing entangled in my research process. I contributed writing to the final book and stood with others from the group at the final event to read a poem I had written. I wrote fieldnotes about our discussions and what came up from the writing. The creative writing exercises worked their way into how I thought about all of the research materials. All of these heritage projects, as this chapter will unpack, were performative occasions for memory and history practices, for imagining the community of the past and giving its contours in the present emotional weight and mobility.

2.7 Popular archives: ‘Down the Bay’, Inside Out and Cardiff before Cardiff

As a fourth case study and counterpoint to the three local women’s heritage projects outlined above, this thesis also examines three recovered and recirculated archives of black and white photographs of everyday life in the neighbourhoods around the Bay in Cardiff: ‘Down the Bay’: Picture Post, Humanist Photography and Imager of 1950s Cardiff (Jordan 2001); Inside Out: Reflections of the Tiger Bay Community (Campbell and Campbell 2013); and Cardiff before Cardiff (Pountney, Robertson and Gibbard 2012). Like the women’s heritage projects, these archives represent occasions to bring the past into the present. Shot in the 1950s, late 1970s and early 1980s, and early 1980s, respectively, the photographs were recovered, reprinted, exhibited and circulated afresh in 2001, 2012, and 2013. While each of the three collections has a distinct story about where the photographs came from and why they have been reclaimed, together
they share an interest in capturing the ‘imagined community’ (Anderson 1991) and past of Cardiff’s working class, lived multicultures.

Materially and mnemonically evocative, each offers a counter-archive, a gesture to re-imagine and recollect the past. They depict people out and about together and the intimate textures of their homes, streets, shops, stoops, front gardens, doorways and open spaces. Brought to life by stories of recovery from ruin or storage, they have also elicited warm and expansive popular responses, in exhibitions, through new books, and in comments online and in the local paper (Gibbard 2012, 4; Pennypost 2012; Waldram 2011; Waldram, Walker and Thomas 2013). According to BHAC founder, historian and photographer Glenn Jordan, Bert Hardy’s 1950s photographs ‘memorialize and symbolically reinstate vanishing traces of community life’ (Jordan 2001, 20).

To choose these archives leaves out others, of course, but I chose these three for a common interest in everyday life, in recovered lost pasts, and feelings about that past. They connect this particular context to a broader efflorescence of public, vernacular interest in old photographs, and of photography as a locus for communities of memory (Ryzova 2015; Keightley and Pickering 2014). Online, for example, popular photo archives include Cardiff Now & Then, Cardiff School Photos, Remember Old Cardiff, Bay Life Archives, and Cardiff before Cardiff, among others, with followers that range from a few hundred to more than 20,000. I also considered but decided not to study the extensive archives of family photographs and portraits held at the Butetown History and Arts Centre (Weedon and Jordan 2012; Jordan 2004). Nor did I include recently digitized 19th century photographs of people laughing, chatting and drinking in and around Grangetown by William Booth (National Museum Wales 2015), nor the Glamorgan Archives’ collection of news photographs and police ledgers of mugshots (Bevan 2015; Cardiff Borough Police Force Records, 1914-1918, 1918-1921). In contrast, the collections I study reflect the same living-memory, intergenerational time frame as the women’s heritage projects.

I also chose not to look at the contemporary, widely-shared pictures of Cardiff After Dark (2012) featuring late-night partiers on Cardiff’s streets, half-dressed and drunk, often literally surrounded by trash. Taken by Maciej Dakowicz and published in The New York Times and as a book, these photographs are in colour and focus on hedonist liminal time instead of a documentary everyday. They have also been critiqued for perpetuating stereotypes like MTVs The Valleys (Hardman 2011). I also did not study closely an earlier generation of photographs by John Brigg, published by Welsh Seren press, called Before the Deluge: Photographs of Cardiff’s Docklands in the Seventies (2002) or Taken in Time (2005). All of these invite
further study, as they form part of the visual imaginary of Cardiff, but none quite address the themes of an intergenerational imaginary of community, and of public feeling about the past, as the three I have chosen.

2.8 Framing projects and archives together

The four sites, despite their differences, have several important qualities in common that suit them to my inquiry. First, all four involved family relationships, some of which overlapped among projects. Sisters and cousins took part together. Mothers worked on the projects, while their daughters and nieces joined in and took on leadership, as in ‘I kind of have to [attend] because she’s my mum’, as one young woman put it. Mothers, aunts and grandmothers in the older generation came in to be interviewed or joined to help for a few sessions. Other family members led sections of the projects. Extended family and friends came to the public exhibitions and events. Second, they all took place in an archipelago of community spaces and museums around the Bay and the city centre, even as several of these have closed or changed dramatically due to funding cuts. The Cardiff Story Museum, the Butetown History and Arts Centre, and the Wales Millennium Centre all saw iterations of several of these projects move through their spaces.

Third, the three women’s heritage groups were all funded by the Heritage Lottery Fund, a grant-making body committed, as outlined in the introduction, to certain values around community and participation. Other official support in spaces, funding, or labour from a traditionally Labour local council, the Welsh Government and funding bodies like Literature Wales all also inflect all four projects. Funding in various forms kept the lights and the heat on in the community centres, local archives, and local museums, paid for some people’s time, bought the art supplies and materials, the journeys by minibus, the biscuits and tea and coffee and celebratory food for final public events. All four projects thus move in a context in which kin and institution, unpaid artmaking and paid youth work, moments of coming together and funding objectives, are not easy to untangle.

Part of the unspoken sensibilities guiding these projects, these shared qualities make for occasions of imagining community and doing community that are both on stage and off stage, homely and official, acutely specific and part of more general institutional and political moments. As such, they have some limits. They are not, for example, studies of everyday practices, such as gestures of care and conviviality in a café (Warner Talbot and Bennison 2013), nor a systematic study of economies and dilemmas of care and community-making (Bishop 2013), nor a broad collection of ‘ordinary affects’ (Stewart 2007) that get at the tone or feel of a whole historical moment. They are not set in homes, on the street, or in the
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rooms where policy is written, but in a collection of semi-porous, fungible, homely and fractious ‘third spaces’ with high ceilings, fresh and chipped paint, art in the corners and on the walls, teeming with people (Bhabha 1994; Soja 1996). But this also makes them fruitful places to look for the interface of the personal and the political, the intimate and the public, around big questions about how to live together with difference.

Finally, all four sites explicitly invoked public feelings and moving local, intimate publics. As I develop in Chapter 3, feelings of all kinds surged through the girls and women’s heritage projects. The photographic archives, too, have been noted for their local popularity, for the way people ‘deeply aggrieved’ by how they might have been represented elsewhere love these pictures and find them ‘alluring’ (Jordan 2001, 9). The collections have been celebrated for the way they brought on a surge of nostalgia, for their evocation of *hiraeth*, a longing for a lost place to which one cannot return, and for capturing the scrappy, warm ‘spirit’ (Pountney 2012; B. Campbell 2013 no pn) of everyday life in Cardiff’s neighbourhoods in the past. This emphasis on emotion and mood drew my attention.

For all four sites, I developed methods to think about patterns of feeling in the archives, working with their materials as collections, coding them loosely for their subject matter, sensory qualities, and punctum, or emotional charge (Barthes 1980). Developing the work of postcolonial, materialist historians of photography and anthropologists, I approached the project materials and photographs not as single objects with contents – or at least, not only as images with contents – but as haptic, material objects, ‘material performances that enact a complex range of historiographical desires’ (Edwards 2009, 131). Toward the photo archives, as toward the projects, I cultivated what postcolonial anthropologist Ann Laura Stoler calls ‘an ethnographic sensibility’, and worked to cultivate ‘disquieted and expectant modes’ of investigation (Stoler 2002, 109; Highmore, 2006, 83). These methods meant that I treated the photographic archives as performative occasions, like the women’s cultural heritage groups.

As local sites of heritage, the recovered photography archives and intergenerational women’s heritage projects chosen for this thesis make up part of much broader debates on the performativity and ‘common sense’ of community and intercultural belonging (Yuval-Davis 2011). In this, the thesis follows a line of cultural studies committed to disturbing the formations that ‘converge to construct notions of “common sense”’ (Hall and O’Shea 2015 in Naidoo 2016, 5050). Attention to how imagined communities take shape matters because ‘the constructed past itself is constitutive of the collectivity’ (Trouillot 1995, 16). The collectivity, in this case the ‘community’, does not exist already: it comes into
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being through ‘constructing’, finding, restoring, reprinting, fashioning, writing, cutting and gluing and stitching, exhibiting and sharing the past. As sites interwoven with postcolonial roots and routes (Gilroy 1993), these heritage projects are sites where, as Homi Bhabha puts it, the ‘terms of cultural engagement, whether antagonistic or affiliative, are produced performatively’ and the terms of difference made, dragged up and fought over (Bhabha 1994, 2 in Naidoo 2016, 512).

2.9 Parochial places, diaspora spaces

The sites of these heritage projects happened in particular kinds of places of deliberate community naming and making. The projects took place mostly in third sector spaces, art and community centres, youth centres, local galleries, museums and exhibition spaces (but not, usually, workplaces, homes, or places of worship). As such, they are sites of cultural ‘third space’ (Bhabha 1994) that make certain kinds of community-making and conviviality possible. As Amanda Wise and Greg Noble (2016, 429) note in their introduction to a special issue of The Journal of Intercultural Studies on conviviality, ‘the gentle offerings of community centres of all kinds are probably underestimated for the role they play in provisioning the infrastructure for new modes of sustained conviviality to emerge that offer something more than spaces of fleeting encounter’. The sites afforded occasions for both conviviality (as a description of being together) and collectivity (as a description of solidarity, of collecting to do something). From youth centres to local museums, these ‘microspaces of conviviality’ (Wessendorf 2016, 456) were part of a ‘parochial realm’ of places like ‘sports clubs, associations or relations between neighbours where more communal relations can be formed’ and ‘interactions across differences can be deeper and more sustained’ (Hunter 1985 and Lofland 1989 in Wessendorf 2016, 451). Such ““parochial” sites and scales’ (Jarvis and Bonnett 2013, 2365) may be particularly fruitful occasions for studying how people ‘mix’ and come together (Wessendorf 2013). As both sites of deliberate, imaginative community making and sometimes of convivial connection, the heritage projects in this thesis also open up case studies for how community and conviviality come to be imagined and formed.

Although they mark out some of the affordances of ‘parochial’ spaces, organized around an idea of ‘the area’ or ‘the community’ that is rooted in a sense of place even as that sense of place is itself plural and diffuse, the projects also stretch out into diaspora space (Brah 1996). The local spaces of the community centres should be seen as ‘a vehicle of travel and displacement to wider constellations of time and space’ (James 2012, 35). The sites extend to other sites: trips to London museums, a rural farm in the Brecon Beacons, occasionally on the streets of Butetown and other neighbourhoods, and a range of other sites on a continuum between home and public institution. The funding goals of the Heritage Lottery Fund
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(Our Heritage 2017), the Welsh Government and local authority’s interest in ‘community cohesion’ weave these weekly meetings into broader politics. They also took place in a broader context of hostility and austerity (Emejulu and Bassel 2015; Nayak 2012) that makes such spaces, as conservative as they may be, ever more rare, fragile and contingent (Wessendorf 2016, 456-7).

Furthermore, as this thesis will explore, the sites are also haunted by ‘the ghosts of the distant that equally make that place possible’ (Massey 2004, 120). The ‘ghosts of the distant’ show up in diasporic routes and loops of colonialism and migration (Gilroy 1993; Brah 1996; Stoler 2002). They appear in the transnational trees of kin and connection participants imagined for themselves, in their invocation of archipelagos of what I call dreamplaces of imaginative sanctuary and respite (developed in Chapter 6). They also took place in mediated virtual spaces. Stories and images from the projects circulated on local news sites, social media pages, posted videos, and project websites, for example. They were catalogued in temporary archives that were often available for a time and then disappeared, and others that persist, but adrift in a mass of other ephemeral events and stories (Caraffa 2015; Moschovi, McKay and Plouviez 2013). They show up in the transnational divisions of labour (Sassen 2012) that structure everyday life and consumption in Cardiff, and the material biographies (Kopytoff 1986) of the sweets, photographs, magazines, textiles and digital technology used in the projects. Symbolically and materially, these heritage projects invoke both autochthony and diaspora (Brah 1996, Gedalof 2009); an autochthonous desire for a lost home, a wry romantic longing for the mixedness of the past, and a sense of roiling mobility, of violent and dreamy elsewhere.

2.10 Agency and politics

Through its performativity, heritage projects stage making – imagining, reproducing, enacting – both collectivities and subjects. Ethical research means taking people seriously as actors and agents, even as that agency is not romanticized as resistant, nor condemned as passive or absent. Agency might be something more diffuse, sometimes conservative, oriented to causation and time. Agency comes forward, in this understanding, in ‘how people understand the temporality of how one thing leads to another (causation) and what is possible’ (see Greenhouse 1996 in Gunaratnam 2013, 250). It moves in how people organize their ‘usually tacit’ sense of how social life unfolds, what makes what happen (Gunaratnam 2013, 250). I imagine this as a sensed horizon of what it is possible to do in any given moment, a sense of possibility that feels sometimes like a pressure, sometimes a capacious space, sometimes as unremarked as the frame of a door in a familiar house. The description appeals because it evokes an everyday agency, a mix that allows ‘systemicity’ (Mahmoud 2005), re-making and conserving
Feeling together: emotion, heritage, conviviality and politics in a changing city

along with other flares of agency perhaps considered more charismatic, like de Certeau's 'poaching' (de Certeau 1984; Highmore, 2006, 103-108).

Conceiving of agency in this way avoids choosing a side in a binary that has beset debate on agency and resistance in education as well as in other institutional contexts. This binary positions practices as either ‘progressive or reactionary; nihilistic or actively political; agentic or structurally conditioned; reproductive or liberationary’ (Bright 2011, 503). Too often, this model of agency forces familiar either/or questions: When people participate in a cultural institution like national heritage, do they enroll in its governmentality? (Fielding 2004, 198 in Black 2011, 464). Or, on the other hand, is their ‘taking part’ in the institution evidence of politics, ‘a resurgent democratic engagement’ (Fielding 2004, 198 in Black 2011, 464)? Too often, the contours of the debate suggest a liberal, secular conception of the subject as either rebellious or passive, either democratic or compelled, a binary many feminists have sought to unsettle (Mahmoud 2005; Fadil and Fernando 2015). Instead, agency might be ‘unpredictable and counterintuitive’ (Stewart 2007, 86):

agency can be strange, twisted, caught up in things, passive, or exhausted. Not the way we like to think about it. Not usually a simple projection toward a future. … It’s lived through a series of dilemmas: that action is always a reaction; that the potential to act always includes the potential to be acted on, or to submit; that the move to gather a self to act is also a move to lose the self; that one choice precludes others; that actions can have unintended and disastrous consequences; and that all agency is frustrated and unstable and attracted to the potential in things.

What I take Stewart to mean is that the direction or orientation of agency, or taking an action, often defies any linear account of will, or even of causation, but instead has a kind of doubled, ‘counterintuitive’, ‘twisted’, dilemmatic unpredictability.

This is not to say that agency is ‘contradictory or incoherent’, as a construction of everyday forms of agency may be problematic when it describes subjects – especially subjects positioned as ‘other’ – as ‘contradictory or incoherent’ (Fadil and Fernando 2015, 66). Rather I take from this description of agency a sense of openness. Thinking about agency in scenes like the heritage projects, which are performatively political, demands taking people seriously as makers. It requires taking them seriously as teachers and narrators of history, as poets and writers, and as people fluent in visual culture, ‘designers’ in their own right familiar with materials, forms and processes in making (Kress, 2010, 23 in Rose 2014, 38). It also requires tuning in to how they theorise, with their own sense of why things happen as they do (Tolia-Kelly 2010).

Indeed, an adequate conception of agency must recognize at least the potential that people might act
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with an inchoate ‘systemicity’ (Mahmoud 2005). This systemicity does not always follow the liberal map of the self, but it is not necessarily conflicted, ambivalent, at odds with itself (Fadil 2011; Fadil and Fernando 2015). Allowing for agency to be both open and systematic in this way allows for the ways someone taking part in a heritage project might engage in what artist Kameelah Rashid (Roach 2017, no pn) calls ‘strategic opaqueness’: ‘not so much hiding, but strategic opaqueness, refusing to be legible’. One of her artworks, in fact, a print piece called ‘How to suffer politely (and Other Etiquette)’ (2014) speaks directly to the emotional and affective labour involved at moments in these projects with posters in block print with phrases like “Tell your struggle with triumphant humor” and ‘Lower the pitch of your suffering’ (Roach 2017). Indeed, in the performative, pedagogic context of a heritage project or recovered archive, secrets may be held out and then refused, as Mary Lawlor (2006, 5) posits about practices of ‘displayed withholding’ toward whiteness in Native America. This is a sense of agency as everyday practice, following de Certeau, which ‘foregrounds creativity and resistance while simultaneously inscribing them within, rather than dislocating them from, existing norms and values’ (Fadil and Fernando 2015, 66). Therefore, the task of the researcher is to track the contours of these ‘existing norms and values’ within which agency might be expressed.

2.12 Conclusion

This chapter began with the vexed ethics of research with people and places configured as ‘other’, and subjected to relentless attention and surveillance. It traced my own messy path through scholarly debates on how to approach research in a way that unsettles the processes through which ‘others’ become ‘others’ at all. Research methods that invite straightforward participation or ‘giving voice’, I argued, can end up contributing to the problem. Methodologically, ‘if methods are performative, it follows that they discriminate by trying to enact realities into and out of being’ (Pelletier 2009, 141). This is therefore not only about imagining community, good forms of subjectivity, or possible futures in an abstracted way but about registering their affective stickiness, the ways these feel, and how they might move people (Walkerdine 2010).

Instead, my methodological focus turned to track community, in which I enfold both convivial being together and the solidarity of collectivity, as a process of plural, contested becoming. This chapter illustrates that research with people and in places ‘made minor’ (Hall 2005; Laurie and Khan 2017, 2-3; Ngai 2007) requires a slow, engaged and in-process fluency with everyday practices and materials, as well as a critical engagement with the social, political and cultural formations that inflect that everyday. It contends that the ethical imperative of the research process is to denaturalize those formations: ‘to
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discomfit, to unsettle and question any taken-for-granted assumptions regarding social worlds and practice, including our own’ (Hurdley and Dicks 2011, 289). This involved tuning into the practices of memory and history making through which community formations of the past and present were imagined (and sweetened and freighted, embittered and set alight with patterns of feeling, as the next chapter will unpack), and therefore to sites of heritage making in various forms.

The chapter described the three intergenerational local women’s heritage projects and three recovered photographic archives, and my role and approach to them, which made up my case studies of imagining communities charged with feeling. As performative occasions of community in drag, I argued that the local heritage and photographic archive projects I chose opened an opportunity to research processes of becoming and formation of both collectivities and subjects of those collectivities as they unfolded.

Further, as occasions that both constituted convivial being together and forms of collectivity, and called attention to themselves as pedagogical occasions and performances of both conviviality and collectivity, this approach takes seriously the people taking part as actors, narrators and makers (however low-key, diffuse and even conservative their agency might be). It opens up how convivial and collective arrangements come into being through uneven affective and emotional labour, and traces which bodies are called on to perform that labour. It also ‘re-directed’ my focus (Fernando 2014, 239-240) to the ways that the liberal, secular, middle class whiteness of new economic modes, ‘community cohesion’ policies and heritage discourse mould how communities of the past may be imagined and put to work for the present.

The next chapter delves deeper into the theoretical orientations of these debates, and the research practice whose story I outline here. It outlines the more theoretical process of tuning in to observation, materials, and the grain of the archive (Stoler 2002; 2012). It demonstrates the necessity for an open, attuned theoretical orientation that connects sensory experience and materials with broader affective patterns, which the subsequent chapter will describe in richer detail. In particular, it explores the possibilities and limitations of what Sarah Pink calls ‘sensory ethnography’, Tim Ingold (2014; 2011) immersive ‘participant observation’ and ‘following the materials’ to dwell in the forming or becoming of existing categories and concepts. It connects these approaches to post-colonial and materialist orientations to going ‘with the grain’ and attending to the genres of the archive (Edwards 2012; Stoler 2012; 2013). It returns to address the persistent question of the durability and intransigence of power – why some forms seem to ‘stick’ (Ahmed 2004), or gather social, cultural and political force – by connecting sensory observation with structures of feeling and patterns of affective intensity.
Chapter 3: Throwing bodies, sedimenting archives, tracking affects – theoretical orientations

3.1 Introduction: Moving feelings

Details flush out of local archives and stir up public feelings. There is a sense of breath. A headline in the South Wales Echo, for example, a local paper, reads ‘a photographer is breathing fresh life into an archive of hundreds of images …[of] life in the South Wales Valleys’ (Cresci 2013). Stored in slumped cardboard boxes in the back of the local Treorchy library, the documentary snaps of a late South Wales wedding photographer, David Thickins, became part of a blog called *Hiraeth: Rhondda Remembered*. The photos feature cheerful scenes, the usual cheerful stuff of nostalgic longing: kids racing homemade carts, a parade down a village street, a crowd thronging around singer Petula Clark (Pountney 2015; Cresci 2013a; 2013b). *Hiraeth* means a longing for a lost place, and the pictures stir longing for a past way of life in the Valleys, a nostalgia that should not be dismissed outright as pathological (see Chapter 6, and Bonnett 2010; 2011; Bonnett and Alexander 2013). In with the sunny parades and races, startlingly, is Enoch Powell, moustachioed and jocular, at a party with men in dark rumpled suits. As Pountney commented, ‘It’s surreal to develop these and suddenly find Enoch Powell - you can't get much closer to time travel’ (Cresci 2013). Powell’s toothy smile leers out like a ghost. There is also single photograph of a small protest against Powell on a neighbourhood street corner. Framed behind a blurred figure in the foreground, as if at the wrong end of a telescope, the small figures of protesters lean on signs that read: ‘Blaming the Blacks Won't Whitewash the Tories’; ‘What is Enoch doing in Wales on May Day?’; and ‘Enoch Powell OUT’.

Why do the ‘surreal’ photographs of Enoch Powell startle and attach the intimate public drawn together by this archival recovery, circulated in the local paper, stirring and moving public feelings – and not for the first time? In the photograph, a single black man in a dashiki, aviator sunglasses, and a short afro, holds one of the signs; a pale woman in a long coat stands beside him, her arm hooked in his. A handful of other people stand side by side and shout down the motorcade as it passes. An older woman in a Jackie O-like white dress and shawl, hugging what looks like her post or a parcel, watches at the curb. Children and others mill behind their picket line. I argue that here, as in the other materials studied in this thesis, the details of the Thickins protest photograph animate a being-together that ruffles other,
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public feelings circling the past and the present.

Powell was of course an infamous anti-worker Thatcherite and racist. His vitriolic ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech of 1968 (Powell [1968]2007) blamed recent migrants from the Commonwealth as a threat to white British life. Terraced houses dipping in and out of a hillside, chimney pots, bare trees and electricity lines locate the protesters in one of the workers’ neighbourhoods of South Wales in spring: just the kind of street supposedly under threat from outsiders in Powell’s speech. The image ruffles the ‘the sense of alarm and of resentment’ catheted onto black and brown bodies by Enoch Powell ([1968]2007) through the figure of the ‘respectable’ white, working-class neighbour. There they are, standing together, in a dashiki and a white dress.

Further, the small crowd knits up protesting bodies. Their placards fold together ‘May Day’ labour activism and anti-racist action as ‘shared interests among the multi-racial working class’ (Khan and Shaheen 2017, 3-4). Their touching bodies, lined up together, ‘stage a politics of proximity’, as Elizabeth Abel argues of bodies in anti-segregation sit-in protests in the United States in the sixties. As Abel explains, ‘bringing skins of diverse hues into transgressive contact, they dramatized a new social body’ (Abel 2014, 96; see also Abel 2010). The photograph startles and moves in 2013 because this ‘social body’ is somehow still urgent. The protest photograph’s haptics suggest a different a poetics of ‘fugitive kinship’, of solidarity ‘where it should not be’ (Campt 2012, 91). A little scrap of history on a piece of brown film in a local library basement ‘breath[es] fresh life’ into an archive that moves a public. As one moment in what has been described as a ‘memory boom’ (Gooding, 2013, 153), through these projects, local publics negotiate how the past should live in the ragged, uneven Cardiff of the present (Gonçalves, 2009; Gonçalves, 2017; Cardiff Council, 2014).

Over the past two decades, research in a range of fields has converged on the question of how ephemeral but palpable public feelings and affects forge social, political and cultural formations. Countering the limitations of theory focused only on discourse (Wetherell 2012) and social science on concrete ‘movements of labour, capital, culture and commodities’ (Jones and Jackson 2014, 2), this research has turned to more sensory emotional movements, attunements, and affective patterns. It has set out to define and track ‘structures of feeling’ (Williams 1977), public, ‘sticky’ emotions and ‘ugly

---

10 Or not additive, but a shift away from (only) discourse (Adkins and Lury 2009, Ahmed 2007, Blackman and Cromby 20007 Blackman and Venn 2010; Davidson et al. 2008; Fraser et al. 2005 in Wetherell 2012: 3).
feelings’ (Ahmed 2004, 2014; Bondi and Davidson 2011; Ngai 2007), structured affects, often ‘ordinary’ ones (Berlant 2011; Sedgwick 2003; Stewart 2007; Wetherell 2012), along with shared social moods ‘like the weather’ (Felski and Fraiman 2012; Highmore 2013; Flatley 2012). While some of this research has been primarily theoretical, other research has concentrated on how feelings register in the social present, in order to understand why, for example, a post-colonial, de-industrialized ‘melancholia’ in Britain might be so pervasive and so politically potent (Wetherell 2012; Gilroy 2004). Yet how emotions register in everyday experience, take shape from and give shape to people and collectives, move people (or fail to move them), and contour political possibilities, are phenomena still not well understood (Wetherell 2012; Jones and Jackson 2014). To open up ‘the full spectrum’ (Jones and Jackson 2014, 2) of the social, cultural and political forces involved in imaginations of community, therefore, this chapter lays out an argument for studying affect. It also offers one approach for how to trace them.

In my research in Cardiff, patterns of feeling rooted in the past – of convivial sweetness and kinship, anger and shared struggle, nostalgia, mourning and loss, and an assiduous dreaminess, among others – drifted and surged through the heritage projects in the present. By taking these seriously, I hope to tune into the force of affect in these heritage projects, and into the way feeling set alight by their materials, textures and tone stick ‘imagined community’ together (Anderson 1991; Weedon and Jordan 2012, 145). The first passage of this chapter will chart a way through current debates on how patterns of feeling register in and move publics, and therefore articulate with politics.

The second part of this chapter will focus on how to tune into emotion in research on social life. Methodologically, for me this looks something like ‘tracking patterns, following the coming-into-form of activity’ to produce a ‘radical ethnographic historiography[y] of the present’ (Berlant 2011, 13), as Lauren Berlant describes some of her foundational influences in her study of public affect in Cruel Optimism. My research brings something new by mixing two approaches to ‘track patterns’ of feeling: immersive, participant observation (Ingold 2014; Pink 2009, 2012) which focuses on process of ‘becoming’, and materialist, postcolonial scholarship on archives and performative repertoires (Edwards 2012; Stoler 2002; 2010; Taylor 2003), which focuses on how the poetics, haptics, and biographies of archives, their uses and social lives, matter in social life and move publics. This section describes my approach to the patterns of feeling in the field, and how I handled the profusion of materials produced in the projects.

Emotion in research matters, in part, because it reinvigorates the study of social life with ‘the dramatic and the everyday’ (Wetherell 2012, 2). Affect and emotion can reground research in the senses,
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materials, and in the messy, unfixed territory of open questions. This chapter argues for ways of researching that not only tune in to the plurality of the lives of the people taking part (James 2014, 655) here, but also tune in to the ways differences – the forms and contours of different subjectivities and collectivities – gather sticky affective intensities and come to matter (Ahmed 2004; Hall 2005). In so doing, in tracing the forming or becoming ‘sticky’ of concepts and categories, it investigates the institutional formations and historiography that shape the conditions of legibility of certain objects of public interest (and study) (Trouillot 1995; Fernando 2014; Sheller 2005). My purpose ultimately therefore is not simply to recuperate certain emotions for progressive politics, but to track how these patterns of feeling ‘become’ or form (deform) in practice.

3.2 Sticky feelings, sedimented pasts

Emotions and affects spin and tangle through any ‘imagined community’ (Anderson 1991), of course, patterning its formation. Charged feelings attach people to places, ideas, and dreams; with diffuse but forcible ‘ordinary affects’ (Stewart 2007), they orient people to certain ways of being, coping, and surviving (Ahmed 2004; Berlant 2011). Feelings, tangled in the senses – like disgust, or desire – also constitute the edges of selves, and the boundaries of who or what belongs (Ahmed 2004; Jones and Jackson 2014; Muñoz 2006). Over the course of the research for this thesis, saturated feelings and ‘ordinary affects’ (Stewart 2007) came up again and again. Sometimes these circulated as feelings declared outright: as one mother and social worker recounted of her childhood neighbourhood, ‘And I remember that everybody loved each other? …Everybody just mingled, regardless of culture, race’ (Nura, 40s, social worker). Lucy, a mixed-race young woman, prompted by a question about heritage, said of her ‘Welsh side’, ‘I really don’t like it. Like the language, I hate the language, I think it’s disgusting how they speak. Chhhh… That’s all it is, like!’. Emotions like these ‘stick’ (Ahmed 2004) to certain objects and ideas – the local, utopic community of the past, or the national language ‘they’ speak – charging them with import, giving them the heft and coherence.

Other forms of affect registered, too. Winding through my fieldnotes and photographs was a sense, for example, of a dragging mood over the long, overlapping durations of dark winter and light summer, exams and other thresholds, and times apart like holidays and illness. Convivial, celebratory occasions of being together sparked and then subsided. The feel of materials – a silky synthetic fabric, haphazardly stitched, a plate of custard cream biscuits, the sound of a deep, confident voice reading her own poem before a crowd, a jagged collage from a fashion magazine – released more subtle, prolix patterns of feeling. Wars in diasporic homelands subsided and resurged; distant factories collapsed; people mapped
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the lost past; young people and older people made moves, stayed put, and nudged into futures. In the heritage projects I followed, ‘feelings become a form of social presence’ (Ahmed 2004, 10) around contested heritage and historic violence, the tangible but hard to describe *something* in the atmosphere about the uncomfortable past and uncertain future.

As outlined in the introduction to this thesis, the demographic, geographic and economic data on Cardiff suggest that historic inequalities pattern inequalities in the present. Communities in ‘deprived’ areas of Cardiff in the present, for example, ‘share experiences of class, gendered, and racial, inequalities inherited from [a] common history’ (Threadgold et al. 2008, 2; Elliot et al. 2016; Dewis 2015; Jordan and Weedon 2004). This ‘common history’ seems to stick around. Writing about ‘social haunting’ in an English coalfield community of strike, struggle, and collapse, N. Geoffrey Bright distinguishes similar inarticulate but ‘embodied feelings rooted in [local] social, political and labour histories’ (Bright 2012, 318-319).

These feelings, rooted in the past, persist in the community as ‘something like a “structure of feeling”, “spatialities of feeling” or “ordinary affects”: as inarticulate (even silenced) but nevertheless present shared feeling (Williams 1975; 1977; Thrift 2008; Stewart 2007 in Bright 2012, 318-319).

To understand how the past registers in the bodies and lives of people in particular, therefore, requires a turn to emotion and affect (Walkerdine 2010; Wetherell 2012). Writing about another de-industrialized town in South Wales, Valerie Walkerdine (2010, 91) argues that feelings of loss and being ‘held’ by community are fundamental to how the hurt of de-industrialization in the recent past is lived in the present. Such shared feelings are the answer to her question, ‘what makes a community stick together?’. As the photographs of *Hiraeth Rhondda* suggest, the local past moves public feeling. Feeling then, I argue, forms the contours of an ‘imagined community’ (Anderson 1991), the proper subjects of that community, and its dream-able futures (Skeggs 2010; Tyler and Gill 2013; Walkerdine 2010, 2016).

While emotions move in social life, or stand suspended ‘in solution’ (Williams 1977, 132), Sara Ahmed (204; 2010) argues that this is not fluid: emotions also ‘stick’ to certain words and figures. Other scholars write about the way affect ‘sediments’ over time in bodies, or ‘sediment[s] down’ (Branston 2005, 148; Bright 2012, 2016; Reay 2009). Further, archives – including new, vernacular archives – are, as Costanza Caraffa and Tiziana Serena (2015, 9) put it in *Photo Archives and the Idea of Nation*, sites of ‘an organic but never definitive accretion of sedimentation processes’. Sarah Lloyd and Julie Moore (2015, 242) propose ‘sedimented histories’ as a way to describe the collaborative formation of social histories by local communities. These histories ‘sediment’ in locations and moments ‘where voices and memories are
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contested or perspectives fragmented, where elements of the past are differently weighted or valued, … to create a ‘sediment’ of connected, but not necessarily uniform histories’. The layering and proximity of these histories means they are ‘available over time, adjacent to one another’, but no one narrative dominates any other.

What some affect theorists and empirical researchers argue, of course, is that not only knowledge ‘is sedimented’ in an archive, but affects. ‘Sedimented affect’ describes the way layers of inherited, generational memories of and feelings about school, and its disciplinary regime founded on ‘a century of class domination’, accrete in working class young people in the present (Reay 2009, 24, 27). The haunting Stoler (2010; 2009; 2006) describes in the imperial archives she studies comes similarly clotted with intimate feelings and moods. ‘Sedimented experiences’, thick with feeling and held through refracted forms of collective memory, affect the way young people approach rules, futurity, and resistance. In the context of entrenched deindustrialized loss, Bright has explored how such ‘sedimentation’, rather than being declared or even part of the narrative, ‘might be affective, collective and somehow ghosted or hidden’ (2012a, 229). That is, it might manifest in patterns of feeling layered over time, ‘hidden’ but loosened and set alight in particular moments to return in the present.

The metaphor of generationally ‘sedimented affect’, however, only works if the sedimentation doesn’t settle down into mudstone, or something fixed, but retains a sily, fluid instability. Raymond Williams’ (1977, 132) ‘structures of feeling’ as ‘in solution’ that has not yet ‘precipitated’ inflects this metaphor. The ‘solution’ in this case might be a river chalky with silt and sediment, like the Taff, Ely and Rhymney rivers running through Cardiff, out past the Docks neighbourhoods of Riverside, Butetown and Grangetown to the Bay. The threading fans of the Cardiff fen’s many ‘waterways’ and canals, rivers and dredged docks have been filled in and covered over through industrial development (Finch and Hartwig 2016; Philpotts 2016). The watery, tidal places of the neighbourhoods of the past are ‘all gone, gone now, along with the canal, the timber float and the docks. Dredged and filled in’ (WOL 2015, 61-62). Memory and feeling might sediment like the sticky mud of these waterways. The metaphor I prefer is not the implied stillness of sedimenting (or precipitating, settling out of a solution) but the clot. Clots can form and stick together even in fluids on the move. Clots catch and adhere material. They can block and dam and stop up as well as settle gently.

My argument is sedimented, clotted public feeling forms in and through the performative occasions of history making and memory practice in the heritage projects studied in this thesis. Indeed, I suggest that these occasions of making heritage, collective memory and vernacular archives – however rich, DIY,
heteropoietic, and both ephemeral and fragile – open a unique way to study how embodied feelings connect to complex histories, including histories of struggle. Thus, the community-based cultural heritage projects in this thesis work as sites where affectively-sticky knowledge and narratives about local social histories form, clot, ‘sediment down’. Understanding how this might happen requires turning to recent debates on affect theory and the ‘cultural politics of emotion’ (Ahmed 2004).

3.3 Making, moving and labouring bodies

Research on questions of affect, mood, emotion and feeling in social life has followed many disciplinary trajectories. In such a heterogeneous critical debate, what to call and how to understand the ‘cultural politics of emotion’ (Ahmed 2004, 2014) or affect continue to be zealously contested (Ahmed 2014; see, for example, Leys 2011; Wetherell 2014). Describing the phenomena of feeling, of being moved, or a sensed atmosphere is of course a long, passionate and entangled creative, scientific and philosophical project. As Ben Anderson (2009, 78) writes, ‘rather than having been downplayed, repressed, or silenced, affective life has been subject to an extraordinary array of explanations and descriptions’. As a project, this history therefore enjoins us to think with ‘concepts equal to the ambiguity of affective and emotive life’ (Anderson 2009, 78).

In particular, affect has been culled out as one kind of phenomena, while emotion (or feeling) is another altogether. Brian Massumi (1995, 88; 2003) distinguishes between feelings as ‘intensity owned and recognized’, or embodied and named by a feeling subject, and affect, which he describes as diffuse, everywhere palpable and nowhere settled, ‘the unassimilable’ (Massumi 1995, 88; 2003). As Ben Anderson argues of this division, ‘invoking one or the other term has come to signal a basic orientation to the self, world and their interrelation (as well as in some cases a particular politics and ethics)’ (Anderson 2009, 80). If the researcher orients herself with emotion, so too with the ‘personal and subjective’, and with ‘narrative and semiotic’ modes of meaning-making (Ngai 2007 in Anderson 2009, 80). If with affect, she orients herself with the ‘impersonal and objective’, the ‘non-narrative and asignifying’ (Anderson 2009, 80). As I mention in the introduction, the duality of these terms does not suit the slurried mix of declared feelings and less tangible moods that interest me in my research.

11 Among them, psychosocial modes (Walkerdine 2010; Walkerdine and Jimenez 2012), a theoretical position on affect as structure, distinct from emotion (Berlant 2008; 2011; Massumi 2002; Thrift 2004), a queer, feminist insistence on emotion (Ahmed 2004, 2014; Muñoz 2006; Cvetkovich 2007, 2014); and a particular interest, drawing from Heidegger’s ‘attunement’, in mood (Guignon 1984; Highmore 2013; Felski and Fraiman 2012; Flatley 2012).
This distinction, which defines affect as the ineffable, the historical-made-palpable, and emotion as the intimate and personal, has been critiqued for its gendered overtones (Jones and Jackson 2014, 2; Bondi and Davidson 2011). It has been critiqued for ignoring the long feminist and queer genealogy of theorizing the social and political movements of emotion (for a critique, see Ahmed 2014; Muñoz 2006; Cvetkovich 2007; Bondi and Davidson 2011), for incoherently dividing body and mind, and for using a vague scientism that premises affect on fuzzy and contested neuroscience (Massumi 2002; Thrift 2004, for a critique see Leys 2011, 2012). Yet affect, perhaps taken more loosely, continues to have political and ‘analytical purchase’ because of the way it redirects our attention from the ‘I’ of ‘I feel terrible’, as Gabriel Winant (2015, 113) explains, to ‘this feels terrible’. What is going on with ‘this’?

Indeed, I argue that great critical fecundity lies in unpacking a genealogy of affect and emotion as inherited and evolving from feminist and queer writers, and in thinking about how these phenomena entangle and overlap (Bondi and Davidson 2011). Just as affect cannot be cleanly disentangled or abstracted from emotion, emotion and feeling cannot be isolated from the social or located only in the personal. Like Sianne Ngai (2007, 27), my objects of study are those moments or ‘transitions from one pole to the other: the passages whereby affects acquire the semantic density and narrative complexity of emotions, and emotions conversely denature into affects’. It is this clotting, forming and dissolving of feeling that is interesting because it does not quite presume normative concepts, but tunes into their becoming (Ingold 2014). However the phenomena in question might be named and mapped, what threads through these debates is a shared commitment to the idea that the phenomenon – of ‘sticky’, moving emotion (Ahmed 2004), a shared sense of something (Stewart 2007), an affect, what I would like to call a pattern of feeling (Highmore 2016) – shapes and moves the social world, and therefore has powerful political effects.

According to these lines of critique, affect and emotion carry a kinetic force: this force pushes and pulls, forms and diffuses, tunes and spins, limits and blurs. For Raymond Williams (1977, 132) ‘structures of feeling’ ‘exert palpable pressures and set effective limits on experience and on action’. Although these pressures and limits may not be clearly identifiable or named, they nevertheless are felt, and move as well as restrain people. Gabriel Winant (2015, 112) helpfully glosses affect as both a ‘generalized way of talking about the connections between feelings and power’: he uses the example of the feel of a room, the way it seems to have a certain mood, ‘some way of feeling that is proper to a place’ that shifts and turns and moves bodies in that place differently, but invariably affects us (see also Felski and Fraiman 2012; Highmore 2013, 9). An atmosphere might “‘envelope” and “press’ upon life’ (Anderson 2009, 77).
Public feelings (Cvetkovich 2007) thread in and through generations and distinct, overlapping durations in time. They persist, emerging, and pattern the present. Affects have kinetic, political and social force: as ‘grab[bing] people’ and ‘power[ing] public scenes’ (Wetherell 2012, 2). This force has also been described by critics as stickiness (Ahmed 2004), or as a diffuse kind of tuning (Guignon 1984, 2003). Tracing patterns of feeling helps us to track ‘who gets to do what when, and what relations does an affective practice make, enact, disrupt or reinforce?’ (Wetherell 2012, 17 in Jones and Jackson 2014, 2-3).

As well as moving people along, emotions matter for this research because they form the boundaries of collectivities – such as an imagined community centred in a place – and figure the subjects who belong (and don’t) to them. As Sara Ahmed (2004) argues, emotions are not interior to the body. They are not something one ‘has’. Emotions do not belong to individuals or collectives. Instead ‘it is through emotions, or how we respond to objects and others, that surfaces and boundaries are made: the “I” and “we” are shaped by, and even take the shape of, contact with others’ (Ahmed 2004b, 10). Emotions form the edges and coherence of individual subjects and collectives that might speak as ‘I’, ‘we’ or ‘us’. Further, by the way emotions like disgust, love or fear circulate and attach to certain figures, ‘particular kinds of emotional subjects and citizens are repetitively materialised’ (Ahmed 2004a in Wetherell 2012, 14). As conceptual objects on the move, as Sara Ahmed puts it, they ‘become sticky, or saturated with affect, as sites of personal and social tension’ (Ahmed 2004, 11). Emotion gives a charge to ‘cultural circuits of value as some get marked out as disgusting and others as exemplifying modern virtue’ (Ahmed 2004; Skeggs 2010; Skeggs and Wood 2009 in Wetherell 2012, 16). Conceptual figures, like as Lila Abu-Lughod puts it, the figure of Muslim women as a “neat cultural icon...over messy historical and political dynamics” (Abu-Lughod 2002, 783 in Rashid 2014, 590), or the figure of the disaffected working-class young person (Skeggs 2010), gather their coherence and negative power as anxious, negative public feeling ‘sticks’ and layers around them, repeated through everyday gestures, media, popular culture, and policy and policing (Cameron 2016; Rashid 2014).

The uneven way affect clots around certain bodies then also commands labour unevenly from those bodies. Feminist accounting for the affective labour of women as unwaged labours of love gets at some of this unevenness (Ahmed 2004; Cox and Frederici 1970 in Winant 2015, 113). So, of course, does Arlie Hochschild’s (1983/2003) study of gendered emotional labour in the workplace. Hochschild’s *The Managed Heart* tracks how workers work on feelings as part of the job, because the liberal service economy demands ‘producing emotions in themselves or others’ (Durr and Wingfield 2011, 599). Hochschild frames emotional labour as either productive – the worker might need to appear happy, or
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calm, or tough – or repressive, as, for example, ‘part of the job [of the flight attendant] is to disguise fatigue and irritation’ (Hochschild [1983]2003, 8). Yet while Hochschild acknowledges that ‘there are both gender patterns and class patterns to the civic and commercial use of human feeling’ (Hochschild [1983]2003, 21), her initial study glosses over other patterns, including imperialism, sexuality, and race, all of which matter a great deal to global economies of care (Carby 1984; Sassen 2012; Durr and Wingfield 2011, 599). In the present, migrant women and women of colour increasingly absorb the burden of care labour in Britain as part of ‘the global care chain’, for example (Bishop 2013; Mancini and von Bochove 2009, 116). Another form of affective or emotional labour might be the way migrants to a country like Britain, for example, are expected to perform ‘hygienic’ selves (Marciniak 2006, 34) and warm, grateful ‘affective citizenship’ (Fortier 2010; 2016; 2017), and thereby to “return” the love of the nation through gratitude’ (Ahmed 2004, 137). Indeed, Sara Ahmed’s (2008; 2010a; 2010b; 2012) various killjoys – feminist killjoys, melancholic migrants – refuse an injunction to labour at shared happiness they do not (cannot) share. Perhaps more subtly, Nadia Fadil charts the way Muslim women who do not veil in Belgium perform affective labour in how they explain and construct themselves as liberal, ethical selves. Thus, it is important not only to think intersectionally about affective labour, but to consider the subtle, affectively stippled, textured kind of ‘we’ or ‘I’ the movement of emotion might create (Crenshaw 1991; Brah and Phoenix 2004; Ahmed 2004, 10).

This becoming takes all manner of affective labour. José Estaban Muñoz (2006, 680) describes whiteness as the ‘affective gauge’ against which all other ways of feeling are measured. For Muñoz, whiteness is ‘a cultural logic that prescribes and regulates national feelings and comportment’, a way of gauging ‘some modes of emotional countenance and comportment as good or bad’ (Muñoz 2006, 680). The promise that to ‘measure up’ will be to secure the good life is the affective ‘allure’ of whiteness (Berlant 2011; James 2014, 653). In East London, a place interwoven with threads of deindustrialization, entrenched struggle, and migration, and with an abiding mythologized white working class identity, ‘phantasms of whiteness and class loss are traced over’ (James 2014, 652). The good life, however, has already been foreclosed for those marked out as other. It might therefore produce melancholia, a sense of feeling stuck or ‘feeling down’ (Muñoz 2006), of ‘bitterness’ (Skeggs and Loveday 2012, 483) or of a punishing ‘cruel optimism’ (Berlant 2011; Eng and Kazanjian 2003).

Affective and emotional labour have been conceived in new ways under the influence of queer theory like that of Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick (Winant 2015, 116-117). While Hochschild’s abiding concern is that such labours to fabricate and disguise emotion then corrupt the capacity of a subject to feel anything
authentically, or to know how she really feels, subsequent theorists move away from this idea of a ‘true self’ (Winant 2015, 117). Emotions orient and attach subjects differently, shaping “how it is that we come to find our way in a world that acquires new shapes, depending on which way we turn” (Ahmed 2006, 1 in Carabelli and Lyon 2016, 1111). Thinking about a more open, perhaps ‘disoriented’, out-of-joint, queer subject (Sedgwick 2003) always in the process of becoming helps to open up political possibilities for ‘the production of new selves altogether’ (Winant 2015, 117).

In the broader public debate in the UK, feelings of disgust or revulsion circulate to exclude new categories of people as abject, outside the norm and therefore constitutive of the norm (Bright 2011, 2012, 2016; Tyler 2013; Tyler and Gill 2012; Skeggs 2010). It is through emotions, feelings, ‘shared atmospheres’ and affective patterning, that forms and norms take shape. Thinking about norms, Judith Butler (1994) explains that her project has been in part about the behaviour, operation or processes of a norm: how a norm ‘materialises a body’, or gives it form and identity and gravity, but also ‘contours’ or ‘animates’ the body, giving it boundaries and ways of doing itself.

Like gender, normative concepts like ‘community’, ‘black’ or ‘minority ethnic’ or ‘Muslim’ woman work through a process of “becoming”: as Stuart Hall puts it, ‘cultural identity is a matter of “becoming” as well as “being”. It belongs to the future as much as to the past’ (Stuart Hall 1990 in Tolia-Kelly 2010, 41). That is, cultural identity is under formation and oriented toward both heritage and tradition in the past as it is toward the demands and imaginary contours of the future. As Heidi Safia Mirza argues, ‘being “black” in Britain is about a state of “becoming” (racialized); a process of consciousness, when colour becomes the defining factor about who you are… where identity is not inscribed by a natural identification but by political kinship” (Mirza, 1997, 3). ‘Being black’ becomes meaningful in a specific context and out of history (Carby 2009). As Laura Tabili (2003) puts it, based on her research into the centuries-deep history of racial and ethnic difference and intermarriage in Britain, ‘race is a relationship, and not a thing’.

Likewise, the gendered production of community, where women might be imagined and set up ‘as a resource or ground for the politics of collective reproduction’ (Gedalof 2003, 91), for example, ‘home’ is also a process that is ‘becoming’. As Irene Gedalof explains, ““home” is not fixed, but ‘produced through a constant process of adjustment, transformation, negotiation, redefinition – a never-ending, ongoing work to reproduce the appearance of stability and fixity that is part of the imagined community’ (Gedalof 2003, 101). Because emotions do not belong inherently to individuals or collectives, but give
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shape to their edges and coherence through their circulation (Ahmed 2004), this thesis turns to the processes through which norms of being and being together (and apart) find their shape and force.

3.4 Emotion, history and politics

While their touch may feel intensely personal, emotion and ‘ordinary affects’ (Stewart 2007) brush against much larger social and political forces. As well as through the uneven labour of different bodies, affects move at broader scales. Felt on a small scale, they can link to ‘large-scale social changes such as patterns of modernisation, rural-urban shifts, equality movements and the logics of capitalism’ (Wetherell 2012, 13). These forces attach to politics in deliberate and less deliberate ways. In the ‘ordinary affects’ of a roadside accident, a turn of phrase, a bulletin board, as Kathleen Stewart tracks, ‘something’ makes itself present, that shivers with historical portent but defies the name of any established explanatory rubric. Affect attaches to history and politics because ‘affective atmospheres are shared, not solitary’ and can therefore speak beyond the individual subject to ‘historical time’ (Berlant 2011, 15).

At the local scale, emotional attachments to particular places – including loss, disgust, and love – crisscross city neighbourhoods during processes of gentrification, migration and urban change (Bonnett and Alexander 2013; Dicks 2008; Jones and Jackson 2014; Rogaly and Qureshi 2013). A local community, felt to be lost in the aftershocks of a steelworks closure, might be felt and imagined as a skin in which individual people were ‘held’ together as a coherent body; the loss of community, a rupture to that skin (Walkerdine 2010). In East London, a place interwoven with threads of deindustrialization, entrenched struggle, and migration, ‘phantasms of whiteness and class loss are traced over’ through collective memory, with ambivalent longing (James 2014, 652). Beyond the neighbourhood, other researchers have focused on more general ‘structures of feeling’ (Williams 1977) at the scale of the nation and beyond, such as ‘postcolonial melancholia’ (Gilroy 2004).

