



Editorial

Paul Bowman

*School of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies,
Cardiff University, UK*

Email: BowmanP@cf.ac.uk

Twitter: [@JOMECjournal](https://twitter.com/JOMECjournal)

Keywords

JOMEC Journal

Journalism

Media

Cultural Studies

Disciplines

Interdisciplinarity

Abstract

This editorial reiterates the investment of *JOMEC Journal* in the (potential, if not always actual) nexus of journalism studies, media studies and cultural studies. It proposes that these fields are often assumed to be quite distinct, which means it is easy for scholars working within them to operate uncritically and unthinkingly as if they are necessarily distinct disciplines, at a distance from each other. The editorial proposes that this 'distance' ought to be rethought. Accordingly, it reiterates that *JOMEC Journal* seeks to be a place in which researchers in each of the overlapping and interconnected fields of journalism, media and cultural studies might encounter the work, thought and interventions of the others.

Contributor Note

Paul Bowman is editor of *JOMEC Journal*. He teaches cultural studies at Cardiff University and is the author and editor of numerous academic books and journals, most recently *Culture and the Media* (2012), *Beyond Bruce Lee* (2013), *Reading Rey Chow* (2013), and *Rancière and Film* (2013).

Issue 1 of *JOMEK Journal* was a themed issue. Issue 2 was a 'rapid response' issue: one planned and mapped out in the run up to a major event – in this case, the London 2012 Olympics – and published quite quickly thereafter. Issue 3 was originally intended to be an open issue. It was to have no single theme, and would publish works that would in various ways cross the borders, establish connections between and pressure the disciplinary boundaries of journalism studies, media studies and cultural studies.

Future issues will include guest-edited collections. Indeed, in direct response to issue 2 of *JOMEK Journal* – the 'rapid response' Olympics issue – Jeremy Valentine proposed that we should plan something on the death of Margaret Thatcher. This idea was welcomed by the editorial team, although we were mindful that *timing* could prove to be quite problematic: for, how could we coordinate a publication date? In other words: how could we know when Thatcher was going to die?

As it happened, before we proceeded very far with that conversation, Thatcher did die. Consequently, rather than being able to produce a 'rapid response issue' in the rather cunning sense given to the idea by Verica Rugar when she first proposed it – i.e., by having a team of authors standing by, ready and waiting to deliver articles in the immediate aftermath of a major event – this third issue of *JOMEK Journal* was forced to be rapid in the rather more conventional sense. As such, it includes some genuinely rapid responses to Thatcher's death, in the form of reflections on the significance of her controversial interventions and contested legacy.

The reflections gathered together in the Thatcher section of this issue all come from academics who each have histories of very deep – and very diverse – engagements with Thatcher and Thatcherism – professional, theoretical/analytical and political.

In both the open issue section and the Thatcher section, readers will note the different styles of writing – the different discourses and protocols that come together. We are delighted about this, as *disciplinary difference* is something that *JOMEK Journal* seeks deliberately to engage – indeed to foreground – even if only by juxtaposition. As we have asserted from the outset: *JOMEK Journal* does not aspire to be univocal or continuous. It is conceived as a place in which the *contiguous* (and not simply continuous) disciplines or fields of journalism studies, media studies and cultural studies can collide.

This is valuable because academics, researchers, students and teachers may see themselves as occupying particular positions in one or more of the putative 'fields' of journalism studies, media studies, or cultural studies. But this can work to close down thinking and engagement. Indeed, it is all too easy to use such terms (journalism studies, media studies, cultural studies) *as if they necessarily refer to fixed, stable or transparent entities*. But, perhaps such terms as these are actually *empty* or *floating* signifiers, whose meanings are only ever established within specific contexts. Moreover, perhaps the production of such contexts and identities involves the imagination of others, and declarations about some supposedly necessary distance or difference between 'us' and 'them' (as in:

'I don't do *media* studies: I do *journalism* studies').

Rather than repeating uncritical processes of positioning and identifying through dubious taxonomies and acts of othering, *JOMEC Journal* seeks to work away at the disciplinary differences that are sometimes imagined to be intractable (or that are acted out as if they are intractable) between, across, and within, journalism, media, and cultural studies.

