Debates about the structures and processes of globalisation – along with those of localisation – have important implications for the discipline (or is it still a field?) of media studies. The first implication, framed as a counter-hegemonic resistance to what some might consider to be the totalising tradition of Western media studies scholarship, is that we can no longer continue to look only to Western centres of academe for intellectual edification. The need for a critical deconstruction of Euro-American intellectual centrisms, and the need for recognising and thus reconstructing a truly transcultural onto-epistemological agenda for media studies, has become more urgent than ever before.

Secondly, the rise of China as an economic and cultural unit of analysis in media studies – regardless of all the complexities and uncertainties engendered by China’s rise as a soft power – calls for a different set of analytical tools to understand the interpenetration of China with almost all parts of the developed and the developing world. China’s unfolding global economic – and political – dominance is particularly implicated in the economics, politics and cultures of the developing countries. This makes it all the more scholastically urgent to comprehend the structures and processes through which China is asserting its nationalistic and internationalist agendas – both of which are a reflection for recognising and thus reconstructing a truly transcultural onto-epistemological agenda for media studies, has become more urgent than ever before.

Understood against the background of the changing faces of globalisation, Internationalizing Media Studies, a book edited by Daya Kishan Thussu, assumes both a scholarly and political resonance. Scholarly, because it brings to the fore the intellectual realignment that much media studies scholarship has come loose. It means that we must tie them back together by using different – or at least more internationalised – theoretical moorings. In and of itself, this should engender a greater sense of intellectual pluralism and empowerment. The political resonance of the book lies in the fact that it is published in the immediate aftermath of the global financial and economic crisis, engendering a rupture in the neo-liberal orthodoxies that have shaped the practice of economics and scholarship both in the developed and developing world. Although it is too early – and possibly too presumptuous – to agree with Yuechi Zhao who suggests that “neo-liberalism has suffered a fatal blow” (188), it is evident that the seemingly unassailable (neo-)liberal, Western shackles of much media studies scholarship have come loose. It means that we must tie them back together by using different – or at least more internationalised – theoretical moorings. In and of itself, this should engender a greater sense of intellectual pluralism and empowerment. The book sets about its project of internationalising media studies through four parts. Part 1 deals with internationalising media research. The analysis is underpinned by several theoretical treatises of globalisation and their implications for media internationalisation, and therefore for internationalising media studies. The debates are by no means new – they principally focus on the emmeshing of global and local influences and how the resultant hybrid identities can inform the analytical trajectories of media studies. The authors make a strong case for the need to understand the empirical dimensions of a hybrid media studies tradition for, as Tristan Mattelart in this volume argues, “These new approaches apprehend moreover the cultural consequences of globalisation in speculative terms. The sophistication of their theoretical analyses contrasts strongly with the poverty of their empirical analyses” (9).

Part 2 is thus appropriately about broadening the field of media studies. Given the now – I believe – trite conclusion that media is a cultural product, it makes sense to study it in relation to the totality of the extant cultural systems. As such, many of us have taken it for granted that our analyses of media are informed by something of the “circuit of culture” (DuGay, Hall, James, Mackay and Negus 1997). The circuit-of-culture analytical framework highlights how the different but interconnected cultural moments of production, identity, representation, consumption and regulation articulate in the lived experiences of the people. Therefore, it is expected that the thematic con-
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