Along this line, mood describes an atmosphere that tunes bodies together, ‘an overall orientation to the world that causes it to come into view in a certain way’ (Felski and Fraiman 2012, vi). Mood is, in the words of Rita Felski and Susan Fraiman, ‘like the weather’, and permeates as ‘shared, collective, and social, shaping our experience of being with others’ (Felski and Fraiman, 2012, v; vii). Mood works as a kind of ‘attunement’ to the social world that filters and sensitizes us to certain modes of being and not others (Heidegger in Felski and Fraiman, 2012, v-vii). Because mood is everywhere, ‘tuning in’ to mood involves absorbing and registering the subtle, often inanimate cues that structure social experience and set up genres of expectation and response (Highmore 2013).
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No mood, as a permeating shared or collective sense, touches subjects and objects equally (Highmore 2013, 8). Mood moves instead in an ‘uneven and asymmetrical’ way around and over different subjects, pulling some in and pushing others out; it ‘calibrates the world—focuses aspects of it, blurs other parts’ (Highmore 2013, 7, 9). If feelings, as embodied, make the surfaces and boundaries between subjects, then mood might be said to organize those subjects, to pick out some and blur others. Another way to say this might be that moods generate what Ahmed terms ‘affect aliens’, or people who are not in on the mood (Ahmed 2008, 11). ‘Contagious’ feelings or a contagious mood can’t be caught by everyone, nor caught in the same way (Ahmed 2008, 11). Sticky, stubborn forms of difference inflect who can catch a mood (or tune into it) and how (Highmore 2013; Tyler and Gill 2013).

Atmospheres may be explicitly political, of course. The UK Home Office’s controversial anti-migrant ‘Go Home’ campaign, for example, aimed to inflame anxiety and ‘to affect social and political relations by working on emotional reactions’ (Jones and Jackson 2014, 3). Community cohesion policies make emotional ploys to compel gestures of love, mixing and good neighbourliness from people marked as other (Fortier 2007; 2010). I argue that their more pervasive work happens through the haptics, poetics and ‘aesthetics’ of culture made and shared. They may also, therefore, emerge in the DIY creations and occasions of homely heritage projects. Mobile, structured, and diffuse, affect ‘saturates’ everyday ways of carrying and performing the body, habits of intimacy and relationship, and political gestures in the present: these ways, habits and gestures register a ‘shared atmosphere’ (Berlant 2011, 16). What’s more, as Berlant puts it, ‘in its patterning’, affect palpates the edges of what’s imaginable in a given present, and demonstrates ‘a theory-in-practice’ of the reasons things happen the way they do.

In his essay about a Detroit auto plant workers’ strike, Jonathan Flatley (2012) asks ‘How A Revolutionary Counter-Mood Is Made’. While the moods of the heritage projects and recovered photographic archives are rarely revolutionary in their orientation – that is, orientated toward something sharp and drastic, like a strike – Flatley’s attention to the style and tone of the materials archived in newsletters that set off and tuned the collectivity into a shared revolutionary mood resonate with my project. He is interested in ‘the scene’ in which ‘variously depressed, stunned, and abused persons come together in solidarity as a newly energetic, hopeful, and demanding collective, which then engages in transformative political action’ (2012, 503). Flatley (2012, 504) argues that the tone of plainspoken, acutely-observed details in stories of injustice – a tactic recommended by Lenin – recounted in the autoworker newsletter ‘works by facilitating a mood-shifting affective attunement’. This tone brings workers in to ‘share an affective state and indeed to become aware of themselves as a collective, and in so doing invoke a counter-mood’ that creates momentum for political action. My interest in counter-
mood is not this moment of action, but the one just before it, in which attunement helps a group ‘to become aware of itself as a collective’. Through convivial sweetness, circulating loss, disciplining fury into fight, and modelling mixed selves (and mixed feelings), the heritage projects also work through a process of aesthetic, poetic and haptic attunement that I argue forges a sense – however brief – of collectivity.

Moods move through labour, but also through materials. Following Heidegger, among others, critics argue that the touches, feel and look of a site or scene shape a shared mood. Mood suffuses the buildings, textures, materials and feel of objects and environments. Affect lingers in the material such that ‘epochs, societies, seasons, couples, places, buildings and much more can be said to be atmospheric, in the sense that they are animated by singular affective qualities’ (Anderson 2009, 79). A mood might shift through attuning to the material suggestion of dimmed lights of a movie theatre or through chairs bolted to the floor in an immigration waiting room (Highmore 2013). Mood, I argue, might also be built up, however, by certain aesthetic choices. Lights, sounds, textures – the whole sensory range and ‘distribution of the sensible’ (Rancière 2004) – might tune a mood. They might make what Ben Highmore refers to ‘the mood cues of social genre’ (2013, 5). This is part of why ‘instead of flowing, a mood lingers, tarries, settles in, accumulates, sticks around’ (Felski and Fraiman 2012, v). Through gathering details, sensory traces and story fragments, Stewart gestures to describe how ‘something throws itself together in a moment as an event and a sensation; something both animated and inhabitable’ (2007, 1 original emphasis). Tracing ordinary affects therefore matters for my research because tracing them allows me to track how a pattern of feeling ‘throws itself together’, how it finds a form, takes shape, becomes.

Pattern, as one of the ‘standbys in empirical research’ (Wetherell 2012, 4), helps to stitch together theory on affect with research into social life, something the theory has perhaps struggled to do (Wetherell 2012, 11; Winant 2015, 113). Rather than the formidable edifice of ‘structure’, pattern evokes habit, the slow accumulation of meaning through repetition. Pattern therefore gets to the sensory homeliness, everyday rhythm and repetition of social life (de Certeau 1984; de Certeau, Giard and Mayol 1998; Fadil and Fernando 2015, 66). Through repetition, ‘affective practices unfurl, become organised, and effloresce with particular rhythms’ (Wetherell 2012, 12). It is through habits and everyday, iterated acts, after all, as Sara Ahmed argues, that emotions mould subjects and collectivities: ‘emotions shape the very surfaces of bodies, which take shape through the repetition of actions over time, as well as through orientations towards and away from others’ (Ahmed 2004, 4). Lauren Berlant refers to the critical practice of ‘tracking patterns’ to describe tuning into everyday aesthetics and ‘following the coming-into-form of activity’ (Berlant 2011, 13). It is in the ‘patterning’ of the affective ‘shared atmosphere’ she
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describes that affect articulates with social and cultural politics. It is in tracing and describing those patterns that critics can get a grip on what might be going on. Further, pattern also came up concretely in the materials of my research: in the familiar, ritual tastes of biscuits; in the patterns in the textiles and garments stitched in the heritage projects; in the rhythms of net curtains and knitted jumpers, windows, ironwork and chimney pots in the recovered photographic archives.

In thinking through affect in this thesis, I turn away from discourse. This is not to overemphasize the visceral and embodied and wholly distance discourse, when it may be that ‘it is the discursive that very frequently makes affect powerful, makes it radical and provides the means for affect to travel’ (Wetherell 2012, 19). I agree that discourse might be a site where affect lodges and clots or picks up speed. Rather than the term discourse, however, I prefer to think in terms of aesthetics, poetics, or haptics, to emphasize the way discourse always arrives and registers through the senses. As I mention in the introduction, drafting off of Kathleen Stewart’s Ordinary Affects, thinking discursively doesn’t always seem to capture the live way power moves. Tuning into affect means tuning into the way affects ‘work not through “meanings” per se, but rather in the way that they pick up density and texture as they move through bodies, dreams, dramas, and social worldings of all kinds’ (Stewart 2007, 3).

Thinking about the material aesthetics of a hand-stitched, collaged garment on a white mannequin or on a live body on a runway, floating through the dark and florid yellow marble of City Hall, for example; registering the haptics of a dirty photograph peeled from a 30-year-old negative and set off online to thousands of screens; tracking a plate of chocolate digestive biscuits, shared among women around a table on a rainy evening in an unheated Victorian building as the night draws in – these moments have a charge. This charge heaves a little against the sensory coolness of discourse. As Susan Fraiman and Rita Felski (2012, vi) put it, ‘there is no moodless or mood-free apprehension of phenomena’. My position therefore owes much to phenomenologies of emotion and mood, of course (Ahmed 2007; Highmore 2013; Flatley 2012). It articulates with power because such poetics, haptics and aesthetics are always political: they map the ‘distribution of the sensible’, as Rancière (2004) puts it, the boundaries of what may register as meaningful.

3.5 Forming, throwing and becoming

In much of the theory on affect, instead of ‘formed’ and familiar objects of social study there is a focus on processes of ‘the becoming, potential and the virtual’ (Wetherell 2012, 3). This premise argues that explanatory scaffolding like ‘neoliberalism’ and categories not only feel inert (Stewart 2007, 1), disguising
their power, but make it all too easy to take these structures as monoliths rather than porous, chimeric, patchy formations on the move. Categories like race or social class, or institutions like public education or museums, might therefore come to seem monolithic and inert. Therefore, this thesis focuses on the processes through which structures or patterns of feeling ‘become’, ‘materialize’ and ‘animate’ social bodies and intimate publics (Butler 1994 no page number). Tracing patterns of feeling matters for my research because tracing them allows me to track how something ‘throws itself together’ (Ingold 2014), how it finds a form, takes shape, becomes. This preference for the unfixed or fluid is also part of Raymond Williams’ definition of ‘structures of feeling’ as ‘social experiences in solution’: that is, feelings still liquid, mobile and even muddy, not yet fully ‘precipitated’ into recognizable forms (Williams 1977, 134). ‘Structures of feeling’ are therefore not still, or at least not always still, but carry in them the emergent possibility of becoming. To study and explore ‘social experiences in solution’ is to try to catch what’s emerging as it emerges (Williams 1977, 134). This next section therefore presents my approach to studying the messy, ephemeral subject of emotion in social life through two methods: participant observation (Ingold 2014; Pink 2009, 2012) which focuses on processes of ‘becoming’, ‘throwing’ and ‘casting’ (Ingold 2010, 95).

Tuning in meant doing participant observation as an immersive following along and doing-with, as Tim Ingold (2014) defines it. Doing-with looks like ‘joining…in the same currents of practical activity, and by learning to attend to things – as would any novice practitioner – in terms of what they afford in the contexts of what has to be done’ (Ingold 2011, 314). Aligned side-by-side, immersed in materials and process, the participant observer can soak up sensory realms, rhythms and patterns, and the gestural, performative ‘repertoires’ (Taylor 2003) of practices. Getting into processes together, ‘this communion of experience establishes a baseline of sociality’ on which talk and other methods depend and build (Ingold 2011, 314). Participant observation immersed me in the materials and sensorium of a particular, local present, slow pins-and-needles attunement. The teacher, artist and archivist Kameelah Rasheed, whose work also influences my take on archives, describes her commitment to ‘an ethics of engagement, where we patiently engage with people in a durational practice of being’ (Rasheed 2017). It was the durational quality of going along that helped to tune me in at all. It helped me to learn something of context, to come alive to the detail of what it’s like here – where here is in time and space, imaginatively and viscerally, where here has a history, where a structure of feeling touches down.

Ingold uses the mood word ‘attunement’ (Flatley 2012; Felski and Fraiman 2012; Highmore 2014) to describe the ‘observational engagement and perceptual attunement that allow the practitioner to follow what is going on, and in turn to respond to it’ (Ingold 2014, 390). Structuring this immersion too early –
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by, say, doing ‘ethnography’, which he glosses as ‘literally writing about the people’ and even ‘on their backs’ – would be stultifying. Formulating one’s object of study in this neat way, ‘to cast encounters as ethnographic’, takes these categories and objects as already formed. As Ingold puts it, writing in this way ‘is to consign the incipient—the about-to-happen in unfolding relationships—to the temporal past of the already over’ (2014, 386). Participant observation, on the other hand, draws the researcher into an ‘as yet unformed world—a world in which things are not ready made but always incipient, on the cusp of continual emergence’ (Ingold 2014, 389). His language resonates, deliberately I think, with the ‘emergence’ of social, cultural and political forms in and through ‘structures of feeling’ that Raymond Williams describes.

In this, participant observation offers a potentially helpful way of researching questions about affect and patterns of feeling in blurry, noisy social life. Ingold wants to unsettle the apparent solidity (what might be archival sedimenting) of concepts, persons, things, by questioning whether they even exist outside of or anterior to the moment of ‘throwing’; ‘casting’ (and ‘sedimenting down’). Ingold writes: ‘for the constituents of this world are not already thrown or cast before they can act or be acted upon. They are in the throwing, in the casting’ (Ingold 2010, 95). Instead of taking meaning as already ‘built in’, as it were, Ingold advocates for a ‘dwelling perspective’ in which meanings are always becoming (Ingold 2000, 153 in Dicks 2014, 270). The gesture denaturalizes what appears solid, a given, like the concept of ‘community’ or ‘race’.

Zora Neale Hurston explains that she feels race as a kind of throwing, too, and being thrown. In her 1928 autobiographical essay, ‘How it feels to be colored me’, recounting what she calls the ‘helter-skelter skirmish that is my life’ as a child in rural ‘oleander’-scented Florida and a woman writer in Harlem Renaissance New York, Hurston explains ‘I do not always feel colored’ (Hurston 1928). Instead, she notes, ‘I feel most colored when I am thrown against a sharp white background’ (Hurston 1928). The American artist Glenn Ligon (b. 1960) stressed her point by stencilling the line in black over and over again on the white wall of a museum (Ligon 1990). Hurston describes the ‘sharp white background’ of an academic institution – for Ligon, the white wall of the museum – where ‘sharp’ registers abrupt contrast, emphasizing both the white ground and the black figure. While being thrown is only one of many startling metaphors Hurston uses in the essay, my point here draws on the way Hurston stresses the historical background of present formations; the way things – like being racialized – become sensible only as they get ‘thrown against’ other things, like whiteness, with historically-accreted power and solidity. Here, I return to Muñoz’s (2006, 680) description of whiteness as an ‘affective gauge’, in which whiteness contrasts and throws forward ‘some forms of emotional countenance and comportment as
good or bad’. As Malcolm James argues, whiteness is ‘traced’ over and reformed through memory practices (2014, 653). Hurston and Ligon’s work emphasize the way both of these norms are made ‘in the throwing’ (Ahmed 2007; Ingold 2010, 95).

3.6 Unsticking habitus

This approach has been critiqued, however, for not adequately accounting for the ‘durability’ of power. The ‘imaginary space of immediate, being-in-the-world, sensory experience that the ethnographer can inhabit, albeit reflexively’ which Sarah Pink and Tim Ingold describe doesn’t address how power sticks around. Power sticks around in how a body inhabits and materializes norms, and thereby keeps everyone in place: it sticks around as habitus (Hurdley and Dicks 2011, 284). For Bourdieu, ‘the habitus – embodied history, internalized as second nature and so forgotten as history – is the active presence of the whole past of which it is the product’ (Bourdieu 1990, 56). Habitus, developed over time, inherited from others and the past, inhabits us, including how we sense and perceive things (Hurdley and Dicks 2011, 284).

If the question to ask of any method is ‘what image does it project of the subject? What has to be included and excluded from such an image for it to hold together?’ (Pelletier 2009, 141), then this critique of the immersion of participant observation is that it projects an image of the subject free of and from history. It is too much in the present. Here, for me, is where theorists of affect and emotion step in, as they work on precisely this problem: how, in ‘coming into form’ (Berlant 2011), some things (Stewart 2007) come to stick, to attach us, to stick to otherwise invisible edges and therein give power to concepts and collectivities (Ahmed 2004). For Sara Ahmed, ‘what moves us, what makes us feel, is also that which holds us in place, or gives us a dwelling place’ (Ahmed 2004, 11). Ingold himself invokes the question, quoting anthropologist Karin Barber: ‘In a world of fluid process, how can emergent forms be made to last? What makes things stick? (Barber, 2007, 25 in Ingold 2010, 100). My answer is that emotions, affects and feelings might be what make some things ‘stick’ (Ahmed 2004, 11). And emergent, sticky forms gather significance through repetition and pattern. The metaphor I am using is not of an abiding, already built structure, but a clot: a coming together, a mass, but one that might dissolve.

While it is important to acknowledge that history persists in the present, therefore, I don’t think this critique undoes the potential for tuning into practices of becoming or ‘throwing’. This approach does challenge habitus as a portable, useful shorthand for how the past patterns and is inherited in the present. Habitus, as I sketch out in the introduction, has been critiqued for its determinism and
foreclosure (Reay 2004; Skeggs 2011). For these critics, it no longer describes the complex, kaleidoscopic ways patterns of feeling might settle into and sediment down in a body, or ‘how affective practices sediment in social formations’ (Reay 2009; Wetherell 2012, 104). For one, while affect might sometimes be ‘the unfolding and reiteration of an unbidden, long-term, embodied habit’, it is not always (Wetherell 2012, 116). Affect and feeling also move in idiosyncratic, odd and new forms. Elsbeth Probyn (2004) unpacks ‘the potentially disruptive quality of emotion’ along this line; Lauren Berlant (2000, 5) describes the mobility of ‘minor’ intimacies that ‘have no designated space’ and instead must ‘push these spaces into being’ (Wetherell 2012, 107). What’s more, habitus theorizes the social world of a particular moment, and therefore might therefore strain to account for the plurality of lived multiculture, intersectional ‘plurality and polyphony’, and diaspora space (Wetherell 2012, 116-119).

For another, I agree with Rancière that with habitus Bourdieu overemphasizes both the obscurity and fatality of repetition as a trap or trapping machine whose mechanism only the sociologist can understand. The obscurity of habitus (the machine of the past that reproduces inequality) then gives the sociologist something to do (pop open the lid and expose it). With others, I track the sense of fatality in habitus to nostalgia for lost moment of political potency on the Left (Pelletier 2009, 10; see also Bonnett 2010; Brown 2003). According to Rancière, ‘there is no “sensible” totality of social relations, as implied in Bourdieu’s notion of “field”, but rather antagonistic ways of crafting and “knowing” realities’ (Pelletier 2009, 142). These antagonistic, crafted realities have specific aesthetic regimes that filter what is understood as speech (a citizen’s protest, a reasoned argument) and what as noise (a scream, a riot).

Habitus conceives of people positioned as working class only as those who are stuck, a critique Skeggs shares with Jacques Rancière. For them, what’s passed on from the past is only imagined as a trap (Skeggs 2011, 501-502, 497). But what seems like a trap might not be. Researchers in Cardiff, for example, suggest that the past immobilizes new migrants living in the city’s southern arc as they ‘take on the habitus, an embodied way of being and doing and thinking, which is perceived by others to be “working class” …even when their own heads are somewhere else’ (Threadgold et al. 2008, 33). Yet immobility – staying in place, ‘keeping close’, and being ‘a proper home bird’ – might not be a trap but way of cherishing relational values, and indeed a tactic to survive precarity, as Chapters 4 and 7 will develop (Mannay 2013, 91; Skeggs 2011; see also Walkerdine, Lucey and Melody 2001). Understanding the lives of people who might be positioned as trapped by habitus instead requires another rubric. It

---
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requires a rubric that tunes into the affective or ‘psychic economy’ (Reay 2005; Skeggs 2010) of how people feel injustice or precarity, how these pasts touch, surge in, prickle and move people, and how their reactions to it might bloom in new repertoires (Bright 2016). Instead, as Margaret Wetherell argues, ‘perhaps it is time now, after a generation of thinking about habitus and structures of feeling, to re-
consider solidifying affective patterns in ways that also focus on sites, scenes, actual practices and contexts of use, and the messiness of social life’ (Wetherell 2012, 119). This thesis posits sites of heritage making and memory practice, scenes of intergenerational pedagogy about conviviality and struggle, and the actual, messy affective practices that come forward in making and imagining community of the past for the political purposes of the present.

This method is therefore not about finding the one reason why a pattern of inequality persists, laid down along historical tracks, or about stripping down to a singular explanatory structure. All of these social history and heritage projects met in shards and slices of time: a few hours episodically in much longer, richer, larger weeks, months and years. As Wetherell explains, ‘figurations of affect have different durations’, from the brief and intense to the slow and subtle; therefore, ‘understanding the chronological patterning of these figurations, along with their sequencing and “parsing”, is crucial’ (Wetherell 2012, 12). The projects also swept through body times and other calendars (Baraitser 2013; 2014; Felski 2000), other thresholds for marking passage through time, such as exams, leaving school, religious fasts and feasts, the rites of adolescence (including choosing whether or not to start to wear a headscarf), disability and illness (Gunaratnam 2014), among others.

These episodes punctuated much larger historical and political sweeps and turns, too: the first effects of austerity measures and budget cuts to core social services, a Diamond Jubilee, the surprise arrival of a Conservative government, the unravelling and repression of the optimism of the Arab Spring, the Syrian civil war and refugee crisis, which rippled into and affected who lived in Cardiff and who passed through the community halls and spaces where this project touched down. This research is therefore composed of shards and fragments. It makes no claims to be comprehensive of the lived experiences of the people who took part in it in different roles and for different durations: nor does it wish to. It is a collection of small moments in an ‘affective hinterland’ which ‘always escapes entire articulation’ (Wetherell 2012, 129).
3.8 Carrying a body, ‘ugly feelings’ and the appetite of whiteness

An approach of participant observation and attunement, and of writing fieldnotes and responses to archives that were full of the senses, necessarily brings in the feelings and affective attachments of the researcher. All methods have their weaknesses, and I did not want to make how feelings registered in me too central a focus in the research. Methods, too, are performative: they make objects and subjects (Pelletier 2009, 141). I approached the methodological dilemma of how to tune into the senses, and to how power moved and skimmed in and through their alluring immediacy, through a return to Sara Ahmed’s theorizing of the stickiness of emotion, and what emotion does. She posits that both the subject and the collective find their form through attachments and responses to ‘objects and others’ (Ahmed 2004b, 10). The ‘I’ of the researcher, then, of my sensory researching self comes into being through this contact, and how it registers. The subject and the collective formed in this way are not neutral, as ‘such objects become sticky, or saturated with affect, as sites of personal and social tension’ (Ahmed 2004, 11). It is in fact moments of ‘personal and social tension’ – what Sianne Ngai (2005) describes as ‘ugly feelings’, and Sara Ahmed (2010) ‘affect aliens’, or people who are not in the mood – that therefore give a sense of affect’s movements and power.

To illustrate what I mean, I want to offer two examples: my pregnant body in the course of two the projects, including Mothers Then and Now, and my experience of secular, liberal whiteness as awkwardness and appetite. The pregnant body, a presence in the latter half of the fieldwork, not only gave everyone an object to talk about (or not): to offer to babysit, to commiserate, to comment ‘you’re carrying so tidy!’, or to avoid, among other responses. It was also a sensory liability – bringing nausea, fatigue, occasionally disabling dizziness, general discomfort to everyday moments – and a kind of emotional liability in the preoccupation with the future and with loss it seemed to stir up, as my own imagined mothering changed my orientation to place and politics. As Yasmin Gunaratnam glosses Hannah Arendt, (2013, 257) pregnancy involves ‘the bodily process of gestation and giving birth to an unknown other and as the opportunity for a new unforeseeable future’. The writing I did about these times together brims with descriptions of how these sensory experiences and feelings touched down. In addition to anticipatory worry, I felt an ongoing sense of loss for both independence and the last gasp of an all-but-invisible, vanishing queerness.

Along this line, ‘carrying’ another body resolved my body into a normative kind of woman, at least apparently, at least for a while. It also shifted the boundaries of groups in each project: in one, I moved...
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from a liminal, in-between figure in an intergenerational mix of mothers and daughters to being located on the side of the mothers. In the other, the pregnancy brought out stories of mothering (‘don’t have six, six is too many!’, or complaints about adult daughters); it created silences around earlier discussions of pain and pressure around not wanting to or being able to be pregnant for various reasons (see Gameiro et al. in review and El Refaie et al. in review for more on this question); it emphasized the way the writing group was an occasion among women, as time apart from other demands and relationships. The shifting temporality of the pregnancy, the feelings that moved around it, brought out how these moments formed and deformed the contours of the group, and the shape of myself in the group.

Where sensory ethnography can sometimes seem naïve to power is in a focus only on moments of empathy or ‘closeness’, when of course an ‘empathetic engagement’ in ‘the production of meaning in participation with [research participants] through a shared activity in a shared place’ (Pink 2011, 271, emphasis in original) also often involves moments of dysphoria, disassociation and distance. Caroline Knowles (2005, 393) argues that the ‘difficult, antagonistic, research relationships’ may be as productive as the ‘empathetic, consensual ones’, if not sometimes more provocative and unsettling. She identifies a risk to the sameness of certain research relationships, arguing that antagonism, as ‘a dynamic between researcher and informant: not a “problem” with the informant’, may be productive (Knowles 2005, 394); difficult, antagonistic relationships produce research encounters that helpfully unsettle the reflexive researcher’s own ‘baggage’. Knowles points, for example, to Yasmin Gunaratnam’s (2003, 55–6) interest in the ‘significance of emotion in (race) research relationships’, particularly the painful, awkward or unpleasant feelings these may stir up. In research on the presence of fear, shame and guilt among social workers in UK, for example, Gunaratnam and Gail Lewis unpack ‘the deep emotionality of racialising practices and discourses for both those racialized as being of colour and for those categorised as “white”’ (Gunaratnam and Lewis 2001, 133). More broadly, for Hannah Jones and Emma Jackson (2014, 2), writing about how emotion moves people and contributes to a sense of ‘cosmopolitan belonging’ (and unbelonging), it is just these ‘uncomfortable’ and ‘unpretty’ emotions that we need to understand in order to understand social life.

In my research, antagonism came up most often in encounters with whiteness. Emotions – particularly, awkwardness and discomfort, tears, guilt, fatigue and a desire to withdraw or not go to meetings or gatherings – appear in my fieldnotes. In writing about white fragility, Robin DiAngelo (2011, 54) describes the ‘display of emotions such as anger, fear, and guilt, and behaviors such as argumentation, silence, and leaving the stress-inducing situation’ as symptomatic responses of ‘white fragility’, or the way
whiteness expects, demands and protects its own comfort. Generally, however, the desire to withdraw from these projects turned up as wish to avoid the long and often wet journey across town to what felt to me to be awkward, sometimes vague encounters in homely spaces (2011, 56). In addition to an innate introversion perhaps ill-suited to social research, the ubiquity of this feeling of drag suggests an abiding white fragility.

Regarding another young white American woman involved in one of the projects, for example, I wrote: ‘try to be open, not clammed up, shut up, knowing what to expect. Why does she bother me? I need to let it go, the spoiling effect. …The way it feels good to be the only one in the room, awkward not to be…’ (FN 2014). While there were other white Welsh and English women involved in all three of the projects, her particular white Americanness interpellated me as like her, to my discomfort. Her gaffes made me wince at my own confused equations and associations between the US and the UK, especially race here and race there. The story she told of why she was in Wales, of ‘falling in love with Wales’ embarrassed me for my own ‘naff’ effusiveness, and reminded me of all the feelings I had for my new home that were not love. All of these ‘ugly feelings’ (Ngai 2007) and antagonisms dragged against the only approach that helped, what Malcolm James (2012) describes as ‘clocking time’ – showing up, listening and sharing, joking and playing, working on tasks together, building particular and delicate intimacy over time that included regular moments of discomfort. In their force as negative, ‘ugly’ emotions, however, they oriented me to the significance of emotion in the research process.

In my research, it was the ‘ugly feelings’ (Ngai 2007) – of awkwardness, of dragging fatigue, of shame – that first brought my attention to affect in the context of the research. The ‘ugly feelings’ drew my attention to moments where at first it seemed like nothing was happening (my research wasn’t going anywhere, it was full of banal ‘busy nothings’, it was unethical voyeurism, everyone including me was irritating and irritated with it, the spaces felt shabby, etc.), but which were in fact some of the key places power was making itself felt. In fact, the moments of ‘ugly feelings’ became useful indicators of the kinds of affective pressure and labours that wound through the occasion of making (and unmaking) community and imagining community past.

It was also, however, through tracing my attraction to certain kinds of objects in my fieldnotes, analysis and related writing that I could occasionally pick out the other, and perhaps more productive, ways that power made itself felt. I noticed my pleasure in the photographs of interracial ‘haptic kinship’ (Campt 2012) in the documentary photographs of Hardy, Richardson, the Campbell brothers, and Jon Pountney,
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for example, and thought about Coco Fusco’s observation that ‘photography renders and delivers interracial encounters that might be dangerous, forbidden, or unattainable as safe and consumable experiences’ (Fusco 2003, 20). Whiteness, of course, sometimes works most potently through desire and appetite, because its power means that it gets what it likes (see also hooks 1992). A shorthand for this insight would be that if I liked it, it was probably problematic, if not inflected with assumptions that were deeply racist in ways that were not yet clear to me. Tracking lines and objects of desire in the research process therefore unsettled the idea that the good was an object of any kind of consensus. Together with the moments of ‘ugly feelings’, I do not read these as (or at least, as only or most interestingly) expressive of a psychoanalytic narrative of repression and projection (see Billig 1999 in/and Wetherell 2012, 130 for critique); nor do I want to centre with this account the development of my researcher-self, although these moments were part of that process, too. Instead, I bring up my feelings as methodological instruments that point back to the social, dynamic movements of affect and feeling that were busy forming both collectivities and subjectivities, including me, in discomfitting ways. As Anoop Nayak puts it, moments that register the weight or pressure of race. What these daily events and small acts achieve is that they bring the silent, immanent markers of race into emergence (Nayak 2010 in Nayak 2011, 554).

3.9 Material patterns gesture to patterns of feeling: thinking through archives

If participant observation is about ‘doing with’, then what we did together in these projects was make things: making oral histories, recovering and curating new archives, making new, reclaimed media out of archives, making scrapbooks, making websites, making films, making garments, making stories and poems, making songs, making events and occasions for being together. How, then, is a researcher to approach this heterogeneous profusion of objects and moments, materials and occasions, and trace patterns there? What kind of thing, after all, is a piece of wax print fabric brought back from Ghana to Cardiff and donated by someone’s mother, cut up and stitched into a series of garments by a young person new to patterning and stitching, displayed on a mannequin and modelled in a photoshoot, only to appear in the local paper in honour of International Women’s Day? What about a photograph of a protest, taken in the late 1960s, stashed in a local library basement, exhumed by a young artist fascinated by the local past, and recirculated online? How do such objects move – in its making, for the maker, in its circulation and reception, gathering and dissolving plural, contentious meanings – and come to matter, if at all (Edwards 2010; Miller 1998)?

My answer invokes a perhaps unexpected precedent in materialist photography and postcolonial scholars on the archive. The ‘material turn’ in photography scholarship has taken up how photographs are
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‘socially produced material objects with histories, rather than abstracted, decontextualized images’ (Edwards 2002 in Hurdley 2007, 356; Edwards 2012). Elizabeth Edwards recommends studying collections of photographs as ‘material performances that enact a complex range of historiographical desires’ (Edwards 2009, 131) in their form, arrangement, and circulation. Studying ‘the more mundane sensual and material qualities of the object’, such as texture, frame, weight, provenance, etc., can open up ways into the ‘desires’ (or structures of feeling) that animate their use (Edwards 2009, 136). This involves tracing how photographs ‘matter’ rather than how they signify or mean (Miller 1998 in Edwards 2009, 136; Miller 2010).

These scholars all argue for attention to the physical structures and organising principles of archives as evidence of where pattern touches down. In particular, this scholarship helps to address the problems of miscellany, profusion and heterogeneity – qualities my miscellaneous body of research materials, which included film clips and drawings, maps and photographs, fashion shows and readings, shared. While the massive abundance of an archive presents challenges, ‘heterogeneity is both the problem and the answer’, as ‘what is of significance are the shapes, forms, relations and structures of this body of material’ (Moretti 2005, 4 in Edwards 2009, 135). Instead of looking at snapshots as art or for their idiosyncratic content, for example, Geoffrey Batchen argues for thinking about how the vast mass of snapshots, in their ‘determined banality’, get made, handled, shared, and used (Batchen 2008, 124). This involves sifting for patterns, for the contours of form. Along similar lines, postcolonial historian Ann Laura Stoler argues for reading not ‘against the grain’ of archives (for the stray trace or subaltern silence) but with the grain: reading for the operative, shaping desire and mechanisms of the material. Archives should therefore not be handled not as ‘sources’ of content, but instead as ‘process[es]’, as ‘epistemological experiments’ in creating order (Stoler 2002, 87).

These scholars have argued for a direct relationship between cultural heritage collections, archives, and other constellations and collections of memorabilia, and imagined community: as Gillian Rose (2000, 555) puts it, ‘the production, circulation and consumption’ of such objects ‘produce and reproduce the imagined geographies of the social group or institution for which they were made’. The archival objects that matter are not only the singular, iconic ones, but also all of the profuse and random material, ‘the dirty, documentary, and didactic images’ such as snapshots, which are not often included because they are too many, too repetitive and too banal (Schwartz 2015, 29). These archives work ‘as a form of affective glue, bringing visual coherence to the idea of nation’ and other subjects (Schwartz 2015, 25). They give a feel for the edges of that imagined community, freighting certain ideals (and abject others).
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with affective intensity. This assemblage of objects resonates with something like Barthes’ ‘punctum’: ‘punctuated, sometimes even speckled with these sensitive points’ (Barthes 1961; Brown and Phu 2014). As collections of many photographs, but also of garments, oral histories, text and other media and materials, the archives of this thesis also work as ‘affective glue’ to stick together or ‘cohere’ a vision of local heritage, community and past place.

While archives have been a central tool of colonial empire and the state to form ‘images and imaginings’ of colonial spaces and relationships and to create the ‘imagined community’ of the nation (Stoler 2008; 2010; Said 1994, 7 in Schwartz 2015, 20, 24), the DIY counter-archives treated in this thesis are of a different kind. In their organic disorder, they are hardly the ‘arche’ of power Derrida seemed to have in mind in ‘Archive Fever’ (Steedman 2001, 1162). Derrida (1995) argues that the ‘arkhe’ of archive describes both the ordering of beginnings or origins (‘the order of the commencement’) into a form of power that commands and compels (‘the order of the commandment’) (Derrida 1995, 9). This is the colonial archive that organizes photographs of ‘primitive’ ethnic people, or the police archive of photographs of criminal types, for example (Pinney and Peterson 2003; Sekula, 1986). Yet, like historians Carolyn Steedman and Thomas Osborne, I disagree that the organizing principle of a concrete, material archive is an inscription and embodiment of ‘all the ways and means of state power’ (Steedman 2001, 1162).

Actual archives’ banal, anarchically profuse materiality operates quite differently. Archives, Steedman argues, ‘hold everything in medias res, the account caught halfway through, most of it missing, with no end ever in sight’ (Steedman 2001, 1175). In addition to the partial and half-finished, the logic of the modern archive, as Thomas Osborne (1999) argues, is ‘ordinariness’. This argument follows Foucault, who explains that archives are not ‘empirical’ but ‘functional’: ‘expressive of the historical a priori of thought in a culture’ (Foucault, 1972, 129 in Osborne 1999, 53): an archive orders not according to official teleology but follows (and diagnoses) what is imaginable, according to what Rancière (2004) might call the ‘partition of the sensible’ of a given present. As such, the archive’s interest in the everyday object and detail ‘reveals a style of memory’ (Osborne 1999, 59) that locates history’s significance in the ordinary.

Along this line, how objects matter connects to their materials (whether red spray paint and a heart stencil on an inexpensive white cotton tee-shirt, or a digital movie shot in an early spring twilight out in the streets and public open spaces around where the Docks used to be, now lit up with restaurants and
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bars). Therefore, the process of analysis I use ‘follows the materials’ (Ingold 2010) – such as wax print textile, or a kind of black and white film, or a picture on social media – in order to parse how they matter to and move publics in different forms. What I want to argue is not that ‘making things is therefore making knowledge’ (Marchand 2010, 5118 in Pink 2012, 21), or at least not only knowledge. The rich affordances of made things, of material produced through collaboration – the rhythm buildings on a street, how a green velour dress or a black and white photograph or a song feel, look, sound and move people – also pattern shared feelings and tune moods. While some multimodal researchers argue that distinct mediums each offer a preferred palette of modalities such as light and shadow in photography (Dicks, Soyinka and Coffey 2006; Hurdley 2007; Hurdley and Dicks 2011), others insist that any medium affords a profusion of sensory qualities (Edwards 2008; 2009; 2012; Pink 2012). A photograph, for example, might have qualities of light and shadow, but it also offers up rhythmic, haptic, and sculptural qualities, whether on someone’s phone screen at night, compiled in a polished book, abandoned in a cupboard or folded in acid-free paper in a sophisticated national archive (Edwards 2008; 2009). Indeed, objects may engage with senses that seem utterly slant: a photograph of an ice cream truck, for example, on Cardiff before Cardiff, set off a torrent of taste and scent memories.

I take the media and objects produced through these heritage projects as contingent, situated, collaborative, sometimes failures sticky with a variety of meanings. This centres the act of making in the projects as a serious form of making culture. The openness of these methods may also draft off the fluidity of practices of making, and how form comes into being through the process of working with materials (Ingold 2010). Arts-based methods, as education researcher Eliot Eisner argues, ‘capitalize on the emotions and use them to make vivid what has been obscured by the habits of ordinary life’ (Eisner 2006, 11). The new media created as part of the projects may be: ‘created with particular purposes or uses in mind’ but ‘they are commonly adopted and used in unanticipated ways – reinvented, reconfigured, sabotaged, adapted, hacked, ignored’ (Lievrouw and Livingstone, 2006, 5 in Myers and Thornham 2012, 228-229). They therefore actively propel what heritage critic Ralph Samuel describes as the ‘whole series of innovations’ (Samuel 1994, 303) that cascade through any act of conservation or preservation. In considering them as part of ‘the heritage’, too, I respond to a call by Stuart Hall to include the dynamism of contemporary making and grassroots archives – art, culture, music, dance, film, exhibitions – in the broader project of ‘heritage’ (Hall 2005).

The analysis process involved 1) adapted logbooks that loosely coded objects for subject, aesthetic/poetic/haptic qualities, and punctum; 2) creative writing methods drafted from collaborative work in one of the heritage projects to reflect on and capture senses and moods; 3) textual analysis of fieldnotes, interviews, oral histories, and film transcripts; 4) gathering and mapping data visually on walks and during the projects through photographs and drawings.
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Arts-based research methods always bring with them problems around interpretation, ownership, and the kind of knowing they might hold. There is a tendency in some research studies involving young people’s ‘creative’ participation, for example, to take media produced in the projects as loaded up with clear meanings by deliberate, creative agents (Buckingham 2009, 635 in Myers and Thornham 2012, 229; See Piper and Frankham 2007 for a survey and critique). A video, painting or garment elicited and constructed as part of a project gets taken as a concrete message from a maker who made careful and effective choices; this message delivers itself neatly to an audience, and intelligibly to the researcher. Media and objects produced by participants become levers to open up how young people feel, act or think (Buckingham 2009, 635; Myers and Thornham 2012, 229). Instead, for me, these productions are much closer, in fact, to Taylor’s invocation of the repertoire. For Taylor, ‘the repertoire requires presence: people participate in the production and reproduction of knowledge by “being there,” being a part of the transmission. …The repertoire both keeps and transforms choreographies of meaning’ (Taylor 2003, 20). As practices, by making things in the heritage projects, the people taking part actively ‘keep and transform choreographies of meaning’.

3.10 ‘Small objects’ and some limitations

All this materiality and thingness of things, carries poetics and haptics, lives: these sensory material lives reflect and cathect public feeling. These objects evince ‘affect’s activity’, which ‘saturates the corporeal, intimate and political performances of adjustment that make a shared atmosphere something palpable and, in its patterning, releases to view a poetics, a theory-in-practice of how a world works’ (Berlant 2011, 16). But how can I say that the phenomena of patterns of feeling – and sticky, fraught formations of imagined community – come forward in these local social history projects, and the things and media made in them, and not better somewhere else? After all, in the scheme of things, these objects barely ripple the surface of popular and mainstream culture that churned through the years I followed these projects. How do such small objects articulate with social and cultural politics? As Berlant unpacks, ‘how can it be said that aesthetically mediated affective responses exemplify a shared historical sense?’ (Berlant 2011, 3) – a sense of the meaningful, collective past, rather than something fragmented and diffuse?

Some might object that I am, as Lauren Berlant puts it, making ‘big claims on the backs of small objects’ (Berlant 2011, 11) such as poems, stories, films, political occasions, and other traces of everyday gestures. For Berlant, these ‘small objects’ hold in them indicators of much broader and more popular ‘aesthetically mediated affective responses’ (2008, 3) to the conditions of the present. Berlant chooses poems, films, stories, and other moments of social life framed and fragmented, to make arguments for a
broad national ‘historic sensorium’. While my objects are different – more homemade, more performative – my method is similar: ‘to read patterns of adjustment in specific aesthetic and social contexts to derive what’s collective about specific modes of sensual activity toward and beyond survival’ (Berlant 2011, 9). Like Berlant, in the profusion of immersion, I am reading for ‘patterns of adjustment in specific aesthetic and social contexts’. The aesthetic context is the profusion of media and made culture in the projects. The social context is the ‘third space’ (Bhabha 1994; Soja 1996) or ‘stage’ of the heritage project nested within the broader context of the city’s present unruly, uneven and haunted diaspora space (Gordon 2011; Brah 1994).

The heritage projects and recovered archives make good (if small) examples because the heritage projects present moments of community on stage, in ‘drag’, self-conscious of their own telling and curation, as argued in the previous chapter. Staged in a ‘third space’ – the community room, the local exhibition, the local media and social media – people form community (and imagined community) by making things and forming relationships even as they are hypothesizing about community's origins, qualities and demise. The forms they perform, the patterns in these forms, tell a story about the messy, incoherent but forcible character of ‘community’ and the good subject in community as an imagination. This is taking the people taking part seriously as makers of objects that mean and matter (at least for a moment) even as that meaning and mattering might be rough, blurry, or frail. I interpret ‘specific modes of sensual activity toward and beyond survival’ (Berlant 2011, 9) to include the emotional attunements and labours of feeling invoked and set off in these projects. These labours might be understood as ‘toward and beyond survival’ in their political orientation toward the presence of the past in the future.

3.11 Conclusion

In the photographs of *Hiraeth Rhondda*, the cheery photographs of children playing jangle with the violence of Enoch Powell’s three-piece suited body: but the protest photograph suggests, in a breath, a hint that divisions that feel natural are not natural after all. The lambent black-and-white ‘once upon a time’ quality of the photographs offer a mythology of community life that also holds some surprises. They tune a local mood, but tune it to a modulated, subtle counter-narrative of Wales’s long history of struggle.

This chapter has outlined how the study of public patterns of feeling matters to understand the way patterns of inequality in the past resonate and retrench in the present. While emotion and affect might escape more concrete methodologies, understanding how they form subjectivities and collectivities,
move publics, figure imagined community in a context of complex histories of violence and struggle is necessary to answer questions about the politics of the present. From here, this thesis traces the formations of the present – and future – as both are built out of the imagined past. The imagined past, mobilized to contrast with the present, offers up dreamy, utopic models of Golden Eras (James 2014, 655-656), dystopic reminders of failures and damage, and embodied memories of how things used to be now blurred by the slow shift of habit and wear of time on a place. The formation of imagined community of the present, its apparently natural and normative boundaries, categories and exclusions, happens at least in part through affect and feeling.

This critique is useful to people working on ‘challenging history’, on community art and heritage projects of all kinds that are motivated by an ethics of inclusion and remediating past harms. It is useful as a meta-analysis of the ‘good’ feelings and desires which animated and moved the projects along and forward: that is, the critique explores how power operates through and along these hegemonic desire lines, which bear force because white middle class liberal desires magnetize power whatever their intentions. These desires include a desire for good intergenerational contact, for celebratory, visible, public mixing of different bodies (especially Muslim bodies), for aspirational, mobile, future-oriented young women, for secular ‘good’ cultural reproduction, the right kind of heritage.

In what follows in this thesis, I argue for four patterns of feeling as tactics: ‘shared sweets’ that make homeplace, anger disciplined into fight, loss and mourning, and modelling hope. ‘Shar[ing] sweets’ and labouring to create and share sweet feelings through occasions of convivial mixing, shared ‘homeplace’, and community, help people heal from violence (hooks 1992; Anim-Addo 2014), learn radical histories, and knit people together across differences. ‘Orchestrating the furies’ (Lorde 1981), and turning hurt and anger into forms of fight and struggle, reflect a long if ambivalent tradition in Cardiff of the tactic of the ‘quiet riot’ (Mirza 2009; 2015). Mourning lost places, livelihoods and feelings of kinship – and circulating these losses – generate a leaky, excessive loss that refuses to forget the dispossessions of the past that continue to set inequalities in the present. In the landscape of the Docks, ‘[h]idden in ruins are forgotten forms of collectivity and solidarity, lost skills, ways of behaving and feeling, traces of arcane language, and neglected historical and contemporary forms of social enterprise’ (Edensor 2005, 166-167 in Bright 2012, 319). Finally, young people navigate pressure to model the right kind of hopeful futurity and fashion selves that cut and mix ‘a bit of the other’ as a brand; their modelling reaches for an escape even as it generates ‘affect aliens’ who are ‘not in the mood’ (Ahmed 2014) for an ugly future, and insist on relationships, piety, and ‘staying’ as forms of resistance to neoliberal pressures.
Chapter 4: ‘Shared sweets’, shared labour: Caring, mothering, mixing, and other labours

4.1 Introduction

What’s in a plate of biscuits, passed around a group on a rainy Sunday afternoon? What is it, as Valerie Walkerdine asks (2010, 91), that ‘makes a community stick together’? One artwork of Cardiff-based artist and activist Rabab Ghazoul entitled ‘Baking for the Neighbours’ (Ghazoul, undated) addresses these questions in a tactile way. The text accompanying the piece reads, ‘On a long busy street, it can be tricky to build a sense of community’. In the artwork, Ghazoul made trays of sticky-sweet baklawa and gave them away to neighbours on her street in Cardiff. Over five days, she delivered the baklawa as gifts to all of the other 231 households in her street. In one of the photographs, in front of cosily jumbled kitchen shelves, the artist, face out of the frame, holds a tray of small, golden squares of pastry in her arms. In this work, gifts of shared sweets ‘stick’ the 231 households on her street together for a moment through exchange. ‘Baking for the neighbours’, like this chapter, explores the ties between gifts of shared sweets and living together with difference that might be called conviviality, a feeling or ‘a sense of community’.

Mary, a lifelong resident of Butetown in her 80s, describes a similarly visceral relationship between sharing ‘sweets’ and a sense of community, a convivial living together. In her interview, framed by colourful children’s history books and posters for Black History Month, Mary sat across from Rasha, a fresh-faced student. Rasha began by asking Mary about her childhood, and Mary responded:

Well, growing up in Butetown was really magical. And I am not exaggerating. You couldn’t have had better friends. [...] Most of our fathers were seamen. And if one of them came home from sea with sweets, or any delicacy, then we shared it between our neighbours. If someone in your house was taken ill, you knew that someone would come and help. You couldn’t wish for better friends, and I’m still friends with the people I grew up with when I was a child. (Mary, 80s, education)

In her telling, Mary’s childhood owes its feeling of magic to friendships and neighbourly kinship. This neighbourly closeness was forged through sharing both the ‘sweets, or any delicacy’ of their lives and ‘help’ during inevitable hardships, like illness. In the Butetown of her childhood, acts of care and sharing bring a magical quality. Sharing sweets, and sharing the burden of everyday struggle, build relationships – neighbourly relationships, friendships, kinships – that last a lifetime. They represent a strategy for collective survival in hard times, but also of pleasure, sweetness.

Community in these projects comes redolent with feeling. They describe a sense of community, a community feeling, or community spirit. Here by community I mean both a convivial living together in
difference, close to what Valerie Walkerdine (2010, 95) calls ‘communal beingness’, and a collectivity united in struggle (Dicks 2000; Wise and Noble 2016). Nura, a youth worker in her 50s who had grown up in and moved back to Butetown to raise her own children, described community as suffused with loss: ‘I think there was more of community when I was younger. Um, everybody mixed more. Now it seems to be... there’s little groups. But if something happens to you, there’s still a big community. So, I think it kind of depends’. The community of the past is felt to be ‘vibrant’, full of ‘spirit’, even in ‘hardship’, as Alun Gibbard puts it in the introduction to Cardiff before Cardiff (2012, no pn). As social worker Halima put it of the neighbourhood of her childhood, ‘And I remember that everybody loved each other? And [...] we didn’t even know, like what background people were from or anything, we just mingled’. In her telling, around a table of young women, ‘we were a very close-knit community’.

Even as community is a site of longing, love, mingling, and of course other mixed feelings, how affect relates to community has been largely ignored by sociological debates (Walkerdine 2010; Wise and Noble 2016). Even as conviviality has been described as ‘an atmosphere and an affect…related to a sense of becoming’ (Wise and Velayutham 2014, 407-408), how this sense of ‘becoming’ together might be created remains underexplored. Questions of conviviality and community therefore require a turn to patterns of feeling, to ‘how people sharing a locality might be held together, in other words, how communal beingness might work’ (Walkerdine 2010, 95). Further, I argue they require a turn to the emotional and affective labours that go into ‘sticking’ and ‘knitting’ a collectivity together.

Mary’s invocation of the gift of sweets and ‘Baking for the Neighbours’ get at something missing from discussions of community and convivial multiculture: how to make it, and who does that work (Gilroy 2005; see also Noble 2009; 2013; Nowicka and Vertovec 2014). In this chapter, I shift from a focus in recent research on the ordinariness of convivial multiculture, as ‘a social pattern’ of ‘dwell[ing] in close proximity’ (Gilroy 2006, 27), to a focus on how conviviality might be laboured at or worked on. I explore how creating convivial life might demand specific forms of what Nadia Fadil (2011, 91) describes as the ‘affective, material and discursive labours’ of the self: labours of feeling and attention, of bodily habits and comportment, and ways of narrating the self as a part of or alienated from the collective. Creating convivial life demands emotional labour, too, to move others (Hochschild 1983; 2003). These include sharing ‘sweet’ feelings, working on ‘ugly’ (Ngai 2007) or spoiling feelings, tuning shared moods, and moving others. And these labours move unevenly over different bodies.

To dig into these questions, this chapter takes up the oral history interviews young women conducted with older women from neighbourhoods around the Bay as part of Mothers Then and Now and 16-60 A
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*Woman’s Voice.* These interviews offer performative occasions for pedagogy among generations of women, lessons for collectivity in groups whose collectivity is unsettled, perhaps ‘becoming’. In part, they offer a pedagogy for how to make community through affective and emotional labours. Where Chapter 5 will take up the topic of discrimination and racism, this chapter focuses on how older women answered questions about changes in the locality and in the role of women over their lifetimes. Making community is presented, by some, as the unremarked but nevertheless powerful inheritance left by the ‘matriarchs’ from the area. In this, the speakers celebrate the underplayed but lively contributions of women to collective survival and to what makes the area special. They mark their activities as part of a legacy of Black British women’s ‘real citizenship’, the ‘low-key and slow collective activism of women of colour’ (Mirza and Gunaratnam 2014, 130). The accounts also make an argument for the power of community and the need for convivial labours to make a liveable future. They make an appeal for these labours as a gift, an inheritance and duty of the next generation.

In this chapter, I track three convivial labours as lessons from the intergenerational oral histories. The first, as sketched above, involves sharing ‘sweets’, gifts, burdens of everyday and extraordinary struggle, and with them good feelings, to ‘stick’ community together. The second involves caring for others as matriarchs mothering and ‘(other)mothering’ (Hill Collins 2000, 178 in Anim-Addo 2014, 53). Care and ‘kinkeeping’ (Rosenthal 1985) and kin-work (di Leonardo 1987), often through community work, create radical spaces of sanctuary and counter-politics. The third involves ‘mixing’ and ‘mingling’ across social boundaries, particularly of race and religion.