In this issue, therefore, there are sharp contrasts in 'style', in focus, in topic, and in approach. The connection between articles is not the connection of tidy disciplinary recognisability, wherein each intervention has an already-established 'proper place' in a stable field. It is not a matter of articles 'fitting in' to an established disciplinary arena in a neat and tidy way. Rather, it is a matter of the juxtaposition of works, especially those which exist in a more or less deliberate manner on the (fault) lines of one or more of the three ostensibly distinct fields – journalism, media, cultural studies.

In this sense, the intervention seeks to be performative. But, of course, 'fields' themselves are performative. They may seem to be constant and distinct, but they inevitably fold out from and back into each other. Each is a fold of the others. Each is also folded into the others. This means that these are fields that may seem to add up to three, but which may equally be regarded as having been produced to some extent by acts of double and even triple counting.

In this issue Matt Carlson discusses 'Journalistic Change in an Online Age: Disaggregating Visibility, Legitimacy, and Revenue', in an article which explores the

relations between journalism and new media in terms of three aspects that he proposes to be key: visibility, legitimacy and revenue. David Harte examines hyperlocal citizen journalism in 'One Every Two Minutes: assessing the scale of hyperlocal publishing in the UK', with reference to questions of the relations between hyperlocal journalism and community in the UK. Meanwhile, Benita Heiskanen, in '*Ni Una Más*, Not One More: Activist-Artistic Response to the Juárez Femicides', discusses art-activism in response to the Ciudad Juárez Femicides at the U.S.-Mexico border.

Shifting contexts again, Darren Kelsey's 'Myths, Monarchs and Prime Ministers: "Blitz Spirit" Discourses of Royalty and Tony Blair in British Newspaper Responses to the July 7th Bombings' uses Critical Discourse Analysis to explore the myths (re)activated in the media in response to the July 7th terrorist attacks on London. Then, from another geographical, disciplinary and journalistic location, so to speak, Scott Rodgers' article, 'Circulating cities of difference: assembling geographical imaginations of Toronto's diversity in the newsroom' uses actor-network theory to engage with journalism, materiality and multi-culturalism.

From a concern with media and popular culture, John Seed offers a reading of the ever-popular TV series, *Made in Chelsea*, in 'Made in Like Chelsea', a reading which proceeds with an eye on the cultural dimensions of neoliberalism. Whilst, from a concern with economic specificity, Sean Tunney analyses 'The UK Press and Corporation Tax: learning lessons from Ireland'.

Finally, the section on Thatcher includes contributions from Jeremy Valentine,

Simon During, Heather Nunn, Peter Leigh-Wright, and Richard Tait.

I would like to extend my gratitude to all of these contributors. Equally, for help in completing this particular issue, I would like to thank the rest of the *JOMEK Journal* editorial team, who were always on hand to provide advice and who recommended appropriate peer review-

ers, often at a moment's notice. Thanks also to our 'blind peer reviewers' themselves, who, as convention demands, as well as being 'blind', must also remain nameless. Their critical comments and suggestions, however, were invaluable. Thanks also to Isabelle Gibbons, who helped with proof reading. And, finally, thanks to James Clemas for getting the issue up and out.



This article was first published in *JOMEC Journal*

JOMEC Journal is an online, open-access and peer reviewed journal dedicated to publishing the highest quality innovative academic work in Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies. It is run by an editorial collective based in the School of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies at Cardiff University, committed both to open-access publication and to maintaining the highest standards of rigour and academic integrity. *JOMEC Journal* is peer reviewed with an international, multi-disciplinary Editorial Board and Advisory Panel. It welcomes work that is located in any one of these disciplines, as well as interdisciplinary work that approaches Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies as overlapping and interlocking fields. It is particularly interested in work that addresses the political and ethical dimensions, stakes, problematics and possibilities of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies.

To submit a paper or to discuss publication, please contact:

Dr Paul Bowman: BowmanP@cf.ac.uk

www.cf.ac.uk/jomecjournal

Twitter: @JOMECjournal

ISSN: ISSN 2049-2340

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License. Based on a work at www.cf.ac.uk/jomecjournal.