Finally, however, the chapter unpacks how longing for and love of community, as a lost and longed-for object, also refracts mixed feelings, and might repeat patterns of violence (James 2014). Bad, bitter or ‘ugly feelings’ (Ngai 2007), such as youthful ‘disrespect’ or a sense that ‘home, after all, can be hell’ (Epps, Valens, Johnson González, 2005, 25) might not chime with neighbourly ‘shared sweets’ (Ahmed 2010). What’s more, convivial labours of sharing ‘sweets’, caring, and mixing, are all vulnerable to appropriation by other political projects. They might play into sexist narratives and roles; nourish the desire of liberal whiteness for certain too-sweet forms of diversity; or chime with state and cultural policies that prefer mixing to contestation as part of ‘community cohesion’ (Fortier 2007; 2010). As unspoken gendered, racialized labours, they might complicate critical enthusiasm for the everyday reproduction of convivial multiculture (Gilroy 2005). This chapter therefore takes up the broader problem of whose labour underwrites ‘a sense of community’ and more convivial futures.
4.2 ‘Shared sweets’, shared struggle – labours of conviviality

In the heritage projects themselves, the occasion of being together was often marked by shared sweets of one kind or another: boxes of Cadbury chocolate sweets in crinkly wrappers, packets of McVitie’s digestive biscuits, chocolate and plain, custard creams, chocolate fingers, and mini chip cookies, sometimes even Haribo gummies, among others. Shared sweets marked the everyday rhythms of the heritage projects. The women’s writing group always had a plate of biscuits. In the ritual break from creative writing for teas and coffees, for example, there was an art to remembering how people took their tea or coffee and in making it in just the way they liked. Writing about jittery introductions with the British people they interviewed about class injustice, Bev Skeggs and Vik Loveday (2012, 478) describe being welcomed with ‘the classic traditions of working class affective hospitality – tea, cake and biscuits’. This gesture of hospitality is braided, however. The young women often tore apart cartons chocolates. One whole morning of beginning Arabic in the Severn Community Centre, for example, was devoted to how to use the hospitable phrase *tafadahli*, (please help yourself), demonstrated with biscuits. These shared sweets, the ritual of sharing them, were an unremarkable and unremarked part of the projects, but they bonded the groups together nevertheless.

Shared sweets do more, however. They hold in themselves whole – diasporic, capitalist, uneven, gendered, violent – worlds. Stuart Hall uses sugar to describe ‘the outside history that is inside the history of the English’ (Hall, 1991b, 48-49). Hall explains that when he arrived in Britain in the 1950s he was not migrating but ‘coming home’, because ‘I am the sugar at the bottom of the English cup of tea. I am the sweet tooth, the sugar plantations that rotted generations of English children’s teeth’. The rise of sugar as ‘an everyday staple of European domesticity’, sweetening up ‘those colonial goods (coffee, tea, rum, tobacco and chocolate)’, of course entangles with histories of imperialism and the long ‘wake’ of slavery (Mintz 1997, 360 in Highmore 2011, 8-10; Sharpe 2016). Using sugar as a synecdoche for the Caribbean body and history, he insists on the fundamental, constitutive relationship between England and the Caribbean. Hall lays claim to his part of an ‘English cup of tea’ and Englishness: ‘there is no English history without that other history’ because ‘symbolically, we have been there for centuries’ (Hall, 1991b, 48-49 in Highmore 2011, 8-9). Along a similar line, Charlotte Williams (2003) memoir, crisscrossing Wales, Sudan, Nigeria, and Guyana, takes its title from two evocative materials: *Sugar and Slate*. In one moment, Williams (2003, 181) describes crossing Guyana ‘to Wales, on the west coast of Demerara’ to visit a cousin, driving through burning cane fields and watching ‘the charred ash of sugar cane falling like black snow’. History is ash in the air, sugar in the cup.
In the context of the community spaces of the heritage groups, with their lines of diaspora, the materiality of sugar entangles symbolically and viscerally across the Black Atlantic (Gilroy 1993). Thus, ‘shared sweets’ carry symbolic, visceral and metaphysical meanings. In *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Henri Lefebvre cites that ‘the simplest event – a woman buying a pound of sugar, for example’ is a brief moment from which unspools every social, political and cultural formation – ‘the sum total of capitalist society, the nation and its history’ (Lefebvre 1947). For pound of sugar, then, substitute some Welsh West Indian seaman’s sweets brought home and shared from afar in the 1940s, or a sweet cup of tea and a packet of biscuits in 2013. Or think again of Nadiya Hussein’s elaborate and kitschy cakes on *The Great British Bake-Off*. From them unspools a whole world of relations.

In the women’s groups meeting over biscuits and memories in Cardiff, shared sweets describe a particular ‘grammar’, as Barthes (1961, 20-22) put it, of conviviality and connection. For Barthes, after all, ‘sugar is a time, a category of the world’ and ‘a set of images, dreams, tastes, choices, and values’. More than wordplay, the sensory and the symbolic mix in how a given moment might feel. As Ben Highmore puts it in an essay called ‘Sugar on the move’: ‘we live our metaphorical worlds in intimate and material ways to the point where metaphorical meanings flavour material experience (a sour taste, endlessly pleasurable, will never have the comforting ease of sweetness for a society that equates sweetness with kindness and gentleness)’ (Highmore 2011, 140). Shared sweets, of course, do not have a steady or certain meaning. But I think it would be a mistake to dismiss them, and their importance, to the formation and holding together of these collectivities. The shared ‘sweets, or any delicacy’ Mary describes offer both ‘metaphorical meanings’ and ‘material experience’ that builds a feeling of being together, and knits the collective together in tough times.

Sharing ‘sweets, or any delicacy’ among neighbours cultivates conviviality in part through the relationship of the gift. Echoing Mary Douglas, conviviality researchers Wise and Velayutham argue that ‘social solidarity and gift exchange are intimately related’ as both involve ‘acts of reciprocity and moral obligation’, especially in intercultural spaces (Komter 2005 in Wise and Velayuthum 2014, 418-419). Sharing food – particularly sweet tastes, but anything good – is performative, as it knots people together into relations of mutual care. Mary Douglas explains ‘through inclusive hospitality, community solidarity is both demonstrated and actualized’ (Douglas 1984, 33). In the multilingual, multiethnic social housing of Singapore, Wise and Velayutham (2014, 418) describe the way neighbours would offer gifts of food for Buddhist, Muslim and Hindu holidays – such as pineapple biscuits – that was attentive to religious
taboos, as well as ‘pitch in’ with everyday tasks. The shared sweets offer a promise of care and ‘recognition’ (Wise and Velayutham 2014, 418). They also lend a metaphorical and visceral sweetness to everyday interactions across difference.

Shared sweets and shared gifts support survival outside of formal systems and wages. Recently, researchers into conviviality have charted the tools, labours and orientations that might go into ‘sticking’ people together. They describe convivial labours as ‘tools to move and dwell’ with difference (Illich 2009 [1973], 11 in Back and Sinha 2016, 523). Among them are the ‘bridging and connecting work’ of exchanging gifts and sharing chores, or mixing and moving among languages (Wise and Velayutham 2014, 422-423). Other ‘tools’ have been described as ‘attentiveness’ to others, ‘an ethics of care’, ‘a capacity for worldliness’, ‘an aptitude for connection and building home’ (Back and Sinha 2016, 523-526). Sharing sweets, gifts and good feelings chime with these labours.

Many of the older speakers told younger listeners that a solidarity built on gift-giving had come back to support them. Halima, a social worker in her 40s, described how loyalty to ‘mingled’ friendships earned her loyalty, a first job, and even many years later, help: ‘whenever we need work done on our house, he’s a builder, so he always does bits and bobs for us’. Mary, in her 80s, said of her family and friends in the area, ‘if you went out of the Bay, and there was a problem, you knew that if there were people around who knew you, that they would give you their support’. Youth worker Nura explained, ‘[be]cause of being through the, from the community, which is the best to be in, believe me, you can find somebody’ who can help you. Appreciation of this labour and return might grow on someone. As Annie reported with a laugh, while she ‘used to want to escape from my family when I was little’, now she ‘appreciate[s]’ them:

And it’s great, you know, involving my family in projects, and, things you know, that I know they can do. Because I don’t have to pay them. It’s really good having a big family, because we’re all involved in different things, and when we want things done we just call on each other. You know, because you can.

Family bonds work outside of the wage economy. They extend her reach because they are ‘involved in different things’. They also make it possible to get ‘things done’, because ‘when we want things done we just call on each other’. Together, these examples present an argument for the rewards of the convivial labour of sharing gifts of time and help, because those gifts will be returned to you. Kin and community heal and repair when someone gets sick, when someone dies, when someone needs something – even now, in the more isolated present. Such mutuality is part of what makes this community ‘the best to be in, believe me’.
4.3 Caring for community, creating conviviality

These gifts of shared sweets are affective labours, in part, because they involve working on good feelings of loyalty, care, and pride. Along this line, many of the older women celebrate the legacies of local ‘tough women’ and their care of community. In this narrative, the unremarked but vital ‘matriarchs’ helped build a feeling of community which helped the community to survive. This narrative has a history.

Within Butetown, from the 19th century into the 20th ‘an atmosphere of sociability, trust, and mutual assistance characterized Butetown, largely deriving from the influence of women’ (Gilliat-Ray and Mellor 2010, 471). Often cut off from other family, cut down by systematic discrimination in wages and employment, women held family and neighbourhood together, especially when seafaring men were working at sea (Jordan 2005; Weedon and Jordan 2010). As Mary, in her 80s, explained of her own mother and her mother’s peers:

One of the things I would say about the women whom I grew up with in the Bay, they were tough women. They were very tough women. Because their husbands would be away at sea, and they were left with the children… And I don’t know how some families, where there were a number of children, you know, just how they managed. But a lot of the women went out, they went out scrubbing. I have scrubbed public houses with my mother. They did all sorts of things, you know, for jobs, to get money coming into the house.

Her narrative celebrates the labour of the women in the Bay who held life together. Life was tough, but the women of the area were tough, too. In their roles as wives and mothers, they ‘did all sorts of things’ to help their families survive.

The ‘tough women’ of the area continue to keep the community going in the present. Annie, a community worker in her 50s, took the opportunity of the interview to celebrate the contributions of what she called local ‘matriarchs’. Annie recalled:

Well, I remember when I was growing up, the sort of matriarchs were very, very important. They were the ones who organized the fetes, the festivals, the carnivals, Mardi Gras, or the different types of activities that you know, young people would be involved in. They were very much at the centre of that. … [Now] lot of people in Butetown, especially women, are involved in sort of, community development work, education. Some of them are at the forefront; some of them are working behind the scenes. They are very involved in homework clubs, and um, they do a lot of volunteering with schools. So, they’re very much involved. Maybe people might not know about them. I know about them, because a lot of them are around my, my generation. So, they’re still very much involved. …I’m not saying the men don’t do it either. But a lot of the women are sort of heavily involved in, sort of community-based activities.

For her, the women leading in this ‘community development work’ are ‘sort of matriarchs’, with a motherly authority. She breaks down what they do: they organise ‘the fetes, the festivals, the carnivals,
Mardi Gras’, the festive, intercultural occasions ‘young people would be involved in’, when people in the area to get together. Where others describe the pleasure of ‘joining in’ the festivals, parades, and religious celebrations from Easter to Eid, Annie fills in the background that many were organised by women. In her account, women do both waged and unwaged work in ‘community development [and] education’, some ‘at the forefront, and some…behind the scenes’. They support young people through ‘homework clubs’ and ‘volunteering with schools’; they do work as educators and advocates. While acknowledging the contributions of men, Annie’s speech claims community work as cultural matriarchy. Among other labours, women connected to Butetown organize, celebrate, advocate and educate. These activities may be invisible, and ‘maybe people might not know about them’, but Annie claims their community work as the heritage of Butetown women and as a contribution to be recognized.

Of course, it is important to note here that the category of woman or matriarch is neither settled nor an object of consensus in these groups. The meaning of being a woman gets hammered into shape here through performative storytelling about women. The meaning moulds and remoulds. One of the most heated, contentious writing sessions in the writing group, for example, involved writing about what it meant to be a woman. Poet Samar, a healthcare professional in her 40s, wrote a lithe poem about a vexed and unsteady ‘x’ chromosome, where ‘x’ also stood for the unwritten and unknown. A few other women talked about her frustration with other people’s questions and pressure around not having children.

The homework clubs, youth clubs and school advocacy in Butetown that Annie describes above resonate with other recognized black British feminist praxis. For example, Heidi Safia Mirza and Diane Reay have charted the history of African Caribbean supplementary schools that were part of a grassroots activism and ‘a radical black agency’ that carries forward into the present (Reay and Mirza 1997, 479; Mirza 2009; 2015). Starting in the 1960s, supplementary schools took place ‘in church halls, vacant school rooms, community centres and even the homes of teachers and activists’. From the 1960s, supplementary schools became ‘places where Whiteness is displaced and Blackness becomes the norm, creating a sanctuary for the Black child in which he or she is celebrated and recentred’ (Mirza 2006, 143). Not funded or supported by the state or any other official body, and regarded suspiciously (before being appropriated) as ‘separate, dangerous “Black power” places’ they were designed ‘by and for the Black community’ not only to support Black students’ education, but to open up radical spaces for ‘hope and transcendence’ (Mirza 2006, 141-142). This form of struggle, like bell hooks invocation of ‘homeplace’ (1990), is ‘underpinned by invisible women’s work’ (Mirza 2006, 142).
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Their purpose was to help heal and redress the everyday and pervasive bourgeois white supremacy of mainstream British education. Mirza gathers together these heterogeneous, here-and-there forms of collectivity and affirms them as richly political activism, a ‘quiet riot’:

Black female centred new social movements – like the supplementary school movement – which are steeped in women's transformative acts of commitment, love, and care, constitute a ‘quiet riot’ that is overlooked in masculine theories of social change that privilege violent confrontation on the streets. …Through their everyday activities and campaigning they disrupt the static modernist distinction between the state and the family providing a base for new forms of democratic, multiracial, female centred politics. (Mirza 2015, 5)

The work the ‘matriarchs’ and active women of Butetown do offers just such ‘transformative acts of commitment, love, and care’. Whether the orientation of the homework clubs, festivals, holiday celebrations and other spaces is explicitly radical or even political, these activities re-orient space by creating ‘a context in which whiteness is displaced as central and blackness is seen as normative’ (Reay and Mirza 1997, 477). Their ‘quiet riot’ happens within families and in more public and communal ways, as Annie puts it, ‘some of them are at the forefront; some of them are working behind the scenes’.

Hospitality – teas or coffees sweetened or unsweetened, with a biscuit or two – is part of the sanctuary. So is listening. As one youth worker described:

So, I used to, say sit on my front door in the summer nights, and I’ve had all the kids out there. Sometimes through, the ones who used to be able to stay on the streets, from ten o’clock until two in the morning, making them teas and coffees. And they’d sit there and have an aunt to talk to. (Nura, 50s, youth worker)

Nura takes her role in hosting spaces of sanctuary for young people seriously, to make sure that young people were not out and about on the street ‘on summer nights’, that they’d have ‘an aunt to talk to’.

This sanctuary is part of creating something political: a form of what the Black feminist bell hooks calls ‘homeplace’ (1990, 385). Such safe, protected spaces allow for healing, renewal and political education. In the essay, hooks describes the home of her grandmother as a place of refuge and radical education. For hooks, creating such sanctuaries has been a way black women in the United States ‘have resisted white supremacist domination’ (hooks 1990, 385). Black women ‘expanded’ the role of mother and caregiver ‘in ways that elevated our spirits, that kept us from despair, that taught some of us to be revolutionaries able to struggle for freedom’ (hooks 1990, 385). The scene of her listening to young people on the threshold in the dark, offering time as ‘an aunt to talk to’, offers a ‘homeplace’ off the streets and out of reach of the police or other trouble.

Convivial rituals of care for others and labours to create occasions for being together took many forms.
One woman described ‘making the rice’ every week after church, with the help of her daughters, for her children and multiracial, religiously-diverse grandchildren and great grandchildren. Another talked about making lamb and rice for special occasions for family, another for an event at Refugee Week in June. Another hosted a Halloween party for fifty children, friends and relatives every year. For some, celebration meant music: Annie described putting on the ‘Electric Slide’ because ‘that’s the Bay anthem. Everybody knows it, everybody gets up to it, all your grandmothers go up for the Electric Slide. Even the men do the Electric Slide’. Ilene, an elderly grandmother and church deacon, said that she liked to play reggae, soca and calypso music for family get-togethers ‘in the summertime when the weather’s nice’.

Hosting Mardi Gras to which anyone was welcome, cooking for others, or organizing an intercultural, women-only Global Eid Extravaganza and fundraiser, are labours that take up and create a ““third space” of radical black feminist opposition’ (Mirza, 1997). Even as the term ‘black’ fits and does not fit, the point is that they push back against a prevailing, overwhelming context of whiteness. Such occasions might be imagined as part of ‘a revitalized “theatricality of the public sphere” (Villa, 2001)’ which ‘bring together diverse people through “prosaic joint ventures”’ (Amin 2005, 625 in Nayak 2012, 457). Further, it is important not to obscure the creativity of this work by equating ‘reproductive’ cultural labour with sameness or stasis (Gedalof 2003, 101-107; 2012). Instead, creating these spaces for being together ‘ongoing process of rehearsal and reconstitution’ (Gedalof 2003, 100), mixing and making again. Like Bakhtin’s carnival, the festive occasions of being together, for example, sometimes ‘create[d] a particular intense feeling of immanence and unity – of being part of a historically immortal and uninterrupted process of becoming’ (Robinson 2011b).

4.4 Matriarchs and (other)mothers

Care of community, therefore, the work of the ‘matriarchs’, needs to be understood as a political act. In a ‘braided’ genealogy of Black British feminist history, Joan Anim-Addo (2014) invokes the term ‘(other)mothering’ for this kind of work. The term comes from historical work on African American families’ kinkeeping by Patricia Hill Collins (2000): it refers to how women sutured together families and kinships ripped apart by Atlantic slavery. An (other)mother, according to Collins, helps to care for children who are not her ‘bloodchildren’, and builds ‘complex kinship patterns’ (2000, 178 in Anim-Addo 2014, 53). Anim-Addo ‘braids’ this history across the Atlantic into Black British feminism, arguing that forms of mothering and (other)mothering are part of ‘a politics of potential, pluralistic and democratic community building’ (Anim-Addo 2014, 44). In this community building, she explains, ‘the
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personal—mothering our children—is the political, affording a nurturing of alterity through a politics of care. Such practices offered ‘invaluable support while undermining and resisting a system that waged war on Black kinship or family life’ (Anim-Addo 2014, 53). For Anim-Addo, the work of (other)mothering brings together everyday care of children and young people with a broader political project grounded in radical practice.

In this context, caring and mothering become collective, political acts. For example, Olive Salaman was “known locally as the ‘mother of the Yemenis’” (Aithie 2005, 190 in Gilliat-Ray and Mellor 2010, 470). Brought up in the South Wales Valleys, Salaman, a white Welsh woman, married a Yemeni seafarer, converted to Islam, raised ten children of their own with him and fostered fourteen more, many of whom still live in Cardiff (Gilliat-Ray and Mellor 2010). As ‘the mother of the Yemenis’, this description frames her extended mothering as knitting Cardiff Yemenis into an extended family. Caring through fostering, as a kind of (other)mothering, echoes in another woman’s story. She explained how she started fostering:

Right. My mother became a foster carer…And at the time, she was the only black foster carer in Cardiff, and they were looking for some more carers. So, because of the families we come from, [laughter in the group listening] my mother said, you’re going to be a carer, so I became a carer, me and my sisters. My mother’s [in her 70s], and she’s still a foster carer.

Here care of others is framed as a matrilineal duty and inheritance. She cares as duty to and legacy from her own mother. This work of mothering is explicitly intercultural and explicitly shared around the community. Because she cares for children from a host of different ethnic, linguistic and religious backgrounds to her own, she recruits help from her community of colleagues, neighbours, friends and family, knocking on doors and calling in favours.

In her foster caring, a form of ‘(other)mothering’ (Anim-Addo 2014), she engages in caring as an act of community care and politics. In making a home – even a temporary one – for children of colour she is ‘restaging the meanings of origins, that the work of cultural reproduction is never a simple repetition or replication but is always a creation of something new’ (Tsolidis 2001, 193 in Gedalof, 2003, 106). The reproductive and emotional labours of community and social care are not static, drudging ‘repetition’ of tradition or ritual, as women’s work has often been conceived, but creative acts of forming and reforming community and home, a ‘dynamic or creative generation of difference and becoming’ (Gedalof 2009, 82). Her fostering creates a collective around acts of care: translating and interpreting, taking a young person to worship, cooking them the comforting foods they like and introducing them to new flavours, listening to them. Even as the young people she fosters may be from very different
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backgrounds, from China and Eritrea and England, it is significant to her that she, her mother and her sisters are ‘black’. Her home is a ‘homeplace’ (hooks 1992), a place of sanctuary, respite, regathering.

‘Homeplace’ and ‘(other)mothering’ both have qualities in common with other formations of affective solidarity among working class people. In these class politics, ‘relationality’ and ‘enactment of another way of living has been a key feature of a catalogue of collective actions against precariousness (of one form or another) over a 200-year period’ (Bright 2016, 151). Thus, we might understand ‘homeplace’ not only as a respite from systematic racist violence but from the worst harms of capitalism. As Bright argues, ‘relationality is therefore neoliberalism’s nemesis; that is, it stands utterly and permanently against it as a living possibility of persons being “valued otherwise” than they are in value regimes based on extraction or accrual’ (Bright 2016, 151). This has not been accounted for in Paul Gilroy’s (1987) early genealogy of black British activism as a broad vision for class justice that offers a ‘sophisticated critique of capitalism’ and ‘speaks in a ‘utopian’ mode (Gilroy 1987, 15). Nevertheless, ‘homeplace’ – as care of others, care of community, sanctuary – represents another line in this anti-capitalist mode of imagining living together otherwise.

Care of kin and community was framed, somewhat problematically, as a gendered duty, too. Fatima, 14, a soft-spoken, studious girl who had been born in Somalia and lived in Grangetown, asked Annie, a community worker in her 50s, how the role of and opportunities for women had changed in the area over her lifetime. Annie explained that around the Bay in particular, ‘the role of women, in terms of the nurturing role, I think has extended’. She explained, ‘women of my age, they’re either looking after elderly parents, or they’re supporting their young people’. For her, commitments to caring for others set out the shape of local women’s lives:

**Annie:** And it’s mostly, especially around I would say, our culture, the BME culture, black culture, Asian culture, it’s very much dictated or driven by family responsibilities. And because we don’t necessarily stick our, our family members in a home, you have

**Fatima:** You stay –

**Annie** (cont’d): A duty. You stay with them. And you look after them. And so, you have opportunities, but then, you have decisions to make over, well, ‘shall I just let the state look after my family, or shall I do my best to make sure that I look after them, because I don’t trust the state to be able to look after them in a way that they should be looked after’. Do you see what I mean? So, you know, opportunities are there, but sometimes it’s a bit difficult to access them if you’re a woman. Unless you’re, sort of, really selfish, and think, do you know what, I don’t care about anybody. I’m just going to go for... And most women, I would say, are not like that. (Annie, 50s, community worker)
Caring for kin and community, taking on ‘family responsibilities’, ground Annie’s sense of women’s ‘BME culture, black culture, Asian culture’. The young woman interviewing her interrupts her to agree with her: ‘you stay’. Staying has particular meaning that is not about stasis or being static. The speaker acknowledges the cost of this responsibility to care for kin and community, as it makes opportunities more ‘difficult to access’, but presents no viable alternative, ‘unless you’re, sort of, really selfish, and think, do you know what, I don’t care about anybody’. Indeed, while research emphasizes that these attitudes are not ‘generic…within or across ethnic groups’, care labour does disproportionately fall to women among Caribbean, Pakistani and Somali people across the UK (Kahn, Ahmet and Victor and 2014, 3). Whatever unspoken feelings might have rippled through the interview, the text offers a consensus that to be a good woman and create good community, ‘you stay’, you ‘look after them’.

Convivial community involves care, and both the body that cares and the body that needs care affect what it means to live together. As Yasmin Gunaratnam (2014, 6) outlines, ‘the hardening of material inequalities’ happens through broad patterns of ability and disability, movement and immobility, health and disease, as different bodies move through time and carry the psychic and physical burdens of oppression differently. For those living in a place where more people need looking after, the labour of care might be greater here than in wealthier and healthier areas of the city. As I have outlined elsewhere, dramatic health inequalities carve across Cardiff’s neighbourhoods; these health inequalities pattern women’s everyday experiences. Not only is there strong evidence that ‘class inequality is – literally – marked on the body’ (Bottero 2009, 9), but there is rising, substantial epidemiological evidence that racism marks bodies, too, and makes people sick (Paradies et al. 2015). This happens not only through physical environmental injustice, as in where an incinerator gets built, for example, but also through the just sensible pressures and stresses of everyday structural violence and oppression.

Disability, ill-health, diabetes and literal heart-sickness marked more than one life, and sometimes several, in each of the heritage projects. These conditions ranged from life-threatening illnesses that altered careers and kept people at home for long stretches, to smaller changes like the distracting discomfort of new braces, the sudden sinking dizziness of a fainting spell, the threshold of a pregnancy, the cramped stress of exams, or the dilated time of fasting over the long days of the summer solstice. Youth workers described listening to young people share scars like bullet wounds from the Somali civil war, for example; a few of the young women told stories of depression and cutting themselves. These experiences of the body shift relationships among people in a family and any collectivity, whether in the
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room of the Woman’s Workshop or Butetown History and Arts Centre, or in ‘the community’ more widely imagined. As Yasmin Gunaratnam (2014, 6) explores:

The phenomenological experience of disability and illness, for instance, can fluctuate over a period of years, days or within a matter of hours, rearranging the temporary outlines and intra-actions of identity and experience. Here, matters of tempo and pace—such as somatic changes—come to the fore, adding depth to long-standing feminist concerns about the nature of ‘coeval’ relationships—what it is to live with different others in the same time.

The recognition in the pedagogy of the projects around the importance of ‘shared sweets’, shared hardship, and care of others gets at the gaps and the labour required to ‘live with different others in the same time’. It also represents a tuning into the way power is lived in the body and through the body.

Registering a need for care, and the potency of care to heal, gestures to the way power moves as ‘ordinary affects’ – immanent, dragging, moving bodies (Stewart 2007).

4.5 Mixing and ‘mingling’

The third labour that comes forward in the projects an invocation to ‘mix’ and ‘mingle’ with others. Mixing and mingling involve more than ‘the skilled, collaborative work of “everyday diplomacy”’ (Noble 2013, 181), as other researchers have noted of convivial practices. Warmer than diplomacy, they involve what speakers describe as ‘love’. Halima describes the neighbourhood in Cardiff where she grew up:

Um, my neighbours are um, they’re really nice, a mixture of different people. The majority of people have lived on the street for thirty to forty years, so I knew them when I was a young child. So yeah, and people just tend to be friendly, so most of us know each other… So, my neighbours are a mixture of people of different races, cultures, and everybody seems to get on. … [Growing up] everybody was like brothers and sisters. We all went to each other’s houses. It was just, you just knock on the door, there was no, like, telephoning people or making appointments. And that’s the same kind of conduct I have in my house? I say to people, you’re walking past, you just knock, you don’t need to ring me to make an appointment? Because that’s what I remember, the way I was brought up. ... And I remember that everybody loved each other? And everybody liked each other, and, we didn’t know who people, like we didn’t even know, like what background people were from or anything, we just mingled. Everybody just mingled, regardless of culture, race. (Halima, 40s, social worker)

The speaker, a social worker, talks about how the area used to be thick with pride and warmth. She describes her neighbours as a cosmopolitan ‘mixture of people of different races, cultures’ most of whom she has known for her entire life, and a place of generally friendly bonds, where ‘everybody seems to get on’. As a child, the neighbourhood felt to her like one extended family of brothers and sisters. ‘Background’ didn’t seem to matter; it was something ‘we didn’t even know’. Spatially, her long street of terraced houses didn’t wall people off behind their front doors, but was porous, shared, because you
would ‘just knock’ (see also Walkerdine 2010). The coal lanes behind the rows of houses, the public gardens, and the streets themselves were for her all spaces of mingling, too.

Like the narrative of ‘tough women’ and the ‘sort of matriarchs’ who create a feeling of community in Butetown, nostalgia for a more ‘mixed’ past threads through the accounts. This narrative, in which ‘everybody just got on with each other’, has a mythological quality. While mixed – ‘quintessentially mixed – racially, ethnically and culturally’ (Weedon and Jordan 2000, 175) – is something a subject might be, mixing is also what someone should do. Halima went on in her interview, ‘I had this, I’ve always had this thing about mixing with different people. So, I never just, never just mixed with people from my own kind, I mixed with other girls, so. And whether they were black, white, whatever, whatever color’. For her, mixing with people who are ‘black, white, whatever, whatever color’ is a value and source of pride, something to be cherished and passed on. To take another example, in the book of creative writing, another woman wrote, ‘my friends were Muslim, Catholic, Christian and one Greek Orthodox and another of no discernible religion. I attended all of their religious establishments mostly for special occasions like Easter, Eid, and Christmas midnight mass’ (MOL 2015, 107). She goes on that this mixing contributes to her identity as ‘a bit of this and a bit of that’ and a ‘humanist’ (MOL 2015, 107-108). It is the labour of mixing and ‘mingling’, particularly across ethnic and religious boundaries, that these speakers and writers point out as significant.

The ‘mixed’ past contrasts negatively with a present characterized by what youth worker Nura called ‘individual little groups’, divided along ethnic and religious lines. Halima’s views play into a much broader discourse across Cardiff – and Britain – that “communities” of neighbours [are] a thing of the past’ (Threadgold et al. 2008, 20). Divisions and separations along ethnic and religious lines within the area were, in contrast, generally agreed to be a new problem, a feature of the world outside the sanctuary of the Bay or nearby neighbourhoods. Mary, a generation older than Nura, said that in her childhood and her mother's childhood in Butetown:

We didn’t have any prejudice in the area. … Everybody just got on, ah, with each other...Everybody seemed to be so close together. And we never had this division of, we never referred to people as, ‘He’s a Somali,’ or ‘He’s an Arab,’ ‘He’s a West Indian’. They were either Mr Abdallah, or if they had a nickname, one Somali man ran the milk bar, and we called him ‘Berlin’. Everybody had a name, or they were either your auntie, or your uncle. But there was never this reference to people from, you know, different ethnic groups. Never. And that’s the one thing that really annoys me at the moment, is there’s too much dwelling on where people come from, and not really what people can give. (Mary, 80s, teacher)
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The story that ethnicity and religion have only recently come to matter, and that both now matter too much, ricocheted through all of the projects. This mixing was actively mourned in many interviews as now, in contrast, ‘like maybe the Somalis don’t want to mix with the Arabs. …We never had none of that’ (Nura, 50s). This sense of nostalgia for and loss of a certain kind of community, of course, is not particular to this one part of Cardiff (Threadgold et al. 2008; James 2012, 2014). Mixing and mingling, another kind of loving labour, is offered here as an antidote to the loss of conviviality and closeness in the area.

4.6 Boundaries, politics and mixed feelings

Such emotional labour on the part of minority women produces ‘good’ collective feeling, suggest these accounts; it creates the feeling of convivial community. Through memories that feel almost ‘sedimented down, told already, and solicited again and again’ (Branston 2005, 148), the women interviewed describe the role of women in the warm, almost utopic past as responsible for its feel and success. Through these forms of emotional labour, minority women again find themselves positioned as the boundary-keepers and makers of ‘community’ through their everyday activities and the way they engage in the ‘the physical and cultural work of reproduction’ (Gedalof 2012, 73; Yuval Davis 1997). Care of community not only involves producing respect, to as youth worker Annie advised, ‘observe and listen to your elders’, but learning their history and heritage in order to feel ‘proud of ‘the stock they’ve come from’, as she continues. Doing the labour of making community feeling then becomes framed as the inheritance and duty of young minority women.

The writing and oral histories also acknowledge ambivalent and sometimes hotly negative feelings (of ‘hatred’, for example), however, around convivial labours. Throughout the three heritage projects, there are moments of push back against the gendered structure of these duties. One writer, in a piece called ‘Growing up a Girl’, titled ‘Hooya and Aboyo’, mother and sister in Somali, with frustration: ‘I obeyed and showed respect while my brothers did nothing… My role was to be mum to my two younger siblings. I hated this and asked why they had to be born’ (WOL 2015, 72). In the oral histories, two women also describe the pleasure of escaping chores and duties for a while. Most emphatically, however, a woman described being forced to leave school before high school to care for her younger siblings and to work, which prevented her being a ‘teacher, a police officer’ or a ‘nun’, as she’d dreamed as a child. Later, she lived with her husband’s family where she was expected to stay home: ‘So pretty much I spend my time in home, in a house. I didn’t have much time to enjoy? Since when I came out, I explore a bit more’ (Maria, 40s). The intimacy of a close family and community, of course, can sometimes bring its
own forms of entrapment and violence. At moments, the interviews and writing address the way ‘home, after all, can be hell, anything but a sweet refuge from the trials and tribulations of public life’ (Epps, Valens, Johnson González, 2005, 25). Maria expressed a desire to break with this duty in her advice for young women: ‘I don’t want, because my daughter, she’s a teenager, she want to please everyone else, before her? And I want they please themselves first, be happy with what they are, instead. I want to see them happy and doing something they love’. For this speaker, rather than reproduce the requirement to ‘stay’ and care for others, what matters to her is that ‘they please themselves first’, and [do] ‘something they love’.

Sharing sweets and creating affective connectivity doesn’t guarantee radical politics. Community, after all, is a bargain. It is a bargain in the way what Sara Ahmed calls ‘the promise of happiness’ might be a bargain. The promise of community might be that in exchange for the emotional labours of sharing sweets, caring for others, mixing and mingling, the good community-minded woman will be rewarded with help when she needs it. When illness or disability comes, when she suffers a loss, when something breaks, then the community promise comes through in different forms. Of course, as with all gendered bargains, this promise is contingent. As Sara Ahmed (2010) points out about the bargain with the patriarchy that underwrites ‘the promise of happiness’, some forms of loss or change (an unsanctioned love, being queer, a desire to escape, a depression, for example) might not be considered as part of the community contract. Commenting on Joan Anim-Addo’s (2014) essay on the political force of black activists’ ‘other-mothering’, Yasmin Gunaratnam (2014, 5) includes the caveat: ‘there is nothing inherently liberatory about such practices and structures of kinning or mentorship’. Such practices may just as well create collectivities that aim to conserve power, to perpetuate existing systems (Smith 2012, 317 in Gunaratnam 2014, 5).

Other speakers offer similar injunctions to perform listening, respect and pride – even curiosity, in the form of engagement, interest, or enthusiasm – as ‘good’ feelings that will help soothe divisions. One of the open questions then becomes what to do with bad or ‘ugly’ feelings (Ngai 2007), from bitterness to what speakers call out as youthful ‘disrespect’ and ‘rude[ness]’. Bad feelings like ‘disrespect’ sour the good feeling of mutual respect and solidarity.

Generations have changed. This generation, I think is a more disrespectful generation. More the boys than the girls. Cause the girls seem to be a bit more tolerant. But saying that, I think it also depends on what cultures the girls come from. Because there are some girls, um, that are just really rude [to people] that they think don’t know their family. (Nura, 50s, youth worker)
I can’t generalize, because you can never generalize on anything, but there are lots of children who have no respect for the teachers in their school. ... I’ve noticed that some children, you know, if they’re spoken to, they sort of take umbrage right away, and they are ready to, to answer back. Now, I’m not saying that children never answered back when I was teaching, or when I was in school. But I think with the children today, there’s so many things going on in their lives…” (Mary, 80s, education)

In the curated, performative occasion of listening and respect that is the oral history, the speakers are careful not ‘to generalize’. They direct their critique to other young people. What they do not interrogate is why a young person might ‘answer back’, or ‘take umbrage right away’ at a teacher. As Arlie Hochschild notes of ‘emotion work’, acting with what would be considered ‘right’ feeling ‘can be a form of obeisance to a given ideological stance’, while not acting right ‘a clue to an ideology lapsed or rejected’ (Hochschild 1979, 567). In the polite performative context of the oral histories, these questions about the ‘ugly feeling’ of disrespect do not come up. The young women listening are already called upon by the arrangement of the project to listen in a ‘respectful’ mode: whatever their internal states of feeling, whether irritated or questioning, judgmental or bored, irate or enchanted, they produce a quiet, absorbed listening that performs respect, and with it good femininity that makes good community feeling. The other young people who do not listen to or respect their elders therefore hover outside of this scene.

In other ways, this broad argument about convivial labours of sharing ‘sweets’, caring, and mingling as the necessary labours for a sense of community, and as the inheritance and duty of women in the area, ‘retrace’ and retrench old patterns of violence and exclusion (James 2014, 659). While young women are not exclusively or harshly blamed for the lack of mixing and community feeling, minority women are framed as its natural producers (Yuval-Davis 2012; Gedalof 2009, 2012). The absence of community feeling was in some cases located in the failure of women born outside of the UK to mix and mingle in the same ways they had in the past. In the heritage projects, when asked about how the community has changed since she was a girl, Mary, in her 80s, noted:

When I was growing up, most of the, ah, if you had, a seaman – Muslim men, mainly they were from India, Pakistan, Arabia, Yemen – but they nearly all married local women, because they couldn’t marry an Arab woman because there weren’t any Arab women here. And so, the big change now is that you see more ah, groups marrying into their own ethnic group, whereas when I was growing up you had, well, you could marry anybody from any part of the world. So, I think that, that, that’s a big change, a big difference. The fact that there are men now who can marry someone from their own country. When I was growing up that wasn’t always the case. My husband was, is, from Jamaica. And then my mother’s husband, my father was from Jamaica. And my granddaughter’s courting a Jamaican in London… So, so there has been a change, but the biggest change is that we don’t have so many Welsh or English women marrying foreign men, because the foreign men have now their own women here.
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She locates the change in the community in Muslim women who are not ‘local women’. While earlier generations of Welsh, Irish and English women, married to Somali and Yemeni seafarers for example, they often converted to Islam: Gilliat-Ray and Mellor, in their recent history of the four-generation Yemeni community in Butetown, point to gravestones in the Ely cemetery marked with “the names of Welsh women who had evidently married Muslim seafarers, and adopted new names as a consequence,” (Gilliat-Ray & Mellor 2010, 468; OCA 2016). A bit of graffiti in 1948 read ‘Elsie loves Ahmed’, for example (Little 1948, 9 in Gilliat-Ray and Mellor 2010, 468). The Muslim families of the past were therefore families that were mixed in themselves, and part of a community identity that also imagined itself as ‘quintessentially mixed’ (Weedon and Jordan 2000, 175). The new generations of women migrating to Cardiff get positioned comparatively as ‘their own women’, making borders – in a way, being seen and felt to be ‘owned’ by other collectivities organised not around place or shared history but around nationality, ethnicity, religion, and language. ‘Their own women’ don’t carry on the ‘mixing’ and being ‘mixed’, framed as the inheritance and duty of previous generations of women in Butetown.

The loss of a sense of community gets attributed to many causes, including a vague drift. Annie, a youth worker in her 50s, ascribed it to the older generation ‘seek[ing] out their own’ as they aged: ‘they want their own thing, in their own environment, with their own people’. Another writer seemed to put the blame on recent arrivals from Eastern Europe to Grangetown, across the river from the Docks, from Eastern Europe as ‘a step too far’: ‘it seems the old Grangetown families don’t like the changes – it’s a step too far’ (WOL 2015, 99). Writing about memory practices around a ‘Golden Era’ of community in London’s East End, Malcolm James (2014, 658) describes how ‘nostalgia and xenophobia were widely traced by people of various ethnicities and migratory trajectories’. Another youth worker described how a profusion of new youth clubs meant young people socialized in distinct, separate spaces: ‘I just think everybody either did their own thing, or it just seemed to happen. … And I don’t know if it was encouraged by the adults, or the young people just did it theirselves, because they just had their own group of friends. Not intentionally’ (Nura, 50s, youth worker). The phrases ‘their own’ or ‘their own people’ describe new patterns of collectivity along ethnic lines. This language frames those lines as natural even as it mourns the way those lines now feel more divisive.

Further, these observations register shifts in migration that have changed the constitution of families and gendered patterns of community in around the neighbourhoods of the Bay (Dubuc 2012). Whereas most early migrants to the Docks and the UK generally were men, and men dominated rapid post war migration from the New Commonwealth to the UK, by the late 1960s, more women and children from
the Caribbean and India settled in Britain, to work (Mama 1984; Brah 1996) and to join family (Dubuc 2012, 354). Women’s migration as part of family reunification from Pakistan and Bangladesh has been still more recent, rising in the 1980s, as migration from the Caribbean declined; in Cardiff in particular, thousands of Somali women and their families fleeing the civil war came to live near the settled Somali community around Cardiff’s docks in the 1990s (Save the Children 1994; Runnymede 2012). The now 10,000 Somalis in Cardiff, for example, have a strong and heterogeneous presence in the city, with diasporic links to distinct parts of Somalia (Wightwick 2015), but collectively, also, Welsh Somalis are ‘deprived and getting more so’, and describe pervasive discrimination in employment in particular (Threadgold et al. 2008; Wightwick 2015).

As a result of these broad shifts in migration, more of the women in Butetown and Grangetown, therefore, were born in Somalia, Bangladesh, Pakistan, and Yemen, among many other places (Jivraj 2013). This may have changed family and neighbourhood dynamics in both subtle and dramatic ways (Osman 2016; Davies et al. 2011; Dubuc 2012). In the heritage projects, for example, a young woman described how, while many of her friends had tighter bonds with Somali language and culture because they ‘translated for their mums’, Somali cultural heritage mattered less to her because her mother had been born and grown up in Cardiff. These demographic shifts have changed who lives in and around the docks neighbourhoods, even as new migrants may choose to live outside more historic settlement areas (Jivraj 2013). A woman in a public library commented to me that Butetown was ‘mostly all Somalis now’. Sometimes marked as the cause of lost community, sometimes just marked, the presence of foreign-born Muslim women of colour gets looped in with stories about the loss of convivial feeling and ‘community spirit’ that the speakers also remember and retrace.

The sense of change in community sensibility related to convivial mixing also related to the presence of Muslim women, and to certain styles of bodily comportment, in other ways. When the interviewer asked, ‘Do, did you prefer living in Butetown when you were eighteen, or do you prefer living here now?’, Nura answered carefully, but mapped out changes in Muslim women’s presence and covering in her answer:

I think it’s, um, I think there’s different aspects of it. I think there was more of community when I was younger. Um, everybody mixed more. Now it seems to be…there's little groups. But if something happens to you, there's still a big community. So, I think it kind of depends. In Butetown over the years, things have changed, like um, well, say, there are a lot of Muslims now. Like I come from a Muslim background – I don’t wrap, right? Mainly because we were never, it was never actually a big thing for people to wrap up. That only came, I would say, about the last fifteen, twenty years? The only people you seen in scarves when I was younger, was the older women. The only people you seen in full facial hijabs, full facial clothing, is if you went to London and you
seen the ones who came from Saudi and stuff. The first time I saw somebody with their face fully covered when I was in London, I nearly had heart failure, cause I’d never seen them. And we had a big community of Muslim people here. But there’s a community of all different races.

Nura takes care to answer with nuance, to recognize that there are ‘different aspects to it’. She recognizes a loss ‘of community’ particularly related to less mixing in the present, more ‘little groups’, but also notes that in moments of hardship, the old lines of solidarity are still there, as ‘there’s still a big community’.

Like Mary, she describes changes in the community feeling through changes in the women who live nearby: ‘there are a lot of Muslims now’, and more Muslim women who ‘wrap’. She doesn’t ‘wrap up’ because it wasn’t ‘a big thing’, but rather something new, something which only ‘older women’ did, and ‘the ones who came from Saudi’, in London – women from away, and whose ‘full facial hijab, full facial clothing’ was so shocking to her than when she first saw it she ‘nearly had heart failure’. Through these references she triangulates veiling, and the face-veil in particular, as other, something that shocks her. Her choice of symbol for change has an element of provocation, as most of the young women in the group, including Nura’s interviewer, wore headscarves in different styles. The comment reads as a moment of intergenerational contrast and formation.

While I read a bit of self-mocking in her tone at being so easily shocked, her answer reflects the way women’s comportment matters for mixing, and making community: ‘women, in their “proper” behaviour, their “proper” clothing, embody the line which signifies the collectivity’s boundaries’ (Yuval-Davis 1997, 46). Women at work on and in community knit the collective together and also marked, through their efforts, its sense of itself and its boundaries of belonging (Gedalof 2009; 2011; Mohammad 2005, in Gilliat-Ray & Mellor, 2010, 469). Without making the connection explicit, Nura loosely juxtaposes the loss of community and ‘little groups’ of the present with the presence of more Muslims, and particularly more Muslim women who ‘wrap up’. The ‘little groups’ contrast with a ‘big community of Muslim people’ that was nevertheless distinct because it is also a community ‘of all different races’ who mixed together. Her explanation connects uneasily with government rhetoric that also positions Muslim, migrant women as the source of social problems: rhetoric that argues, for example, that requiring migrant Muslim women to learn fluent English and pass citizenship exams within a few years of arriving in Britain will resolve Britain’s risk of extremist violence (Cameron 2016; Fortier 2016). In a slant way, by expecting certain recognizable kinds of convivial, community labours from all women of colour in the area, ‘the exclusions and historic de-legitimizations enacted in the past were retraced for the present’ (James 2014, 659).
4.7 Conclusion

Bitterness might be sweetness’s other (Barthes 1961, 20-22). Bitterness gets at the sensorium of the complex ‘histories of hurt’ (Ahmed 2007, 135) at stake in these heritage projects. The intersecting lines of this history are some of what Paul Gilroy has called ‘the bitter dynamics of the post-colonial present’ (Gilroy 2005, 39). In a paper on the politics of writing Black History, historian Glenn Jordan cites history’s bitterness, too, through the words of African American historian George Washington Williams (1883). Williams writes of his feelings on reading and writing Black history, ‘the woes of a race and the agonies of centuries seem to crowd upon my soul as a bitter reality. Many pages of this history have been blistered with my tears (Williams 1883, iii in Jordan 2015, 120). Such bitterness over the hurts of the past is not restricted to racial violence, however. In conversations with working class British people about the UK government’s corrosive ‘respect’ policies, Beverley Skeggs notes that ‘discussions were replete with the term “bitter”, used to describe their reactions to injustice when accompanied by moral judgment: “It just makes you bitter, that sort of stuff”; “It makes you bitter when you look back”, “It leaves a bitter taste this sort of stuff”’ (Skeggs and Loveday 2012, 483). Bitterness is an ‘ugly feeling’ (Ngai 2007), one of those affects that sticks to individuals despite being a sticky spore of historical oppression (Skeggs and Loveday 2012, 483). It might be, therefore, that one of the vital aspects of sweetness is that it eases bitterness in a visceral way.

This chapter has argued that conviviality as atmosphere or shared feeling requires uneven affective labour. These labours are sharing sweets, caring and (other)mothering, and mixing. These gestures are political in the way they decentre whiteness in favour of intercultural spaces speakers call ‘mixed’, creating sanctuaries and counter-narratives for young people. They open up moments of intercultural exchange and ‘shared sweets’ that layer into feelings of togetherness and solidarity. The ‘quiet riot’ of matriarchal organising also creates a space and a foundation for fight and struggle. These efforts are part of the history of struggle and of different kinds of fighting for justice in the area I map out further in subsequent chapters. It also connects the survival community work of Butetown to broader, gendered patterns of remembering and emotional labour in other deindustrialized working class communities across Britain (Bright 2012, 2016; Walkerdine 2010, 2015).

This chapter therefore critiques the idea that conviviality arises organically. By this I refer to a conviviality that just seems to happen as people with a profusion of differences go about their lives alongside and among each other. If, as this chapter suggests, the labour of minority ethnic women, including and especially emotional labour, unpaid and underpaid, underwrites convivial community, it challenges the notion that what Paul
Gilroy (2006, 27) calls ‘racial, linguistic and religious particularities’ (and gender is a notable omission here, given the way the reproduction of everyday life is gendered feminine [Gedalof 2009, 2011]) – do not matter so much in a convivial multiculture. Instead, these ‘particularities’, and the way they inherit, embody and reproduce racialized and gendered patterns of labour, matter a great deal in the kind of political possibilities for a more equal future convivial multicultures can afford. This chapter therefore develops recent critical research into the “repertoire[s]” of ways of acting, the ‘tools’ and labours that lend themselves to convivial living with others in contexts of difference and histories of damage (Kendall et al. 2009, 107–8 in Noble 2013, 168; Back and Sinha 2016; Wise and Velayutham 2014).

At the same time, all of these labours seem particularly vulnerable to co-optation. Mixing can repeat and ‘re-trace’ the violent exclusions of the past: as James writes of community projects in East London, through memory practice and shared nostalgia and xenophobia, ‘the incompatibility of the old nation with new people was retraced and maintained across ethnic boundaries’ (James 2014, 659). Indeed, mixing has been particularly vulnerable to co-optation by the state, too. Anne-Marie Fortier (2007; 2010) describes the development in the UK over the past two decades of liberal ‘affective governmentality’ that works on good and bad feelings as markers of good and bad citizenship, and that favours mixing across ethnic groups instead of any form of building collectivity within them. She argues that the Cantle Report of 2001 set off an ‘institutionalisation of “mixing” as a key governing principle for the management of diversity in local communities across the country’ (Fortier 2010, 20). Her critique of ‘community cohesion’ as a form of governmentality reaches into the uneven emotional labour such policies and discourses demand of some subjects more than others. Like Katarzyna Marciniak’s (2006) immigrant who must cool and discipline her rage, the racialized other must labour at caring for others and mixing to earn the status of good citizen subject.

As heritage projects with institutionally set objectives, the convivial moments and labour registered here are also open to co-optation. In places, particularly in the public exhibitions, the projects reproduce problematic forms of ‘good’ heritage and ‘good’ femininity, while perhaps sidestepping more challenging violent local histories and alternative modes of collectivity. The urgent problems facing people in the area – racism, ill health, post-industrial decline, uneven redevelopment (Gonçalvez 2008; Threadgold et al. 2008), neoliberal pressure – have retrenched old inequalities and produced new forms of everyday violence. With such uncertain futures at stake, the Heritage Lottery Fund project aims can feel too ‘sweet’, because ‘good’ cultural heritage emphasizes the pleasures of visible, cheerful diversity, in which people of different generations, ethnicities, religions and backgrounds ‘mix’ together around telling
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stories, making music and fashions or sharing food, for example. In their format and goals, the projects produce forms of ‘good’ femininity and good culture for display: modest but ambitious girls and women, respectful to elders, engaged in care of community as volunteers, aspiring to get out of the area but also loyal to it. Such explicit and unspoken rules about what’s good or proper to these kinds of heritage projects police the boundaries of proper (multi)cultural community and proper femininity.

Following Foucault, I think racism works not in the form of explicit bigotry, which it is easy to pick out and cast out, but in the habits and desires of institutions, where it slips in and perpetuates old ways in new language and new policies. Not being in the mood for too-sweet or celebratory heritage expressed itself in many ways. One girl, reflecting on her mixed Welsh and Caribbean family, said of being Welsh, ‘I absolutely hate it. I just hate the culture, the just… I hate everything about it’ (FN 2014). A too-sweet, celebratory community ignores these other flavours of feeling: hatred, boredom, anger, hostility, a desire to escape your family or area, even nihilism about the past and its relevance to the future, the way hostility spills onto the newest arrivals. Where is the place for a bitter or rotten sense of the past, for an anger that might be, as Audrey Lorde might put it, put to use? How can we draw out the rotten and the bitter in heritage as well as the sweet? The next chapters unpack the politics of some of these ‘ugly feelings’, particularly melancholia and loss, and hurt and fury, in navigating living together in contexts riven by histories of violence.
Chapter 5: ‘Orchestrating the furies’: fights, riots, and feelings

5.1 Introduction

The last chapter focused on the many labours of shared sweets and conviviality – sharing gifts, good feelings and hardship, caring and creating sanctuaries, and mixing with others – which, however ambivalent, were presented as the necessary labours for making convivial community. This next chapter focuses on feelings that are not sweet at all. It traces fury and hurt, upset, fear and other ‘ugly feelings’ (Ngai 2007) churned up by encounters with racism, acute and subtle patterns of violence, and class oppression. Just as shared sweets and other convivial labours are offered as a kind of pedagogy and politics, however, in the performative, connected spaces of the heritage projects, women offer narratives of what to do with all these not-sweet feelings. In particular, they offer tactics for how to turn them into forms of fight: to discipline them as part of broader histories of struggle.

All of the heritage projects were rife with life stories and broader ‘histories that hurt’ (Ahmed 2008: 135). In their own lives, many of the women taking part recounted being physically attacked, spat on in the street, told to ‘go home’, and called the ‘n’ word, ‘black so and so’, or other racial slurs. Some Muslim women describe being bullied and called ‘raghead’ and other kinds of hate speech, forced to remove headscarves and deal with school dinners of pork sausages: ‘You know, like we would say to them, ‘We’re not eating sausages’, and they would say, ‘No, you’re eating them’. Another woman described being sent letters and threats, which she reported to the police, by the White Wolves, a white supremacist organisation.

In addition to attacks, a structural, suffusing racism saturates many people’s experiences of school and work. Annie, in her 50s, explained to a group of listening young women: ‘I’ve had, I’ve had racism where people just call you black something, just because they just want to. And I’ve had experiences of, I suppose, racism when you apply for a job and people say, ‘Oh, the job's gone, really’, when you know it hasn’t. That sort of thing’. Others describe postcode stigma or failure to get a job with a Muslim name, and success with a changed name. They describe therefore using an aunt’s postcode in a different neighbourhood, for example, or changing their names when applying for job (a pattern Heidi Safia Mirza [2006, 144] recalls was necessary over multiple generations in England for her own father and her
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daughter). There are also more subtle encounters with discrimination. In the heritage projects, one mother described leaving school at twelve to work in a chicken factory while her brother went to high school; another described doing cleaning and canteen work in the UK although she had secretarial and clerical training. These bits and pieces refract the ways ‘power, ideology and identity intersect to maintain patterns and processes of inequality and discrimination which both structure and are reflected in black women’s lives’ (Brah and Phoenix 2004 in Mirza 2009, 3). ‘Black’ here of course both fits and doesn’t fit (Gunaratnam 2014), as different people in the groups were marked out and racialized differently. Intersectional discrimination and violence, however, touched most of their lives as a force at once sharp and abstract, acute and pervasive, everywhere and nowhere.

Being subject to all of this of course provokes storms of feelings. The prickling anger, hurts and fatigue this stirs up are part of the history at stake in these heritage projects. In the heritage projects, these feelings come out in a profusion – being ‘hurt’ and ‘upset’ (WOL 2015, 86), incredulous (‘they serious?’), feeling ‘shaken’ (WOL 2015, 52), frustrated, moody, furious, ‘upset and angry’, resigned, determined, irritated, sarcastic, and ‘beside oneself…with fear’, haunted by a ‘residual fear’ (Tiger Bay is my Home 1984), among others. In one poem, observing her son being called names, the poet ends, ‘I felt my heart break into a million pieces’ (WOL 2015, 87). In an oral history, Halima (40s, social worker) remembers, ‘we also experienced a lot of racism so that kind of made us upset and angry what we went through in school’. Elsewhere, other feelings refract the way terror, particularly terror on behalf of beloved others, has been cited as racism’s ‘inaugural experience’ (Gilroy 1993, 73). They refract forms of what Katarzyna Marciniak calls ‘immigrant rage’, for example, which surges through migrant bodies even as it is ‘consistently silenced because its acknowledgment might be threatening to the one who voices it and to the larger cultural apparatus that insists on aliens feeling grateful’ (Marciniak 2006, 34). Her analysis of silenced rage applies just as well to people born in Britain and still marked out as racially, culturally or religiously other.

Feelings claimed in this way pick at the question of who gets to feel, and whose feelings matter, in a context in which whiteness demands its own comfort first. These feelings come forward in a context in which secular, liberal whiteness is ‘a cultural logic that prescribes and regulates’ who may feel what and express what forms of feeling, ‘an affective gauge’ by which to measure ‘some modes of emotional countenance and comportment as good or bad’ (Muñoz 2006, 680). Feelings of hurt, fury and fear are ‘unhappy’, as Sara Ahmed (2010) puts it, in that they disturb or threaten to disturb the consensus around, for example, Wales as ‘A Tolerant Nation?’ (Williams, Evans and O’Leary 2003; 2015), or a heritage
project as a celebration. They include more minor ‘ugly feelings’ (Ngai 2007) like bitterness (Skeggs 2011; Skeggs and Loveday 2012), feeling which attach to the who feel them – as ‘embittered’, say – even as bitterness might be symptomatic of the structures in which subjects find themselves.

This chapter charts some of the ‘bad’ or ‘ugly’ feelings stirred up and moved toward collective struggle. In this context, some forms of bad feeling have their uses. Addressing an audience of feminists in ‘The Uses of Anger’ (1981), as a founding example, Audre Lorde argues for the validity and function of anger as a response to injustice. For Lorde, what moves her activism is ‘anger of exclusion, of unquestioned privilege, of racial distortions, of silence, ill-use, stereotyping, defensiveness, misnaming, betrayal, and co-optation’ (Lorde 1981, 124). She argues that, in fact, her activism is charged by ‘the symphony of anger’. To respond to harms requires reckoning with that anger rather than avoiding or policing it: ‘women responding to racism means women responding to anger’. She explains, ‘And I say symphony rather than cacophony because we have had to learn to orchestrate those furies so that they do not tear us apart. We have had to learn to move through them and use them for strength and force and insight within our daily lives’ (Lorde 1981).

For Lorde, ‘learn[ing] to move through’ those feelings ‘and use them for strength and force and insight’ is a matter of survival and struggle. ‘Moving through’ feelings like anger to put them to use involves a kind of learning to labour to manage and produce ‘emotions in themselves or others’ (Durr and Wingfield 2011, 599; Arlie Hochschild [1983]2003), however. Calling this process labour follows a feminist line to account for historically unwaged and unrecognized tasks; these affective and emotional labours can therefore better be counted, as labours of personal and collective survival and political resistance. This chapter therefore focuses on the forms of affective labour on the self and emotional labour to move others involved in ‘orchestrating the furies’.

The first part of the chapter charts the convergent, heterogeneous, complex histories of struggle here, and the affective and emotional labour that underwrite them. The second part asks, in the performative spaces of the heritage projects, what emotional tactics around struggle people talked about and taught. ‘Orchestrating the furies’ involves labour that is both affective, in its suffusion of the process of becoming a certain kind of just subject (Fadil 2008; 2011; Skeggs 2011; Skeggs and Loveday 2012), and emotional, in its circulation in public and collective contexts and institutions. It involved tuning into a sense of shared experience through shared feeling. Turning unpretty feelings like fury into fight meant knitting lived experience into histories of struggle. People describe tactics of resistance from fights on
the playing field and in the city centre, to fights at school, in the workplace, and in local government, and fights over narrative and history. In everyday encounters, fight involved projecting loyalty, playing tough but untouchable, and ready to fight with your fists and to ‘use your mouth’. In encounters with institutions, it also involved winning white love, earning the affection of allies, pacifying ‘white fragility’ (DiAngelo 2011), and managing a normative, hegemonic imaginary of the good feminine citizen subject. Finally, it involved tactics of venting and escape from all this careful discipline: tricking people, playing with and mixing stereotypes, and escaping to what I am calling ‘dreamplaces’ of solitude and repair in a diaspora space of memory.

5.2 Histories of struggle, riots and ‘quiet riots’

While the legacies of struggle against racism in Cardiff have not been written in full, and are not the focus of this thesis, they do inflect the projects with a specific, charged sense of justice. Even as the riots of 1919 or the post-war displacements might reverberate in the cultural memory of the area as a ‘lingering fear’ (Tiger Bay is my Home 1984), there is also a strong history of protest. A 1930s protest out of Butetown read ‘Black and White Unite You Have the Same Oppressor’. Seafarers like Guyanese Harry O’Connoll drew on Communist networks to organise for equal pay, union representation and employment rights for multi-ethnic sailors and workers (Featherstone 2016, 71-72; Tiger Bay is my Home 1984). Local activism around Butetown and the Docks connected with and was shaped by organising by black British people and people from the then-colonies (R. Ahmed and Mukherjee 2011; Evans 2015a; 2015b; Featherstone 2016; Sherwood 1991). This organising took place in white union halls, in the barracks and mess halls for people in the service in both wars, official complaints, and protests in the streets (Sherwood 1991; Tabli 1994; Weedon and Jordan 2010; Williams 2012). During WWII, seamen, other workers of colour, and many mixed-heritage young people born in Butetown faced discrimination in hiring and racist abuse in the service, to which they fought back with what they described as characteristic Tiger Bay toughness (Weedon and Jordan 2010, 231-237).

Strikes and protests during the war won some seafarers higher wages (Wemyss 2011). As Butetown resident Nora Glasgow Richer recalled of her father, ‘At first they didn’t make good wages: they were working horrible ships for menial money. But after the war, wages got higher and most seamen’s families had reasonably nice homes’ (Jordan 2005, 60). Struggle also took more everyday forms. Yemeni seafarers who worked out of and lived in Cardiff, to take another example, called on diasporic networks for funding, and leaned on local councillors to secure city permission for a mosque and for a Muslim site in Ely cemetery (Mellor and Gilliat-Ray 2013; Gilliat-Ray and Mellor 2010).
Struggle has often had an international cast. African American WWII G.I.s, although segregated and forbidden to go to Butetown, found their way there, and as many as 70 women emigrated to the United States as ‘Tiger Bay Brides’ (Hill-Jackson, Campbell and Campbell 2014; Hill-Jackson 2014; Weedon and Jordan 2010). Post-war Cardiff, unlike Birmingham, Manchester, or other cities in Britain, was not one of the key centres for black or New Commonwealth migration (Evans, 2003). While some workers and migrants made their way to Cardiff over these decades—from Somalia, the Caribbean, and South Asia—the need for workers in major industrial centres like Birmingham and London drew more migrants there (Children, 1994; Runnymede, 2012; Evans, 2003, 27-8). This is not to imply that anti-racist struggle stopped, or that the city was isolated from events around the world. National independence movements in many former British colonies—in Egypt, in Kenya and Tanzania, in Aden, for example; India, and through partition Pakistan and Bangladesh; Somaliland and Somalia in 1960 (Children, 1994) reverberated through Cardiff as well (Runnymede 2012). Connections to diaspora continue to play a part in residents’ relationships to political struggles around the world (Moore and Clifford 2007; Osman 2015).

In the first chapter of the 1982 *The Empire Strikes Back*, the authors track the ‘parallel growth of repressive state structures and new racisms’, both entwined in colonialist history, in Britain in the 1970s. This is the Britain of Enoch Powell, of course. Locally, this time in Cardiff saw organizing on issues from miscarriages of justice and police brutality to oppressive immigration laws and union busting (Campbell and Murrell 2017). The David Thickins photograph of an anti-Powell protest in Merthyr, described in chapter three of this thesis, offers a fragment of this history. The film *Tiger Bay is My Home* (1984) features protesters marching through Cardiff with signs that read ‘Shut up Enokkk’, ‘The Act is Anti-Black’, and ‘Act Now Kill [the] Bill’. In one scene, protesters embark on a symbolic funeral march, lit with torches, carrying a coffin with ‘The Law’/‘Black Trade Unionism’ ‘Freedom of movement’ written on it in pale paint. Amidst photographs of people celebrating at a festival by Keith Robertson, a handmade banner against South African apartheid has been tied to the fence (Robertson in Cardiff before Cardiff 2011-2015).

There were groups for radical organising and education. One woman remembered going as a child to a community centre called the United Idrin of Israel (The United Children of Israel), a Black Power and Rastafarian group, and learning radical Black history and politics. Several of the women in the heritage projects were involved in a racial justice organization called the Cardiff Black Alliance in Butetown which
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met throughout the 1970s and 1980s. This group published a regular newsletter (*Tiger Bay is my Home* 1984). They organized for tenants’ rights, welfare rights, and against over-policing in the area. In particular, the 1980s arrest and trial of Tony Paris and ‘the Cardiff three’, falsely accused of the murder of Lynette White, brought protesters out to the streets to fight against what became ‘one of the UK’s most infamous miscarriages of justice’ (Jackson 2016b). In posts to the Bay Life Archive Facebook page appearing April 7, 2017, July 19, 2017, and on other dates, Simon Campbell and Keith Murrell have posted photographs of crowds at protest marches, speeches and demonstrations over the past thirty years.

These forms of struggle are in dialogue with a broader vernacular of ‘utopian’ ‘black political action’ in the UK, the London forms of which Paul Gilroy unpacks in *There Ain’t No Black in the Union Jack*. This political action offers a ‘sophisticated critique of capitalism’ and ‘speaks in a “utopian” mode to aims beyond only ending racism to broader social and economic justice (Gilroy 1987, 15; for photographs of this time, see Gilroy 2011). The 1930s activism of Harry O’Connell, for example, leveraging Communist groups and rhetoric against the white protectionism of the unions, carries elements of this mix of economic and anti-racist rhetoric (Featherstone 2016). As Brixton-based poet Linton Kwesi Johnson described it, ‘Although our slogan was “black power, people’s power”, we weren’t anti-white. The ideas were working-class solidarity - giving people power over their lives’ (Jaggi 2002). Johnson’s invocation of ‘freedom, equality and justice’ and power in fact echoed in the women’s creative writing project. One woman, for example, connected Welsh struggles with Muslim ethics of justice; another explained, ‘at 18 I discovered politics. Black Power and I began to see why things were the way they were’ (WOL 2015, 76). It is a history that in some cases still needs to be charted and told (Back 2016).

Elsewhere in the UK, of course, the 1980s saw dramatic uprisings, labelled ‘race riots’, in which racially-mixed groups protested widespread unemployment and unjust policing, and clashed violently with police (Gilroy 1987). Of the 1980s Brixton riots, Heidi Safia Mirza mused that ‘the hate was consuming, but this explosion of anger and frustration was also a watershed’ (Mirza 2006, 149). Riots or uprisings made plain the convergence of race and class oppression. In contrast, the story told over and over again in the heritage projects was that unlike London, Bristol, Birmingham, or Bradford, for example, Cardiff doesn’t riot. One afternoon at the writing group, for example, Halima said, ‘Here isn’t like there [America]. It’s not like the big cities. It’s safer. When there were riots in London and Birmingham and all over, especially in the eighties, people came to Cardiff from Westminster to ask why not riots in Cardiff. Why were there not riots in Cardiff?’ Another person went on, ‘we don’t have gangs like they do in London,
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Birmingham, or the States. We don’t have the violence. It’s safer here’. Cardiff itself was imagined as a sanctuary.

There have been some flaring moments, of course, but nothing to inspire official action or redress. In 1981, as these conflicts flared across Britain, in Cardiff, local media coverage noted only ‘a small-scale riot in the area’ in 1981; in 1986, local headlines declared “Police Hurt in the Battle of Butetown . . .”, when a “mob” of black and white youths fought for four hours with police in Loudon Square’ (Cameron 1997, 89), but the scale seems to have been small. Riots, however, can provide ‘a watershed’ for change. In the early 1980s, a local Rastafarian group was working on Council permission to convert industrial warehouses into cooperative workshops, and so didn’t riot (Evans 2003, 28-9). In the context of further uprisings across England in 2001 and 2011, too, Cardiff was presented as a place that didn’t riot, that was ‘safer’ for young people, and more peaceful. Two older women, both of whom had extensive experience in community work and administration, commented wryly, ‘I wish we’d had them. I wish we’d had them, because money poured in’. By keeping quiet, by not rioting, Cardiff may have been safer, but it was also left out of the resources that ‘poured in’ in response to the social problems made visible in the form of violent protest.

The forms of organizing and struggle outlined in this chapter do knit into a history of black British feminist praxis Heidi Safia Mirza calls a ‘quiet riot’. After the ‘riots’ of 2001, a piece in The Guardian drew readers’ attention to the ‘quiet riot’ (Carters 2001 in Mirza 2006, 153) of activism among women of colour in Britain. As part of this ‘quiet riot’, people ‘strategically [used] their social and cultural knowledge drawn from their experience to educate themselves and their children’. As discussed in Chapter 4, Mirza (2006; 2009; 2015) borrows the term ‘quiet riot’ in part to describe the ‘low-key’ ‘real citizenship’ of Black women (Gunaratnam and Mirza 2014, 130). Black Caribbean collectivities have, for example, through ‘Black-led churches, supplementary schools and welfare organizations’, provided an antidote and resource when people were excluded from mainstream institutions (Ray, Hudson and Phillips 2008, 128). The ‘quiet riot’ extends to struggles to ‘fight for’ children at and in mainstream schools and institutions, to fight for access to job training programmes, and indeed design and run such programmes. This slower, more ‘low key’ activism (Gunaratnam and Mirza 2014, 130) has been neglected as a constitutive part of the history of struggle here.

The histories and tactics of struggle that come forward in these heritage projects are also shaped by the histories of Welsh labour solidarity, struggle and strike, even as that struggle entangles with gender and
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race (Virdee 2014; Weedon and Jordan 2010). Elsewhere in South Wales, industrial communities have been framed as the apotheosis of loyal, close community, united in solidarity (Dicks 1999; 2008). Strikes that nearly starved workers and their families out, violent clashes between workers and police from the 19th century through the 1980s, all create a ‘very clear sense of the past as struggle’ (Fentress and Wickham 1992, 115 in Bright 2016, 145). Part of this mythology of the united collective is a culture of working men – white and Welsh, however ‘dirty white’ against the English bourgeoisie (James 2014, 653) – united by toughness, knitted by loyalty (Evans 2003, 15-16; Aaron, Rees, Betts and Vincentelli 2004).

Their struggle for class equality has been written as a thread in a universal struggle (Sparrow 2017). Yet the history of class struggle in Cardiff or in the UK is not exclusively white nor were its victories or tactics universal. In 1931, for example, in response to the Alien’s Order and racist antagonism by the National Union of Seamen, the Coloured Seamen’s Union and the Colonial Defence Association set up by Guyanese seamen Alan Sheppard and Harry O’Connell campaigned for and won equal wages and the restoration of citizenship for some black seafarers (Featherstone 2016; OCA 2016). As Kenneth Trotman, a Cardiff seaman from St Lucia, remembered how these activists ‘fought and they brought in people to talk, holding meetings to try to make something different’ (OCA 2016, 26-27; Tiger Bay is My Home 1984). Satnam Virdee describes a widespread ‘historic amnesia’ about the contributions and conflicts of racialized working class people in England (Virdee 2017, 14-16; Virdee 2014). Such casting misremembers the rich history of labour organizing, strike and struggle by Asian factory workers in the UK (Brah 1996) or by black Welsh union advocates, or the Welsh Committee Against Racialism (1976-1980) or the Wales Anti-Racist Alliance (1991-1995, both at Llyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru/The National Library of Wales). The sense of the past as class struggle in and around Butetown is therefore crisscrossed by racism and other forms of activism for equality.

In the present, the shape of contemporary class struggle has shifted, as working class people (often but not always ‘hyperwhite’ [Tyler 2015]) find themselves figured as abject, worthless, pathological burdens (I. Tyler 2013; K. Tyler 2015; Skeggs 1997; Skeggs and Loveday 2012). They have become the embodiment of ‘familial disorder and dysfunction, dangerous masculinities and dependent, fecund and excessive femininities, of antisocial behaviour, and moral and ecological decay’ (Levitas 1998; Haylett 2001; Morris 1994 in Skeggs and Loveday 2012, 474; Reay et al. 2007, 1049; I. Tyler 2013). Their “dirty whiteness” [is] “contaminated with poverty”’ (Nayak 2006 in K. Tyler 2015, 535). In these spaces, because of ‘the absence of collective forms of expression and action’ such as unions, clubs, and religious groups, both responsibility and ‘despair becom[e] privatised’ (Chakrabortty, 2015; Shildrick &
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MacDonald, 2013 in Byrne, Elliott and Williams 2016, 77). Working class people find themselves left to shout into this noise that they are decent, respectable people (Skeggs and Loveday 2012).

In the heritage projects, many of the older women deflect and transfigure ‘ugly feelings’ about not having enough or struggling, avoiding association with contagious abjection or failure, and instead claim respectability and ordinariness, noting, for example, never having been ‘out of work’. While she left school at 15, for example, youth worker Nura noted, ‘I’ve never been out of work’; Halima noted that while she went into ‘the most lowest course that you can think of’ via further education when she left school at 16, ‘because I didn’t get the right grades, and I didn’t know what I was going to study’, but ‘I’ve worked all my life, since I was sixteen years old’. Being in work is a mark of defensive respectability nevertheless haunted by the spectre of being ‘contaminated with poverty’, and a ‘workless’ working class subjectivity that is ‘beyond the pale’ (Lawler 2012). Narrating a self who is ordinary, hard-working, and respectable protects the subject from the stain of abjection (I. Tyler 2013).

The heritage of struggle in these projects, therefore, needs to be understood in context to be legible as struggle at all. The very status of this history as a history of struggle for justice has been obscured by its intersectionality: the women who took part in the heritage projects are not understood as part of workers’ labour movements and deindustrialized community struggles in Wales, for example, because these histories are implicitly white and male, or black or ‘colonial’ and male (Weedon and Jordan 2010; Virdee 2014; 2017), although they refract the ‘sedimented affect’ of loss traced in those communities. They have not been counted in stories of Black resistance or Muslim struggle in Britain, as activism has often only been heard in the form of violent disturbances on the street and ‘race riots’ in Bradford or Brixton, rather than ‘quiet riots’ of mutual support for collective livelihood (Gilliat-Ray 2013; Mellor and Gilliat-Ray 2015; Mirza 2006; Modood 2010).

Finally, Welsh women of colour have not been understood in relation to the strong history of Welsh women’s organizing and feminism over the centuries, either (Williams 2003). From Chapel charitable work, to supporting the unions in times of crisis, to the anti-nuclear peace camp at Greenham Common, that history has been understood as largely white (Aaron 2011; Aaron, Rees, Betts, Vincentelli 2004; Mannay 2016; Walkerdine 2010). Nor, moreover, have local histories of struggle been included in accounts of black British feminist activism, because these have so often focused on London or in English cities in the midlands. Telling Welsh feminism as white, however, ignores, as Hazel Carby points out, the ‘decade[s] in which black women have been fighting, in the streets, in the schools, through the courts, inside and outside the wage relation’ (Carby 1982, 110). And not only ‘black’ women, but as Neil
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Sinclair (2003: 152) points out, women with family and migration lines across Wales, Britain, Europe and what long-time resident Olwen Watkins called ‘those pink splashes on the map—from India, Malaysia, the British West Indies, China, Arabia, Africa’. They, too, have been ‘fighting’, albeit in unofficial ways. In the heritage projects, older women describe the intricate and powerful feelings that move in and across all this ‘fighting’, and how they might be put to use.

5.3 Feel together, fight together

Moments of feeling together – feeling hurt, feeling angry, feeling afraid – become moments of alignment and attunement (as well as discord and ambivalence). Feeling together is one of the tactics, although not always a sure one, for fighting together. The projects provided significant occasions to name and share feelings stirred up from their experiences of growing up, going to school and to work in a miasma of class oppression, colonial ‘spectres’ (Mirza 2006), and subtle but ubiquitous whiteness. In the creative writing group, in particular, women shared memories of hurt: the humiliation of being forced to remove her headscarf for a school sports day; the trauma of being the first and only black child at an all-white Catholic school, and feeling a mob of children touch and unbraid her hair; the strange ‘shaken’ feeling when, in a familiar place, someone told her father to ‘go home’. This writer described the hurt vividly:

I…was called horrible names which put my confidence right back in deep waters. However, my sister was hit with a hockey stick across the face [and] she ended up in a hospital. We were called all sorts of names. Abusive language was used quite often which put us right back into the black hole. Each time we’ve tried to take a positive step to go outside the front door people made you feel different. This made me feel inadequate and stupid, I found that very upsetting. (WOL 2015, 28-9)
The writer evokes the pain of abuse in evocative terms, as the feeling of a hockey stick across the face, as ‘deep waters’ and ‘the black hole’, and as an affront that happened each and every time she ventured ‘outside the front door’ of her home.

As pedagogy of what racism is, these descriptions identify racism as explicit bigotry and violence. This sometimes brackets off other forms of racism, making them more difficult to name as such. Yet by citing direct verbal and physical attacks and connecting them with hurt feelings and bodies, she names racism’s obviousness in a Britain often reluctant to admit its existence. The focus at first is on documenting and putting down how much and how deeply attacks hurt. However, in most of the interviews and the writing, that hurt then gets transformed into another feeling. As this writing continued, ‘anger and frustration leaves you in despair’, and so instead, she works on them. She closes the short piece: ‘learning from experience believing in your own abilities and never, ever, give up. Appreciate differences and reflect on other peoples’ views, learn to live and let live, to be unique, me’ (WOL 2015, 29). Her writing
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With hurt, another ‘ugly feeling’ provoked by racialized violence was of terror, of ‘a residual fear’ (Tiger Bay is my Home 1984), a fear for others. One day, a week after the attacks at Charlie Hebdo in Paris, Samar spoke up: ‘With this, for the first time, we are thinking about leaving the UK. …For the first time, with everything, I wonder if I can raise my boys here. You just read the comments section in The Guardian, and you wonder, what is this place’ (Fieldnotes 2015). Another participant, with Welsh and Caribbean family, who had been born and brought up in Butetown, responded to her:

I am an older generation … It has changed. When I was a girl, there wasn’t any stop and search – if the police stopped you, they took you. If you were a boy or a man, they beat you up and let you go. My mother used to be beside herself not for me but for my brother, every time he left the house, with fear. This is politically incorrect, but my brother says, “Thank god for the Arabs. It gets them off our backs”. (Iona, 60s, administrator)

Samar and Iona compare experiences of struggling to protect over-policed young men, their sons and brothers, from state, police and mob violence. They share the bitter feeling of Iona’s mother, ‘beside herself … for my brother, every time he left the house, with fear’ that this would be the day the police got him. They share the feeling of fear that alienates Samar from the country that is ostensibly her home – even as a third woman in the group expressed exasperation at the idea that leaving Britain would fix anything. While Cardiff might not riot, Samar also pointed out that ‘there are sectarian differences here that you wouldn’t know about unless you were a part of the community, between different sects and groups in Islam’. Her comment retunes the characterisation of Cardiff as peaceful and safe, tracing fault lines under the surface of things.

Iona’s brother’s comment, ‘Thank god for the Arabs, it gets them off our backs’, which she acknowledges is ‘politically incorrect’, got a laugh of recognition around the table. The comment points out both the present unevenness in state violence, in which the police have shifted their target, and also the durability and perpetuation of that violence in new forms. It is significant here that Samar’s worry for her sons, which refracts Iona’s mother’s fear for her sons, reverse current cultural logic of which bodies feel ‘terror’, anxiety and unease, and whose terror matters (Fortier 2007; 2010).

Much of this ‘quiet riot’ of collectivity-building doesn’t often appear in the celebratory, public, performed elements of these projects: instead, they come through when people have the opportunity to share experiences and strategies together. In this, they reflect the way the ‘third spaces’ of the heritage
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projects-in-process, although contingent, often fleeting, and ‘without guarantees’ (Hall, McRobbie, Gilroy, Grossberg 2000), make space for people to share feelings of hurt, harm, upset and fury. In these spaces, such feelings can be voiced, heard, recognized and connected up to broader, common histories of violence and struggle.

The occasion of meeting together on a Sunday afternoon to write opened a moment to tease out the way violence shifts and transforms but also stays the same. Their conversation doesn’t resolve the problem of PREVENT surveillance, or everyday Islamophobia and abuse, or police brutality. But it re-centres the dialogue around a shared question – in this case, how can we protect our children? How can we survive here ourselves? (Mirza 2006) – and weaves it into a narrative and historical context that draws attention to the patterning of police violence. This fear for others and urge to protect them is of course affective labour. As another poet wrote of her son: “You will feel hate directed at you/ in the name of love. You will be viewed with suspicion...I wish to be the alchemist/who turns hatred into love for you’ (WOL 2015). The context of a ‘homeplace’ (hooks 1990) for women with different but overlapping experiences to gather creates an occasion for shared feelings and political discussion. These raw conversations, among women, which actively acknowledge tensions, never made it into the book of writing; but poems and stories about personal experiences of abuse, alienation and worry for others did.

5.4 ‘Ready to bell’: turn your anger into fight

Other writers also grounded the personal in histories of struggle. One writer, for example, described herself as a ‘fighter’. Being a ‘fighter’, for this writer, ‘is a part of my identity that has bought me a lot of trouble’ (WOL 2015, 70-71). It has been shaped by the intersecting threads of her identity, she explains: ‘every element feeds into this aspect of who I am. I fight because as a Muslim justice, not only forms, but is the basis of our action’; and because as a ‘Welsh Muslim’, she aligns herself with the Welsh ‘struggle for their country, territory and citizenship’. Connecting her own family genealogy to the prophet and 7th century, she both cites her dignified lineage and writes herself past the history of 19th-20th imperialism in countries like Pakistan, Yemen, Egypt, Iraq, and Somalia to an earlier origin (Kabir 2010, 29-30). This sense of an Islamic origin, ‘an Islam of the parents’, grounds her ethics (Fadil 2015). She sites being a fighter in her history and in her relationships, the ‘deep love and complete commitment’ for family and friends that ‘is what brings out the fighter in me’, to protect those she loves from harm. She advises ruefully that while being a ‘fighter’, however much ‘trouble’ it causes her, won’t be quieted, ‘I should change the methods I use to fight’. Within the broad frame of injustice, she advocates specific tactics, because ‘each occurrence of injustice is instigated or created in different ways and so it needs to be
tackled by different means’ (all quotes above are from WOL 2015, 70-71).

One of the kinds of emotional labour minority women must do to make good community, according to the accounts in these projects, is to filter and transfigure the feelings stirred up by encounters with oppression into a useful form – fight. As part of this discipline, they name and share feelings of hurt and anger, and then perform fighting back without getting hurt, they turn ‘upset’ into active forms of protest. Fight registers a *useful* form of feelings set off by bigotry and injustice such as rage, hurt, bewilderment, surrender or even numbness outlined earlier. The American writer and comedian W. Kamau Bell described the role of anger in thinking about racism this way: ‘It makes sense to be angry. The anger helps you push back against the injustice. Anger is not the goal. It’s the fuel’ (Bell 2015). They also suggest specific tactics for turning diffuse, unruly or painful feeling into fight. First, women describe defending themselves against attacks through fighting back with ‘our fists’, and then learning ‘to retaliate, ah, with my mouth’.

In places, fight is taken literally. Scrappiness, Weedon and Jordan (2010) point out, has long been a necessary and respected value for some people from Butetown and the Docks, as defence against attacks from outsiders. Leaving the sanctuary of Butetown in earlier decades meant regular verbal and physical assaults. One woman described that while she didn’t feel any racism as a young person in her neighbourhood:

> I soon found out when I was old enough to start going into town on my own. And then I was called black so-and-so, I was called nigger this, nigger that. I was like, they serious? I’d a fight in town one time, me and a friend. Because some woman, we was coming home, and she just decided to punt over, call me nigger, and then wanted to come fight with me. I was sixteen. I was already to bell, but I’d just gotten my first payment, I’d bought myself new clothes, and I wasn’t going to go scruffing up my clothes (Nura, 50s, youth worker).

While the abuse leaves her with a kind of disbelief – ‘[are] they serious?’ – she doesn’t dwell on her feelings at the racial slur or the threat of physical violence. Instead, she describes disdain and being ‘ready to bell’, and thereby demonstrating toughness. Yet, in choosing to protect her ‘new clothes’, she also places herself above the ‘scruff’ of a fight, demonstrating discipline in staying unmussed, tidy, her new clothes fresh. The assault didn’t and can’t actually touch or harm her. In the story, she floats through white violence, sound and strong.

Another older woman, in an oral history, tells the story of a baseball game played outside the area when she was a child. A white child called her friend a racial slur, which she deflects as ‘not a very nice name’, but again, instead of actually fighting, she explains that the Docks team responded by withdrawing,
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thereby forfeiting the game. They said, ‘That’s it. We are not playing’. Here, again, the right way to fight is not to react, to ‘use our fists to hit the person who’d made the remark’, but instead to discipline one’s feelings to ‘learn to retaliate in other ways’ – in this case, by leaving. The speakers demonstrate toughness but fight back against bigotry and violence with withdrawal, stepping out of reach of the fist or the slur, as it were. In these stories, they are the victors; they leave themselves untouched, whole, united with their friends.

The performative context of the interview, in which the speaker is co-creating a narrative of her life for an audience of young women, means this account is not an account of a fight. Instead, as a fight-never-was, it can be read as a pedagogical model for how to manage one’s feelings and behaviour when confronted by a racist attack. Another interview, this one with Mary, in her 80s, repeats the sense that the Bay was a sanctuary and the world outside the area dangerous and threatening; she also makes the pedagogy of how to handle a fight even clearer:

…It used to be that if you went out of, out of the Bay somebody would call you not a very nice name and most of the time we would use our fists to hit the person who’d made the remark. But I think as I grew older, I realised that punching people wasn’t always the answer, and so I learned to retaliate, ah, with my mouth, which is very big…So when you have prejudice when you’re that age, when you’re young, the first thing you generally want to do is to be physical about it. But as it you grow older, as I said, you learn to retaliate in other ways. (Mary, 80s, teacher).

Mary describes the process by which her anger grew up from fists to argument, to retaliating ‘with my mouth’ and ‘in other ways’. Annie also describes fighting back with words: ‘So, now, if somebody says something that I don’t agree with, or I think is a little objectionable, and making reference to my colour or my culture, I’ll tell them. But that’s because I’m old now. So, I can do that, now’. All three women describe a process of disciplining anger and hurt at racist abuse into an effective, pointed retort or reaction. Yet what happens when the racism comes in other, less direct forms? The accounts also unpack how ‘to retaliate in other ways’.

The speakers thus teach a right and a wrong way to handle anger. Sianne Ngai sees ‘a symbolic violence’ at work in expecting ‘right’ anger from someone subject to violence, grounded in ‘an underlying assumption that an appropriate emotional response to racist violence exists, and that the burden lies on the racialized subject to produce that appropriate response legibly, unambiguously, and immediately’ (Ngai 2007: 182). Perhaps because of the performative context of the heritage projects, perhaps because of the maturity of the speakers and writers, anger – or other unruly, ‘bad’ feelings like pain or fury or ‘upset’ – in a raw form do not always come through. Instead, anger and other ‘bad’ feelings are described
as belonging to the past, and having been disciplined into ‘fuel’ to help the speakers and writers ‘push back’: what I am calling ‘fight’. In effect, perhaps, they perform the very burden Ngai suggests.

For others, the turn is, in part, about connecting these personal feelings to the political. Many of the older women in the heritage projects took the pedagogical moment of writing for or being interviewed by young women to explore their relationship to struggle, histories of struggle and politics. Unruly feelings become politically useful by framing the personal in broader discourses of injustice. In a memoir, one writer unpacks how she began connecting her lived knowledge with politics as a young person:

I always knew that life was unfair and unequal but I didn’t know why my life was the way it was. I always knew I lived in a white world but didn’t know about the world. … I always knew that men ruled things and talked and discussed and took action, but I didn’t know that women took the brunt of the discussions and actions. At 18 I discovered politics. Black Power and I began to see why things were the way they were. (WOL 2015, 62)

For this writer, coming into politics, which she describes as ‘her moral compass’, involves connecting lived knowledge of inequality, whiteness and gender with broader, political narratives of social injustice ‘to see why things were the way they were’. For this writer, exploring ‘why’ through politics and Black Power is a revelatory moment that guides her life.

5.5 ‘You have to fight for them’: Struggles with institutions

Fight was articulated as practices of rebellion shot through with a kind of mischievous joy. Halima described problems in high school such as curriculum of only ‘negative’ portrayals of Africa, a school culture that celebrated only Christian holidays, among other failures of cultural or religious recognition. Describing this racism in front of the young women in an oral history interview, however, she didn’t tell those stories, instead recounting how she and her friends fought back and rebelled at school:

…I loved school, loved education, but we also experienced a lot of racism so that kind of made us upset and angry what we went through in school. Especially in high school, high school was really bad. But it made us stronger. And maybe we rebelled a bit? (Laughter) We were a bit jealous about celebrating, about Christmas. (More laughter) And we, some of us, what we did was, which was really naughty, we pulled down the Christmas tree! (Laughter) So, so things like that. Then we got in trouble. And those times, they used to cane us. (Halima, 40s, social worker)

While this speaker is careful to explain that she ‘loved school’, she describes other, ‘upset and angry’ collective feeling in herself and among her friends in response to racism and religious discrimination at school. Her love of school performs deservingness but also refracts what Mirza (2005) describes as ‘educational desire’, the push to challenge injustice through education. The story is playful and played down, as the young people feel ‘a bit jealous’ of the school’s Christmas tree, and their gesture of
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destructive protest is ‘naughty’, but in fact the stakes are high, as the punishment for their ‘naughty’ protest is at very least beating with a cane, at worst expulsion or leaving school with no qualifications.

Schools were the sites of all manner of injuries and affronts. Samar, as the only Muslim student at a Catholic school in England, had just started wearing hijab, when on sports day one of the nuns told her that she had to take it off because it was ‘unacceptable’. Forced to take off her hijab in front of the whole school, Samar said she felt humiliated, like she should have stood up for herself, and didn’t tell her parents right away because she ‘felt like she had done something shameful before God’. As she told this story, another woman in the group chimed in: ‘our parents didn’t believe us; they thought the teachers were always right, that we should respect them, so they wouldn’t believe what had happened’. Sophia, a generation older than Samar, who was proud of her ‘resourceful’, happy upbringing in Butetown, described leaving Butetown for her first day of school at a school where she was the only black pupil. ‘[The other children] un pla i ted all my hair so they could touch it’, she said, to the consternation in the room. One of the white women asked, ‘but did they mean it badly or were they just curious?’, and Sophia pushed back, responding that whatever their intentions were, ‘the experience for me was very traumatic, and I didn’t get over it for the rest of the year’. Describing racism at school, Halima shared that one teacher at the school had said ‘You’re all from the jungle’ and did monkey gestures at the students; another, a man, had pinned a black young student against the wall in the hallway when they were alone and said, ‘If I punched you right now no one would see the bruise’.

By registering these moments of humiliation as moments of religious and racist violence – as not-so-micro-aggressions that build up to make people feel traumatically out of place, alienated and othered – Samar and Sophia practice a politics of recognition that is a vital part of the politics of struggle. By sharing these experiences in the ‘third space’ of this project, in the Butetown History and Arts Centre gallery surrounded by portraits of generations of Butetown residents, a plate of biscuits to hand, they connect intimate personal experiences of trauma to a collective experience of being racialized, stigmatised, and othered. The goal of the book of writing produced through this heritage project, too, was to extend this politics of recognition, so that young people could read and make their own connections between the personal and the political.

When the trauma is not so obvious, but instead registers in a feeling or an atmosphere, or in a hard-to-pin-down institutional habit or formation, the politics of sharing feelings for recognition are still more important. Other writers in the group talked about getting ‘remedial banded’ – assigned an academic
track according to aptitude – based on who their brothers and sisters were, or on a vague assessment that felt, to them, based on race. There was a sense that certain schools were ‘bad for [Black] boys’ (not unwarranted, as ‘Black boys are three times more likely to be excluded from school’ [Mirza 2006, 148]). The women in the projects kicked against this by working hard to get excellent marks and go to university ‘to prove them wrong’. As Nura explained, ‘Because I, I do know a lot of people who have come out, even your, I’d say maybe a bit older than you [young women conducting interview], have come out with nothing, because they were scared to talk to the teachers’. At these schools, ‘you’re targeted before you even get your first day in’.

The sense that reverberates through these heritage projects, that schooling was and continues to be a site of racist struggle, is supported by broader research. From the 1960s, Black children were ‘bussed out’ of school catchments if they made up more than one third of the student body (Brah 1999). They were told they were stupid by official, now debunked IQ tests that argued Black pupils were ‘deficient’. Speakers of Urdu and Caribbean patois, for example, were ‘put in special units, what were then called “sin bins”’, systematically criminalized, and offered white supremacist curricula (Gillborn, 1990, 30 in Mirza 2006, 148). In the heritage projects, Nura explained, ‘I, I left school at fifteen. …We had, um, a lot of racist teachers there. Um, a lot of people hated that school. The teachers used to pick on you’; instead, she continued her education and training in social work ‘after I left school’. Nura stopped going to the class of one teacher who she felt picked on her, ‘but then, that didn’t do me no good’ in terms of her qualifications. In fact, her response was to escape and find another way, as ‘a lot of my education and stuff that I did, I did after I left school’. Mainstream school perpetuates racist violence. As one mother noted, ‘the teachers are the worst culprits and they knock the confidence out of the children’ (ACES undated). Inequality in school persists in subtle, felt ways, sometimes as pressure and suffocation: Namita Chakrabarty uses the embodied metaphor of being ‘buried alive’ by the systemic whiteness of education in Britain (Chakrabarty 2014, 61 in Bhopal 2016, 490).

The work of advocacy is relentless. It is, as one older woman who had come to Cardiff from the Caribbean explained, ‘hard work’. Discussing schools, another older woman noted, ‘you really have to fight for your children in this country otherwise they will be looked at as numbskulls’ and added ‘We have to fight for them and it just makes hard work because you have to be working hard to keep them and running to the school all the time’ (ACES Undated). Two writers, both mothers, talked about how the racism in school used to be more ‘direct’ but now still exists and is indirect, and therefore is harder to handle, although their children feel it. At one local high school, for example, ‘they pick the white kids’,
one mother said her kids tell her. When a third mother asked, ‘how do you help them cope?’, she responded, ‘I tell them to watch out for it, and that this is how things may be sometimes, but not to let it stop them or get them down’. Registering these institutional patterns, these subtle atmospheric feelings, and offering advice on how to cope, becomes part of how to fight.

5.6 ‘But he loved me’ – Winning white love

Against institutions, fight has to take a different form. The pedagogy of struggle offered by these women – the social workers, youth workers, teachers, community leaders and other professionals in particular – suggests different tactics. For Halima, fighting racism in a the ‘white space’ (Jones 2015) of Welsh schools required turning ‘hatred’, and ‘upset and anger’ into affection from allies who can broker change. This comes in the form of a white English teacher, the ‘favourite’ of the woman who pulled down the Christmas tree with her friends, who ‘stood out different from the other teachers. He never stereotyped us. He never, he looked, he accepted our differences’. Through his help, and only through the help of a white advocate in authority, the young people were able to force changes at the school. She explained that at that time, unlike the present: ‘there was no, like equality policy or things like that, or respect for religious belief, but he understood that, and I think he got that across, finally to board of governors, to the headmaster. And things started to change. And they started allowing, things, certain things to be implemented’. Only a ‘well-liked’ teacher ally is able to ‘get that across’ to the board of governors setting policy and rules for the school; holding all the power, when pressed by a white teacher, the board ‘started allowing’ new changes. In another story, it was only when the white father of a white friend who was a city ‘councillor’ joined the fight that they were able to ‘push through’ changes at another school.

Many of the stories of struggle speak to the pervasive ways in which white people’s feelings dominate public, professional, institutional and sometimes intimate spaces in Cardiff, and therefore how everyday survival in Cardiff depends on handling white feelings adeptly. One of the most subtle and pervasive forms of emotional labour in these projects involved protecting white feelings, especially protecting ‘white fragility’ (DiAngelo 2011) and ‘white unease’ (Bigo 2002; Fortier 2010). Black feminists and anti-racist advocates and writers have pointed out the grave risks of failing to take care of white feelings, for example those of a white administrator with professional authority, or a police officer (Ahmed 2011; Bell 2015; Brah 1999/2012, 7; Bigo 2002; Coates 2015; DiAngelo 2011; Lorde 1981). To fail to soothe white unease, or to provoke a backlash, is to risk violence: that violence might be emotional, psychic or imaginative, professional, or physical, or all of the above, and be exacted over a lifetime (Gunaratnam and Lewis 2001). In the performative, pedagogic context of the interviews, the stories stand as lessons
for younger women for how to manage the threat of volatile white feelings and the necessity of doing this well. As lessons and conversations held among women with a shared racialized experience, the accounts also describe how this labour feels.

Speakers and writers in all three heritage projects offer stories that show the necessity of protecting white people’s feelings, and tactics for how to do so while protecting themselves. One story stands out in particular for its detail. In the interview, Annie, a black youth worker in her 50s, responds to the question ‘Have you faced prejudice in your life, and how did you deal with it?’ from her young interviewer. She described some of the different ways racism has touched her life, clarifying, ‘sometimes it’s outward, sometimes it’s very, um, subtle’. To explain, she told the story of how she handled a patient who ‘hates black people’ in her first job:

I think it’s [racism is] done out of ignorance. I remember when I first, I had my first job, and it was in a hospital, and I remember, the first thing they said when they employed me was, ‘Oh, stay away from that person over there, because he don’t like black people. He hates black people. And you’re better off just ignoring him, and don’t go to have anything to do with him’. So, me being me, I didn’t take no notice of him, I just treated him like everybody else. And, um, and I used to tease him, because that’s what I do, I always tease people, anyway. But what it, what I found out later on, is that this fellow, well even though, they might have called him racist, and stuff, he had a really bad experience with somebody in ah, in work, and this person he’d had this experience with happened to be black. And he hated this person because he had a bad experience with him. And it wasn’t the fact that he was, that he was racist, he just didn’t like that person. So, because he didn’t like that person and because he was black, all the other colleagues said don’t go to him because he doesn’t like black people, but he loved me. He loved me, so we had, we had a nice relationship.

A significant lesson in this story is not to assume bigotry, or believe what other people say only, but to develop your own view. Annie emphasizes the importance of asking questions and listening in her advice to young people at the end of her interview: ‘[I wish] for young people to talk more amongst each other and be inquisitive. I, I have what I call an inquisitive mind. Somebody tells me something, I want to know if that’s true, and then I want to know again, and so, and so’. The story has another subtext, however, about how to manage white feelings.

From her very first day at her very first job, from ‘the first thing they said’, the speaker’s employers configure the speaker’s blackness as a potential danger. It is her racialized body which threatens to stir up conflict with ‘that person over there’, who ‘hates black people’; it is her racialized body, not the hatred in this patient, which threatens the apparent peace and stability of the workplace, as it is up to her to mitigate this threat. Rather than address the problem of his ‘hatred’, or protect their new employee in her first job from the threat of racist harassment, they suggest ‘you’re better off just ignoring him’. This is
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the emotional labour she must undertake to be successful at her new job, and she tells the story as an example of her success in handling the unsettling violence of this man’s potential ‘hatred’ by ‘teasing him’ as ‘I always tease people’. She listens to his story about his ‘bad experience’ to unpick its specificity, and thereby earns his ‘love’. There’s a contradiction in the site of his racism, as either it lies in ‘ignorance’, or in one encounter with one other black person he ‘hated’, but both explanations actually protect white feelings: racism is individual and not structural, or a function of ‘ignorance,’ and not deeply-rooted patterns of power, or even a mistake. She explains that her colleagues had misunderstood him as being a ‘racist’ – that is, a bigot, who threatens racist violence – but ‘he loved me, so we had, we had a nice relationship’. By carefully managing her own behaviour and ‘treat[ing] him like everybody else’, ‘teasing’ and listening to him explain himself, she is able to diffuse his hatred into ‘a nice relationship’ and thereby protect her job.

In an article about the emotional labour required of professional minority women, Durr and Wingfield point out that ‘black professional women report that they must transform themselves to be welcomed and accepted, especially in the workplace’ (2011, 557). Specifically, one interviewee in their research advises other black women in the workplace, ‘Don’t … show anger, disapproval, or difference of opinion’: such tactics are essential for ‘handling stress and alienation while balancing a need for survival and safety in the workplace or remaining employed without a row’ (Durr and Wingfield 2011, 558). This is the labour involved in ‘getting along’ in a majority white society, shot through with racist legacies. In order to preserve her ‘nice relationship’ with the patient in the story, Annie also endured questions about her body and ‘being black’, questions which, as a result of deeply ingrained white privilege, the patient felt he had the right to ask:

And he used to ask me questions about being black. You know, a lot of people, they have ignorance about being black and things, and so… If I was feeling particularly devilish, I used to tell him stories. Just to freak him out. And he’d believe me. Like saying, in the winter, I’m black, but in the summer, that part of my hand looks really dark. (Points to her palm, quiet laughter) And I used to tell him, oh… And I used to tell him things like that (HW Oral history 2013).

She excuses these questions as ignorance, as ‘a lot of people, they have ignorance about being black and things’. She notes that part of her labour, as a black woman in employment, is to educate and remediate this ignorance, however intrusive or exhausting, unpleasant, offensive or banal, she might find such inquiries on any given day.

She also describes a vent for her own feelings. She explains, ‘If I was feeling particularly devilish, I used to tell him stories. Just to freak him out’, and then laugh at him for ‘believ[ing] me’. ‘Freak[ing] him out’, and making up absurd ‘stories’ about being black, becomes a way to point out that while he may not
have been an explicit bigot, she can raise an eyebrow at his gullibility, critique his ignorance as actually inexcusable, and (perhaps) vent her own ‘devilish’ feelings about being called on to educate him. At this point in the interview, she, the young women interviewing her, and others listening in the room, all laugh. The laugh in the moment, I think, is a kind of release for the burdens and bad feelings that having to cope with everyday white ‘ignorance’ brings with it. Age and experience bring authority and less obligation to please, she explains, ‘So I can do that, now’. Like the fighters who do not fight, her teasing and ‘taking it lightly’ present her as untouchable.

The emotional labour of protecting white feelings from confronting hurt and complicity in racism comes through here and there in the oral history transcripts and research field notes. At one oral history interview, for example, while one woman who had immigrated in the 1960s from the Caribbean directed her answers about racism at work to the researcher, the only white person and stranger in the room, in this way:

> Although I was the cleaner, I was treated like if I was one of the clerical staff. You know, it wasn’t no difference! We used to go out, when it was someone’s birthday, we used to go out with them, we have a drink, we have dinner. And then, you know, in their lunchtime then, they used to come to me, up here, and they come for their lunch, you know, and we gets on marvellous. But one day we went to this, the manager died, and we went to the funeral. …If he – I mean, with his staff, it was different, because that was his staff. Me, I was only the cleaner. But if he sees me outside, or he see me inside, he treat me the same way as he treat me inside, or if he treat me outside. And he was really a nice man. So, I come home and I said, ‘Daddy, you know what? To that funeral, you know, I was the only black one there!’ He said to me, he said, ‘… you know, life is what you make it’! (Mmms all around) See, so all in all, I can’t complain. I can’t complain (Naomi, 80s, canteen worker and church deacon).

Here, the speaker mentions only what she can praise. She describes a convivial workplace in which staff socialized together despite the fact that she ‘was only the cleaner’. At this workplace, her boss was ‘really a nice man’ who ‘treat[ed] me the same way as he treat me inside, or if he treat me outside’. This, again, is not the status quo, but worthy of special remark. Further, by praising individual people for their lack of racial prejudice or bigotry, to be racist or not appears to be a choice, and working against racism about convivial lunches, saying good morning, and ‘get[ting] along’. Like other speakers, she expresses pride in pioneering white spaces, and the power of the individual pioneer: ‘you know, life is what you make it’. At several points in her interview, her daughter suggested she tell stories about other, more uncomfortable moments. The white Welsh workers at the canteen, for example, couldn’t seem to manage to say her full name, and so gave her a short nickname instead. But in this context, Naomi chooses to share only palatable feelings: ‘see, so all in all, I can’t complain. I can’t complain’.
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She does not linger on the broader racism that defined who was seen to be suitable for which jobs, which shaped her working life as a trainee nurse, canteen worker, and cleaner (for a critical history of black migrant women’s labour in Britain of Naomi’s generation, see Amina Mama’s 1984 article in the Feminist Review, ‘Black Women the State and Economic Crisis’), or the implicit violence in which this conviviality and equal treatment are exceptions to be praised rather than to be expected as a basic right. Elsewhere in the oral history, she explains how she was trained in shorthand typing through private instruction as a girl, which should have qualified her to be ‘one of the clerical staff’. She explains that though she wanted to be a nurse, ‘I would have loved nursing…Just for the uniform. But it come like that to clean them, and look after, um, old people, and clean them up, and… Oh no, no, no, no. I couldn’t go down that road’. In the 1960s in Cardiff, of course, the ‘um, old people’ would have been white; black women from the Caribbean were recruited to post-war Britain to undertake care labour for an aging white British public and fill job shortages according to racist hierarchies (Brah 1996; Carby 1982; Mama 1984). In the present hierarchy black Zimbabweans, for example, regardless of professional qualifications, joke about coming to Britain to ‘join the BBC’, or ‘British Bottom Cleaners’ (McGregor 2007). It is this abasement, of having to ‘clean them up’ when Naomi came to UK as a young woman that the speaker can’t ‘stomach’; the reality of her situation – how she experiences being ‘thrown against a sharp white background’ – contrasts with her dream of the pretty, dignified nurse’s uniform. ‘My stomach couldn’t take it’ hints, I think, to how ‘becoming’ black in the new context of white Britain felt for her as a young woman.

Labouring to earn white approval and affection came through in declarations of gratitude and affection toward shared objects (Ahmed 2004) like school, work, or Wales. Managing white feelings also means affirming white beliefs about what interests, hobbies, and aspirations, for example, count as ‘good’. As 2008 research into ideas of community in South Wales explained, some of the demands white groups held of minority groups included: ‘having white friends, speaking and looking like “us” …doing what we do, treating women like we do… or being educated like us to occupy professional and leadership roles like us’ (Threadgold et al. 2008, 13).

Annie, a youth worker in her 50s, described how she and her family pioneered spaces felt to be white: ‘you could spot us amongst the sea of white faces’. The speaker takes pride in the way she and her family break stereotypes by participating in white – and specifically Welsh – interests and pursuits; she encourages young women listening to ‘be inquisitive’ and to follow her example. Without deprecating her courage as a pioneer, her story reiterates that minorities still bear the burden of ‘joining in’. As
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Nirmal Puwar (2004), Heidi Safia Mirza (2009; 2015) and Sara Ahmed (2012; 2014) point out, the fact of inclusion, participation and diversity in these institutional spaces – ‘the very arrival of the black/othered body into white/normative organisations’ – becomes proof that the old problems and histories of whiteness have been resolved in favour of ‘local pride’ and good community feeling. Wales’s self-imagination as ‘a tolerant nation’ (Williams, Evans and O’Leary 2003, 2015), a place, unlike elsewhere in Britain, with fewer problems with racism, might therefore remain unperturbed. White, liberal desire for good, happy diversity (Ahmed 2012) and therefore racial and class comfort set out the parameters of these projects. Such desire for comfort might displace hurt and rage, and thereby ignore the ‘uses of anger’ (Lorde 1981).

5.7 Taking the piss, vents and tricks

Rather than turning bad feelings into fistfights, protests, or campaigns, in places some of the accounts instead play tricks: they play with words, categories and stereotypes, and with borders and boundaries (Bhabha 1994). In particular, one poet in the Writing Our Lives book uses wordplay to expose the absurdity but potency of stereotypes. One poem begins, ‘I wanted to fit in/ but they said I'm ill-fitting’, and then proceeds to describe all of the ways she is ‘ill-fitting’ in a series of couplets. Her personality is ill-fitting, ‘The loners say I'm over-friendly/ extroverts say I'm aloof’ (WOL 2015, 48), and so is her race, as ‘Black people say I'm white/ White people call me brown/ the Browns call me pasty/ pasties call me pie’ (WOL 2015, 48). Throughout, her tone stays lively through rhyme and word play. Her lightness twists the politics of race to a pun between ‘pasty’ pale and the cold British hand pie, often eaten for lunch, called a pastie.

She sweeps through a series of highly politicized binaries, from vegetarianism to disability to feminism to belonging to a place: ‘The able call me disabled/How awful it must be/…Feminists say I'm oppressed/Extra-dressed call me floozy/The locals call me foreign/but so do the foreigners’ (WOL 2015, 48-50). In the poem, she feels somewhere in between, ‘ill-fitting’ in all of these categories. By playing with categories in this way – as in ‘Traditionalists call me unorthodox/Alternatives call me paradox’ – the poem deconstructs categories, even the idea of a category, showing them to be ‘unbefitting’. The joke is on the category as device for organising people into this and that, us and them. Instead of choosing a side, the poet describes a self that has the idiosyncrasy and specificity of a fingerprint: ‘for no community/can hide my fingerprints’ (WOL 2015, 50), and also plays with – and deconstructs – stereotypes.
Writing about the emotional labour of former coal miners leading tours in a coalfield heritage site and joking as they go, Bella Dicks frames joking or lightness in a larger repertoire of working class tactics: ‘as Skeggs (2004) shows, drawing on Willis (2002), taking the piss is not only about making a hard job bearable, but also about a kind of doubling, in that it pokes fun at what is real as though it were not real, at what is serious as though it were not serious’ (Dicks 2008, 448). When she is feeling ‘devilish’, Annie plays both educator and trickster (for a contemporary critique of this term, see Morra and Reder 2010), skilfully negotiating the treacherous place between managing white hostility, the ‘little digs’ and questions, and preserving her own sense of justice. Part of this negotiation involves telling another story about playing both educator and trickster to her extended family living in the Caribbean:

But when I was older, and I went to the Caribbean, the same sort of, I suppose fears and stories that white people would have about black people, my cousins and family had about white people, because, because they weren’t in their company. We’re talking about a long time ago, before you were born, about forty-odd years ago. So, when you went to the Caribbean they didn’t have experiences of, of working, or meeting white people. So, I used to tell them, equally, long stories as well. (Annie, 50’s, youth worker)

The story positions the speaker as a liminal but authoritative figure, the trickster teacher, who finds herself both labouring to handle white hostility and questions and translating her experience living in a majority white society to her family in the Caribbean. The ‘teasing’, and ‘long stories’ are a tactical way through the burden of being responsible for all this labour.

5.8 Dreamplace as sanctuary

The final tactic that comes through in these projects is not only one of escape, but of actively created a mnemonic sanctuary I term ‘dreamplace’. Dreamplaces afford imaginative sanctuaries for their writers, tellers and listeners. The term invokes some of the writing in the projects, as one poem asks, ‘Was it a dream?’ of her place of sanctuary, Barbados, while another titled a memory of rural Kashmir, ‘Was it a Dream? Return to My Father’s Land’ (WOL 2015, 36), describing a rural home in Kashmir, in the mountains, where she slept to the sound of a river in the gorge at night (WOL 2015, 35-36). It has sympathies, too, with Gaynor Kavanagh’s coinage of museums as ‘Dream Spaces’, spaces that form an imaginary out of the openness and richness of memory (Kavanagh 2000). Instead of a physical ‘homeplace’ held apart from noisy, corrosive world of white supremacy, this sanctuary is imagined, felt. The accounts describe all manner of dreamplaces of retreat, both in memory and time, and in diaspora space.

Another remembers a house of reading and sleeping, where sleeping seems to signify complete safety, surrender and expansion into the space, ‘I read the classics in that house from Vanity Fair to Animal
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Farm. I slept everywhere. I slept on the roof in the summer to be awoken by the flies and cockerels. I slept on the floor. I slept in the bedrooms. I slept in the living rooms. I slept in the corridor. I slept in the garden’ (WOL 2015, 119). The books are portals to dreams. Still another remembers that she could retreat with a book to the privy, then in the back garden:

I know when I was growing up, if you wanted to get away from your mundane, everyday life, you did it by reading a book. And one of my favourites was, if I didn’t want my mother to ask me to do anything, I would go, we always had outside toilets at the time, back down [in the garden], well, I was brought down to the toilets and I would take my book. And then I would sit reading, because I knew I wouldn’t be disturbed (Annie, 80s, education).

Time in the garden privy with a book was a way ‘to get away from your mundane, everyday life’, a way to occupy another place and time where she ‘wouldn’t be disturbed’. Here the dreamplace is not just the private space of the outhouse, a room of her own, but the imaginative escape offered by books. The book is a hatch out of ‘mundane, everyday life’ (in contrast, however, technologies like phones and tablet computers get described by everyone, including the younger generation, as traps that can ‘suck you in’).

The shape and quality of these dreamplaces, as alternatives to the present of Cardiff, show in their contrasts what’s absent and longed for in the lives of the women describing and remembering them. Dreamplaces matter as sites of ‘belonging’ (WOL 2015, 32). One writer, in a poem called ‘Coming Home’, describes the feeling of arriving in Barbados to a feeling of ‘home’, ‘where the sense of belonging is so, so strong’ (WOL 2015 31-32). Between Cardiff and Barbados, she notices chiming details, postcolonial and colonial: ‘rain pouring just like home, the post boxes, uniforms the same, and smells everywhere, the same’. Yet unlike Cardiff:

The people are so inviting, engaging in local banter with the children. There isn’t a divide here, young, old, dreads, baldheads everyone seems connected, seems as one.

... The smiles from everywhere entrap you into smiling back, you’ve caught it, too – you’re under the spell of the land that heals, the land where all your troubles melt away by the sun.
(WOL 2015, 31-32)

For this writer, ‘there is no divide here’ between generations or between ‘dreads, baldheads’, but of connection. In another piece about being in Barbados, the same writer speaks in the voice of one of her children: ‘I’m a boy with long dreadlocks, back home I’m bullied and called a girl. Here there are whole families with dreads. They call after me “little brother? little youth?” It feels good, I belong’ (WOL 2015, 33). The feeling of being among people who smile at you, among ‘whole families of dreads’, is of being ‘under a spell’ of racial belonging: the result is to feel ‘your troubles melt away by the sun’. Part of the pleasure of this dreamplace, perhaps, is the pleasure of being on holiday, of mobility and privilege. Naomi, who emigrated from the Caribbean, was quite wry and unromantic about the island as a
sanctuary of beaches, sea, palm trees and ‘lovely hotels’, as she joked, ‘you know it’s fantastic over there! All you need is the money! (Laughter) Once you got the money, I’m telling you, that could be heaven over there’. One person’s dreamplace might be another person’s ironic dystopia, or a homeland to which it is impossible to return. The importance of some place as a dreamplace, however, moves through the life writing and oral histories.

The territory of dreamplace reaches back into memory, too. Others remember the secret world of the lanes that ran behind the terraced houses in Cardiff, the ‘dens’ in Grangetown’s park or other secret play places loved as a child: ‘Lanes were our safe haven… Lanes were our playgrounds…We would walk through the lanes at night playing hide and seek and finding little treasures, such as lost coins’ (WOL 2015, 68). Such memory work is not only active, as Keightley and Pickering (2012) argue, made in the moment, not organic to the past but useful to the present in which it is invoked. Dreamplaces are useful as sanctuaries and hiding places from the present. But they are affective, thick with feeling. The stolen apples from neighbours’ gardens on the way home from school in Madeira, lunch treats from the snack shop bought by her daddy every day at school, the landscapes and tastes and smells are little snatches of beauty and love to sustain the one remembering, and perhaps sometimes the listener.

Going to a dreamplace might be an escape, but it is not simple escapism. It dilates the rim of the imaginable world. The dreamplaces add heat, flavour, rural sanctuary to the imaginative landscapes that are available. They are hospitable. They bring with them an embodied proof that other ways of living and feeling might be possible, because one of the most insidious ways that racist hegemony works is by making itself seem relentless, inevitable, everywhere, always. As Raymond Williams describes it, ‘hegemony is secured when the dominant culture uses education, philosophy, religion, advertising and art to make its dominance appear normal and natural’ (Miller and Yúdice 2002, 7). Dreamplaces offer an emotional proof that life could be otherwise. Indeed, while they are places of fantasy, they reflect what Gabriel Winant (2015, 127) names as affect theory’s ‘reparative impulse to generate new fantasies, yet fantasies made practical by their placement in historical time’. It is in the invocation of dreamplace as a lesson in survival, an antidote and alternative – often slower, warmer, quieter – to the real, exhausting world where ‘you really have to fight’, therefore, that it has political promise.
5.9 Conclusion: Fight and staying ‘sore’

This chapter has charted out how forms of struggle remembered and offered up as part of the heritage of women in the area intersect with other histories of struggle. It has tried to get below the skin of particular protests or movements to the way feelings moved in and through these struggles. In part, this tactic was necessary, because the projects do not offer riots, protests with dates and clear victories, or unifying moments of solidarity in these heterogeneous groups. There is no single decisive moment or even string of moments to give a clear sense of a narrative of struggle and overcoming. Instead, the moments of articulation, while they may have sweeping consequences, were intimate, fleeting, and affectively charged. By tracking feelings, I am able to begin to track some of the complexities in how these moments of collectivity arise and dissolve.

All this fight is “sweaty”, as Ahmed (2014, 18) has called those hard-thought ideas and imaginings that glisten with “the labouring of bodies” (Gunaratnam 2014, 4). In this case, struggle is ‘sweaty’ with the labouring of racially and religiously marked classed and gendered bodies to feel in the right way, to discipline and vent bad feelings, and to move others to feel in the right way in order to affect a change or an opening in attitude, policy, institution, or dangerous or opportunistic encounter. The history of struggle is ‘sweaty’ with labours to name ‘how it feels to be’ (Hurston 1928) and share those feelings with others. This history is sweaty with the industry of ‘orchestrating the furies’ (Lorde 1981), and using feelings to win white love, to appease white discomfort, and to find escapes and dignity through all this hard work.

The older women in these cultural heritage projects offer a pedagogy of struggle that is, at least in part, about how to turn unruly feelings into struggle. They offer affective tactics of various kinds, different ways to ‘retaliate in other ways’, as Mary put it, and ‘orchestrate the furies’ stirred by all this ugly violence. Yet these feelings sometimes will not be disciplined, and shouldn’t be. Sara Ahmed, of course, insists on the need to ‘remain “sore” and “angry”’ (Ahmed 2008; Ahmed 2009 in Mirza 2009, 5), to refuse to get over these feelings of upset, hurt and fury, history’s hurts. The next chapter takes up the politics of a kind of soreness, loss, that circulates in and around the heritage projects and even amplified by the collections of photographs of past everyday life.
6.1 Introduction

In a 1995 story in The Independent on the redevelopment of Cardiff Bay, Olwen Watkins, a long-time Butetown resident and retired teacher, explains how she felt about past and present losses. She tells the reporter, ‘I could cry. Sometimes I do, when I think of what we have lost... Coming here used to be like entering an embrace.’ In her sense of ‘what we have lost’, Watkins is not alone. Feelings of loss continue to saturate popular memory around Cardiff’s past. In other research based in Butetown in particular, people mourn a ‘ruined’ community (Gilliat-Ray and Mellor 2010, 462), one facing ‘the real possibility of final extinction’ (Jordan 2001, 20; Sinclair 2003, 5). In the archives and women’s groups and writing that ground this thesis, older women recount grief for places and communities ‘obliterated’, ‘demolished’, and ‘all gone’ (WOL 2015, 61-63). Responding to photographs lost and found of working class neighbourhoods in the city, some describe a nostalgia, others an ‘uncanny’ haunting (Cardiff before Cardiff 2015, Cresci 2013). Still others describe a feeling of ‘hiraeth’ around the Cardiff of the past, a yearning for a lost landscape to which it is impossible to return (Gibbard 2012; Pountney 2015). This is hiraeth for a time as well as a place, a time before redevelopment, ‘of warm smiles and scruffy jumpers, the linked arms and grubby raincoats, of net curtains and graffiti, of muddy puddles that children play in’ (Gibbard 2012, 4).

This loss comes to inhabit people. In the same story in The Independent, for example, in a pub in Butetown, the reporter describes how ‘Sidney Gabb, 55, pulls a pint of bitter towards his bearded face. “I’m lost,” he says, “I’ve lived here for 30 years. But now I’m lost”’ (Mgadzah 1995, 22). Indeed, public feelings of loss seem on the move everywhere, whether in popular affection in South Korea for the work of photographers of everyday life in Seoul’s post-war slums (Im 2016), in online communities of memory in Egypt sharing archives of old Ottoman and found family photographs (Ryzova 2015), or in the memories of youth workers in a northern English coalfield town and London’s East End (Bright 2012; 2016; James 2014). The sheer profusion of forms of loss here suggests a powerful if misunderstood ‘structure of feeling’ (Williams 1974) patterning the present.

This feeling of loss moves in a particularly powerful way in the three recovered archives of photographs of everyday life around Cardiff’s docks selected in this thesis: 1) ‘Down the Bay’: Picture Post, Humanist Photography and Images of 1950s Cardiff (Jordan 2001); 2) Cardiff before Cardiff (Pountney and Robertson...
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(2012); and 3) Inside Out: Reflections of the Tiger Bay Community (Campbell and Campbell 2013). Pulled out of basements, forgotten storage cupboards, personal collections, and the post war archives of a popular magazine, these three collections taken in the 1950s and 1980s have been turned into popular recent local exhibitions, printed books, and digital archives on social media. All three make a particularly rich ‘place where knowledge is sedimented’ (Caraffa 2015, i) about the local past. They also gather together intimate publics (Berlant 1997), forming fragile collectivities around an imaginary of lost community, and moving those publics. For Butetown History and Arts Centre co-founder Glenn Jordan, for example, Bert Hardy’s 1950s ‘alluring’ photographs of people in Butetown not only celebrate the ordinariness of Butetown people, but ‘remind me that what I see – my friend, my street, my community, my self – is no longer there but “has indeed been”’ (Barthes 1984, 115 in Jordan 2001, 19-20). The recovered, reclaimed archives become performative occasions for this feeling of longing and loss for what ‘has indeed been’.

The photographs make sensible a pattern of feeling that might otherwise seem idiosyncratic, scattered, and at ‘the edge of the effable’ (Bright 2012, 144). These three collections of photographs interweave with the spaces, people and themes of the women’s groups (see Chapter 2). Yet while nostalgia and other forms of loss do appear in the three women’s heritage projects, the archives of photographs get at qualities of loss as a public pattern of feeling more vividly than the women’s heritage project materials on their own. Photography seems to have a peculiar, close relationship to emotion. Barthes, of course, describes the ‘punctum’, or ‘prick’ of feeling of a photograph, ‘that accident which pricks me (but also bruises me, is poignant to me)’ (Barthes 1981, 26-27). Others describe photography’s animation of broader ‘historiographical desires’ (Batchen 1999, Edwards 2009, 131). For Stuart Hall, writing about Picture Post articles like Hardy’s of people in the Bay, photographs ‘recapture, not only the facts, but the experience – the feel’ of the time (Hall 2001, 68).

Indeed, as Elsbeth Brown and Thy Phu (2014, 3) argue, ‘that we feel photography can hardly be doubted’. In particular, the documentary photographs treated in this chapter animate loss because the genre has had a sustained relationship to nostalgia and melancholia. They offer ‘another language for loss’ (Eng 2014: 331). In a retrospective of British documentary photography, How We Are argues the form is ‘a medium of melancholic grandeur, tinged with nostalgia, which seeks to memorialise the past’ (Williams and Bright 2007, 8). What is more, photographs have a peculiar, vivid relationship to emotion because of their materiality, haptics, and aesthetics. Photographs and photographic archives may therefore be ripe with loss as a public feeling. They might also be ripe for thinking about the politics of loss. The politics of loss, after all, matter in a context like Cardiff of rapid urban redevelopment and economic and social change. The rhetoric of redevelopment rings with promises for a better future, to
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which what has been lost or destroyed is consigned as the inevitable cost of that future. In what follows, I argue that these archives make sensible not just the existence of loss as a mood, but something of how loss moves politically in such a context.

Loss, melancholia and nostalgia as public feelings may have been rejected as dangerous and pathologically backward by some scholars, but in this chapter I begin with some recent lines of critical reappraisal of the ambivalent, generative politics of loss. Loss moves here, I argue, in three ways. First, all three archives perform stories of being lost and found, salvaged and reclaimed. These biographies set up the collections of photographs as curated performances of holding on to what has been or might be lost. ‘Sticky’ (Ahmed 2004) with loss, the photographic archives stay stuck on what has been ‘ruined’, lost, ‘knocked down’ and ‘knocked back’ (Mgadzah 1995, 22). Second, plush sensory details held in the photographs become ‘mnemonic devices; …triggers for sensations, emotions, and sensibilities’ (Meusburger et al. 2011, 8 in Bonnett and Alexander 2013, 399). They become sensory maps of what has been lost – places, livelihoods and ways of living together – and spaces for abiding in the feeling of loss. I suggest that texture and pattern in the photographs memorialize embodied memory and conserve everyday details (what Glenn Jordan calls ‘THE WAY WE WERE’ [2001, 20]). Patterns in the photographs – terraced houses, chimney pots, brickwork and net curtains, the rhythm of things on shop counters and shelves – evoke a lost way of life and also stress its abiding presence. As indexes of losses, they represent a collective effort to hold onto what Sara Ahmed calls ‘histories that hurt’ (Ahmed 2007, 135).

Finally, I argue that through creating an archive of touching bodies, bodies which express a ‘fugitive kinship’, the photographs resist ‘the segregation or banishment of those whose “origin, sentiment or citizenship” assigns them elsewhere’ (Gilroy 1987, 45). In a blurred hand and a scribbled set of wrinkles, a grip, a caress, in a packet of chips and a slant of light, these photographs profess a politics of sticking together and sticking around. They also animate something of the lost kinship and closeness, the sense or spirit of community, I describe in Chapter 3. The photographs therefore open up questions about the role of a love of the past in shaping how people might imagine living together in the present. Through all of these mechanisms – biographies of salvage and reclamation, conserving sensory worlds and everyday patterns, and printing ‘fugitive’ touch – the photographs produce a feeling of loss that refuses to move on to a future that has already been foreclosed.
6.2 ‘Living’ loss, reclaiming nostalgia and melancholia

Over the past two decades, there has been a sustained critical effort to describe forms of loss as public feelings (Cvetkovich 2007), and to plumb their politics. Nostalgia, melancholy and melancholia, social haunting, and ‘feeling down’ (Muñoz 2006), among other affective atmospheres, have all drawn critical attention (Boym 2001; 2007; Bonnett 2010; 2012; Bright 2012; 2016; Flatley 2012; Gilroy 2005; Gordon 1997; 2011; Walkerdine 2010; Walkerdine and Jimenez 2012). Often, such moods have been pathologized. After all, nostalgia might be kitsch, sentimental, and reductive. Nostalgia can harden into ‘the restoration of origins and the conspiracy theory’ (Boym 2007, 14-15), like the angst-y, besieged white loss of a white supremacist group like the Proud Boys, or the protectionist xenophobia of Enoch Powell and the Brexit campaigns (This American Life 2017). Melancholia, as ‘a mourning without end... [that] results from the inability to resolve the grief and ambivalence precipitated by the loss of the loved object, place, or ideal’, is troubling when that object, place or ideal carries the ugliness of empire, for example
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(Eng and Kazanjian 2003, 3). Postcolonial melancholia might repeat as anti-immigrant violence, as ‘bile’ that ‘goes round and round’ (Wetherell 2012, 7; Back and Sinha 2016). It is the indiscriminate profusion of nostalgic and melancholic attachments, heedless of the politics of their lost ‘object, place, or ideal’, that make them seem so dangerous. This omnivorous ubiquity has marked out forms of loss like nostalgia not only as incompatible with modernity itself, and neoliberal futurity, but also as incompatible with any progressive politics (Bonnett 2010; 2012).

The unsettled politics of loss have also invited careful reappraisal, however (Ahmed 2007; 2010; Eng and Kazanjian 2003; Bonnett 2010a; 2010b; 2013). In everyday practice, as geographers Alastair Bonnett and Catherine Alexander argue (2010; 2012, 393), nostalgia – a love of the lost past – holds ‘an articulation of homelessness’. Even the kitschiest nostalgia has in its structure ‘a declaration of distance from one’s object of desire’ that is ‘self-reflexive’. It is nostalgia’s ‘distance’ from its ‘object of desire’ – the very lostness of the past – that makes nostalgia restless, unsettled, and therefore open. In deindustrializing Tyneside in England, for example, where nostalgia might signal a retrenchment and repetition of old violence against perceived outsiders, Bonnett and Alexander document how ‘fond memories and a sense of loss … enable and pattern an active attachment and engagement with the city’ that extends out of the past and into how the place might be reimagined for the future (Bonnett and Alexander 2013, 391). This is not to argue that nostalgia is always politically good, as Bonnett (2010, 235) clarifies, but that it is everywhere and everywhere unsettled, in practice ‘mobile and interwoven’ (Bonnett and Alexander 2013, 391). In line with radical and utopian traditions of the past, even apparently simple nostalgia might offer ‘a “productive” and “living” disposition’ toward the future (Bonnett and Alexander 2013, 391).

Just as others argue for a reappraisal of nostalgia in practice, scholars have argued for a reappraisal of melancholia. Melancholia, too, might not be a morbid failure to move on from attachments to the past but instead a mode in which the ‘past’ is ‘alive in the present’ (Eng and Kazanjian 2003, 4). Melancholia might offer ‘an ongoing and open relationship with the past—bringing its ghosts and spectres, its flaring and fleeting images, into the present’ (Eng and Kazanjian 2003, 4). The deindustrialized melancholia of a rustbelt, coalfield, or factory town might seem ‘stuck’, ‘mired in a kind of compulsive, melancholic attachment to un-mourned trauma’ (Bright 2012, 145). But melancholia in practice might not be stuck but instead, as Bright found of an English coalfield community, liable to shift and flare, even to burst into unexpected, public, bonfire-and-effigy forms of protest (Bright 2016). Like the melancholia of class loss, Sara Ahmed has argued that the melancholia of migrants’ ‘bad feelings’ over racism’s long history might not be so pathological, either. Instead of framing melancholy – and the body who feels it – as a problem, Ahmed suggests we ‘reread the melancholic subject, the one who refuses to let go of suffering,
and who is even prepared to kill some forms of joy’ for a resistant politics.

David Eng and David Kazanjian, in their eponymous book on loss, perhaps put this most clearly. Similarly, they seek to ‘depathologize’ loss, and explore its lived political itineraries and potential (Eng and Kazanjian 2003, 3). Mourning and melancholia’, as Eng and Han point out, might be organic to ‘processes of immigration, assimilation, and racialization’ that minorities experience (Eng and Han 2000, 667). As part of their project, they wonder what are ‘the modes of being and affective registers—that make investment in that new world imaginable and thinkable?’ (Eng and Kazanjian 2003, 4). They contend that it is the ‘excess’ of loss which, in refusing or failing to let go of the lost object, keeps the present open to such new imaginings.

Loss, nostalgia and melancholy may therefore not only index history’s losses, refusing to ‘misremember’ the hurt of the past, but also open up the possibility that the future may be otherwise. By staying ‘stuck’, these losses refuse to go away. They refuse to be buried as the inevitable casualties of a better future promised but perpetually deferred. Indeed, I argue that loss may open up generative, if ambivalent, ‘melancholic excess’ (Eng and Kazanjian 2003, 5), a way of staying ‘sore’ (Ahmed 2007, 133; 2010) at the ugly histories of the past that linger in the present. What is more, I argue for an unremarked but queer and pointed pleasure in ‘staying sore’, and actively feeling of loss and ‘hiraeth’ on the move here. In this, I build on the work of critics who argue that to staying stuck in a lost time, or failing to move on ‘is a violation of normativity and thus a kind of queerness’ (Freeman 2010; Sedgwick 2002; Winant 2015).

6.3 Stories of recovery and salvage

Moods of loss move in the photographic archives through acts of salvage and recovery. As I argued in Chapter 3, the kind of public feeling that interests me often moves in patterns rather than particulars. As postcolonial scholars remind us, it is important to read along ‘the grain’ of archives, to understand the ‘patterning effect of archives’ (Highmore 2006, 83; Stoler 2002; 2010; 2011). Archives should be imagined not as not ‘sources’ of content, but instead as ‘process[es]’, as ‘epistemological experiments’ in creating order (Stoler 2002, 87). What’s most interesting about these photographs then might be how they ‘matter’ to people (Miller 1998; Edwards 2012) and move socially as gestures of recovery. In this light, the photographic archives belong to a genre of loss and salvage, mourning and return.

In these three stories of photographic archives lost and found, single images matter less than the archive of images as curated collection, a body with its own biography. All three share biographies of salvaging the lost past by reprinting, re-exhibiting and sharing that past in the present. Not only are the
photographs ghosts and memorials of what has been, conserving sites and candid shots of people from disappearing altogether: they are performances of return, salvage, and getting stuck on the past. As performances of recuperation, I argue, they work in a genre of loss. Here, I follow Elizabeth Edwards in thinking about collections of photographs as ‘material performances that enact a complex range of historiographical desires’ (Edwards 2009, 131). Their order is a romantic, luminous imagined community in which, as social worker Nura put it in the heritage projects, ‘And I remember that everybody loved each other? …Everybody just mingled, regardless of culture, race’. The archives return and return to ‘the Cardiff of vibrant communities, however hard they had been hit’ (Gibbard 2012, 4). In this case, I argue that all these stories and practices of recovering lost or buried photographs make the photographs ‘material performances’ of a profound desire to recover lost pasts: lost places, livelihoods and ways of living together.

The story of the Cardiff before Cardiff archive exemplifies this kind of salvage practice, but the other two photographic archives share similar stories of recovery. Jon Pountney, an artist and photographer, found a wreck of more than 1000 anonymous, dusty negatives and photographs in a cupboard in a dilapidated building slated for renovation. Captivated by the images, Pountney began restoring the negatives, printing them in his darkroom and posting them to a Tumblr blog and Facebook page he called ‘Cardiff before Cardiff’ (Waldram 2011; Walker and Thomas 2013; Pennypost 2012). Covered by The South Wales Echo and The Guardian, the anonymous photographs on social media soon gathered more than 10,000 followers.

Stirred by the anonymous photographs, noticing how the neighbourhoods were undergoing dramatic change, Pountney went out to reshoot the places and subjects in the found photographs. He shot in black and white, using a camera like the original, juxtaposing the old photographs online with the new. Sometimes the old pubs, halls, shops, front gardens and streets in the new photographs were gone, or all but unrecognizable. Sometimes, however, they were almost the same, and the same people, thirty years older, opened their doors and looked back again at the young photographer’s camera (Waldram 2011; Gibbard 2012). The two photographers met, and out of the mix of old and new photographs created an exhibition in the Wales Millennium Centre and a 2012 book, Cardiff before Cardiff. They are part of an artistic practice continues to focus on memory, longing, recovery and place. Pountney has also pasted large prints of his own and Robertson’s photographs on railroad bridges, buildings and graffiti walls.

14 See, for example, Hiraeth: Rhondda Remembered, which features the work of Valleys photography of David Thickins recovered and reprinted from boxes of negatives in the local library, and Llanhrnymney, a project with the Cardiff Story Museum to take photographs in colour of the first residents of the Llanrhymney Council Estate and their homes.
around the city (see Figure 6b). At this scale, the doorframes and structures in the pictures accordion-fold back in space; the people grow to the size of the body or even bigger, silvery and cinematically grand. Pasted up, they glow under grey cloudy skies, beside technicolour posters for circuses and shows, and over time buckle and peel away.

Figure 6b. Prints of photographs taken by Keith Richardson in the early 1980s, pasted to a derelict building and graffiti wall on City Road, in Cardiff, by artist Jon Pountney as part of Cardiff before Cardiff. Photograph taken by author, City Road, Cardiff. Undated.

As the found past mingled with the sought-after present, the photographs offered an occasion for ‘intimate publics’ (Berlant 1997) to connect to the past. People captivated by the photographs have commented and written in to identify themselves, to point out friends and neighbours, and to share stories and memories about the places in the pictures. The images seem to reinvigorate the past, as one woman put it, ‘bringing the old Splott back to life’ (Holliday in Pountney, 2011). They curate a specific biography of loss and salvage. As a project, Cardiff before Cardiff evokes a feeling of loss, a ‘recognition that something is gone, which won’t return’, and one that reverberates with ‘emotional impact’ among people who recognize themselves and family in the pictures (Gibbards 2012). They reanimate a particular
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vision of a past way of life. As the writer of Cardiff before Cardiff insists, the photographs show ‘the Cardiff of vibrant communities, however hard they had been hit’, including the ‘multi-ethnic’ people who were ‘part of its warp and weft’ (Gibbard 2012, 4). They continue to attract people, the social media sites still lively with conversation and new posts of historic photographs, links to stories of Cardiff’s historic sewers and caves, old family photographs, maps of neighbourhoods, portraits, and street photographs.

The book and exhibition of 1950s photographs, ‘Down the Bay’: Picture Post, Humanist Photography and Images of 1950s Cardiff (Jordan 2001), published by the Butetown History and Arts Centre (BHAC), shares this biography of recovery and loss. At the turn of the millennium, as work on the Cardiff Bay redevelopment began in earnest and ‘the community that was “Tiger Bay” faces the real possibility of final extinction’, Glenn Jordan and the BHAC conducted a project to reprint and re-exhibit Hardy’s photographs in celebration of his warm vision of that community. Hardy’s photographs, owned by Getty Images, appear regularly in WalesOnline’s ‘nostalgia’ section. For this project, however, the photographs were enlarged to poster-scale and meticulously reprinted on lustrous archival paper for an exhibition at the Centre, as well as a book. The book featured the original Picture Post story’s text, an edited version of 1972 essay by Stuart Hall, and a substantial introduction by Jordan, who is a historian of photography and a photographer (2004; Jordan 2008a; 2008b).

In the introductory essay to the book, Jordan explains that the photographs trigger in him memories of ‘THE WAY WE WERE’, because ‘these images memorialize and symbolically reinstate vanishing traces of community life’ (Jordan 2001, 20). The recovery of Hardy’s photographs resists this ‘vanishing’ by ‘reinstating’ the detail and texture of a lost everyday life in the area. Yet however ‘real’ the photographs might feel to audiences (2001, 7-8, 13), it is important to remember that they attach those audiences because they make a visual, emotional argument about the past. The photographs are ‘popular’, ‘alluring’ and beloved because they create an image and imaginary of the area as ordinary, tidy, and glowing with life. Indeed, in a closing essay edited from a long form 1972 journal article about the arc and loss of populist, progressive politics, Stuart Hall registers this argument about ordinariness as the magazine’s signature style.

The project does not only salvage what has been and might be lost, however, but amplifies and polishes it, adding volume and luminosity. Jordan’s research in Butetown develops the captions, naming the people in them where they were unnamed in the 1950 magazine, and continuing their stories. In a picture of dapper, unnamed Somali men in a cafe, Jordan points out Mahmood Mattan, wrongfully accused of the murder of Lily Volpert just two years after this photograph was taken (2001, 52). Another note names smiling Malia Hersi, captioned only as ‘Bay Beauty’, and shares that she later married and moved
to the United States (Jordan 2001, 60). Again, as for Jon Pountney, this act of recovery and reclamation is part of a practice of gathering, archiving and preserving the past for the purposes of the present by Glenn Jordan, Chris Weedon and the Butetown History and Arts Centre.

An original copy of the 1950 *Picture Post* helps further clarify the politics of this act of salvage and illumination. Here, behind a cover headline advertising ‘How Coloured People Live in Cardiff’s Dockland’ (*Picture Post* 1950), Hardy’s original photographs are haunted by a wash of cheerful, banal racism. One advertisement for a laundry soap, for example, features a minstrel character called the ‘Jungle Joker’ who speaks in mock pidgin; another for ‘Robertson’s Golliberry preserve’ features a golliwog caricature on the jar (*Picture Post* 1950, 48). Everywhere in the advertising, only white people feature. An enormous blonde model’s face, in color, fronts the Dockland story, advertising face powder in shades ‘from Natural, Rachel, Peach, Suntan, Apricot’ (*Picture Post* 1950, 48). The stories immediately adjacent feature blurry, shirtless, unnamed photographs of West Indian and South African people, and the stories offer stereotypes about ‘the Caribbean’s lazy calm’ or colonized people’s ‘envy’ of the colonizer (*Picture Post* 1950, 22, 28). The high contrast pictures look as two-tone as a photocopy.

In this context, Hardy’s photographs make subtle, lambent rebuttals. Even on aged newsprint, the photographs glow. The captions name the subjects, and quote or tell a story about them. The pictures ring with textures: a shawl wrapped around a baby, a newspaper wrapping fish, a fresh white shirt and handkerchief, smoke, brick, slate, shiny brass, puddles, bright canals and clouds all bring a homely, sensible haptics to the images. The photographs might also offer memories that never were, imaginations, fantasies and new visions. Qualities of the photographs, such as a shadow, glow, or slant of light, can alter memory. The poet Philip Levine describes the ‘surreal’ experience of noticing ‘soft golden light’ in photographs of a now-derelict Detroit automobile plant in which he had worked as a young man: ‘this sudden revelation of sublimity in a place I can only think of as a hellhole simply stops me’ (Moore 2010, 114-115 in Strangleman 2013, 32-33). Similarly, light in these photographs of Cardiff is one of the devices that makes the city both look like itself and look more romantic than itself. In the photographs, low Northern light, suffused with Atlantic clouds and weather, transfigures the ordinary. Long light carves up the perpendicular with dramatic diagonals. It marks up the faces and features of the portrait subjects, gleams on their skin, rakes over their wrinkles and lines. Because of the way the photographs capture light, a sensible, material quality of the place, they make over homely subjects into visions; they turn the scruffy ordinary into ‘sublimity’. These visions of the past map onto and over memory.
Finally, the story framing Anthony and Simon Campbell’s *Inside Out: Reflections of the Tiger Bay Community* (Campbell and Campbell 2013) follows a similar story of recovery. The collection of photographs has been curated according to a story of capturing the past for the present. The photographs were shot in a period from the late 1970s to the early 1990s, but only published and exhibited at the Butetown History and Arts Centre in 2013. The collection, pulled from their personal archive, is framed as an insider’s view of Butetown in the past, and therefore a corrective to outsiders’ imaginations of the place. The Campbell brothers grew up in Butetown, and like a family photo album, everyone in the book has a name and a story, as the index names all of the people and places in its pages.

Like the other two archives of photographs culled, curated and researched by Pountney and Jordan, they gather intimate collectivities and cathect shared feeling. The forward, for example, describes the exhibition as ‘highly praised’ and ‘popular’, as the photographs ‘truly capture the atmosphere of Tiger Bay’ (B. Campbell 2013, no pn). Lately, with photographer Keith Murrell, Simon Campbell has been developing the *Bay Life Archives*, a local history project connected to a Facebook group, which is dedicated to gathering and documenting pictures and other ephemera to capture ‘the history and life of the Butetown community’ (Campbell 2016). Like the *Cardiff before Cardiff* group, *Bay Life Archives* is lively with people taking part, using the page to share pictures, memories, stories and questions about the past. The book is further framed as a fragment of an archive that spans decades of work, immanent with the possibility of further recovery.

The photographs of *Inside Out*, in particular, capture a vibrant ‘multiculture’, with an emphasis on culture, in which cultural forms and genres mix and flourish (James 2012, 24-25; see Alexander 2000; Back 1994; Williams 2002[1958]; Vertovec 2007). The book is full of people making music, dancing, and enjoying being together: two kids dance in front of a record player, for example; musicians play outdoor sets in the sun and in dark, smoky venues; people eat and laugh together in a crowded hall; dancers rehearse in a mirrored studio. Because so many of the featured sites of everyday conviviality have long since been knocked down, the photographs therefore memorialize and celebrate a lost way of being together.

### 6.4 Mapping lost places, conserving patterns

Structurally, all three archives enact a recovery suffused with loss and longing. To look only at their structure, however, would be to miss how they mobilize loss: through the piquancy of detail and the rhythm of pattern. Unlike portraits that fill a frame with and focus on a face, all three archives offer streets, neighbourhood landscapes and scenes rich with the textures, details, patterns and materials of everyday life in a place. Here a photograph is not a disembodied image but ‘a sensory photograph,
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entangled with orality, tactility, and haptic engagement’ (Edwards 2012, 221). Indeed, studying ‘the more mundane sensual and material qualities of the object’ (Edwards 2009, 136) might open up the ‘desires’ that animate the social lives of the photographs. The granular detail of textures, materials and patterns of stuff and flesh within the photographs make them richly sensory mnemonic objects. Such details map a particular place that has since been ‘demolished’ and rebuilt in many ways beyond recognition.

One of the most pronounced losses brought forward in these photographic archives and refracted through the heritage projects is a loss of place, a loss precipitated by city redevelopment and dispersal in and around the Bay and Butetown. The lost places are intimate and local: buildings ‘knocked down’, squares and parks paved over and rebuilt, canals filled in, factories ‘gone’, trees downed, houses ‘obliterated’ (WOL 2015, 47). In the life writing group, one woman who had grown up in Butetown wrote: ‘the place where I grew up and played, the place of childhood has gone, obliterated to such an extent that only in my mind’s eye can I see the streets, the landmarks and the people’ (WOL 2015, 47).

With these sites go the granular feel of specific materials, from curled iron gates to net curtains, from stained glass pub windows to the long tables at a community hall, from rows of sweets, beer and other everyday items in a corner shop.

Places invite and entangle attachment. Geographers studying emotional attachments to places have noted that ‘even short moves across space can be intensely felt’ (Rogaly and Taylor 2009 in Rogaly and Qureshi 2013, 424). For Nura, a long-time Butetown resident and youth worker, the redevelopment registers as destruction of the buildings that make up the tangible heritage of the place:

> There’s a lot of changes in the area, from knocking buildings down, rebuilding stuff... They decided they were going to redevelop, and they knocked it down. Anything that they want to put up? Doesn’t matter. They knock it down.... As for everything that’s new down here? I really do think it’s, ah, them and us. And I think it was done for tourist people. It was not done for Butetown people.

Along the same line, for those who do not or cannot move, these geographers argue that not being able to move, or ‘having to stay put while others move in around one, may be equally affecting’ (Rogaly and Qureshi 2013, 424). For another writer in the Writing Our Lives group, the physical landscape of the past is elegant, organic and full of movement: the ‘tall’, ‘sculptured’ ‘lampposts where we hung our ropes to make a swing’ (WOL 2015, 48) contrast with the new ‘straight steel poles’ of the present, which offer ‘no soft glow giving a hint of illumination but hard stark florescent light’. Throughout this piece of writing, the writer repeats that the old place is ‘all gone’, ‘gone now’, in a refrain of loss. Of course, the sterile, hard city landscape as she describes it is a metaphor for the losses of redevelopment, but the material, physical features of her childhood neighbourhood affected how it felt to be there and the kinds of movement and play such a landscape afforded. If affect is indeed ‘sedimented’ (Bright 2016) through...
generations, these open, watery sites have been ‘dredged and filled in’ (WOL 2015, 47) over time. The result of redevelopment is not lively but ‘safe and sanitized’ (WOL 2015, 47), not ‘soft’ and welcoming but ‘hard, stark’. To take another example, ‘green park’ in Grangetown, the site of childhood dens and play, has turned into a dystopic scene of ‘abandoned play things, no parents to keep order, toilets closed for years and the bowling green and the Park inn abandoned’ (WOL 2015, 51).

*Cardiff before Cardiff* pairs corner shops and streets from the past and present, both long gone and just the same, and mourns the gaps in city streets ‘knocked down’ by city demolitions and regeneration schemes. Hardy’s 1950s photos capture street corners, shops, front rooms and bedrooms in homes, boxing clubs, a dance hall, a milk bar café, a mosque. In *Inside Out*, the lost spaces are cafes, community halls, pubs, bars, homes and open-air festivals. It is the loss of and change to these spaces, and the kinds of multiculture and convivial feelings that they afforded, that the photographs document and circulate.

In all three archives, everyday details and sites serve as memorial to an ephemeral now lost everyday. These photographs frame the everyday as a set of intertwining and juxtaposed patterns. Patterns in the architecture and materials of Cardiff provides the compositional rhythm or backbeat. Terraced houses in long rows, curling iron gates and garden railings, dotted net curtains, slate roof tiles and pavements, chimneys and chimney pots, shopping bags and knitted jumpers, press into and around the figures (Highmore, 2011, 142). In these pictures, the textures and patterns soothe as printed forms of an everyday life that is also repetitive, patterned, and therefore conserved against transformation. In shots of shops – fruit and vegetable markets, bakeries, butcher shops, corner shops, the textures and patterns and things figured around the subjects embed them in a specific moment. These photographs frame the everyday as a set of intertwining and juxtaposed tessellations of materials and objects. The black and white film registers texture and pattern instead of color: the effect emphasizes pattern as a formal component of the neighbourhood.

What is the meaning of pattern? As Irene Gedalof notes, ‘any site of belonging involves a dynamic entanglement of repetition and innovation’ (Gedalof 2009, 88). Some patterns often refer to the materials and construction of the industrial era – slate, iron, glass, net, brick, etc. – others to the repetitive blare of advertising text. Formally, the interest in pattern therefore offer a subtle visual rhetoric of repetition and conservation of these earlier times. In one of Robertson’s photographs, a family portrait the Patel’s in their corner shop, the cardigan of a woman we know from the caption only as ‘Jay Patel’s wife’ knits a bright looping pattern over the print of her sari. The repeated shapes of candy, cans and bottles create a syncopated and repeating rhythm in the photographs. In Kaid Sala’s grocery shop in the lead photograph in Bert Hardy’s ‘Down the Bay’ story in the *Picture Post*, small repetitions of bottles
and packets frame the figure of the shopkeeper (Hardy 1950, 13, see Figure 6c).

Pountney’s photographs, often set in small shops, are also portraits imbricated in patterns: in a photograph from “March 11”, a man in a machine-knitted jumper mixing Nordic patterns with Kachina skulls stands at the till. Blurred behind him National Lottery posters, a Western Union advertisement, and a ‘Thanks to you’ charity poster glint in the hard light. Made more pronounced in black and white, the patterns materialise the everyday reproduction and keeping on.

Like nostalgia, and like everyday life more generally, the work of ‘conserving’ in neighbourhoods like the ones photographed in these archives might be ‘flagrantly ambivalent…both expansively inclusive and oppressively exclusive’ at the same time (Highmore, 2006: 114). Sharing old photographs of neighbourhoods in Cardiff might connect subliminally to the conservative undertow of an idealized neighbourhood as needing ‘preservation’ from change brought by certain kinds of visibly or audibly or sensibly different new migration (Gedalof, 2009). There are new shops where the old once stood. A walk
down one of the streets in a historical photograph posted to *Cardiff before Cardiff* in 2016 finds Mario’s Food Planet, Perfect Poser Photographer, the Broadway Drawing Studio, a used furniture store, and a flower shop along the street, among others. Clifton Street and Splott Road, just nearby, bustle with little shops like The Happy Wok, Pasha Sandwich Bar, Nata & Co, a Portuguese bakery, and Ana’s Market, a Polish grocer, a green grocer with cardboard crates of cassava and hot peppers, Clarks Fish & Chips, Kebabs & Fried Chicken, Ali Baba Barber Shop, Polski Sklep, as well as several butchers flying Welsh flags, among many others. There is clearly life here, if of a different flavour.

The mood of loss and salvage these photographs set alight, even if open, then, must therefore be understood as ambivalent. Writing about London’s East End, another Docks neighbourhood with a history of migration, industry, and post-industrial class loss, Malcolm James describes how generations there ‘mourn the loss of “community”’ before ‘slum clearance’ and redevelopment (James 2014: 657). Who feels and expresses this mourning, he notes, ‘depended on our bodies, on the collectivity of the
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lament, and on the presence of “others” (James 2014, 660). A mood of loss does not move evenly over bodies, but as Sara Ahmed (2014) points out, attaches and orients people unevenly, producing ‘affect aliens’ who are ‘not in the mood’. The politics of loss, like any mood, must therefore be interrogated on their own terms.

6.5 Lost livelihoods, lost lifeways

An essential part of the politics of loss might be a stubbornness, an emotionally ‘sticky’ refusal to get over the past (Ahmed 2007; 2010). In the oral histories and life writing, many of the accounts of older women chart losses brought on by redevelopment and by a mysterious, post-industrial economic ebb. In places, women of colour seem to cathex the feeling of the collective by mourning losses and ‘feeling down’ (Muñoz 2006) for others, especially men of colour and young people. Mary, in her 80s, when asked about what changes she had witnessed in the area, described how she had seen wages fall, jobs disappear, and the numbers of local children in poverty rise:

Well, obviously there’s been a lot of changes. I’ve lived down here, um, a long time. And I think Butetown is not immune from what happens in the rest of the country and the rest of the world. There was a time when most of the men here went to sea. They weren’t unemployed, except during the Depression, in the 30s, before I was born. But most of the men went to sea, and you had lots of manufacturing factories around. They’ve all gone. And all the men were working. Because I remember when ...there were very few children receiving free meals, very few. And now I think 80 per cent of the schools in this area, the children receive free meals. And you only receive free meals if your income isn’t sufficient. So, there’s been lots of changes there. I think one of the, the saddest changes is that there haven’t been the jobs for men. And a man who is supporting his family, he wants to earn a decent wage. And there are lots of jobs today, where the payment, it is, is derisory sometimes, and it’s not always possible to keep a family, even though you may be working. 15

The interviews refer to patterns of unemployment and not enough to go around. The factories have ‘all gone’: the pay has gone from ‘a decent wage’ to ‘derisory sometimes’, pay that makes it impossible to ‘keep a family’.

The speaker registers economic patterns and statistics, pointing out factories like Currans where her own mother worked during the war, but also an affective charge to these losses: she describes the loss of ‘jobs

15 While most of the wards in Butetown, Riverside and Grangetown are among the 10 per cent most deprived in Wales, the number of children eligible for free school meals in area schools, an indicator of poverty, in 2014 in fact ranged from a 30-45 per cent, still well above the UK average of 19 per cent (see http://mylocalschool.wales.gov.uk/Schools). According to the Wales Centre for Equity in Education, 1 in 3 children in Wales live in relative poverty, and 1 in 7 experience severe poverty, with household incomes of less than £12,200 a year: Wales therefore has ‘the highest rate of child poverty in the UK’ (Grigg et al. 2014).
for men’ as ‘one of the saddest changes’ in the economy. Later in the interview, she continues, ‘Unfortunately now, there aren’t many jobs around. Especially for the younger people. ...And of course, all the factories that surrounded the area that I knew as Tiger Bay, they’ve gone. Those factories aren’t there’. The speech also calls up images of buildings and structures that have ‘gone’, which ‘aren’t there’ in the landscape of Tiger Bay any more except in her memory. Her account registers the industrial ghosts of the area, dredging up the ‘sedimented affect’ (Bright 2012) of deindustrialized class loss.

The affective charge comes forward in the way the area has been ‘unfortunate’. Structural precarity and poverty comes through as a ‘struggle’ felt in an everyday way. When youth worker Nora was asked about changes she had witnessed in the Bay over time, her economics lesson was both full of feeling and concrete:

You couldn’t buy a bar of chocolate for a pound now, could you? You can’t buy nothing for a pound. ...Now, it’s horrendous. It’s so expensive. Government is just messing everything up. Wages are not, cannot keep up with the cost of living. The cost of living is there, wages is there. The cost of living is there, wages is there. So, everybody will always struggle. Unless you become a millionaire or something. Her sense of the present is as a relentless struggle. She contrasts this struggle and the way ‘you can’t buy nothing for a pound’ with the past. When she started working at 16, giving part of her wages to her family, she could still buy some new clothes, and save up for ‘a bit of gold’ jewellery. The everyday good life was within reach. Now ‘the cost of living’ is too high. It pinches everyone, ‘unless you become a millionaire or something’ and happen to be one of the lucky individuals who strike neo-liberalism’s promise.

As she points out, along with a handful of older writers in the creative writing group, part of what has been lost is a kind of elastic capacity to make do with a little, too. Nura describes her son’s surprise that she knew how to fix a broken bicycle. A writer described ‘a background of relative poverty which was rich in resourcefulness’, a grandfather who made her toys from found and recycled wood and taught her ‘to recognise the value and beauty of things even when others no longer had any use for them’ (WOL 2015, 22). Part of what the memoirists and oral histories recount, therefore, is a sense of making a good life through resourcefulness, in a way that seems lost in the present.

Along a similar line, the photographs tune into a sense of livelihoods now lost. Many document workers – mostly shopkeepers and people in their butcher shops, cobbler’s, bakeries, newsstands, paint shops, laundrettes, barbershops, hair salons and market stalls, but also artists in their studios, dentists amidst their dentures, ‘dinner ladies’ in industrial kitchens, bankers behind their desks. These archives of
photographs are, in part, about livelihoods. These working class livelihoods take the form of shop jobs, small repair garages, tattoo parlours, local counters, one man bands, little outfits, and overall, about the reproductive labour of keeping the neighbourhood going. The archives therefore set up an explicit contrast between the livelihoods – and an associated aliveness of a way of life – with the present. In their contrasts, being stuck on the social world of the past (a world in a way before liberalism) counts the losses of changes forced by liberalism’s rapacious destruction and change.

Photographs in the genre of ‘smokestack nostalgia’ have been accused of prettify rough history, capturing former industrial places in lush visual forms that ignore their significance as places people lived, worked, struggled, and suffered (Strangleman 2013). Loss refracts through the visual imagination of deindustrialized and colonial ruins, whether in Detroit, Namibia, or Yorkshire (see DeSilvey and Edensor 2012; Edensor 2005; Steinmetz 2008; Strangleman 2013). Walter Benjamin notes that documentary photography ‘can no longer photograph a run-down apartment house or a pile of manure without transfiguring it’ and ‘making misery itself an object of pleasure, by treating it stylishly and with technical perfection’ (Benjamin 1970, 5). Photographs of poor neighbourhoods often do what feminist artist Marth Rosler critiques as ‘veering between outraged moral sensitivity and sheer slumming spectacle’ (Rosler, 1989, 303). Yet projects documenting deindustrialized landscapes and ‘ruins’ do not necessarily prettify places with deep histories (Strangleman 2013, 29). These pictures are less ‘smokestack nostalgia’ or ‘ruin porn’ (Strangleman 2013), however, and homelier, what I might call chimney pot nostalgia. The grind of inequality isn’t so much captured but made more legible and intelligible through these images.

Their way of framing photographs of people in deindustrialized places has been and may be used for critical effect, not only by labour historians but by the communities of people touched by and negotiating their new relationship to these places (Strangleman 2013, 30-32). The curated mix of the found photographs with the new creates a nuanced sense of what ‘poverty’ might mean from outside and inside its frame, for example. One of the women who recognized herself in the *Cardiff before Cardiff* images as a child described a kind of shock at how her childhood might look to outsiders. In the 1980s photograph, in front of a scruffy brick wall, a blonde girl in dungarees smiles at the camera, hip cocked, gripping a barefoot toddler wearing only shorts in her arms. She wrote in to *Cardiff before Cardiff* with exclamations over a tear in the knee of her dungarees and her cousin’s bare feet: ‘looking back at the photographs now we must have looked quite impoverished. I can honestly say that whilst there may have been poverty in the community, there was never a poverty of spirit’ (Rachael Holliday in Pountney, Richardson and Gibbard 2012, 16). Pountney includes a candid portrait of Holliday as an adult, smiling.
Feeling together: emotion, heritage, conviviality and politics in a changing city

and standing on the street, hands confident in the pockets of her printed dress. As collections, all three collections photographs strike a similarly delicate balance between the scruffy, peeling, warn out or ‘damaged’ materiality of hardship, and a liveliness or ‘spirit’ along with tidiness and respectability.

In one of Robertson’s photographs, one woman’s shins and ankles, pitted with old scars along the shin bones, puffy at the ankles above her sensible shoes below her sensible skirt, speak to the state of things. The whole place is like this: dear, ugly, just what happens to tired flesh. Amidst the rough, overworked flesh, however, there are moments of possibility, because the bodies of people in the city are the organic forms that curve and sweep against the blunt structure of the architecture. The contrast here is emphasized by the uniformity of the terraced houses and shopfronts, and the lack of other organic shapes like trees or gardens. Hair curls and swoops through the frame, clothes pull with wind or gravity, hands and faces gesture expressively, all bringing lightness to the heavy grids and diagonals of the industrial city. They are the life in a gridded, urban geography. On thresholds, in doorways, on sidewalks, stoops, and the low walls of front gardens, as organic forms in pictures otherwise bluntly marked out by industrial and post-industrial architecture and advertising, the bodies in these photographs make an argument for their own vitality despite the frame and pattern and damage of geographies of power. The way bodies appear in these photographs and the way they touch others therefore expresses an ‘opaque and stubborn life’ (Highmore, 2006: 113), a refusal to disappear.

The unique identity of Butetown as ‘mixed’, and of the women speaking, differentiates the mourning in these accounts from the ‘white memories’ (James 2014, 660) James describes. Instead, the mourning these accounts describe is closer to what queer theorist José Estaban Muñoz (2006) describes as ‘feeling brown, feeling down’ (Muñoz 2006, 676). This mourning is an expression of not ‘feeling quite right’ with the state of things. In documenting and mourning lost livelihoods, these photographs and accounts join in a kind of ‘feeling brown, feeling down’ and melancholia that points to the way the job inequalities of the present are patterned by the inequities and disposessions of the past.

6.6 Haptic kinship and community losses

The photograph archives seem, for the photographers and audience, to ‘capture’ (Campbell 2013) a close-knit, convivial community of the past. In these photographs, bodies hold, grasp, lean into, wrap up, wipe clean, laugh with and smile at each other, communicating their kinship and care through touch and gesture. Touch among different bodies in the photographs, all marked by race and variously scarred by age and class, manifests a kind of kinship and multicultural conviviality that presses back against forms of violence to those bodies. In particular, the photographs resist violence against multi-ethnic families,
and relationships between white women and men marked out as black, Arab, or ethnically other (Bland 2005). This violence Les Back and Shamser Sinha evocatively term ‘the ruins of racism – or what might be called the social damage of anti-immigrant times’ (Back and Sinha 2016, 523). But these bodies are surrounded, too, by the material ruins of imperialism, dispossession and deindustrialization (Edensor 2005; Strangleman 2013).

Touch among marked bodies in these ruins has a quality Tina Campt calls (2012, 91) ‘fugitivity’. For Campt, looking at 20th century portraits and family photographs of diasporic black subjects in Europe, the figures in these photographs embody both belonging and unbelonging:

> The fugitivity of these photos lies in their ability to visualize a recalcitrant normalcy in places and settings where it should not be, and to display survival not in heroic or spectacular acts or events but in the mundane practices of the everyday... through defiantly protective practices of homing and embrace. (Campt 2012, 91)

The domesticity and everyday habits and doings in all three archives of photographs demonstrate this ‘recalcitrant normalcy in places and settings where it should not be’. They insist upon a durable ordinariness and respectability (Skeggs 1997). They conserve ‘mundane practices of the everyday’ in shops, at thresholds, at home, at work.

Race and racial difference is ‘produced’ and modulated through all three photographic collections in different ways. All three, however, frame moments of gentle touch. Touch matters in this context because it dramatizes both skin and touch; in dramatizing skin, it dramatizes the visual and haptic politics of race, gender, generation and affiliation – relationships Campt calls ‘homing and embrace’. In many pictures, as I argue about the anti-Powell protest photographs in Chapter 3, the way people touch each other ‘stag[es] a politics of proximity’ (Abel 2014, 96). In one Picture Post photograph, for example, a glowing Patti Douglas holds her baby “wrapped ‘Welsh-fashion’ (Hardy 1950; Jordan 2001: 34). Titled “Welsh Mum” in 1950, the curve and cinch of the cloth wrapper, holding the baby close, spirals compositionally toward Douglas’s hand on the child’s chest. Behind her, a child looks away from the camera, arms wrapped around the neck of dog. Many of Hardy’s photographs in fact feature families and friends in scenes of homely, affectionate touch. In these images, by ‘bringing skins of diverse hues into

---

16 Blurred in the shadows of the open door behind them both, back against a wall, another woman holds her own hand to her chest. The caption goes on, ‘Her friend...stepped back to avoid being photographed’ (Jordan 2001: 34). The effect is of what Mary Lawlor (2006) calls ‘displayed withholding’ – the display of a secret as a secret that refuses to be told. As Lawlor (2006: 62) explains, ‘the gesture points towards a dimension of being and knowing that cannot or will not be shared with visitors’. Such gestures note and mediate the intrusion of a visitor’s desire to know, to see. The caption articulates this relationship. The ‘friend’s’ blurred figure, telescoped back into the shadows, puts the viewer into a haptic, spatial relationship with the photograph: proximity, but distance.
transgressive contact, they dramatized a new social body’ (Abel 2014, 96). Touch ‘dramatize[s] a new social body’ not only within individual images, but as collections of photographs in which affectionate touch repeats over and over again. These two images represent only two of many that feature bodies knitted together by gentle, affectionate touch.

Recovered and recirculated, through touch I argue that the photographs capture and profess a profound politics of belonging and ‘being here’ against those ruins and damage. Through everyday touches of kinship, the subjects in these photographs resist what Paul Gilroy calls ‘the segregation or banishment of those whose “origin, sentiment or citizenship” assigns them elsewhere’ (Gilroy, 1987, 45). In the archive, they insist: we were here, surrounded by and embedded in an everyday Welsh life we also shaped. In so doing, they work against the ‘cultural amnesia’ of minority ethnic life in Wales that scholar Charlotte Williams argues ‘rendered us with an invisible present’ (Williams 2002, 177-8 in Jordan 2005, 55).

The real threats to these forms of family as out of place and out of bounds have been outlined elsewhere (see the introduction, and Chapter 5). The reality of racial violence brings a haunting sense of bravery to the visibly ‘mixed’ friendships, kinships and intimacies printed in the way people touch each other in all three archives. Touch in the frames makes haptic the ‘sense of community’ and closeness others talk about with longing. If, as Marianne Hirsch suggests, photography ‘naturalizes’ ways of doing family, and as it ‘immobilizes the flow of family life into a series of snapshots, it perpetuates familial myths while seeming merely to record actual moments in family history’ (Hirsch 1997, 7), then perhaps photographs of alternative kinships naturalize and immobilize them, too. As photographs of convivial multiculture in practice – people living together with difference – they work at instantiating that community. Belonging is not a fixed, stable or static object, after all, but a forging or making (Campt, 2012 p. 42-43). The photographs insist upon an embodied belonging felt and lived as ordinary in Wales through habits like wrapping up babies, reading the paper, having a cuppa and shopping for fish, sausages, or bread. They offer kind of taking place in pictures.

Of course, it is delicate to take race as something concrete and clear in the bodies of people in the photographs. Instead, I take the photographs as objects and collections which, as Coco Fusco trenchantly notes, ‘rather than recording the existence of race, … produce[e] race as a visualizable fact’ (Fusco 2003, 16). In black and white photography, with its long and violent history as technology of the ‘real’, photographs have ‘shot’ racialized others to document, know, govern and police them (Campt 2012; Abel 2014, 98). Photographs of poor and racialized bodies have long been instruments of eugenic classification, racist justification, colonialist and state control, and police surveillance (Sekula, 1986[1989];
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Pinney and Peterson (2003). Indeed, Tina Campt argues that even family photographs and family albums, to take just one example, became a critical tool for the eugenics movement and its everyday underbelly as families themselves produced pictures as racial records (Campt 2009, 112-113 [notes]). Therefore, I take these collections of photographs not as evidence of racial harmony, but as a performance of an argument about and desire for closeness.

In circulating this desire, all three of these photographic archives orient themselves to a queer kind of temporality and kinship ‘where it should not be’, but maybe was, and could be again. Elizabeth Freeman (2010) describes the ‘chromonormativity’ that tugs people – and maybe cities and other places – into certain narratives of time. These normative narratives of time might include an individual’s progress through heteronormative narratives of marriage and the nuclear (not neighbourhood) family, the future orientation of childrearing (not other-mothering), accreting wealth (not sharing ‘sweets’ and the burden of collective survival), for example. Normative time also dictates the narratives of progress, futurity and promise that wheel around urban redevelopment. To refuse to go with these currents is to practice ‘asynchrony, or time out of joint’ (Freeman 2010 in Winant 2015, 125) with a kind of queer attachment to another way of living.

6.7 Queer times and conclusions

This chapter has explored how, in order to understand the politics of belonging and dispossession in the present, both theorists of emotion and affect, and researchers of social practices, have called for feelings of loss, nostalgia and melancholia to be reassessed rather than dismissed. As this chapter has unpacked, the effects of loss are not a given. These three recovered archives of photographs of everyday life in Cardiff, shot in black and white over the course of more than 60 years, set alight a feeling of loss for lost places and spaces, lost decent wages and livelihoods, and lost kinship and collectivity. Yet they also argue that all three emphatically were once here. Cardiff as a city has undergone a transfiguration over the past thirty years in particular, moulting out of deindustrialized economic depression into a self-declared cosmopolitan capital of culture and ‘world-becoming’ city (Gonçalves 2008; 2017). Yet as the introduction to this thesis makes clear, all this change has come with losses. In the face of a vision for a place that perpetuates entrenched inequalities in the pursuit of a promise of ‘renaissance’ and ‘regeneration’ (Gonçalves 2017), a stubborn insistence on what has been lost insists that this vision is not without cost.

The effects of an attachment or orientation to loss are not secure, of course. Malcolm James (2014) describes how melancholia for a lost sense of community in the East End marked out some bodies as
impossible; instead, memory practices of loss ‘re-traced’ forms of whiteness. A public feeling might indeed touch and move unexpected publics, including new arrivals (Bonnett and Alexander 2013). It might also, in the long tradition of utopic, Leftist imagination, open up scope for a new future to be reimagined. Or it might not. This is, perhaps, where the indeterminate status of photography is helpful. As Coco Fusco points out, photographs offer a promise of both what is and what might be desired. We impute to photography both the power ‘to record pre-existing material realities and to visualize our fantasies of what reality could or should look like’ (Fusco 2003, 26) – to record what has past and to project what might have been and might be. What loss as a public feeling offers then is, at least, a kind of ambivalent openness.

This last turn gets at the thread of pleasure – a pleasure and desire where it, perhaps, ‘should not be’ – in melancholia that winds through all three of the archives (Freeman 2010; Bradway 2011). The photographs stay stuck on a way of living that may also have been ‘knocked down’ and ‘knocked back’; they animate love and longing for that way of living by recovering and returning to these photographs, by refusing to move on. If the broader question of this thesis is about how the contours of what community might be take shape and saturate with feeling, these three collections of photographs, stippled with loss and longing in the oral histories and life writing, get at something of how a ‘sense of community’ forms as a kind of melancholic, queer sense of loss. This queerness in loss is political as a kind of sensibility of or attunement to ways of being otherwise. Paradoxically, in obsessively returning to the past, the archives of photographs orient themselves to the imagination of the future.

As part of this projection into what might be, the next and final chapter turns to their students in this intergenerational exchange: the young women called on to project these histories into their own futures. It tracks new pressures to navigate the demands of the future and produce out of the past the right ‘mix’ of heritage and ambition, a ‘prudent subject’ (Brown 2003), a ‘becoming young woman’ (McRobbie 2007). The chapter therefore explores how the projects refracted neoliberal desires for lush, cheerful, visible diversity, for skills and qualifications, and for embodying the right forms of hope and futurity. It explores the hot and cold feelings attached to the ‘model’ figure of the *hijabi* entrepreneur (and her abject others). It carries forward the attention to feeling by asking both how these new pressures touched the young people in the projects and how they registered moments of refusal as ‘affect aliens’ and being ‘not in the mood’ for what was offered.
Chapter 7: Fashion a model self

7.1 Introduction

This last chapter also begins with photographs, but in different genre: a series of glowing fashion photographs in colour, shot for the final exhibition of one of the girls’ heritage projects. In the pictures, three young women smile and pose in bright bangles and rakish hats. They wear brightly patterned outfits, patched with family snapshots and crackly silver paint, which they designed and stitched. The professional photographs radiate colour, youth and polish. Posed and poised, the three look like the ‘becoming young women’ Angela McRobbie describes as the model feminine subjects of the neoliberal age: ‘the pleasingly, lively, capable and “becoming” young woman, black, white or Asian, [who] is now an attractive harbinger of social change’ (McRobbie 2007, 722). At the final public exhibition for the project, the same young women in the fashion photographs were introduced and praised publicly for their ‘bright futures’. The photographs circulated this ‘becoming’ model subject in posters printed and framed for public exhibition, in local South Wales media to celebrate and promote International Women’s Day, and in materials for the projects’ funders.

This ‘becoming’ figure of flourishing liberal femininity refracts through the heritage projects and their liminal mediations (Tyler and Gill 2013). The figure appears, mediated on the pages of The Guardian and the BBC (Cochrane 2015), as poised Muslim ‘becoming young women’ like Cardiff locals Dina Toki-O and Maysmode’s Haifa Shamsan, who model hijabi fashion, an entrepreneurship of the self, and how to ‘mix well’. As Shamsan describes a design aesthetic that mixes fabrics and designs from Wales and Yemen, ‘I love to mix vintage and I love to mix heritage pieces’ (Shamsan in Lloyd 2016). It is this mix, this well-judged calibration of the ‘bit of the other’ (hooks 1992), that Shamsan hopes will ‘appeal to both Muslim and non-Muslim women’ (Lloyd 2016). She must carefully manage this mixing, because, as Toki-O puts it in an interview in The Guardian, ‘There’s a fear factor around the hijab’ (Cochrane 2015). Mixing is her brand. So is her cheerful hustle, her entrepreneurial fashion line designed and stitched in one of Butetown’s towers of social housing apartments, and her orientation to futurity (McRobbie 2013; Gill 2016). It is toward this style of futurity, and the affective labour of ‘becoming’ such a model subject – fashioning liberal femininity and modelling a model self, or recoiling from both – that this chapter turns.
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While the previous chapters focused on some of the labours of collective feeling articulated by older women in the projects and in the photographic archives recovered from the past, this chapter turns to the more interior affective labours on the self for young women who took part in the projects. It shifts to how they handled a complex cultural inheritance in the present and projected themselves toward the future. These issues came forward in particular in the fashion design sections of the two young women’s heritage projects, in which participants researched, designed, constructed and modelled clothes for fashion shows and exhibitions. As they fashion clothes, I argue, they fashion selves as mobile, ‘becoming’ young women. They model garments and model the norms of what counts as good cultural heritage, good femininity, and good aspiration. They also turn away from these model selves, orienting themselves otherwise toward the future.

The chapter therefore develops in two parts. First, it explores the way fashioning a model self, under the liberal rubric of the heritage projects, demands a range unaccounted affective labours and ‘techniques of the self’ (Foucault 1993[1980] in Fadil 2011, 83; Fadil 2008; 2015; Gill and Orgad 2015; 2017). Girls are called on to acquire qualifications, build individual ‘skills’ and confidence, and orient their lives toward middle class acquisitiveness and mobility (Gill and Orgad 2015; 2017). Further, marked out as racially and religiously other, young women also find themselves called on by the frame of the projects to modulate lived culture into ‘a bit of the other’ (hooks 1992; Huggan 2001). This ‘bit’ will both soothe fears about the threat of the too-other and appeals to liberal desires for the right kind of diversity (Hage 2000, 202; Jackson 2014, 66; Fadil 2011). In this context, ‘radical cultural difference is either co-opted into the normative culture or pushed beyond the boundaries of the “legitimate” and denounced as “illiberal”, “irrational”, “barbaric” or “fundamentalist”’ (L. Ahmed 2010, 41 [notes]). The figure of the successful hijabi entrepreneur, as an exemplar of the creative worker of colour with the right style of ‘cut and mix’ cosmopolitanism (Friedman 2000 in Sylvanus 2007, 205), comes to embody this model self.

Finally, to be a ‘becoming young woman’ also involves affective labour to manage feelings and orient oneself toward whiteness as normative current, an affective measure of good and bad feelings and comportment (Ahmed 2007; Muñoz 2006). Young women reach for this ‘becoming’ model self, even as they also recoil from it, and move toward other forms of attachment and orientations to the future.17

---

17 Many thanks to Naasiha Abrahams at KU Leuven for this evocative term, and for asking me to clarify how people in these heritage projects reach for and recoil from whiteness.
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Figure 7a. Garments and textile details produced as part of *Mothers Then and Now*. Photos taken by author, November 20, 2014 and December 12, 2014. Copyright Women’s Workshop at BAWSO and the author. Used with permission.
The second part charts how the labour of being ‘becoming’ also involves suppressing anything too other, anything which might disturb or run against those norms (or seem to). The ‘top girl’ has nothing to do with what might seem bad, sour, or bitterly difficult, such as challenging histories of racist violence, of exploited labour, or bad feelings about injustice or community itself. The model young woman is therefore haunted by ill-fitting, post-colonial others: here, in particular, Bangladeshi and South Wales garment and call centre workers (Gill and Tyler 2013; Gordon 2011; Bright 2016). These haunting reminders of imperialism and capitalism, the slippery materials of the garments, the girls’ amateur loose stitches, all drag against the promises of liberal whiteness.

In the second part of this chapter, therefore, I trace feelings and moods that drag against this model subject. These other feelings, mixed with fakes and mimicry, and values for living otherwise, all expose the effort of making a habitable ‘becoming’ self. In places, they suggest ‘other “modes of being”’ (Fadil 2011, 105). The young women also orientate themselves away from an instrumental, mobile futurity toward friendships and other bonds, staying close, and other moods. Futurity, what might be imagimable as a future, shifts and moves with a mood (Carabelli and Lyon 2016). This chapter thus follows a feminist line not to adjudicate those forms of subjectivity, but ‘to situate them (in their specificity) and render other “modes of being” intelligible and meaningful’ (Fadil 2011, 105).

7.2 Designing, stitching, modelling fashions

Fashion made up an integral part of both of the heritage projects, Mothers Then and Now and 16-60 A Woman’s Voice. As part of these sections of the projects, young women researched local fashion history and then designed and stitched garments (See Figure 7a). Both groups asked the older women about fashions in clothes and hairstyles as part of the oral history interviews. The older women talked about crinoline petticoats and flared trousers, braids, afros and Jerry curls, skirt lengths, headscarves and face veils. For the design process, young people cut apart stacks of fashion magazines and printouts of vintage fashion image searches to make ‘mood boards’ of different fashion decades. Some went to the central public library to look through fashion books together and make ‘look book’ journals of design ideas from fashion magazines. Some looked through images online. Others went to the V&A museum for the costume collection and a special exhibition, ‘Club to Catwalk: London Fashion in the 1980s: 10 July 2013 - 16 February 2014’, wandered through wild knitwear, safety pin jackets, striped leggings, and other fabulous club kid costumes, and soaking up what Angela McRobbie has described as the first generation of British fashion design (McRobbie 2003). The fashion components of the projects were
performative: through them, the young women both self-consciously performed styling and fashioning a certain type of self, and instantiated that self.

Fashion tutors worked with each group of young women for a section of the heritage project, about three months, to research, design and produce garments for a fashion show. In the first project, the fashion tutors worked for the local college; in the second, the fashion tutors had their own fashion label and design business as well as teaching community sewing classes. In both projects, the tutors brought simple sewing machines to the workrooms, and the garments came together in a scene of chaos, piles of fabric and cut paper, buried scissors and needles, mixed with waiting for the help of a tutor to pin patterns, cut the fabric, thread the machines, fix jams and other issues. The number of young people working on the fashions ranged from two to twenty. One participant, who ultimately decided to go to college in fashion design and production, memorably battled with stitching her garment and produced bird’s nests of scarlet thread. Fabric for both projects was a combination of bought fabric in plain colours and textiles donated by participants’ families, including embroidered silky material for salwar kameez and headscarves, as well as colourful cotton West African wax print. Because the projects met only for a few hours once a week, and as not all participants came to each session, some pieces progressed rapidly while others lagged behind in an earlier phase. Some pieces were never finished at all.

In 16-60: A Woman's Voice, the group produced six garments collectively, as well as a theatre set for the fashion show featuring five collaged figures that included textiles (see Figure 7b). The tutors chose to leave the garments as they were produced by the participants, exposed tacking, loose threads, gaps and all. At a distance, on the runways at the two exhibitions where the clothes were shown, the shapes and textures of the clothes gave a gestural idea of drape and silhouette. Up close, on the dress forms in the exhibition spaces, the homely, collaborative construction was very clear. At the exhibition, one young woman picked at obvious, uneven, white basting thread tacking up gathers in a turquoise gown with disgust, saying ‘it’s not finished’ to her friend.

Participants also made their own tee-shirts stencilled with hearts, words, and peace signs, which they modelled at the exhibition at The Cardiff Story. The six garments were first modelled not by participants but by adult friends of project staff at a runway show open to the public in the community gallery of the Cardiff Story Museum. The garments were also displayed on mannequins as part of the exhibition. Young women in the project did model the garments for a women’s only Eid gala at Cardiff’s Victorian City Hall to a crowd of about 400 people, including Dina Toki-O. At the event, in addition to an
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opening prayer song in Arabic, a talent show featuring street dance and singing, a group performance of a Somali wedding dance, and a comedic dating show skit, three other hijabi fashion designers showed their collections. For this event, the young women spent the whole day preparing to host the event, dressing up, doing elaborate make up with professional supplies, and doing a photo shoot.

In Mothers Then and Now, each participant chose a pattern for and made one garment: a jumpsuit, a kimono cardigan, a skirt, trousers, a top, a jacket, among others. These ten items were then styled and mixed together for the fashion shows and exhibitions. The tutors scheduled sessions on weekends and over the school holiday for the girls to work on their garments. They also spent long unpaid hours themselves before the final exhibition finishing with construction, ironing photos and crackly silver lamé tape into the patchwork, and tidying up the pieces. The young people modelled their own garments at a celebratory Mother’s Day event for the project held for family and friends in the function room of the community centre where the project met. They were also displayed on mannequins as part of the final project exhibition at the Buttertown History and Arts Centre, and in the Millennium Centre. The tutors also recruited a friend who was a professional fashion photographer to stage a photo shoot with three of the participants, styling several of the garments together with funky hats and the girls’ own clothes. For both projects, therefore, fashions were not only opportunities to learn how to design and make clothes, but opportunities to play with fashion, styling, and modelling. As performances, therefore, they are particularly ripe for analysis.

7.2 Contours for the model self

These two young women’s cultural heritage projects exemplify a trend in rising interest and investment in young women as the embodiment of precisely circumscribed success and futurity (McRobbie 2007; 2008; Tyler and Gill 2013; Gill 2014; Koffman and Gill 2013). Millennial young people generally find themselves either coveted as consumers and celebrated as ‘pioneers’, like McRobbie’s ‘top girls’, or remained as abject failures (James 2012, 149; Carabelli and Lyon 2016). The latter are often working class and, as Malcolm James points out, signal widening social and economic inequality and the dystopian effects of late capitalism (Harrison 2004 in James 2012, 149). Any failure to live in a sanctioned way is imagined as private and individual failure of personal management (Byrne, Elliott and Williams 2016; James 2012, 150). Individual ‘people who are deemed “useless” to economic recovery are demonised and degraded’ (Byrne, Elliott and Williams 2016, 78). Yet young people in Wales were also among the hardest hit by the recession, with unemployment rates higher than 20 per cent in 2011 (C. Evans 2013, 2, Barry 2016). They make futures in a country poorer than the rest of Britain and in areas affected by ‘multiple
indexes of deprivation’ laid down over generations. Whatever the obstacles, however, a ‘top girl’ nevertheless leverages access to education, employment and contraception into a life as a wage-earning, avid consumer and liberal cultural citizen. While young people generally bear the weight of the future (James 2012, 149), young women in particular are invited to cultivate themselves as model neoliberal subjects of choice under the promise of ‘capacity, success, attainment, enjoyment, entitlement, social mobility and participation’ (McRobbie 2007, 721).

This neoliberal governmentality compels compliance through a lived sense of freedom and choice, rather than by obvious oppression (Nikolas Rose 1990 in Baker 2010, 3). Girls are invited to choose lifeways which mirror white middle class tastes, desires and normative power, whatever the social and psychic costs (Evans 2013; Mannay 2013; Reay et al. 2007; Skeggs 2004; Skeggs and Loveday 2012; Walkerdine, Lucey and Melody 2001; Walkerdine 2015). Popular media like reality TV offers models of good girls to strive to be and bad girls to avoid at all costs; these models serve as ‘forms of gendered governance (and self-governance)’, a regime of forms of inhabitable girlhood (Tyler and Gill 2013, 82).

As feminists interrogating gender and nationalism have noticed, ‘women, in their “proper” behaviour, their “proper” clothing, embody the line which signifies the collectivity’s boundaries’ (Yuval-Davis 1997, 46). Because ‘the figure of the Muslim woman’ in Britain has become a figure of such public anxiety, too, how Muslim young women behave, what they wear, to what they aspire draws anxious attention and attempts at control (Gedalof 2009, 2011; Lewis 2015, 21; Mirza 2006, 2009, 2015; Puar 2007; Yuval-Davis 1997; Weedon 2016). In particular, the headscarf or hijab has become an ossified object of ‘fear’ in a narrowly circumscribed debate about oppression on the one hand and liberation and agency on the other (Bracke and Fadil 2012). Despite their small numbers, proportionally, British Muslim young women ‘remain a topic for unrelenting public and media debate in the UK’ (Dwyer and Shah 2009: 55).

Both projects were shaped by this broader social and political context. Both were funded by the same Young Roots Programme of the Heritage Lottery Fund, and the HLF articulates the kind of ‘becoming’ youthful subjectivities they hope to cultivate. In the introductory materials for the Young Roots funding scheme, for example, the value of a heritage project lies in part in the way ‘getting involved helps [young people] develop new skills and interests, connect with their communities and have fun’ (Young Roots 2017). Thus, this model subject offers freshness – a sensibility of hopefulness and energy around the future – and also develops herself as an agent with capacities for the future with ‘skills and interests’. Further, the HLF language frames culture as something tangible, as Franz Boas might put it, something
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that “‘belongs” to a place and a people... which marks them out as special and distinct and which can be discovered, described, documented and displayed’ (Dicks 2003, 149). This is culture portable, minable, performable. Leila Ahmed describes how ‘liberal multiculturalism’ in Britain ‘reduces difference to skin colour or to a lifestyle choice (to eat curry, to wear a sari, to listen to bhangra music’) (L. Ahmed 2010, 41 [notes]; Nayak 2012). Along this line, policies of multiculturalism have been pilloried as ‘little more than a celebration of steel bangles, saris and somosas’ (Nayak 2012, 456). In this context, not celebrating the right kind of cultural heritage (Fortier 2007, 113) becomes framed as a source of threat.

Instrumental culture should offer just ‘a bit of the other’ (hooks 1992), as bell hooks describes it, a carefully modulated and tempered multicultural ‘seasoning that can liven up the dull dish that is mainstream white culture’ (hooks, 1992, 21). For hooks, the ‘seasoning’ of cultural otherness promises to restore lost vitality, to heal political disillusionment and alienation in the majority (hooks, 1992, 25). Other critics describe how the middle classes hunt for and consume from the social margins as a source of cultural replenishment (Skeggs 2004). For Bev Skeggs, it is working-class culture which middle classes ‘plunder’ and use to ‘forge new identities in the making of new markets’ (Skeggs 2004 in Reay et al. 2007, 1050). Culture can be put to work by the consumption and display of objects invested with its imagined, reified and constructed allure, and used to fabricate cosmopolitan identities by those who can afford to buy.

As explored in the theoretical chapter of this thesis, whiteness moves in part as a rubric for good and bad feelings, as José Esteban Muñoz puts it. Whiteness is ‘a cultural logic that prescribes and regulates national feelings and comportment’, a way of gauging ‘some modes of emotional countenance and comportment as good or bad’ (Muñoz 2006, 680). Meeting the measure of liberal whiteness means labouring to produce palatable forms of ‘emotional countenance and comportment’. This might be the migrant subject’s labour to “return” the love of the nation through gratitude (Ahmed 2004, 137), for example, or to present as what Katarzyna Marciniak describes as the “clean” subject - humble, disciplined, “invisible” (Marciniak 2006, 34). Outed asylum seeker and teenage reality TV star Gamu Nhengu, for example, worked to prove herself as ‘aspirational, hard-working, talented, demure, caring, community orientated, law-abiding and innocent’ (Tyler and Gill 2013, 84). This is not to suggest that the gauge of whiteness has a total grip on the emotional lives and comportment of people measured by it. Agency is of course more incorrigible than that, and how people ‘inhabit’ the gauge, measure or structure of power more nuanced and mobile (Fadil 2011, 89; Stewart 2007), as this chapter will unpack. But it is to suggest that the labour of becoming a model liberal feminine subject is not only about accruing the requisite trappings, qualifications, or fashions, but about managing and modulating feelings.
The labour required to fashion a model self falls unevenly and disproportionately on some girls more than others (Reay et al. 2007; Threadgold et al. 2008). The model secular liberal subject is not natural, as Nadia Fadil (2011; 2015) explains, but requires intimate affective labour. To be a ‘top girl’ (Tyler and Gill 2013) for young women in Britain involves disciplining, selecting and cultivating certain cultural elements and rejecting or suppressing that which is too other (L. Ahmed 2010, 41). Some young people more than others need to “do” work on themselves to accrue value (Kulz 2014, 688). And to be of value means finding a way to make cultural heritage instrumental, to put it to use, as part of a market in which culture can be traded (Skeggs 2005, 47).

7.3 Top model: the hijabi fashion entrepreneur

The projects focus on one particular ‘top girl’, a hijabi fashion entrepreneur (Lewis 2015; Rahmawati 2015; 2016). This ‘top girl’ is perhaps modelled best by Dina Toki-O, a fashion blogger and designer who threaded in and out of the Cardiff heritage projects, and who is ‘arguably the most high-profile hijabi blogger in the UK’ (Cochrane 2015). As Tyler and Gill (2013) note, model ‘top girl’ selves are highly mediated. They argue that the types or models of girlhood available to young women manifest through new media, particularly the ‘mediated intimacies’ of contemporary media forms like reality shows and social media (Tyler and Gill 2013, 79-81).

As a mediated figure, the hijabi entrepreneur offers, in line with white middle class British values, ‘an aspirational habitus which, despite [her] difference, makes [her] not too different’ (Baker 2005 in Reay et al. 2007, 1048). Toki-O’s social media feeds and YouTube make up tutorials and video diaries regularly garner hundreds of thousands of likes or views (Torkia 2016). Within the UK, indeed, Toki-O is so culturally emblematic that the cover of Reina Lewis’s 2015 book, Muslim Fashion: Contemporary Style Cultures, features a photograph of two young women laughing and, according to the caption, ‘crossing the street to meet Dina Toki-O at Alessia Gammarota’s hijab style street shoot, Oxford St., London, 2012’ (Lewis 2015, 281-282). In 2015, she featured in a one hour documentary on BBC Three called Muslim Beauty Pageant and Me, which followed Toki-O as a finalist in the Miss World Muslimah pageant in Indonesia. As a local celebrity for those in the know, Torkia-O attended the final celebratory event for one of the heritage projects in City Hall, where she sat at the central table. She helped judge the talent show that formed part of the entertainment for the event. Toki-O’s presence also caused a flutter of excitement around the four runway shows of modest fashion by local designers which also formed part of the Eid event’s entertainment. Torkia’s own connections to Cardiff and her rags-to-riches, call centre-
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to-celebrity biography were all a central part of her appeal and relevance to the young women, especially in the first heritage project.

Another example of a ‘hijabi’ entrepreneur from Cardiff, Haifa Shamsan, featured in a BBC Wales series of stories on the tower blocks social housing in Butetown (Lloyd 2016). The article describes how Shamsan ‘is part of the rapidly growing Muslim fashion industry and has set her sights on the big time’, and ‘runs her business - Maysmode - from her flat on the top floor of a tower block in Butetown, Cardiff’ (Lloyd 2016). Through how Shamsan is mediated, the contours of the hijabi entrepreneur as model subject take shape. The article applauds Shamsan’s entrepreneurial efforts as part of a growing industry for Muslim women of ‘modest’ fashion, beauty and lifestyle products with a staggering opportunity for profit: ‘the Muslim fashion market is booming’ the article notes, and will be ‘worth £226 billion by 2020’ (Lloyd 2016). With references to new ‘modest’ lines by corporate fashion giants such as Dolce & Gabanna and British high street standbys Uniqlo and H&M, the article also features Shamsan smiling and modelling her own designs with her daughter.

As the celebratory profiles in The Guardian (Cochrane 2016) and BBC Wales (Lloyd 2015) make plain, Torkia and Shamsan’s combination of entrepreneurship and Muslim identity is a particularly appealing form of ‘becoming young woman’ for middle class white audiences. The way Toki-O and Shamsan’s self-presentation mixes luxurious consumption and creative entrepreneurial aspiration with self-styling as a model of ‘modest’ young Muslim entrepreneurs in particular points them out as models of liberal femininity. Both are stubborn, beautiful survivors of structural precarity: working at a call centre, living in social housing. Reina Lewis points out that ‘the material fact of their presence in the visual world is itself an intervention into knowledges about Muslims’ (Lewis 2015, 29). Yet both women have not only diffused the ‘difference’ of values or beliefs by describing their style as reasonable, familiar, but in fact made them instrumental and part of their brand of self. This is not to say anything in particular about the women themselves, but instead about how they are mediated and translated as successful subjects, and how as models, they shape the contours of what’s translatable, even what can be represented.

These women are part of a global online community of Muslim fashion bloggers who use social media, as researcher Aulia Rahmawati puts it, ‘for self-expression and virtual historical diaries for self-transformation’ (Rahmawati 2015, 1). Rahmawati in fact presented her research on Indonesian hijabi fashion communities to one of the groups of young women involved in the heritage projects. The fashion practices in the heritage projects should therefore also be understood according to Reina Lewis
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(2015, 19) as part of a ‘shared (and internally contested and variable) new Muslim dress culture’ which matters socially and politically. The luxurious, glossy aesthetic of the fashion sites, for example, according to one avid Indonesian hijabi blog reader in her mid-twenties, ‘challenge[s] the impression of poor, unfashionable, fundamentalist Islam as we often see and read in the papers’ (Rahmawati 2015, 5). ‘Pleasure’ for readers, however, also mixes with ambivalence about the ‘problematic and unattainable’ objects, brands and fashions. Muslim fashion, like its secular counterparts, ‘produces its own panoply of marginalized others as failed consumers’ (Lewis 2015, 19). The hijabi entrepreneur as a figure of promise is therefore clearly not set apart from but knitted into broader economic hierarchies of value and subjectivity.

This fashion culture shaped what some of the young women taking part in 16-60 A Woman’s Voice, Mothers Then and Now, and Writing Our Lives wanted to wear. It also inflected the kinds of design that interested them, their sense of collective, if heterogeneous, Muslim identity, and their sense of professional futurity as bloggers, designers, and make-up artists in-the-making. Turning my attention away from some of the meanings the girls attached to hijabi fashion, however, and toward the broader forces shaping their public performance of that fashion culture instead, is about returning to my object of study: the formation of liberal whiteness as a mood, a model of emotional comportment.

7.5 Producing qualifications, violent paperwork, and managing boredom

However open, noisy and messy with process on any given evening, the heritage projects followed a structure guided by acquiring qualifications, developing skills and making time and culture useful (Reay et al. 2007). Cultural heritage in both projects is imagined as instrumental, a source of new skills and interests, a tool for the self. In an evaluation document, the first project explained that ‘the young people developed skills in oral history research, film production, editing, art, music and fashion as well as communication and presentation skills’ (Evaluation 2013). The set of project goals for the second, meanwhile, in addition to providing an occasion for ‘young women to examine the change of women’s role in society across cultures and generations’, and ‘to promote active and positive intergenerational activity’, set out to ‘provide opportunities for young women to gain new skills and accreditation’ (Evaluation 2014). The document reports that ‘the project helped [participants] to make new friends, grow in confidence, find out about their heritage and try new things’ (PAH 16-60 Report 2014).
Figure 7c. Stage set and details for 16-60 A Woman’s Voice. All photographs by the author, October 3, 2013. Copyright the author and People Around Here. Used with permission.
These goals define success in affective and aspirational terms, orienting the girls in the project to new affections, confidence, and new learning and ‘skills’. It enjoins participants to ‘be creative!’ (McRobbie 2013), and join the city’s aspirations toward an economy driven by the creative industries (Creative Cardiff 2016; Gonçalves 2017). Confidence (what Rosalind Gill and Sharon Organ might call ‘the confidence cult’) is the goal: a feeling, a comportment of confidence, becomes the measure of success. It is as if through aspiration and education, mobile young women, as they move out of the economic margins, will haul the whole ‘dirty old town’ with them into the future (Mannay 2013, 92; Baker 2010; Walkerdine, Lucey, and Melody 2001; Chwarae Teg 2015). The promise of mobility persists despite lived experience of being, on the contrary, stuck in low-paid work, even with a degree (Threadgold et al. 2008; Mirza 2009; Davies et al. 2011; Evans 2013; Mannay 2013).

Young women, particularly minority young women in a historically working class area, are invited “‘do” work on themselves to accrue value’ (Kulz 2014, 688), to fill themselves up with skills, and to match white middle class notions of aspiration. In 16-60: A Woman’s Voice, the evaluation reported that some of the young women acquired these qualifications: ‘Oral History – Practical level 1 NOCN (3 credits)’; ‘Creating Video Stories level 2 NOCN (3 credits)’ and a ‘Bronze Arts Award’. In this project, the evaluation reported that ‘the majority of the girls are working towards a Duke of Edinburgh award (either bronze, silver or gold) and all of the activities and skills in the project contributed towards their DofE (Duke of Edinburgh)” (Evaluation 2013). In Mothers Then and Now, only a handful of girls managed the paperwork to acquire an ‘EdExcel Entry Level 3 Award in Creative Media Production’ (Evaluation 2014).18 Young women reflected instrumental back on the projects, describing, among other effects, that the projects helped them to ‘learn more & better’, to ‘gain accreditation’; that taking part was ‘Good for your CV’; and would lead to a ‘Good job’; ‘Be[ing] rich☺’ (Evaluation 2013). All of this bureaucratic and instrumental language contrasts vividly with the talking, laughing, listening, filming, cutting and gluing, painting and performing that happened during the projects. This bureaucratic language licenses these messier processes, this use of rooms and resources and wages, and gives official credit to ways of being together.

18 EdExcel itself, a private, for-profit academic testing, examination and qualifications company, is almost too perfect as an example of how neoliberalism’s ‘competitive meritocracy’ (McRobbie 2007: 218) saturates young people’s everyday lives. The NOCN (National Open College Network) accreditations, by contrast, with origins in 1980s efforts to open up further education, and to recognize and formalize learning people undertook outside of school, now also uses the language of ‘brand’, as ‘a leading brand of adult vocational qualifications’ (NOCN 2016). Whatever its origins, NOCN’s present identity is certainly instrumental, as it aims ‘to provide qualifications including vocational skills, employability training, productivity improvement, traineeships and apprenticeships’ (NOCN 2016).
But bureaucracy also modulated the experience of the projects. While the more colourful, musical, celebratory elements of the projects might draw our attention, as David Graeber reminds us of the banal, ‘stupid’, dystopian hell that is bureaucracy, ‘it is precisely paperwork, rather than any other forms of ritual, that is socially efficacious’ (Graeber 2012, 108). Doing paperwork changed the mood. In practice, acquiring qualifications meant long hours spent on tasks the girls unanimously complained were ‘boring’ (Evaluation 2014). Not every young woman was interested or tolerated this disciplinary ordeal. Further, as David Graeber has pointed out, bureaucracy’s very banality can disguise its violence (Graeber 2012, 112). Meeting the qualifications in practice meant thick stacks of paperwork, and therefore hours filling in questions, complaints about bad handwriting, spelling, and having had enough of school. In the first project, the young women’s critical feedback focused on paperwork: the project was ‘boring sometimes because it dragged’; ‘too much paper work and need a bit more practicals’ (eleven agreed); ‘too much paperwork’; ‘toooooooooo much paperwork’; ‘too much paperwork, too much paperwork, too much paperwork, too much paperwork’. While there were suggestions to ‘video record’ answers for the qualification or to do a bit of paperwork every week (Evaluation 2014), the comments confirm the repetitive disciplinary feeling created by the paperwork.

Paperwork enforced rubrics and templates and was therefore ‘socially efficacious’ in soliciting work on the self from the young women who took part, in drawing authority to white middle class desires for the projects, and, perhaps, in subjecting the young women to its discipline, reminding them of their place. In an interview, two young women talked about how the digital media work, which was necessary for the qualification, felt like a series of instructions, a ‘routine’ and a ‘drain’:

Lucy (age 16): I enjoy media, but this isn’t media. It was more like a drain, like a draw…
Halima (age 14): No, it’s not, because you’re instructed to do this and this and this. I’d rather just…
Lucy: I can’t be creative with it. So, I…
Halima: No, I’m just like ughhhhh.
Lucy: Yeah, it’s just like routine. … It was quite a long time.
Alida: You say you’ve done media, and you like media, what kind, what’s a successful media project that you’ve done?
Lucy: I’ve made my own magazine.
Alida: Mm-hmm
Lucy: Yeah, so I’ve done that for my coursework. Making your own film. And stuff like that, where you can put your own ideas into it. It’s, we’ve got to design a website, but it’s got to be like a certain way, if you understand what I mean. Like I can’t express myself. (Evaluation interview 2014)

The requirements of the qualification felt repetitive, even robotic, because ‘you’re instructed to do this and this and this’, with the result that she felt that she ‘can’t be creative with it’. They describe the way this work felt ‘routine’ and like it dragged out into ‘quite a long time’. Another participant described the
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website element and media qualification of the project as being ‘way too long’ (Rajma, age 15, 2014). For Halima, it’s a chore that can only be expressed with a sigh of disgust. These comments reflect the deadened feel of the group when what the participants made ‘had to be a certain way’. They express one way of not being ‘in the mood’ (Ahmed 2014) for reaching for an aspiring, liberal whiteness in the projects.

Of course, just because something is boring doesn’t make it worthless, and formal recognition may have unpredicted, open future effects. What people do in everyday interactions may loosen and open up political possibilities that take place outside of evaluation documents or promotional copywriting. But the presence of bureaucratic values in the spaces of the projects narrowed and disciplined how young people took part – as participants in need of skills, not as collaborators, leaders and activist organizers, or even artists or practitioners themselves, for example. The boredom provoked by bureaucracy and paperwork suggest some of the ways the force of liberal whiteness pulled at people in the projects. So does the presence of haunting others, which the next section unpacks.

Figure 7c. Sets, runways and stages. Filming set ups for 16-60 A Woman’s Voice and Mothers Then and Now. The first image shows the fashion runway and red stage curtains in the back corner at a final exhibition event at The Cardiff Story. The second shows the set and green screen for filming the devised short film for Mothers Then and Now. All photographs taken by the author, October 3, 2013 and September 2015.
7.4 Ghosts of the other: precarious workers

The *hijabi* entrepreneur is haunted by her other: the precarious garment worker (Tyler and Gill 2013). In one iteration of ‘Can the Subaltern Speak?’, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak describes how the figure of someone like Japanese designer Rei Kawakubo, founder of the androgynous, arty fashion label *Comme des Garçons*, comes forward in her creativity as ‘a plangent female individualist’ who is also ‘the favored subject/object of feminism/masculism’ (Spivak 1999, 352). Spivak’s point is that the figure of the ‘plangent female individualist’, here embodied in the fashion designer who is also a woman of color, does not indicate a breakthrough of or toward equality but in fact ‘often allows an other woman to disappear’ (Spivak, 1999, 352). In this case, the ‘other women’ who disappear behind the figure of the *hijabi* entrepreneur are the precarious failure and the garment worker.

The young Muslim woman entrepreneur works as a figure to be celebrated because of how she fits in certain colonialist narrative. Rehana Ahmed critiques the mainstream appeal of figure in her study of the reception by the British liberal elite of the 2003 Man Booker-prizewinning novel, *Brick Lane*. The novel follows a Bangladeshi Muslim woman who stitches garments in her Tower Hamlet apartment. Ahmed argues that the character ought in fact to be read as ‘an allegory of a woman’s individual liberation from community oppression and her journey into the neutral space of an “inclusive” multicultural Britain’ (Ahmed 2010, 25). That is, the character is appealing to a British audience even of ‘the right-wing *Evening Standard*, for example, which repeatedly distorts and stigmatises Britain’s Muslim minority’ (Ahmed 2010, 35), because she confirms deeply-held British attitudes and narratives about the sources of her oppression (in minority culture, not British cultural, social and political formations) and a satisfactory life (as a liberal subject of choice and entrepreneurship [Fadil 2011]).

Sewing is of course feminised industrial labour. It is also marked by colonial and globalized networks of power and the particular, intimate history of diaspora, Primark, and the Welsh Valleys. Avtar Brah has traced how British worker shortages post-World War II and poverty entrenched by colonialism drew Asian migrants ‘to occupy some of the lowest rungs of the British employment hierarchy’ (Brah 1997, 21), including particularly Asian women in manufacturing, especially in the textile and garment industries. Many British Asian women also worked as ‘home-based machinists, paid on a piecework basis’ (Kabeer 2000, vii; Brah 1997, 69-71), as part of ‘one of the most exploited groups of workers’ (Mitter 1986 in Brah 1997, 71). In the 1970s and 1980s, as recession deepened in Britain and industrial work began to collapse, these jobs were more likely to disappear. Brah argues that Asian women and men contributed
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to the ‘major industrial struggles’ across Britain in the 1970s over low wages and discrimination (Brah 1997, 72). Naila Kabeer notes, however, that Bangladeshi women in particular were left out of mainstream union organizing efforts from the 1970s onward. They were left out in part because of British (colonial) ‘culturalist attitude’ which ‘configures homeworking as the “logical cultural choice” for Asian Muslim women whose movement is apparently constrained by the patriarchal structure of their culture’ (Kabeer in Ahmed 2010, 31-32). Job losses and exploitation in Britain corresponded with new jobs for women in Bangladesh in garment factories after 1982, as part of ‘the extensive geographical restructuring of textile and garment manufacturing since the late 1960s’ that reshaped ‘patterns of employment’ around the world (Kabeer 2000, viii).

This history was part of the class loss and postcolonial haunting that echoed throughout the heritage projects. Garment work threads across the ‘international division of labour’ (Kabeer 2000, viii), from Cardiff and the South Wales Valleys, to postcolonial and contemporary Sylhet, to Cardigan Bay, to the Tower Hamlets in London, to Northern English textile factories, to Turkey, Poland, and Morocco, and back again. Garment workers and fashion designers share an uneasy provenance. The sewing, even inflected by doing their own designs, even transplanted into a room loud with music and conversation and messy with fabric scraps, pattern paper, smartphones and sweets wrappers, touched here and there with the wider politics of deindustrialization and globalized labour exploitation, but never in a clear way.

Instead, the precarity and even outright dangers of fashion and garment work stayed always just out of view. One night, for example, the fashion tutors in the second project, who had their own design label, told stories about the white Welsh women who had worked in the Burberry factory in the Rhondda Valley of South Wales, and who had lost their jobs when the company closed the factory in 2007 (BBC News 2012). They buzzed with inspiration about a small, high-end jeans company in Cardigan, Wales, which re-hired some of the local, Welsh garment workers who had lost their jobs after the last denim manufacturer left the area in 2002 for Morocco (Connor 2013) – could they do something similar in the Rhondda?

During the project, too, the news was full of the Rana Plaza garment factory collapse, in Bangladesh, ‘considered the world’s worst garment factory disaster’, which killed 1138 workers (Kasparkevic 2016). The fashion tutors and girls in the second project touched briefly on the event and women’s working conditions around the world, through talking about Primark, a discount, flash-fashion high street brand infamous for £3 skirts, as the factory was part of its supply chain (Kasparkevic 2016).
invested in fashion they described as ethical and sustainable, advocated ‘upcycling’ as a design practice and alternative to shopping at Primark: taking items from charity shops, or otherwise unused, and turning them into something new. In a conversation on a still-dark early spring evening about high street brands’ wastefulness, as the girls cut out images from glossy luxury fashion magazines to glue and collage into their design books, the tutors also recommended shopping at H&M as an ethical alternative to Primark. Of course, H&M has also been connected with dangerous working conditions in Bangladesh (Kasparkevic 2016).

The haunted precarity of the garment worker – and the call centre worker with big, perhaps impossible dreams – refracted through the project in other ways, too. At first, the biography and ambition of another young woman involved in one of the projects, Sumaiyah, aged 19, seemed to mirror that of Dina Toki-O. Over the 18-month course of the project, Sumaiyah finished school and took her final A-levels exams and, after talking over her options with a youth worker, decided to take a gap year before starting university or further education. In the meantime, like Torkia, she started working at a call centre, with initial enthusiasm – she won an iPad for best new employee in the first few weeks – that seemed to collapse as the winter settled in.

In taking up call centre work, Sumaiyah joined the new, ever-precarious working class, which is ‘now dispersed into service industries based on individual contracts, piecework, home work and work in call centres, with jobs for life having disappeared’ (Walkerdine 2003, 241). Sumaiyah had an art portfolio of photographs she’d taken at the rocky cobbled by the sea, and a series of design sketches for a collection, along with several finished gowns and other garments she’d made and had photographed, all of which she shared with me. She talked about becoming a fashion designer, mentioning Dina Toki-O and other local designers as inspirational models. Through the fashion component of the heritage project, she hoped to design a collection, exhibit it, and thereby make a start in her own business as a hijabi designer. While she was not part of the small group of older young women already in university and at college who were key organizers for the Eid event, Sumaiyah saw her role in the heritage project more as leader or volunteer rather than participant. In that role, on a holiday with her parents, she brought back imported fabric for the group to use from a textile trader in the midlands, but her dreams for the project as an incubator for a fashion line clashed with the collaborative, participatory nature of the projects.

Ownership and curation are of course perennial problems in projects involving young people making media (Carabelli and Lyon 2016; Myers and Thornham 2012; Rose 2012). The misfit of hopes and
possibilities meant Sumaiyah felt disappointed in the garments produced, disappointed in her role, and disappointed in how she was not acknowledged individually. The garments themselves were not what she had imagined, as the tutors chose not to edit or alter them too much, nor did Sumaiyah, who attended sporadically and sometimes complained of feeling tired and down. As an ‘ugly feeling’ (see also Skeggs 2011), disappointment in her inability to make it – at least over the year of the project – attached to her instead of as a symptom of the long, ugly shadow of precarity.

7.5 Bits of the other, collage and mimicry

Along with haunting figures of failure, other qualities of the materials of the garments dragged against the fantasy of the model girl, the ‘becoming young woman’: collage and the fake. Collage featured in all of the garments and designs. A folding screen theatre set, for example, which backed the fashion shows in the first project, featured five collaged girls’ silhouettes on a background of rainbow bricks (see Figure 7c). Bright, voluminous textiles also wrap into and around all but one of the collaged figures as headscarves, a sash, and an embroidered salwar kameez. The images and words in the collages make use of clichéd symbols to produce intelligible meanings: rainbow colours stand for cheerful diversity, maps for diaspora, newspaper headlines and old photographs for history, snapshots for family. Collage as a form relates to De Certeau’s bricolage, a kind of making things as ‘poetic ways of “making do”’ (de Certeau 1984, xvi) that involve ‘poaching in countless ways on the property of others’ (de Certeau 1984, xii). Lewis argues that hijabi fashion cultures are defined by such ‘creative practices of bricolage’ (Lewis 2015, 4). Young women taking part in hijabi fashion, she argues, draw out and remix elements of mainstream fashion to create their style. As a tactic, along the lines of de Certeau, collage in the heritage projects might come in as a method or practice for mediating and manufacturing ‘bits of the other’ into presentable, comely feminine figures. Also, however, textures, patterns, stitching, gluing, draping, or the look and feel of clothes on a body or on a dress form make their own meanings.

The tricky mix of clichéd ‘realness’ and surprising fakery in the exuberant materiality of the textiles they use means the ‘bit of the other’ might be a fake. And that fakeness might be something the maker knows, and that changes things. As archives of their own production and ‘migratory trajectories’ (James 2014, 658), like the recovered photographs in Chapter 6 of this thesis, the material qualities of these garments matter. The silks and wax prints used in many of the garments were produced and imported through elaborate global networks and donated by the families of participants in the projects. In the first project, the vibrant and embroidered silk (or rather silky) fabrics used on the theatre set and for the garments came from Bangladeshi textile importers in Birmingham. In the second, most of garments
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make use of three different pieces of wax print fabric donated by one of the participants’ mothers, brought back from a birth right holiday trip to Ghana. Where the embroidered fabric turned veil comes to signify both Muslimness and a blur of regional geographies, the wax print fabrics read as symbols of ‘Africanity’ (Sylvanus 2007, 2013). It is to the wax prints that I turn first, as they play with the idea that the garments signify ‘heritage’ in a group of young people with family histories of Black diaspora and Black Atlantic (Gilroy 1994) cultural exchange from Somalia, Cardiff, London, West Africa and the Caribbean.

Almost all of the garments produced for one project incorporated some wax print fabric (see Figure 7a). In an interview, British-Nigerian and London-based artist Yinka Shonibare comments, ‘So if you see a woman walking down a road and she’s wearing African cloth, you might think – now there’s African-ness, true Africanity. But that cloth, those clothes, are not African-ness (Yinka Shonibare, interviewed in 1996 by Nancy Hynes; see Hynes 2001, 62 in Sylvanus 2007, 201). Wax print fabric bears a material biography of cultural syncretism and colonial exchange mixed in the present with global patterns of consumerism (Sylvanus 2007; 2013). From 15th century Javanese batik to 21st century Shanghai fancy fabric, the textile has been copied, produced and sold along routes from colonial Indonesia, to industrial Flanders, to post-colonial West Africa and contemporary Pakistan and China (Felsenthal 2012; Sylvanus 2007; Sylvanus 2013). Wax print’s history over six centuries of copying, appropriation and imitation make it particularly evocative as a symbol not just of Africanity but of the fake, or postcolonial mimicry (Sylvanus 2007; 2013; Bhabha 1994). The fabrics carry a long history of imitation and appropriation connecting Asia, Africa and Europe (Sylvanus 2007). It is only through ‘elaborated’ circuits of exchange that the wax-prints ‘become African’ and thereby gather to them the feel (however troubled) of ‘authenticity’ at all (Sylvanus 2007, 202).

One of the girls described how the wax print fabrics seem to carry a general ‘Africanness’ (Shonibare in Sylvanus 2007, 201) in them. Huda described herself as someone who loved netball, physics, and chips and cheese sandwiches, as being ‘really fussy in what I eat’. For her, cultural heritage as a topic and being Somali seemed like something that might be relevant in the future, ‘But I think it’s not a priority right now. Like when, at our age exams, social life, going to school, what you wear, what you do. You know what you actually have matters? Like, I want the best thing, I want this I want that’. She contrasted herself to other Somali girls who spoke Somali fluently and who translated for their mums, whereas, ‘I’m just like… Hi… I’ll just do my schoolwork and stuff because I already know English and I don’t have to explain to my mum. Yeah, heritage doesn’t mean a lot to me right now’. Asked to describe what she
made as part of the fashion section of the heritage project, Huda laughed. She explained, ‘I made a top out of African kind of like, material kind of thing…and I did different sleeves, different top and back’. Huda’s comment about the wax print material is prescient, because it acknowledges something of the material politics of the garments and heritage projects.

Legacies of copying and recopying, of colonial and globalized loops of production and consumption, therefore live redolent in the colours and patterns of the ‘African kind of like, material kind of thing’ of wax print used in a Welsh heritage project. Here, the wax prints become a way both to signal African identity, to fashion an identity made of Africanity, and to signal the performativity of African-ness in such a context. Using wax print and silky, synthetic fabrics in these collaged garments unsettles the idea that the ‘bit of the other’ is natural, authentic. In a similar way, while the embroidered silk (or synthetic silk-like) material used as headscarves and garments for the figures on the theatre set in the first project seem to signal ‘Muslimness’ and ‘Asianness’, they are also much more slippery signifiers of diasporas of people and material culture, the real and the fake. They mean Bangladesh, but they also mean Birmingham; they mean Ghana, but they also mean China. They mean cosmopolitan consumption of the ‘becoming young woman’, but they also mean mimicry (Bhabha 1994).

Indeed, Nina Sylvanus argues that like East Indian calicoes on a Brontë heroine, wax prints therefore might come to ‘represent “Englishness” more than they did “otherness”’ (Steiner, 1994, 128 in Sylvanus 2007, 202). Shonibare’s artwork of helps to make these material and symbolic interrelationships clear. The sculpture ‘Butterfly Girl’ (2016) features a Victorian English flower fairy dressed in wax print; ‘The British Library’ (2014) features hardwood shelves of folios bound in bright mixes of wax print cloth. In all these works, Shonibare uses wax print textiles to make postcolonial imbrication material. The textiles play with the unequal but coeval, interwoven threads of African and European art, knowledges and lives (Sylvanus 2007; Shonibare 2016). The young women’s wax print and collaged garments on white dress forms echo Shonibare’s models in wax print clothes in colonial styles. They invoke a similar postcolonial politics. Standing still on dress forms, modelled by the young women who made them, photographed and circulated around to funders and local media, the wax print and silky fabrics circulate echoes of these politics even as they are part of the image of the ‘becoming young woman’ so central to these projects.

7.6 ‘Cut and mix’ cosmopolitanism, and being ‘mixed’

If many of the Muslim young women were called on to style themselves as a certain kind of liberal fashionista, the handful of non-Muslim young women were also called on to make culture instrumental
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and mix and be ‘mixed’ in the right way. While the labour of mixing is uneven, being a model subject is contingent on ‘mix[ing] well’, as Anne-Marie Fortier (2007, 110) argues: “mixing” is framed within a tight policing of community and family relations, consensual reproduction, and the choice of appropriate partners (friends, neighbours, or lovers)” (Fortier 2007, 110). Further, ethnicity as a source of cultural capital is often only available to middle-class young people; for working-class young people, or others set to the margins of the mainstream, only aspiring to whiteness brings ‘mobility’ (James 2014, 663). Only orienting oneself self-consciously toward white spaces, institutions, qualification, and values, therefore, promises mobility (James 2014, 663).

One of the ways to adopt whiteness or reach toward whiteness might be to commodify and consume ‘a bit of the other’. Indeed, several of the young people in the projects express an appetite for cultural otherness and renewal that could perhaps best be described ‘middle class [cultural] omniverousness’ (Warde et al. 2000).

Lucy (age 16): Yeah. Like there is a difference. But I can, like… My mum’s um, well, she’s, she’s Welsh. But she’s got like, a [Black British] friend do you know as well? So, then my dad’s like on the Caribbean side. So, like you can say my dad’s really strict? Like, and the cooking is really like Caribbean food. My mum’s starting to like it as well. She’s influenced by my dad so much. And like, um, yeah. So. I prefer the Caribbean foods and stuff like that than the Welsh foods. If I could actually like be that culture I would too. Like go to Bermuda and do, be that culture than be here. I think it’s so much better over there.

Alida: Have you ever been to where your dad’s from?
Lucy: It’s too expensive. Like my dad said he would take me to see family, but it’s like really expensive, especially for all of us to go you couldn’t just take the one.

For Lucy, claiming her ‘Caribbean side’ means fending off her mother’s working class white Welshness, which she explains later in the interview that she ‘hates’: ‘I absolutely hate it. …When it’s my dad’s side I find it so interesting. Like everything’s different. But yeah. Just the same, it’s kind of boring’ (Interview 2014). She reorients herself away from the ‘hyper-white’ (K. Tyler 2015), inhabitable position of ‘white working class’ and its associated stigma, and toward the unnamed normativity and omniverousness of whiteness. Her mother has been making this move too, ‘influenced’ by her dad, and starting to ‘like’ the foods her father makes. Caribbean culture becomes quite literally the seasoning that livens up not just the ‘boring’ norm (hooks 1992). What’s more, it saves her from the abjection or contamination of working class whiteness (K. Tyler 2015; Skeggs 2011; Skeggs and Loveday 2012).

The heritage project becomes a performative space for turning complex, lived cultural heritage – like a dad’s ‘strictness’ or cooking – into a kind of object to be examined, exhibited and celebrated. Lucy offers Bermuda – imagined, unreal – as an escape from what’s ‘just the same’ and therefore ‘boring’. ‘That culture’ is something she wishes to value and that she could slip into ‘and do, be that culture’, but which
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she also recognizes as out of reach, in part because her family can’t afford to visit. In this moment, Lucy navigates a complex affective terrain of desire and disgust, ‘like’ and ‘hate’; she performs liking and cultivating ‘a bit of the other’ even as she acknowledges that such an instrumental, consuming middle class relationship to cultural identity is foreclosed to her.

The right kind of mix also involves the right relationship to gender, sexuality and a liberal (post)feminism. For Nadine, whose family was both ‘proper Welsh’ and Bajan, distinguishing herself involved both a cosmopolitan taste in food and a distancing herself from a patriarchy located not in the present of Wales but in the past and in the Caribbean, where and when ‘girls probably wouldn’t have been allowed to be as free as boys’:

Alida: How, what do you think some of the privileges, you said privileges, like your life is more privileged. (N: Yeah). What are some of the privileges that you have? Nadine (age 15): I dunno, probably back in [island in the Caribbean] they couldn’t go to just like, go out to the cinema with their friends and stuff, and… I don’t know, it just, it just seems a lot different over there, like… I don’t think, girls probably wouldn’t have been allowed to be as free as boys, so that would probably be different. Whereas if that was now, and like if my brother was the same age as me now and he got to go to the cinema with his friends and I wouldn’t be able to, like, I wouldn’t be happy, at all. But it would probably be accepted back there? Like, I get to go on holiday every year. I don’t think my nan got to do that. So, I’m lot like, more privileged in that way. And also like, my nan probably didn’t taste, like eat other, like, is it, I don’t know how to, is it – coo, coosines, cuis –
Alida: Cuisines? Nadine: Yeah. She probably just ate, like, [local] food? Which is, which is really nice. But I just find that really weird. Like, imagine not having noodles.

In cultivating tastes for ‘cuisines’, or talking about travel and holidays, the girls practice turning elements of everyday culture into ‘a bit of the other’; they draw themselves toward whiteness, at least in interviews with me, by talking about practicing white consumption and appropriation. At the same time, Nadine distances herself from her nan’s Caribbean island of origin (and blackness) by framing it as a place in which ‘girls probably wouldn’t have been allowed to be as free as boys’, unlike Britain, which is something she declares she ‘wouldn’t be happy, at all’ about. Because in the reach for whiteness, some forms of blackness can’t be whitened, because blackness is imagined as the constitutive outside of whiteness, these elements must be cut out and displaced to other times and spaces.

7.7 Teenage killjoys and ‘ugly feelings’

One of the troubles with a mood or pedagogy of celebratory cultural heritage, of course, are all the other ways of feeling and general affects that don’t fit. This is about pressure and lines of force around how to be oriented to the past, to the ‘histories that hurt’ (Ahmed 2007, 135). Some of the affects that don’t fit
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might be anger, hostility, what Sianne Ngai (2005) calls ‘irritation’, even nihilism about the past and its relevance to the future. All this emotional and affective work creates what phenomenologist Sara Ahmed calls ‘affect aliens’ (2014), or people who are not in the mood. According to the HLF, projects like this can create public feeling. They ‘can bring people closer together, help them discover each other’s heritage and create a sense of local pride’ (Our heritage 2017). The projects are valued for the way they build collectivity by bringing people ‘closer’, but not for the way they attend to the agonistic, plural, ‘intransigent’ aspects of difference (Fortier 2007, 112; Mahmoud 2005, 199; Waterton and Smith 2010). Closeness and pride contrast with anxiety, surveillance and state scrutiny (Cameron 2016; Puar 207).

As mentioned before, dancing, chasing each other around the building, laughing together, hiding out from the rest of the group on the back stairs might be understood as ways of resisting the discipline and serious mood of the heritage projects by ‘having a laff’ (Willis 1977, 29 in Creswell 2013, 31). The idea of ‘having a laff’ as resistance comes from a 1977 ethnography of ‘the “lads” who participated in behaviour as opposition to authority, as informal groups “having a laff” (p. 29) as a form of resistance to their school’ (Willis 1977, 29 in Creswell 2013, 31). Here, the young women who joked around instead of doing their ‘work’ used laughter and the distraction of being rowdy, spinning and rolling in the computer room office chairs, both as an expression of a sheer excess of energy that won’t be contained, and a literal refusal to be still, to follow the plan.

Not being in the mood for heritage expressed itself in other ways, too. The formats of the projects obliged participants to dig into their own family histories, without any real acknowledgment that those histories might be a source of pain. One quiet young woman had, it turned out, a family story of escaping abuse, which the project staff knew but I did not. One night during an activity gathering photographs from social media for a family tree and collage, she came to me to say that this gave her ‘this painful feeling in my stomach’ (FN 2013). I told her that she didn’t have to do any of it, but rather than draw attention to herself by not doing the activity at all, she decided to make a collage of fruits and foods from places she had visited instead. We sat at the computer together and translated fruit names into the image search engine. I felt the recklessness of my eagerness around the activity, and of my assumption that the topic of family would be easy, or good. After the session, as participants walked home over the bridge or their mothers collected them, I mentioned what had happened to the youth worker, Sara, and heard more about her story and referral. Even as this girl was one of the most committed participants, and often a joyful one, this moment would not let me go.

Another girl, Anna, left one of the projects abruptly when it emerged that, while she identified as
Swedish, her parents were from a country in the Levant. As the group, gathered around a table, answered questions about their biographies, Anna hunched over her notebook, drawing, and a youth worker moved to sit next to her. When she answered a direct question about her parents, her voice defensive, the room burst with surprise and noise: one of the other girls shrieked, ‘I knew it! I knew you weren’t...’. While the adults protested that she could be or say what she liked, the girls in the room had a point to make. Anna left the project soon after this incident. While it might have been that artistic Anna was not interested in oral histories, and her close friend had also stopped attending because she had left school, it was clear she did not want to be in this group anymore.

Other girls shared stories about depressions, abrupt moves between schools, among other painful changes and losses. These negative feelings of hate and hurt around heritage seethe a bit against the cheerful convivial multiculturalism presented by the cheerful photographs in the exhibitions, for example, or cultivated by the events. They hint at the other valences of heritage beyond the convivial or the sweet. They might articulate with a wider mood: as Ann Cvetkovich and the Chicago ‘feel tank’ articulate, depression might be understood as not an individual but a collective ‘structure of feeling’ produced by the present political and economic moment (Winant 2015, 119-120).

7.8 Friendship, kinship and staying close

In these projects, the young women who took part also found occasions to cultivate and assert ways of imagining a future otherwise. As Beverley Skeggs and N. Geoffrey Bright describe of working class young people making sense of a pattern of power that shuts them out and offers no habitable future, the heritage projects I followed were also full of ‘ducking and diving, the same looking out for each other in “localized spaces of protection [and] fun”’, in which young people were ‘making the best of “limited circumstances in the present where the future seem[s] bleak and their best chance of value [is] moral and affective not financial”’ (Skeggs 2011, 504 in Bright 2016, 150). Nearly half of the young women in both projects drifted away over the course of the year, for many reasons: to focus on school, or devote their attention elsewhere.

Like the young people in Skeggs and Bright’s research, many offered up ‘reciprocity, care, shared understandings of injustice, and insecurity’ (Skeggs 2011, 509 in Bright 2016, 150). These marked out, I think, a flinching at the appetites of whiteness, and instead an insistence on ‘a supportive sociality’ also characteristic of working class practices. In the projects, particularly in conversations about navigating school, the future, and their own anxieties about mobility and ‘staying close’, the young people offered up alternative values for ‘reciprocity, care, [and] shared understandings of injustice, and insecurity’.
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Sometimes this was explicit, as on one afternoon waiting for others to arrive when Rukia, who was 12 and went to an independent school on scholarship, described with scorn how some of her classmates only cared about being rich. Even as a student who earned several exams early, her scorn for their greed marks a rejection of the ‘future-projected, strategizing, capital accruing self that epitomises middle class subjectivity’ (Reay et al. 2007, 1053). For her, other things mattered, particularly being close to family. When she imagined her future, she pictured her parents, grandparents, aunts and cousins all staying close. The value of ‘staying’ close to home and in close relationships with family and friends also seemed to matter. Dawn Mannay (2013, 91) has written about how ‘keeping close’ and being ‘a proper home bird’ are cherished values in the working class Welsh communities she researches. For Lucy, even as she imagined a future of travel and fame, this future also involved staying close, spending ‘every Sunday’ with her mum: ‘I’d have my own place. And I’d… like, I’ve got a plan. Like every Sunday I’d go to my mum for dinner. …holiday all Sunday. Like every Sunday go back there, phone all the time, go shopping with her. And then, because I’ll be so rich (Laughter)’. Her desire for all the glossy trappings of success – to be working, mobile, ‘so rich’ and a journalist ‘everyone will know’ – gets its value in part because it will mean she can go home on Sundays, phone all the time, and shop with her mum.

Rukia and Lucy’s emphasis on relationships resonated for many of the other young people in the same project. The young women who took part in the first project named meeting new people and making new friends as a fundamental element of the project for them. In the second project, friendships and relationships developed over the course of years felt ‘weird’ to be dissolving when the project ended. Nadine, whose sparky personality often cheered up the group, described how respect for her depended on how well she knew someone, especially authority figures like teachers who ‘respect you, so you respect them’. Others described coming along even when they felt overwhelmed with school or like they wanted to drop out because they wanted to see friends they only ever met in the space of the projects.

Relationships were built on affective reciprocity and loyalty. Katherine Tyler writes about how ‘neighbourliness, care and kindness’ are the fundamental values of the white working class estate she has researched; further, these qualities have to be renewed through everyday practices, or ‘earned/won/offered/given’ (Skeggs and Loveday 2012, 480; Tyler 2015, 1177). Some of those values might also be “solidarity, community-mindedness, work ethic, cleanliness, strong parenting [and] respect for others” (Garner 2012, 454 in Tyler 2015, 1172). Gillies (2005 in Tyler 2015, 1177) points out that these relationships and feelings of connection and respect constitute ‘emotional capital’ to replace the forms social capital like money or qualifications which the middle classes attract to and keep for themselves.
7.9 Conclusion: Politics and orientations toward futurity

This chapter builds on the arguments of the previous chapters about the patterns of feeling, sedimented from the past, that stick around in the present. This last chapter has explored how cultural heritage – the past – works on the self who inherits, carries, sheds, collages, cuts and mixes, that heritage. I track pressure on the young women in these heritage projects to fashion model selves. In organizing the project around objects like building confidence (Gill and Orgad 2015), a sense of celebratory women’s history, skills, and ‘bright futures’, the projects called on the young women taking part to take on forms of feminine subjectivity that were properly ‘becoming’. To be ‘becoming’ means to be oriented toward the future, committed to producing a brand of identity with the right ‘mix’ of culture, and entrepreneurially prepared to market that self. These pressures reflect much broader patterns in the project of producing the liberal self (Fadil 2008; 2011; 2015). By tracing out some of the specific forces moving and pressing in on young people, this approach challenges the given-ness, common sense or apparent inevitability of the kinds of subjectivity produced within and mediated by the projects.

The trouble with this figure of the ‘becoming young woman’ lies the way having a future depends on culling just the right amount and kind of ‘culture’ – the right tastes, religious practice, language, race and class politics, for example. In such a context, acquiring qualifications and orienting oneself toward a particular aspirational subjectivity seem to be the only possible way to make a valid life. Other scholars have already begun to ‘unpick this constellation of values linking youth (or at least youthfulness), fashion, and feminism’ (Gill 2016, 611). In the two projects studied here, talk of skills and qualifications, choices on who is hired for a wage and who volunteers, timings, spaces, materials, themes, and the common sense understanding of what participation should look like, create a scene in which having a future means meeting the measure of liberal norms.

This is not to fault the HLF in particular, of course. For an institution like the HLF, ‘the wider social context of structural injustices is bound to throw up impossible moral dilemmas’ (Reay et al. 2007, 1053-1054). Indeed, as Diane Reay and other researchers point out, ‘ethical behaviour is only partially achievable in a society which is structurally unethical in the way it distributes resources and opportunities and, with them, possibilities for equal recognition’ (Marx 1997 in Reay et al. 2007, 1053-1054). While Reay and her colleagues describe the dilemmas confronted by liberal, middle-class parents who choose to send their children to diverse comprehensive schools, their argument could just as well describe the
dilemmas faced by the HLF and partnering organizations when they choose to fund local groups to produce, archive and celebrate history and heritage that has been marginalized or left-out. These kinds of dilemmas in fact drag at and saturate many efforts to live together ethically (Hoggett, Mayo and Miller 2008). The wider context of historical and present inequality throws up impossible dilemmas for such projects because that context sets out the contours of success and legitimacy (Our Heritage 2017; Naidoo 2016; Nayak 2012; Waterton 2009). Community cohesion policies reify ethnicity and religion as definitional differences, supporting certain kinds of mixing while rejecting other forms of collectivity (Byrne, Elliott and Williams 2016; Fortier 2007; 2010; Nayak 2012). These policies allocate social services funding along certain vouchedsafed themes. Postfeminism’s project of the confident girl might therefore be seen as another iteration of how liberal Britain can ‘save brown women from brown men’ (Emejulu and Bassel 2015; Mirza 2012; Spivak 1988, 296).

This recognition of the compulsion to fashion a model self in order to inherit a viable future is not to suggest, either, that the projects reproduce only unjust, problematic, normative ends. It is instead to suggest that the tone of aspiration, confidence, bright collages of colour, and ‘brightness’, is a kind of ‘distribution of the sensible’ (Rancière 2004) that makes some things easy to say or do and others not so easy. Following Imogen Tyler and Rosalind Gill, who also invoke Rancière, I argue that aesthetic tones of these projects reflect a range of what can be seen or heard as political (Rancière 2004b, 13 in Tyler and Gill 2013, 82). For Gill and Tyler, ‘prevailing regimes of representation and perception’ around being a girl, particularly a racialized or migrant girl, ‘delimit “the visible and invisible” and “speech and noise”’ around the sensible horizon of what a ‘good’ feminine subject might be (Rancière 2004 in Tyler and Gill 2013, 81). In the regime of representation around the projects, the successful hijabi entrepreneur or the confident young woman of colour who cultivates (and sells) the right cultural ‘mix’ can lay claim to a bright future. Yet like Tyler and Gill, what this chapter has also argued is that the model liberal self is always hitched to and tracked by other haunting figures (Gordon 1997; 2011): the garment worker, and the teenage killjoy who is bored or laughing or hurt or otherwise not in the mood for cultural heritage (Ahmed 2010). These figures interrupt the apparent ease and naturalness of forms of liberal femininity (Fadil 2011). Moreover, in their playful, ‘ugly’ and stubborn ways of navigating the performative space of the projects, the young women who took part also suggest other ways through and in an all-but-foreclosed future.

What this final chapter does, therefore, is to explore the affective labour and politics of meeting and not meeting the norm (Muñoz 2006). It explores how it feels to be pulled and pushed by the ‘allure of whiteness,’ which is enfolded with the allure of the secular (or just secular enough) liberal, mobile,
middle class subject (James 2014: 653; Kulz 2014). In so doing, the chapter challenges normative consensus around the naturalness and ‘goodness’ of such a subject (Fadil 2011). Politically, it brings new vivid detail to the question, ‘how does neoliberalism feel?’ (Winant 2015: 120). It feels like all of this. And the giddy crackle of joy, the drag of boredom and disappointment, the weight of depression, in their various ways might be ‘grit in [the] gears’ of liberalism’s relentless appetites and promises, what scholars have named *The Happiness Industry*, and *The Promise of Happiness* (Davies 2015 in Winant 2015: 120; Ahmed 2010).
Chapter 8: Conclusion - a return to politics, conviviality and emotion

8.1 Tracking feelings, tracking politics

In this thesis, I have tracked how feelings about the past might shape the contours of the imaginary of convivial community and the politics of living together in the present. Set in a place riven by complex histories of diaspora and multiculturalism, colonialism, racism, industrialization and deindustrialization, and waves of dispossession, this thesis makes the case that the past ha[s] stuck around in the present in Cardiff in ways that defy understanding through conventional frameworks. The analysis is grounded in literature that describes that history as moody and thick with public feelings of postcolonial and other melancholia (Gilroy 2005; Walkerdine 2010; Ahmed 2010), nostalgia (Boym 2001; Bonnett 2010; 2013), anxiety (Fortier 2007; 2010), and even paranoia (Hage 1998). It argues that the study of shared moods, affects and feelings matters to understand the way patterns of inequality in the past resonate and retrench in the present.

The formation of imagined community of the present – its apparently natural and normative boundaries, categories and exclusions – happens at least in part through how the past is given shape and set alight. The imagined past, mobilized to contrast with the present, offers up dreamy utopias (Bloch 1995; Edensor 2005 in Bright 2012), dystopic reminders of failures and damage, and embodied memories of how things used to be, it patterns what’s possible to imagine for the present. The thesis thus traces patterns and labours of feeling as they thread across four performative occasions of making local history and cultural heritage in Cardiff: three intergenerational groups of women researching and making their own cultural productions about women’s lives and histories in and around Butetown, in Cardiff’s docklands, and three photographic archives of everyday life here, recovered in the present. These same occasions are also moments of intergenerational pedagogy about how to live together with others.

Chapters 1, 2 and 3 theorize the broad problem of the vexed ethics of researching in a place where people have been subject to more than a century of surveillance, stigma and misrepresentation, as well as a romantic afterlife as the apotheosis of community itself. Drawing on theories of affect and emotion, I argue that it is through affect that formations like imagined community (and good or bad subjects in it) take shape, get saturated and ‘sticky’ (Ahmed 2014, 4) with significance. Methodologically, this resembles ‘radical ethnographic historiographies of the present’, which outline concepts ‘from tracking patterns,
following the coming-into-form of activity’ (Berlant 2011, 13). The imaginary of community, which enfolds both convivial being together and the solidarity of collectivity, is a process of plural, contested becoming, it is something people do. Here, following its formation required slow, immersive and engaged methods interested in intimate performances of doing and imagining community, whether in groups of women researching and making writing and art about it, or in collections of photographs that, as Glenn Jordan puts it, ‘memorialize and symbolically reinstate vanishing traces of community life’ and ‘re-present, in positive, recognizable and apparently irrefutable terms, THE WAY WE WERE’ (Jordan 2001, 20).

Developing an approach adequate to these phenomena also required finding places where community wasn’t a given but ‘in drag’ – that is, performative occasions which point out the instability of norms like community, and therefore unsettle them. In the intergenerational community spaces in which women met, talked, wrote, painted, shot and edited films, and interviewed each other, I argue that heritage becomes ‘a performance (a conscious enactment) and performative (a reiterated practice)’ (Skeggs 2001, 299) of imagined community. The cultural inheritance in question is therefore homely and in process, not fully formed but forming (Cvetkovich 2014). The heritage projects and photographic archives in this thesis were sites were people were already performing and practicing imagining community past and future.

Chapter 4 addresses how patterns of feeling work as a tactic as part of a politics of struggle and survival. Taking seriously the people taking part as actors, narrators and makers – however ‘low-key’ (Mirza dilemmatic (Stewart 2007, 86), unruly or systematic agency might be – the thesis opens up how collective arrangements come into being through uneven affective and emotional labour, and traces which bodies are called on to perform that labour. These patterns of feeling don’t just happen to communities, they are strategically deployed: they are tactics for making collectivities, for dissolving them, and labours for struggle in various guises. I describe in Chapter 4 how ‘shared sweets’, labours to create and share sweet feelings through occasions of convivial mixing, and work to make a shared ‘homeplace’ (hooks 1991), are presented as a pedagogy of community-making. These labours help people survive hardship, heal from violence, learn radical histories, and develop mutual care and solidarity (hooks 1992; Anim-Addo 2014). In their various formations, these labours represent part of ‘the low-key and slow collective activism of women of colour, challenging racism from within local settings’ (Mirza and Gunaratnam 2014, 130).

For some, these ways of doing community needed to be acknowledged as the inheritance (and duty) of younger women. For others, they were contested as a gendered bargain or a trap. While acknowledging that mixing or caring might get appropriated by sexism that naturalizes this labour for women (hooks
1991) or policies like ‘community cohesion’, which put the burdens of cohering community onto racialized people, especially women of colour (Fortier 2007; 2010; Ahmed 2010), the chapter argues that they may also be part of a deliberate politics, as lessons in collectivity. What emerges too is a critique of the sense that living together in difference just happens: instead, even the unruly ordinariness of convivial multiculture (Gilroy 2005; Back and Sinha 2016) requires labour like ‘shared sweets’, labour which has not often been counted.

Chapter 5 extends the range of feeling labours beyond ‘sweet’ feelings of care, loyalty, pride, respect, and mixing, to what to do with all the ‘ugly feelings’ (Chapter 3) stirred up by acute and pervasive oppression. Sharing feelings of fear, hurt and upset with other people in protected spaces builds recognition of and connections between individual experiences and broader patterns. They also described the necessity of doing what Audre Lorde (1981) described as ‘orchestrating the furies’: harnessing and conducting a ‘symphony of anger’ into forms of intimate, institutional and narrative fights for justice. Along with tactics for soothing and managing white feelings in order to dodge violence, keep a job, or match the desires and expectations of whiteness in the context of an institution like a museum or HLF-funded project (Waterton and Smith 2010), their pedagogy also involved vents for bad feeling by playing with stereotypes, playing tricks, and escaping to imaginative sanctuaries, dreamplaces where life was or could be otherwise. The chapter argues that for these labours as tactics and as part of a broader, intersectional, intertwined history of struggle.

Chapter 6 focuses on the photographs and reclaimed the politics of loss. Loss has been pathologized, but it is ubiquitous and politically unsettled: as a kind of refusal to forget, an excess that keeps what has been lost in public circulation, such melancholic loss keeps present a past – like the racist ‘legacies of departed empire’ (Gilroy 2006, 27 in Back and Sinha 2016, 522), on which a ‘habitable multiculture depends’, or the reverberation of waves of dispossession, or of generations of class oppression (Reay 2009) – that is not really past at all (Ahmed 2007; 2010). Developing the work of geographers studying practices of progressive utopia and futurity (Bonnett and Alexander 2013; Rogaly and Qureshi 2013), and critical engagement with loss and race (Ahmed 2000; 2004; 2010; Eng and Han 2000, 2003; Eng and Kazanjian 2003; Muñoz 2006), I argue that feelings of loss, nostalgia and melancholia need to be reassessed rather than dismissed in order to understand the politics of the present.

In the recovered archives of photographs of everyday life in the area, and in the performative remembering of the heritage projects, lost places, livelihoods, and kinship and closeness, are all set alight. Through photographs rich with textures, tastes, spaces, parties and parades, buildings and parks and other sensory details that map places that have been ‘knocked down’, demolished, filled in, and
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reconfigured; through photographs of shops and workers and everyday keeping on; and through photographs of people embracing, touching and demonstrating a ‘fugitive kinship’ and presence in places ‘where it should not be’ (Campt 2012, 91), these photographs set alight melancholia for what has been lost. They insist on a complex history of kinship and mixing (Bressey 2007; 2013). The photographs circulate as a rejoinder to a celebrated public vision of Cardiff’s future as a ‘renaissance’ (Gonçalves 2017) in which these losses are just fuel for progress, a vision that ‘knocks down’ the past in the name of the future, ‘knocks back’ the people who live there, and perpetuates entrenched inequalities in the pursuit of a promised ‘good life’ (Berlant 2011) that is silently foreclosed. In this story, middle class tastes and economic drives are, in the literature on the development, figured as “inevitable” and “uncontrollable” (Cowell and Thomas 2002, 1254 original emphasis) – effectively undeniable, if one doesn’t want to be left behind. Like Sara Ahmed’s (2010; 2012) ‘melancholic migrants’, ‘feminist killjoys’ or other figures who refuse to get over the damages of history that continue to delimit possibility and hurt in the present, the pattern of feeling of loss is a way of ‘staying sore’.

Lastly, in Chapter 7, I explore how the young women in these performative spaces were called on to project all this history and heritage into their own bright futures. Their struggles reflect new pressures to navigate the demands of the future and produce out of the past the right ‘mix’ of heritage and ambition, a ‘prudent subject’ (Brown 2003), a ‘becoming young woman’ (McRobbie 2007). Even as young people, and young women especially, are positioned as the embodiment of either liberal success or abject failure, and foreclosed from the futures offered to them, they are invited to produce selves like the figure of the bijabi entrepreneur or postfeminist ‘global girl’ (Tyler and Gill 2013) who boot-straps an escape up from call-centre precarity to global fashion icon. Liberal whiteness compels an acquisitive self-development, one that makes culture instrumental, something pleasurable to have.

To fashion a self like this requires creating just the right ‘mix’ of cultures, cultivating a ‘bit of the other’ (hooks 1991) and the right affective and bodily comportment and style while avoiding contamination from that which is considered too other. This too-other figure haunts the projects as the garment worker (an echo of Spivak’s subaltern or Imogen Tyler and Rosalind Gill’s ‘postcolonial girl’), the failure. Yet the slippery materiality of the garments they made defy this gleaming model self. So too do ‘ugly feelings’ (Ngai 2007), a kind of recoiling from whiteness, whether as boredom and frustration with the paperwork of qualifications, or judgments about its selfishness, or an insistence on relationships, fun and other forms of value. The pressures these projects invoke reflect much broader patterns in the project of producing the liberal self (Fadil 2008; 2011; 2015). The trouble lies not in this discourse of a model self
in and of itself, but the way having a future depends on matching its model, even as you may be positioned as perpetually foreclosed from its promises.

6.2 Claims and caveats

In part, what this thesis offers are some fragmentary descriptions of how it feels, in an everyday tactile and sensible way, to be a racialized woman in the complex political scene of a present-day so marked by the imperial, classed past that is not past. At its most capacious, this thesis shows how feelings about the past in a place riven by complex, postcolonial histories might move in and pattern the present. There are descriptions here of how some people register and describe the way power touches down in their lives, moves them and others, and invites and provokes response – in moments from a job application, to a playing field, to a schoolroom, to an exhibition. These descriptions can seem so ripe with detail, so intimate, that they promise a closeness that nevertheless requires care. Nevertheless, there is something to detail, to a description thick with ‘facts—specific behaviors, utterances, and the positions and movements of bodies’ (Flatley 2012, 516). In ‘How a Revolutionary Counter-mood is made’, Jonathan Flatley argues that descriptions of affronts and injustices in workers’ newsletters use a ‘descriptive mode’ to tune a collectivity into sense of itself, a mode that ‘may be powerful, in part, because it removes the events in question from habitual modes of apprehension, allowing us to actually perceive and, in a sense, re-experience what has happened, instead of recognizing or knowing it’ (Flatley 2012, 516). Like the stories in African American auto workers’ newsletters, different ‘modes’ of cultural production, rich with material details, presents an opportunity for people to apprehend – to grip and be gripped by – what is going on.

I offer all this description with a broad caveat, however, and a reminder to myself of the performative occasion of its production. All of these descriptions come forward on stage, as it were, as part of projects dedicated to telling history in community spaces, or collections of photographs published for a particular community of memory. And not only the scene of their staging but the scene of this writing refracts power relationships that are often, like Raymond Williams’ structures of feeling, only perceptible in hindsight, as they lose their grip.

In terms of the generalizability of the research, while I am making claims with this thesis about some of the processes through which convivial community – here living together with difference and in histories of damage – gets imagined and saturated with feeling, and how different forms of subjectivity might gather ‘sticky’ emotional weight and intensity in this context (Ahmed 2004/2014), I am not making any general claims about women of colour in Britain do, think or feel. It is also not an audience study, and I
am making no claims for what people who beheld or walked around or found online the art and stories of these heritage projects felt or did about what they felt. While it brings empirical material to bear on these questions, it does so in pieces, fragments and moments, not as a complete or fixed explanation.

The research process consistently confounded some of the usual categories of social research. The heterogeneity of the people taking part meant there were always outliers: while most of the women, young and older, might be described as growing up or having grown up working class, for example, this was complicated by the fact that not only were many of the older women professionals in health, education, the arts, social care, and government, among other fields, but a handful of others had family in diaspora and migration trajectories that tangled and defied British class categories. Further, not only were these heritage and writing projects episodic moments in rich lives, but the shared space of the weekly meetings could be and sometimes were ‘about’ other interests and topics than the themes addressed here. While many lived in neighbourhoods mapped by the local authority as ‘deprived’, like Butetown, Grangetown, or Adamsdown, many others lived all over the city, or travelled widely for holidays and across the city to school, work, community groups and activities, or university, their geographies of imagination were by no means tied only to Butetown or to Cardiff. They had markedly different interests, from theology, to physics, to circus performance, to religiously-rooted charitable work, and came to the projects for heterogeneous reasons that may have had little or nothing to do with community, heritage, or history.

The thesis, therefore, is a study of process and of making, as a series of examples of moments of making cultural heritage and intergenerational affective pedagogy in practice. The point of the methodology and theoretical orientation of the thesis has been to leave intact the heterogeneity and complexity of the people who were part of these projects – including avoiding extrapolating much about how memory works or feelings feel – but instead charting some of the patterns of practice (patterns of feeling, labours of feeling) in the episodic, performative occasions of being together. The thesis argues that studying moments of process and performativity are fruitful for hard-to-hold questions like these, because they get at the way things are constituted by the doing.

8.3 Orientations and openings

The findings in this study have a number of important implications for future practice, especially for heritage practice and research interested in ‘community’, and in how complex histories might be made and shared. In tracking feeling in the making of heritage about the histories of Butetown communities and women of colour in Cardiff, the findings demonstrate the importance of tracking and theorizing
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emotion to address how the past patterns the present. As I address in Chapter 1, many scholars have critiqued the persistent attraction in heritage institutions and industries to ‘the old, the great, the beautiful, the comfortable, the consensual and iconic parts of the story’, whether that story be of the nation or another institution, place, or collective body (Lagerqvist 2015, 289; see also Hall 2005; Naidoo and Littler 2005; Waterton and Smith 2010). The thesis observes how recent liberal feel-good policies of community engagement and inclusion, while arguing change, may provide a cover for more of the same (Ahmed 2012; Naidoo 2016; Waterton 2009), and then tracks how some of this might work in practice in sensory, feeling ways.

I suggest that the diffuse but sensible ‘affective gauge’ (Muñoz 2006, 680) of liberal whiteness, for example, tunes what feels good or right in the collaborative, participatory occasion of an oral history, for example, or what feels ‘ugly’ (Ngai 2007) or ‘ill-fitting’ in a discussion, as Samar put it. Moving from the rhetorical pressure of ‘Authorized Heritage Discourse’ (Smith 2006), the thesis follows some of the moods, tones, or patterns of feeling suffusing the performative occasion of making heritage in practice. The chapters on disciplining fury into fight and managing whiteness, as well as on fashioning a model self, in particular, explored how imaginative possibilities for what heritage might be or do, and with it how inhabitable forms of feminine subjectivity, or collectivity, might be shaped, for example, by the affective pressure of what Nikki Jones might call ‘white space’ (Taylor 2015; Puwar 2004), white comfort, or liberal forms of futurity. Feelings also moved among people in the projects in rich and ambivalent ways. There is an abiding ‘ambivalence and allure of whiteness’ (James 2014, 653) here, both a ‘reaching for and a recoiling from’ whiteness and its measures of good and bad feeling during the projects. A sweet taste, passed around; snarled thread, wax print or gleaming lamé in a piece of fabric; a series of old photographs of people laughing and leaning against one another; a shared fear, spoken aloud. These also connected and alienated, moved and immobilized people. This thesis therefore invites further thinking and interrogation about the affective aspects of spaces, materials, and bodies in occasions of making heritage.

In particular, the work presented here identifies and tracks labours of feeling invoked in the performance and performativity of making heritage in a place like Butetown traced over with postcolonial, deindustrialized histories. The histories at stake are ‘histories that hurt’ (Ahmed 2007, 135), but that also move in other ways, to fortify, forge collectivity and instruct. It is in thinking about feeling as labour – both affective labour as a kind feeling work on the self, and emotional labour as working on the feelings of others – that the live politics of the heritage projects suggest themselves. I argue that these labours are
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both uneven, in that some bodies find themselves called upon to do more feeling labour than others, and unruly, in that their politics are not settled but on the move.

As ‘ugly feelings’, (Ngai 2007) they often have unexpected affects: circulating loss, even as nostalgia or hiraeth for a place to which it is impossible to return, for example, becomes a way of staying ‘sore’ (Ahmed 2017) about the losses of the past that continue to hurt in the present. Fear shared for precious children at the hands of police, racist education or brutal publics becomes a way to enunciate the way racism repeats itself, to parse its refrain, and recognize its new forms. ‘Shared sweets’ and other gestures of care, even as they might demand labour from women of colour as a burden of duty or be co-opted by the state, can be named as tools for creating ‘homeplace’ (hooks 1991) of radical, healing sanctuary and convivial being together. They become a way of knotting into a black feminist genealogy of ‘real citizenship’ (Mirza 2009; 2015, 5) and a Welsh working class history of struggle through solidarity.

Further work also needs to be done to interrogate how the institutional and discursive liberal heritage regimes can respond to the chimeric, relentlessly productive power of white liberal desire for certain forms of community and not others, especially in a context of austerity and state hostility in which community-based heritage programme funding, because it constitutes some of the only funding available for anything, has a potentially significant role to play.

One open challenge that remains is how to imagine all these contested and fractious lines of history not as a ‘bit of the other’ (hooks 1992) that adds savour to the history of the West (Hall 2005), or as appendages to a hegemonic history, but as constitutive of it (Naidoo 2016). Another is how to account for the histories that are not ‘consensual’, which remain unsettled, whether painfully or with persistent, dragging banality (Kidd et al. 2014; McSweeney 2016). The elision of the complex histories of struggle and ‘political opposition to inequality’, as Roshi Naidoo argues, ‘repeatedly strips people of their active, historical agency, characterising them as endlessly passive’ (Naidoo 2016, 509). What’s missing from the liberal, pleasant heritage discourse of inclusion is a sense of politics as ‘agonistic pluralism’ (Mouffe 2000) and ‘dissonance’ (Waterton and Smith 2010, 4). In the context of new government and affective regimes based on hostile surveillance and privatizing public services and spaces ‘where a liberal ethos is being supplanted by an authoritarian stance focused on securitization, risk and terror’ (Nayak 2012, 454), however, it may be that the contours of the politics of heritage have shifted again. Just being together might matter more: as the systematic erosion of the social state through austerity, which has disproportionately harmed minority women and restricted their organizing (Emejulu and Bassel 2014; 2015), everyday occasions for solidarity and convivial being together become performative occasions of living otherwise.
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Both the fieldwork and photographs wove unexpected connections among histories of struggle often otherwise told as entirely separate. For example, in the pedagogy and performance of the heritage projects and archives, ‘shared sweets’ and other everyday care and community work was invoked as part of a broader history of organizing against racism and precarity. This thesis suggests further research not only into the intimate, local ways that practices of living together and struggle intertwine in neighbourhoods in Cardiff, but also in rethinking how we frame and observe what counts as struggle, and who a good subject, in the first place, and how to therefore map these intersections and movements in ways that more fully reflect ‘what people do everyday’ (Back and Sinha 2016). Some fragments that just nosed above the surface in the projects invite a deeper look, such as the organizing efforts of 1930s black workers through the Colonial Defence League (Tabili 1994), or the Cardiff Black Alliance of the 1970s-1980s, or a fuller portrait of women’s organizing and leadership in spaces like Arabic classes, mosques and churches (Osman 2015; Moraru 2016), grassroots third-sector advocacy and community spaces, workplaces, volunteering, and shops, all of which were suggested as sites by this research.

Future research would build on a rich groundwork in Cardiff but also in studies of practices in other places haunted by postcolonial and deindustrialized close pasts, like this city caught in moments of change. It would build on the work of black British feminist scholars to chart a genealogy and history of black feminism (Mirza 2015; Anim-Addo 2014; Mama 1984). What I hope this thesis suggests is that these specific histories and practices not be gathered up by research as ‘a bit of the other’ (hooks 1991), an addendum to the stories already told about the shape and scope of imagined community and futurity in Cardiff, Wales or Britain, but constitutive of it. While these practices might be the ‘object of observation’ for future research, as Mayanthi Fernando writes, I suggest they turn us around to a much broader ‘object of study’, and an ‘asymmetric critique’ (Fernando 2014, 240) of the ways power touches and shapes everyday life. As Fernando explains: ‘attending closely to forms of Muslim French religiosity and political praxis, including the tensions within, re-directed me to the contradictions and force of secular power that Muslim French life reflects and refracts’ (Fernando 2014, 240).

The critical focus is on ‘the contradictions and force of secular power’, albeit opened up by close observation. Specific ways of being and doing convivial community – and their varied, uneven labours of feeling – therefore turn us up and back to the patterns of power that set out who can belong here, and how. Instead of ‘the contradictions and force of secular power’, here the observation and sensible archives of this thesis turn me back to the appetites, ‘allure’ (James 2014, 653) and chimeric changeability of liberal whiteness to set the edges of imagined community and the ‘good life’, and who may belong to
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it, which the labours of women of colour to make sense of history in these heritage projects ‘reflect and refract’.

The thesis also suggests openings for research into the intimate politics of feeling and affect in social life, especially as these relate to the problem of how to live together. It suggests tracking patterns and labours of feeling in other sites and occasions. In the introduction to Cruel Optimism, Lauren Berlant addresses the objection that she is making ‘big claims on the backs of small objects’ (Berlant 2011, 11) such as poems, stories, films, political occasions, and other traces of everyday gestures, because she argues that these objects, in their aesthetic, affective sensorium, suggest the genres or forms of the imaginable – for her, the imaginable good life.

In a recent essay in N+1, Gabriel Winant describes our current juncture as a shared (and unsatisfied) inquiry into how affect and emotion move in and move politics. This thesis has followed the threads of some of these efforts, whether through aesthetics (Berlant 2011; Ngai 2007), through attunement to material, moody settings and scenes (Flatley 2012; Felski and Fraiman 2012; Highmore 2013), through the movement of palpable but ineffable affect in space and everyday life (Thrift 2004; Massumi 2015), affective patterns in empirical research (Wetherell 2012), or in the feel or emotional modes of institutional power (Ahmed 2017; 2014; 2012; 2010). Whatever the approach, the question feels urgent.

My argument in this thesis has been that the ‘small objects’ of a pedagogical occasion or a collection in an archive open up genres or forms – patterns of feeling – guiding what is imaginable (or imaginatively available?) for collectivity and convivial living together. They require tuning in to patterns of feeling, which register in materials and in what people do. Berlant argues that without this attention to small objects and gestures, ‘we understand nothing about impasses of the political without having an account of the production of the present’ (Berlant 2011, 4). This thesis has tried to answer with some specifics, grounded in observation and detail, of the ‘production of the present’ which affects the stop-and-go of the political present. Moods and feelings are what move people, form concepts, and make things become themselves, how they gather sticky, sedimented weight. This thesis attempts, as Sara Ahmed describes, to ‘[approach] emotion as a form of cultural politics or world making’ (Ahmed 2014, 12). The specifics matter. This thesis therefore invites further research, grounded in observation of everyday practices, of ‘world making’, and of fragile, vernacular archives. When Winant (2015, 120) asks the question, ‘How does neoliberalism feel? It feels like shit’, he gets at part of the question. For future research, I think the question is even less fixed than that. How does the present feel? It feels like – and we go from there.
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The research required careful consideration of ethics and consent, particularly because two of the projects involved young people. In addition, the heritage projects themselves addressed sensitive experiences and themes. As part of my process around research ethics, I wrote plans outlining my research objectives and thinking through potential risks and harms in the research, which are attached below. I submitted these plans to the School of Journalism, Media and Culture’s research ethics review panel, and amended them in response to feedback from the panel. As part of this appendix, I also include a sample drawing-based consent form that I developed for the research, as well as a copy of the information sheet I gave to all participants and their guardians where necessary.

This formal process involved careful reflection and revision of my plans as the research developed. For example, I decided not to research with a group of asylum-seeking women because of the vulnerability of some members of the group, and the fact that I was not convinced participants would feel comfortable refusing to participate in the research if they wished to do so because of their precarious migration status. I also did not end up conducting arts-based workshop with the women’s creative writing group, as the writing exercises we did already touched on themes around the research, and to do so would have been intrusive. I did pilot some arts-based workshops with the groups of young women as part of the activities of the projects. As difficult topics and tense or emotional moments happened in the research process, I often followed the lead of the experienced youth and social workers and programme coordinators who were also involved in the projects.

The sustained engagement over the two years in total of fieldwork built relationships with both the young people and the other women involved in the research, offering other moments to talk over challenges, concerns and reflection on the research process. Some of these exhibitions involved representing key elements of my research findings back to the groups with whom I was working, offering opportunities for people to offer me feedback. As these projects progressed over time, I continued to check in with the people taking part about the research and their willingness to take part and my plans for writing the thesis. At exhibitions and events, and at the community centres themselves, I met and talked with many of the parents of the young people who took part, too, at different stages in the project timeline.

Many of the thorniest ethical issues with respect to the groups I did study came up when I began to write up my fieldwork for the thesis. I have addressed some of the choices I made to use the actual names of the projects and place in which the research was conducted, as well as my efforts to anonymize the data in the thesis, in the conclusion of this appendix.
1. Research plans submitted for ethics review, Writing Our Lives

(amended and revised as research developed)

a. Project: Writing Our Lives

Summary of research plan:

I propose to conduct participant observation/ethnography with participants in a year-long creative writing project. Participants will be Cardiff women ages 19-70, some from migrant and/or minority ethnic backgrounds. The research methods include participant observation, documenting materials/objects produced with photography, and conducting informal interviews with participants, either in small groups or individually.

Description of the writing programme: ‘Writing Our Lives’ women’s writing project

Partner organisations running the programme:
The Hayaat Women’s Trust
Butetown History and Arts Centre
Writing tutors
July 2014 – February 2015 (weekly writing workshops + 3 public events)

- **What?** A series of creative writing workshops run by professional writing tutors on themes from ‘childhood’ to ‘womanhood’, ‘language’ to ‘immigrant experiences’. The writing will be edited into an eBook and presented at two public events.
- **Who?** ~20-30 women in Cardiff (ages 19-70) with different migration trajectories, most from minority ethnic backgrounds, recruited through the BHAC and Hayaat Women’s Trust staff and community links. The workshops provide free childcare, some interpretation/translation as needed, and volunteer support. The group is co-staffed and organized by a professor with more than 30 years of community organizing work and an authorized social worker from Butetown, also with extensive experience working in the community.

Research methods proposed:

For these case studies, I hope to combine two primary research methods: ethnographic observation, including documenting the writing process, and arts-based interviews and/or focus groups. I have been developing and revising these methods through the two earlier case studies, the '16-to-60: A Woman’s Voice’ and ‘Heritage of Our Mothers’ projects with young women. In this new project, I propose to:

I. **Observe the programmes by conducting participant observation** as a programme volunteer. This method involves observing during the writing workshops and events, but also participating when appropriate in the group and occasionally asking questions about process. I won’t record or make notes during when with the group, but after each session.

II. **Document the materials participants produce** in their process through some photographs of these drafts and processes, as well as any public presentations of their work.

III. **Conduct 1-3 arts-based interviews/workshops using visual methods such as drawing, mapping and collage with questions** to explore participants’ experiences of living in Cardiff, everyday practices, and meaning-making. This may happen flexibly in
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small groups during the programme or in small groups or one-on-one outside of the programme (but still in BHAC). The number of interviews will depend on interest and their length. For potential activities and topic guide, see the end of this document.

Ethical concerns and potential risk and harm to participants:

There are some possible risks and harm to participants from participating in this research that I have thought about carefully. I see these risks as: 1) assuring clear communication about the research and freely-given informed consent; 2) protecting confidentiality and mitigating any risks to participants’ confidentiality; 3) emotional risks around difficult topics; 4) structural privilege and the role of the researcher.

a) Communication and informed consent

Given the diversity of experiences, language skills and backgrounds of participants, it may be challenging to make sure that participants understand the purpose of the research, understand their rights with respect to it, and have the opportunity to give informed consent. This might be due to language barriers, cultural differences around politeness and refusal, and cultural differences around paperwork and official or institutional records. Also, some participants do not come to the programme every week, and new participants may join the programme later.

a) To mitigate these risks, first I plan to attend the programme as a volunteer consistently, introduced as a PhD researcher. This approach has been time-intensive but helpful with the prior case studies, as it opens up informal conversation and opportunities for me to answer questions. The programme space is informal and convivial, and doing the writing activities together, sharing food and conversation, helps to shift, although not equilibrate, some of the differences in power and privilege between researcher and participant.

b) Second, I will take 10-15 minutes of programme time in one of the programme sessions to explain my research and the consent process point by point with a picture-based form I adapted from a template (see Appendix 2): what the research involves, protecting confidentiality, Data Protection rights, how any material may be recorded and published, possible risks and benefits, questions and withdrawing, etc. NOTE: if the group is comprised entirely of people who are fully fluent in written English, I may use the text consent form instead (see Appendix 4). I will be very clear that my research and the writing programme are separate and they do not need to consent to being a part of the research to continue in the writing programme. The participants can tick off or cross out/decline individual items as we go, i.e. regarding any photographs or being recorded during the arts-based interviews. I will ask if they have any questions, and if they are interested in being a part of the research.

c) I will also give each participant a copy of the project information (see Appendix 3) for them to keep, and explain that they can also speak to the social worker and outreach coordinator for the programme, who is willing to play this role, if they have any questions or concerns about the research and prefer to speak to her.

My experience with the prior two case studies is that while this process takes time, the different modes of communication – speech, visuals, writing – and being patient with the process all help to clarify important points and any questions. This also helps to accommodate varying levels of English confidence and fluency, as well as varying familiarity with research, in the room. Following this process, I will check in with participants periodically over the ten weeks around their willingness to keep taking part in the research. If anyone joins the programme after I go through this form, I will go through the form with her individually.
d) Some participants might feel obligated to please me, especially because as a white, English-speaking volunteer, I look and speak like some of the programme staff. Others might feel that it would be rude to decline to participate. This pressure might be lessened because I am younger than many of the participants. Many of the participants are also accomplished professionals in leadership positions. To contend with these pressures, however, I will work to be open and clear, to listen carefully, and also to be sensitive to the subtle ways people might express their disinclination—by being busy with something else, leaving the room for some other purpose, or protesting that they don’t have anything to say. Over the course of the project, I will also check in with participants to see if anything has changed for them in terms of what they are willing to share as part of the research and also if they have questions for me. The form also allows people to consent to some if not all of the proposed research. Finally, one staff person, who is Somali and grew up in Grangetown, and with whom many of the women have friendships and other different social relationships, is willing to be a ‘safe ear’ for participants to share any concerns or questions without needing to address me directly.

e) Protecting confidentiality

I face two challenges to protecting participants’ confidentiality in the research:

i) the group is a semi-public, porous space, and staff and participants may talk about each other and what happens in the programme outside of the programme;

ii) and participants are producing personal, authored work about their lives as part of the programme, although they may choose how and under what name that work is published and presented publicly.

Participants will already therefore be navigating some risks as they choose what to say, write and what to share during the writing programme, and how they choose to present it. The writing tutors and other staff all have emphasized that people need not share what they write.

It is particularly important to protect participants’ confidentiality within the research and any research publications, and to keep any connections between the published work they create and the confidential process and interviews untraceable. I will keep my field notebook as a password-protected document on my computer and code names in it to keep participants’ names secret. If and when I take photographs of works in progress, I will make sure to frame the shots so that people are not identifiable in them. My intention for these photographs is to capture the objects, pages, pens, materials, process, etc., and not people.

Most importantly, however, in any published research, I will use pseudonyms, I will disassociate identifying information from quotes, drafts or artworks produced for the research. I will comb over my material to make sure no reader can triangulate a participant’s identity through connecting the information I provide with the participants’ published work. There are models from other project.s using similar arts-based methods and collaborations (Thornham, 2013; Girard, 1998) that I can draw upon to protect participants’ confidentiality.

f) Space, writing and emotional risks around potentially sensitive topics

Risks in the space

The all-women’s spaces of this programme at BHAC are generally welcoming; the space will be set up to accommodate people with limited mobility, for example, and the writing programme budget will provide interpretation and childcare as needed.

BHAC itself has an explicitly inclusive mission and history, and the Hayaat Women’s Trust expertise in activism with Black and Minority Ethnic women living in Cardiff. It is staffed by people from a variety of ethnic, cultural and linguistic backgrounds with expertise in the local systems and resources available should anyone taking part need specific support. The staff for the project include a licensed social worker and a community organiser with more than 30 years of experience in Butetown. The writing
tutors, too, have years of experience leading creative writing groups on sensitive topics, such as violence and grief. Many of the participants have relationships and friendships with each other, but in the event that anyone needs support for any reason, the group has resources set up to help. If someone reaches out to me in particular, I can reach out to networks within the project or outside it, as appropriate.

If the arts-based interviews move forward, I will hold them in BHAC whenever possible, and otherwise in a nearby café. In the event that the participant prefers to conduct the interview in her home, I will be sure to keep myself safe by letting someone know where I will be and when to expect me back.

**Limited risks from observation**

As I will be a familiar and participating member of the group as a fellow creative writer and project volunteer, and because the space is semi-public, the ethnographic elements of the research will be relatively unobtrusive and pose little risk of harm to participants. I will not take any notes when with the group, but afterwards. Any questions I ask will be relevant to the shared writing activity or discussion. The participant observation in this context invites exchange and relationships with participants, but in a setting that is protectively structured around a shared interest – writing – and semi-public. Participants have agreed to share their names and biographical details as the joint authors of the book, although the pieces of writing themselves are anonymous; some read their work aloud at public events, and others will not, or will have the writing tutors read it.

The function of the observation and writing process is primarily to describe things that I sense and perceive to be happening, as well as to make a record of my changing observations, thinking and feelings over the course of the programme. The field notes will be one part of the materials I analyse as part of the research. I will photograph only occasionally, choosing moments when this won’t interrupt other activities, and ask before taking any photographs of work in progress or finished collaborative pieces. I anticipate close-ups of pages, art supplies, and drafts. Other participants are also photographers and will sometimes be taking pictures during the sessions.

Finally,

**Emotionally sensitive topics**

The creative writing activities of the programme present some emotional risks because they treat topics and subjects that might stir up strong emotions. The programme staff members are sensitive to these ethical aspects, encourage participants to write whatever they like and that sharing is entirely voluntary. Further, because the creative writing workshops involve fictional and poetic exercises, they need not be directly confessional; participant can play on what they want to share and how to shape a response. As part of the creative writing exercises, the tutors will discuss how the group wants to approach confidentiality within the group. In the writing sessions, people often do not choose to read aloud what they have written.

In my role as researcher, I can work to mitigate any emotional harm through a handful of strategies. First, I will write and share my writing to be emotionally open, as appropriate, as part of the group. As necessary, I will check in with people taking part if sensitive topics come up, to see if they would like me to omit certain topics or stories. Feedback from research participants in the first two case studies showed that despite (or perhaps because of) the emotional intensity, participants particularly enjoyed talking about many of these questions.

**Risk of ‘writing wrong’**

There may be some emotional risks tied up in the structure of the creative writing elements of the programme as ‘good’ or ‘wrong’ creative work. The group is heterogeneous, with people from different cultural, linguistic, ethnic, religious, education, professional and class backgrounds. Participants might feel embarrassment around writing or drawing ‘badly’, words or thoughts not coming easily, and/or have other feelings around literacy and school, etc. While the facilitators and I will emphasize that there’s ‘no wrong way’ to go about the exercise, and that this isn’t school, and will celebrate the full range of work
produced, it may also be important to provide a range of ways for people to work: with audio recorders, with volunteer scribes or transcribers, with pictures and photographs, in first languages and not in English, with words already printed out, etc. What works will depend on tuning into the specific needs of the group.

**Risks to researcher**

I do not anticipate major risks to myself in this supportive, held research context. As needed, I have a variety of different forms of support within the programme (from the staff, with whom I have relationships), from my advisors (about specific ethical questions or concerns), and for general support from mentors who are social workers and activists in Cardiff.

**Structural privilege and the role of the researcher**

**Background checks (DBS)**

While I have a cleared DBS background check through my previous case studies, I don’t think a new check will be required, as the participants in the programme do not meet the criteria for vulnerable adults. As a backup measure, I also have completed a two-day course on care of vulnerable adults, with Women Connect First (2012).

**Structural privilege**

While the group of women is itself very diverse in terms of migration history, ethnic identity, language, and religious practice, among other differences, I do hold some significant and intractable positions of privilege.

Like some other researchers, I will have an insider/outsider status with respect to different members of the group. My whiteness, my largely monolingual English fluency, my identity as a university researcher, as an American, as secular but with Protestant roots, and my class identity, in particular, all intersect to place me in a position of structural privilege and power. In contrast, my age, recent migration and life-phase will be the most mobile and potentially ambivalent identities for this project, depending on the ages and different positions of participants. My identity as cis gender woman is shared with most of the group, while I don’t know about sexuality as a queer but straight-passing person.

These privileges are problematic. I will work to acknowledge their influence on my relationships with participants and the research, reflect on them in my writing for the research, and work to mitigate some of their worst effects. I will help to make the group’s activities as accessible as possible (free, accessible for people with limited mobility, and with food, transport, interpreting and childcare included for everyone as needed). More subtly, where whiteness often takes up ‘air time’, for example, I will cultivate a practice of listening. Where, as a white woman, I might expect my own comfort or exceptionalism to be considered when painful or charged topics come up, I will try to follow the rule to ‘comfort in (and listen in) /dump out’ – that is, to listen with care to the person describing the experience (listen ‘in’ the group), and ‘dump out’ any uncomfortable feelings I might have not in the group but in my fieldnotes or, where it relates to how I can conduct the research, to my supervisors. Finally, when and if other women in the group who share my privilege (as white women, as middle-class women, for example) do or say something that I think is problematic, I will try to speak up. I will explore questions regularly in my fieldnotes, documenting not only what happened but how I felt about it to reflect on what happens in the group.

I will also try to create opportunities, moments and spaces for people to talk to me in different contexts and at different times. I will also seek feedback around what people liked and didn’t, what worked and didn’t work, and use that feedback to inform my research practice.
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NOTE: I did not ask any of the questions below, as the creative writing exercises had their own momentum and scope. The topics we wrote about in the group were set by the group through brainstorming in the early weeks of the project.

Topic guide, potential questions and activities for interviews

- Identity
  - Draw your hand, and within your hand, write seven words to describe your identity.
  - Which of these words do you think is the most important to you right now?
  - What do you like about being (x descriptor word from the first list—i.e., a mother, a member of a religious or ethnic group, a sister, multilingual, etc.)? What is difficult about it?
  - How do you handle the difficult parts of the above? What helps you deal with those difficulties? How have you or do you respond to them?
  - If your life were a movie, what kind of movie would it be? What genre? What would the story be? Who would play you? Make a movie poster for this film with a title, a synopsis of the story, etc.
  - What would you say made growing up (in Cardiff, or somewhere else) different than growing up somewhere else?
  - What do you think it was like for your grandmothers and other relatives? How are things different for you?

- Place and migration
  - Draw/write (on a big piece of paper) the story of how you came to be where you are now.
    - Tell me about yourself. How did you come to live in Cardiff?
    - Where’s home for you?
    - What did you think of Cardiff when you first moved here?
    - What was the journey like?
    - What did you bring with you? What did you leave behind that you wish you’d brought?
    - Has how you feel about Cardiff changed? How?
    - Tell me about your communities – however you define them. Here? Elsewhere?
  - On the map of Cardiff, use the markers, stickers and other collage materials to turn it into your map of Cardiff.
    - Where do you like to go? What do you do there?
    - Where do you never go?
    - What do you associate with these different neighbourhoods and areas?
    - Draw where you feel comfortable and at home in warm colours. Draw where you feel out of place in cool colours.
    - What do you smell in these places? Hear? Taste? See? Feel?
    - Where are your favourite places to go in the city? When and why?
    - Which places do you not like at all?
    - If you could change Cardiff (or your neighbourhood), how would you change it? Draw those changes.
  - Draw ‘off the map’ – which other places do you enjoy or feel connected to? Why?

- Everyday making, fixing, creating
  - Draw a cartoon of what happens in an ordinary day in your life.
  - What are your responsibilities in your household?
  - What are your responsibilities in your community?
• What kinds of things do you like to do or make? Describe what you do, when, and why. How did you learn how to do this activity? From whom?
• Why did you start to make these things?
• What did your teachers tell you about what you do? (Rules, guidelines, etc.)
• Can you remember a particular moment when you made something you felt was successful/good?
• What about a time you made a big mistake? What happened?
• What have you made that you are most proud of?
• How has what you make or how you make it changed over time?
• What materials/ingredients do you use?
• Tell me about the process of finding your materials. Where do they come from?
• Is there anything you used to use but don’t anymore? Why did you change?
• Tell me about any new materials you have started to use since being in Cardiff.
• Describe how you feel when you are working.
• What do you do if you make a mistake?
• How do you like to share what you have made?
• Describe how time feels when you are working. Does it drag? Fly by? How does it feel?
2. Sample illustrated research consent form:

| I understand the purpose of the research, and where and when the research will take place. | I understand that the research involves:  
1) Being observed by the researcher during the ‘Writing our Lives’ programme. | 2) Participating in writing and arts-based activities and sharing some of what I create.  
The researcher may take pictures of my writing or drawings with my consent. None of the pictures will identify me. | 3) Talking about my experiences in an interview. The interview may be one-on-one or in a group.  
My voice may be recorded, but the recording will only be used to write up my words. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my name and identity will be secret and confidential.</td>
<td>I understand that the research may be published in a university library and/or as part of an academic book.</td>
<td>I understand that being a part of the research is my choice and I can stop at any time.</td>
<td>I understand that the information about me will be stored securely for up to five years, when it will be destroyed. I can ask to see the information at any time. I can also ask for it to be destroyed at any time. These are my rights under the Data Protection Act.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I understand the risks and benefits of participating in the research.  
:: yes  
:: maybe  
:: not really | I feel informed about the research and understand I can ask questions at any time. | I agree to participate.  
NAME:  
DATE:  
SIGNED: |  
Alida Payson, School of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies, Cardiff University  
paysonAB@cardiff.ac.uk |
3. Sample information sheet for participants

Alida Payson  
School of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies, Cardiff University  
EMAIL: paysonAB@cardiff.ac.uk

Research Information

What is this research about?

The aims of the research are to learn more about the experiences of women in Cardiff from migrant and minority ethnic backgrounds, and how women create a sense of place and community here. This research will happen as part of a collaboration with Oasis Cardiff.

I understand that my participation in this project will involve:

1. Sharing sewing and stitching I create as part of the project.
2. Drawing and talking about my experiences in Cardiff and what I have made through an interview.
3. Being observed by the researcher as I engage in the program.

Who is doing this research?

Alida Payson is a second year PhD student at the School of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies at Cardiff University. This research is part of her PhD dissertation. The faculty member at Cardiff University helping to supervise this research is Dr Kerry Moore.  
RESEARCHER CONTACT INFO:  
Alida Payson  
School of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies, Cardiff University  
Email: paysonAB@cardiff.ac.uk

What will my participation involve?

Participation in this project is entirely by choice. Questions are welcome at any time. If you wish to withdraw from the research, you may do so at any time, without giving a reason.

What happens with the research information?

All names and identification will be removed or changed in the research so participants are anonymous in any publications. The research will be held confidentially at the university and any records will be destroyed after 5 years. You can ask for the information about you to be deleted at any time and, in accordance with the Data Protection Act, you can have access to the information at any time.

Where can I find out more about this research and any findings?

Please contact the researcher, Alida Payson, for updates. The final dissertation will be available through Cardiff University’s website after 2016.
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4. Research plans submitted for ethics review, Mothers Then and Now

b. Project II: Mothers Then and Now

In this part of my fieldwork, I hope to collaborate with a local women’s history and creative media project for girls in Butetown, “Mothers Then and Now”, run by the Women’s Workshop.

Research questions:

In my PhD project, I have outlined the following research questions:

What is missing from representations of migrant women? As creative agents, how do women choose to describe, perform and protect their stories, shaping what they want their audience to hear and know? Within a context of heterogeneity, how do migrant women form social and symbolic capital, especially when that capital has been uprooted or transposed? How do women identify and ally themselves? Finally, in what ways do migrant women experience oppression or conflict in their lives in Cardiff—both individual acts of bigotry and structural barriers—and based on which factors? How can we intervene creatively to both complicate public misperception and build unexpected allegiances and understanding for social change?

I am interested in how girls and women in Cardiff with migrant or ethnic minority backgrounds contribute to, create and perhaps catalyse change in the city through everyday work and creative practices. I am also interested in how—and if—these girls, and the women relatives they interview, have experienced social injustice in their everyday lives, and if so, how they have responded to it. In doing research with the girls in the program as participants, as outlined below, I hope to gather material that will help me answer these questions.

Project description:

The “Mothers Then and Now” project, run by a small Cardiff-based NGO, the Women’s Workshop, is an 18-month Heritage Lottery funded project for girls ages 13-15 from Butetown. As participants in the project, the group of 12 girls will explore local women’s history through conducting oral histories with women in their own families from different generations, investigating photographs and records in the Glamorgan archives, and visiting sites and museums in the city. Throughout the project, the girls will learn how to conduct oral histories and start archival research, produce work in a variety of creative and digital media, and even make upcycled vintage fashion. They will interpret what they find in their research through this drama, fashion, photography, other digital media, and will organize and curate community events and a final exhibition to share their findings and productions.

For my research, I hope to gather information in three ways:

1) Document, capture and record the various texts the girls produce in their research and interpretation (i.e., audio recordings of the oral histories, photographs, draft materials for the website, documentation of the fashions, etc. they create)

2) Facilitate workshops (i.e., hands-on focus groups) and interviews to discuss questions about participants’ own experiences and the process of the research (see examples of questions I may ask below)

3) Observation of and reflection on the girls’ processes during the program and my own role, observations and feelings via a field notebook/journal written after each program session.
This project is particularly attractive to me as a site of research because the girls will be, in many ways, co-researchers; the project thus incorporates some of the reflective and social justice features of participant action research that are important to me. Action research is a method that seeks to challenge existing structural injustices and enact social change. As Kindon et al. summarize, in action research: “Researchers and participants identify an issue or situation in need of change; they then initiate research that draws on capabilities and assets to precipitate relevant action. Both researchers and participants reflect on, and learn from, this action and proceed to a new cycle of research/action/reflection” (Kindon et al., p. 1, 2007). Participants take on the role of co-researchers by asking questions, exploring possible answers out in the community and in their own experiences, and analysing and interpreting their findings, as well as taking action on next steps. This structure and cycle is already built into the structure of the “Mothers Then and Now” project, especially as the girls originally brainstormed to set the questions, goals and methods for the project proposal last year. In terms of outcomes or actions, the process is still open, depending on what the girls find and want to present or do.

I see my role as the following: to document the process and capture the richness of the research and creative interpretations the girls produce; to support the project by helping with hands-on evaluation, which can double as part of the reflection and feedback process informing the project and research cycle; to facilitate a handful of workshops and interviews throughout the program in which the girls can reflect on their findings and experiences, and how these connect or form patterns, in a hands-on and dynamic way.

The mixed media will bridge differences and open space for participants to play with what they want to share and how they want to compose and perform it. As other academic researchers note regarding interviews with Somali immigrants in Maine, the texts participants produced ‘bear the marks of all cultural crossings—a layered text of saying and not saying, of offerings and silences, of responsiveness and resistance’ that reflect ‘strategic communication by persons with agency and rhetorical skill’ (Huisman et al., 2011). Because the participants will draft, edit, curate and perform the images and stories they produce, this collaboration emphasizes that participants are co-producing the always-mediated research.

Risks, harm and plans

What are the possible risks to participants from joining in this research? What will I do to mitigate any possible harm or distress that might come from joining it?

First, the Mothers Then and Now group will be led by a project coordinator who has years of experience working with girls and women in Butetown. She and the Women’s Workshop have resources, experience and networks available if, in the course of the research, one of the participants needs additional support. They are available if the participants or I have any concerns. I have a DBS check in the UK and will pass along my US background check for work with young people as needed.

In addition to the consent form, which very briefly outlines my project, I will introduce myself and the research aims/plans to the group in August, and answer any questions they might have. I will bring some examples of published research so they can have a tangible example of what the research might look like in its final, most public form. I will also emphasize that they can withdraw and/or ask any questions at any time throughout the research process.

For the first element of the research, in which I document and capture the research and creative media texts the girls produce, I will: 1) get written consent from participants and their parents or guardians, if under 16, to record and use these materials in my research 2) take care to keep all participants’ work
anonymous and their identities confidential (by avoiding photographs of faces, and disguising names, etc., in my field notes) 3) check in periodically with participants to make sure they consent to share this material. Because the girls the Mothers Then and Now project already involves oral history, family research, and creative media, and the participants are producing this research and media to be shared and archived, and because they can choose whether or not to have this work included in my research but still participate in the full program, I don’t think this part of the research poses any significant risk of harm. Families can be complicated topics, of course, but as part of the project, the participants will be trained by experts at the Butetown History and Arts Centre on how to conduct oral histories, and will discuss what kinds of questions they want to ask, as well as the ethics of sensitive topics and questions.

The workshops/hands-on discussions present some risks because they treat topics and subjects that might stir up strong emotions, but I can work to mitigate these through a handful of strategies. First, before any workshop, we will draft ground rules with the group to support a safe and confidential space (around listening, confidentiality, etc.). I will begin with the topics or workshops with lower emotional stakes, for example, like the workshop on creativity/craft/food, or about reimagining the city, to build a safe space for the higher-stakes workshops about identity and the challenges of stigmatisation or discrimination. Because the workshops are hands-on, and involve drama, mapping, art and other forms of expression and personal narration, they engage participants in a process of making sense of the questions in a variety of ways.

The group of girls, while all living in Butetown, is itself very diverse in terms of migration history, ethnic identity, language, and religious practice, among other differences. Like many facilitators, I will have an insider/outsider status with respect to the group—an insider for some in terms of gender, perhaps being a migrant or an outsider to parts of Cardiff, and a fellow artist/maker, and maybe class, but an outsider for others in terms of being white, an adult, a researcher, nonreligious with Protestant roots, and basically monolingual, and class again in other ways/for others. Through being open about this, reflecting on how my identity plays out in the dynamics of the group in my notebook and writing, and structuring the workshops to allow for the maximum of shared “airtime” for each participant, I hope to be responsive to the dynamics generated by my involvement and role in the group. I will seek feedback from the participants at the end of each workshop and reshape subsequent workshops accordingly.

For the higher stakes questions, I will do shorter, semi-structured interviews with participants individually. I will base my decisions about these interviews and about which questions to ask in them on the dynamic of the group—the participants' comfort and trust in discussion with each other—and on their feedback. Interviews will happen during the Mothers Then and Now programming hours in the Women's Workshop spaces and intrude as little as possible on the girls’ participation in other aspects of the project.

I will remind participants during the workshops and for any interviews that their participation and what they choose to share is always voluntary. I will also do activities to encourage them to be aware of and practice stretching themselves in the context of the project but not risking too much so that they feel unsafe. I have experience with leading workshops and discussions with groups of teenagers about topics like racism, oppression, intercultural exchange, and being a new arrival in a community, and will draw on those experiences. The experience of being a young person itself can be a complicated and emotional one. While some of the research questions might stir up these strong emotions, it’s my experience that these kinds of workshops and discussions can be ultimately strengthening and powerful if facilitated well.

Finally, the third part of my research, the observation and ethnography, will primarily take the form of a narrative journal or field notebook that I keep regularly throughout the research. I will not take any
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notes when with the group, but write in it directly afterwards. This is primarily to keep track of how my thinking changes over the course of the fieldwork, to reflect on what happened or did not happen, and to capture, through description, something of the texture and detail of the research process. This is a standard of action research (Kindon et al., p. 1). The notebook becomes a space to describe and parse out some of the intricacies of what happens in any given program day, and to reflect on the unexpected, brilliant and difficult elements of the process. I include it as part of the consent because I am not sure what role this notebook will play in my final project. In addition to written consent from the participant and her parent or guardian, I will also periodically check in for verbal consent (or withdrawal!) with the participants throughout the 18-month process. I will keep the field notebook as a password-protected document on my computer and code names in it to keep participants anonymous.

While working with young people ages 13-15 presents unique challenges to making sure that the participants are safe and that I engage with them ethically as a researcher, I have thought carefully about how to go about collaborating with them in this research and finding answers to my research questions in the most ethical way that I can.

Potential questions and activities:

Identity
- What seven words would you use to describe yourself? (Give my own example…)
- Draw/write (on a big piece of paper) the story of your identity (who you are).
- What do you like about being a girl in Cardiff (or in your neighbourhood)?
- What is difficult about it?
- What do you like about being (x descriptor word from the first list—i.e., a teenager, a member of a religious or ethnic group, a sister, multilingual, etc.)? What is difficult about it?
- How do you handle the difficult parts of the above? What helps you deal with those difficulties? How have you or do you respond to them?
- Why do you think
- If your life were a movie right now, what kind of movie would it be? What genre? What would the story be? Who would play you?

Everyday making, fixing, creating
- Describe/act out what happens in an ordinary day in your life.
- What kinds of things do you like to do or make? How did you learn how to do them? What do you like about doing them? (Incorporate these, if possible, into the program/future workshops).
- Describe a significant or festive meal in your family. (Make a folding accordion book illustrating it). What’s in it? How and when do you eat it? With whom? Who prepares it?
- What are your responsibilities in your house or community?
- How do you imagine your life in 10 years? 20?

Spaces of belonging/unbelonging
- What do you think the biggest problems in Cardiff are right now? Why?
- How would you describe different places in the city? Where do you like to go? Where do you feel comfortable and at home? Where do you feel out of place? (Use a big map for this)
- If you could change Cardiff (or your neighbourhood), how would you change it? (Use big maps, collage, play dough to make a city)
Gender and history

• What’s missing from the women’s history you know about Cardiff? What do you want to learn about or know about women’s history that this research might help us find out?
• What do you think about what it was like for your grandmothers and other relatives to be a teenage girl in Cardiff? What stood out to you about what they said? How are things different for you?
• Who do you admire/respect most in your family or community? What do you admire about them? (Make a collage/painted/photomontage portrait of this person).

5. Research plans submitted for ethics review, 16 to 60: A Woman’s Voice

In this part of my fieldwork, I hope to collaborate with a local women’s arts and creative media project for girls in Butetown and Grangetown called 16 to 60: A Woman’s Voice.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

In my PhD project, I have outlined the following research questions:

How do migrant and minority ethnic women in Cardiff work, practice creative labour and craft culture in their everyday lives? What forms of citizenship do they engage in, and how do they imagine their own contributions? How do women identify and ally themselves? How do they form social and symbolic capital, especially when that capital has been uprooted or transposed? Finally, in what ways do migrant women experience oppression or conflict in their lives in Cardiff—both individual acts of bigotry and structural barriers—and based on what? How can we intervene creatively to both complicate public misperception and build unexpected allegiances and understanding for social change?

I am interested in how girls and women in Cardiff with migrant or ethnic minority backgrounds contribute to, create and perhaps catalyse change in the city through everyday work and creative practices. I am also interested in how—and if—these girls and women have experienced social injustice in their everyday lives, and if so, how they have responded to it.

In Cardiff now, as part of two Heritage Lottery-funded Young Roots Programme projects, young people here are already asking these questions themselves (about racism, women’s roles, work, and fashions in Cardiff in particular) and producing original art and media works on these themes for the public. For my research, I want to a) interview these young people in small groups about their ideas and insights on themes of gender, identity, racism, and community; b) analyse the original works and exhibitions they produce to express their ideas; and c) interview a small number of participants one-on-one to ask them to reflect on their creative process through the program. Through these methods, I hope to capture some of the thinking and multimedia research drawn out by these community projects that might begin to answer my own research questions.

RESEARCH PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The ’16 to 60: A Woman’s Voice’ project is an arts and heritage program for girls and young women ages 13-21 from Butetown and Grangetown. It is a partnership between People Around Here, a small community arts charity that offers arts programming to young people, Cardiff Youth Service, and Cardiff
Story Museum. The project started in Autumn 2012 and will conclude in December 2013. I have been volunteering on an ad hoc basis with the project since February 2013.

Young people in the program have made a wide variety of media and art projects around themes of identity, belonging, gender and justice. The girls have produced original short autobiographical films, photographs, fashion pieces that bring together different cultural elements and designs, songs, and other art and media work. They have also interviewed elder women from their communities on film, and made short documentaries of those interviews. The girls will share this work on display at The Cardiff Story for the month of October and again at the all-women Cardiff Eid Extravaganza event in November. This autumn, the girls will also be finishing up work required to get certificates in media and the arts on Wednesday evenings.

For my research, I hope to gather information in four ways:

4) Document, capture and analyse the original art and media works the girls produced as they install them at The Cardiff Story and for the Eid Extravaganza
5) Facilitate 1-2 workshops (i.e., hands-on focus groups) to discuss the themes of gender roles, racism, identity and creativity that appear in their creative work
6) Interview 3-10 participants one-on-one about their reflections on their own experiences with the project, as young women in Cardiff, and their own creative identities and process.
7) Observation of participants during the program and reflection in a journal.

This project is particularly attractive to me as a site of research because the girls have been, in many ways, co-researchers; the project thus incorporates some of the reflective and social justice features of participant action research that are important to me.

Action research is a method that seeks to challenge existing structural injustices and enact social change. As Kindon et al. summarize, in action research: “Researchers and participants identify an issue or situation in need of change; they then initiate research that draws on capabilities and assets to precipitate relevant action. Both researchers and participants reflect on, and learn from, this action and proceed to a new cycle of research/action/reflection” (Kindon et al., p. 1, 2007). Participants take on the role of co-researchers by asking questions, exploring possible answers out in the community and in their own experiences, and analysing and interpreting their findings, as well as taking action on next steps.

With the 16 to 60: A Woman’s Voice project, I hope to help participants (who have already done substantial research and synthesizing that research) to reflect on what they have discovered and produced and think about what next steps or actions might be. I see my role as the following: to document the process and capture the richness of the research and creative interpretations the girls produce; to support the project by helping with hands-on evaluation, which can double as part of the reflection and feedback process informing the project and research cycle; to facilitate a handful of workshops and interviews throughout the program in which the girls can reflect on their findings and experiences, and how these connect or form patterns, in a hands-on and dynamic way.

The mixed media the girls have produced bridge differences and open space for participants to play with what they want to share and how they want to compose and perform it. As other academic researchers note regarding interviews with Somali immigrants in Maine, the texts participants produced ‘bear the marks of all cultural crossings—a layered text of saying and not saying, of offerings and silences, of responsiveness and resistance’ that reflect ‘strategic communication by persons with agency and rhetorical skill’ (Huisman et al., 2011). Because the participants have drafted, edited, curated and performed the images and stories they produced, this collaboration emphasizes that participants are co-producing the always-mediated research.
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RISKS, HARM, and PLANS

What are the possible risks to participants from joining in this research? What will I do to mitigate any possible harm or distress that might come from joining it?

Because the research involves young people, some of whom are under 16, and addresses aspects of their lives that may have been or continue to be painful or difficult for them (i.e., gender or race-based discrimination), my research will take particular care to mitigate these risks in the following ways:

Staffing and support:

The *16 to 60: A Woman’s Voice* project is staffed by two project coordinators with years of experience working with young people on arts projects. They have additional support from support staff at the Butetown Youth Pavilion, among them licensed social workers, who also help occasionally as cultural translators and gatekeepers. They are available if the participants or I have any concerns. I am in the process of getting another DBS background check cleared through PAH or the Youth Pavilion if necessary (as they apply on my behalf, they must deem it required given my role—so far it has not been required).

I have been volunteering regularly with the project, too, so I have had the opportunity to build trust with the participants and for them to ask me lots of questions about myself.

Consent:

In terms of consent, I will: 1) get written consent from participants and their parents or guardians, if under 16 2) take care to keep all participants’ work anonymous and their identities confidential (by avoiding photographs of faces, and disguising names, etc., in my field notes) 3) check in periodically with participants to make sure they consent to share this material.

In addition to the consent form, which outlines my project, I will introduce my research aims/plans in person and answer any questions they might have. I will bring some examples of published research so they can have a tangible example of what the research might look like in its final, most public form. I will also emphasize that they can withdraw and/or ask any questions at any time throughout the research process. I will also present myself as a researcher at their events so their parents or guardians can meet me and ask me any questions they might have themselves.

I will give copies of the consent forms, along with an information sheet with contact info and numbers and an outline of the research aims, to the participants and their parents or guardians.

I will periodically remind the participants that participating is entirely voluntary and check in about consent during the program.

Safe emotional space:

My research starts in the project’s most public phase when participants share the work they produced with the public in exhibition spaces, so I don’t think this part of the research poses any significant risk of harm.

The workshops/hands-on discussions present some risks because they treat topics and subjects that might stir up strong emotions, but I can work to mitigate these through a handful of strategies. First,
before any workshop, we will draft ground rules with the group to support a safe and confidential space (around listening, confidentiality, taking safe risks, etc.). I will begin with the topics or workshops with lower emotional stakes to build a safe space for the higher-stakes questions about identity and the challenges of stigmatisation or discrimination. Because the workshops are hands-on, and involve drama, mapping, art and other forms of expression and personal narration, they engage participants in a process of making sense of the questions in a variety of ways that I hope will be also be accessible and fun.

Second, I will remind participants during the workshops and for any interviews that their participation and what they choose to share is always voluntary. I will also do activities to encourage them to be aware of and practice stretching themselves in the context of the project but not risking too much so that they feel unsafe. I have experience with leading workshops and discussions with groups of teenagers about topics like racism, oppression, intercultural exchange, and being a new arrival in a community, and will draw on those experiences. Being a young person, in particular, may bring particular challenges and strong feelings to bear on the research: as researcher Chelsea Marshall put it, “while the dominant narrative of childhood continues to idealise a period of “fantastic freedom, imagination and seamless opportunity”, Jo Boyden argues “there is growing evidence globally that childhood is for many a very unhappy time” (Marshall, 2012). That is, the experience of being a young person itself—especially, maybe, a young person who belongs to a migrant or minority ethnic community or identity—is a complicated and emotional one. While some of the research questions might stir up these strong emotions, it’s my experience that these kinds of workshops and discussions can be ultimately strengthening and powerful if facilitated well.

Third, by being open about my own identity and role, reflecting on how my identity plays out in the dynamics of the group in my notebook and writing, and structuring the workshops to allow for the maximum of shared “airtime” for each participant, I hope to be responsive to the dynamics generated by my involvement and role in the group. The group of girls, while all living in Butetown, is itself very diverse in terms of migration history, ethnic identity, language, and religious practice, among other differences. Like many facilitators, I will have an insider/outside status with respect to the group—an insider for some in terms of gender, perhaps being a migrant or an outsider to parts of Cardiff, and a fellow artist/maker, and maybe class, but an outsider for others in terms of being white, an adult, a researcher, nonreligious with Protestant roots, and basically monolingual, and class again in other ways/for others. I will seek feedback from the participants at the end of each workshop and reshape subsequent workshops accordingly.

I plan to make an audio recording of the workshop for myself to listen to and transcribe, but will code the transcript to ensure participant anonymity and confidentiality. I will explain the purpose of recording ask the girls if they are comfortable being recorded.

Interviews

I plan to conduct a small number of semi-structured interviews (from 20-30 minutes each) with individuals or pairs of the participants, depending on the format they would prefer. These interviews will cover similar questions to the group workshops, but will hopefully allow the participant to respond further and more personally where she might not have been able to in the group setting. If the interviewees consent, I plan to record these interviews with an audio recorder for myself to produce an accurate transcription.

Reflection
Finally, the third part of my research, the observation and ethnography, will primarily take the form of a narrative journal or field notebook that I keep regularly throughout the research. I will not take any notes when with the group, but write in it directly afterwards. This is primarily to keep track of how my thinking changes over the course of the fieldwork, to reflect on what happened or did not happen, and to capture, through description, something of the texture and detail of the research process. This is a standard of action research (Kindon et al., p. 1). The notebook becomes a space to describe and parse out some of the intricacies of what happens in any given program day, and to reflect on the unexpected, brilliant and difficult elements of the process. I include it as part of the consent because I am not sure what role this notebook will play in my final project. In addition to written consent from the participant and her parent or guardian, I will also periodically check in for verbal consent (or withdrawal!) with the participants throughout the 18-month process. I will keep the field notebook as a password-protected document on my computer and code names in it to keep participants anonymous.

Potential questions and activities:

Identity
- What seven words would you use to describe yourself? (Give my own example…)
- Draw/write (on a big piece of paper) the story of your identity (who you are).
- What do you like about being a girl in Cardiff (or in your neighbourhood)?
- What is difficult about it?
- What do you like about being (x descriptor word from the first list—i.e., a teenager, a member of a religious or ethnic group, a sister, multilingual, etc.)? What is difficult about it?
- How do you handle the difficult parts of the above? What helps you deal with those difficulties? How have you or do you respond to them?
- If your life were a movie right now, what kind of movie would it be? What genre? What would the story be? Who would play you?

Everyday making, fixing, creating
- Describe/act out what happens in an ordinary day in your life.
- What kinds of things do you like to do or make? How did you learn how to do them? What do you like about doing them?
- When do you feel creative? Why is creativity important to you?
- Describe a significant or festive meal in your family. (Make a folding accordion book illustrating it). What’s in it? How and when do you eat it? With whom? Who prepares it?
- What are your responsibilities in your house or community?
- How do you imagine your life in 10 years? 20?

Spaces of belonging/unbelonging
- What do you think the biggest problems in Cardiff are right now? Why?
- How would you describe different places in the city? Where do you like to go? Where do you feel comfortable and at home? Where do you feel out of place? (Use a big map for this)
- If you could change Cardiff (or your neighbourhood), how would you change it? (Use big maps, collage, play dough to make a city)

Gender and history
- What’s missing from the women’s history you know about Cardiff? What did you learn about women’s history that you think other people should know about?
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- What do you think about what it was like for your grandmothers and other relatives to be a teenage girl in Cardiff? What stood out to you about what they said? How are things different for you?
- Who do you admire/respect most in your family or community? Why? What do you admire about them? (Make a collage/painted/photomontage portrait of this person).

6. Ethics considerations in presenting the fieldwork and writing up the research

New ethical considerations came up in writing about the fieldwork for the thesis. Many questions came up around how to protect anonymity in a small city, where lots of people know each other, and where some of the opinions and experiences shared were emotionally and politically sensitive or potentially embarrassing. At one point, to protect the anonymity of participants, I considered changing the name of the neighbourhood in which I conducted the research to a pseudonym, as well as the names of the heritage projects. This was in accordance with new recommendations from the ESRC. As an example of this practice, I took recent research on participatory research of poverty in the Welsh Valleys by Byrne, Elliott and Williams 2016.

After discussions with my advisors, however, I ended up using the actual place names and project names for several reasons. First, I decided that Butetown in particular has too specific a story to be believably anywhere else in Wales. Moreover, part of the project involves a critical history of a specific place, because the projects I study also engage with aspects of the history of that place. To unmoor this history would unmoor a significant aspect of the research. Second, the heritage projects all have substantial public-facing components, and there are only a small number of local projects and organisations that could match these descriptions. Further, the funders and organisations involved had a significant impact on the projects themselves, shaping their objectives and scope, and therefore were also a necessary part of my critique. Further, listing the specific project names may be useful to future researchers, both amateur and academic, as exhibitions and many of the oral histories are part of archives at the Cardiff Story Museum, Butetown History and Arts Centre and the Women’s Workshop at BAWSO. While permissions for other researchers to use these materials is managed by these institutions and the trustees of these groups, if I had not named the project partners, any future access to these materials would be very difficult.

Thus committed to naming the projects, I then worked to mitigate any harm to the people who took part, by anonymizing as carefully as possible. I made pseudonyms for all of the participants, and sometimes disguised their specific profession or specific cultural background in order to make sure that it would be as difficult as possible to triangulate their real identities. By sometimes generalizing both young women’s projects, for example, I was able to broaden the group to whom I might be referring to the more than 60 young people who took part in total. In places, I deliberately did not name the speaker who offered a story to ensure that her identity could not be deduced from the combination of stories and quotes I selected (with the foster mother in Chapter 4, for example). I took care not to describe people in such a way that would specifically point out a single person or handful of people. Where I do tell a specific story, as in Chapter 7, I made sure to ask the participant if they were comfortable with this, and included only what I thought was most important to the analysis, without unnecessary linked details.

In addition to changing names and identifying information, I also decided to omit some sensitive stories, among them stories related to the law, contentious political topics, and mental health. Here, I follow
Saunders, Kitzinger and Kitzinger’s (2015a) strategy of potentially saving these data and materials for future publications that do not name specific places or projects. In reflecting on my process, I think I underestimated the extent to which one young people might manage their risk of gossip with other young people. While I did some activities related to this risk in the groups, participants still shared experiences in the projects and groups that may have put them at risk for gossip among their peers. For researchers interested in working with young people on potentially sensitive topics, I would now recommend looking over exercises for young people in keeping oneself safe (AGENDA) developed by Emma Renold (2017) for her studies on young people’s experiences of sexuality and relationships. The ‘internet age’ and public-facing exhibitions and online presence of these projects also adds additional ethical challenges (Saunders, Kitzinger and Kitzinger 2015b). This required me to omit analysis of any media or other material with photographs of participants, for example. It also will also mean careful vigilance in publishing the research.

In general, in writing this thesis I have worked to balance ethical considerations to protect the people who took part in this research with the kind of nuanced, emplaced and complex context of the research. This is of course an ongoing and developing part of the research and writing.