

# editorial

JOHN FROW AND KATRINA SCHLUNKE

This edition of *Cultural Studies Review* brings together a diverse set of essays and new writing that identify particular national tendencies, notions of family, epistemological worries about postmodernity's represented purpose, and queries about cultural studies as it is taught and as it could be understood. There is also some careful exploring of where and why we might be at home in our differences and what a felt homelessness might be. To gather these varied strands beneath the heading 'Homefronts' acknowledges, as always, the plurality of the environments that we call home and the battles of representation, and being, that make up the experiences of nation, family, philosophy and academic discipline that render those sites particular and so personal to us.

One of the fronts across which key ideological strategies have been exercised is around that of neoliberalism. Jon Stratton's identification of a filmic turn to violence via the possessive individualism of neoliberalism has a curious resonance with Virginia Watson's analysis of the 'crisis' in Australian Indigenous affairs—where the failure of national welfare policy becomes the individual fault of the isolated Indigenous communities and thus an order of 'alibi' allowing further national intervention.

The 'saving' of an isolated Indigenous community or the nation itself requires certain figures to always be recuperated as innocent and Barbara Baird's delicately worked essay on 'the child' as understood in relation to the resignation of Australia's Governor-General lets us see some of the work that 'the child' can do. In a related way, the bodies of citizens can be judged as more or less 'national', more or less deserving of national protection, as their borders are judged to be properly managed—as Zoe Anderson pursues. And perhaps

the antithesis to the bounded body of the national citizen is that of the street wanderer. This is Joe Hardwick's rereading of the film *Head On* as being less about coming out than an order of 'loiterature' or, perhaps, identificatory flaneurie. This order of moving along within a space is very different from the order of difference encountered by Ann Deslandes in Brazil as she 'falls on her face'. She turns to an order of writing to try and express the loss and recuperation, experience and reflection of her ethnography. Catherine Robinson writes on homelessness with the intention of producing, within the writing, an idea of homelessness as not simply a problem to be solved but an experience, a corporeal sensation that is productive and painful and which needs to find a way to be articulated. In Robinson's writing you see the formation through the writing itself of new ways in which the bodies of the homeless can appear—through the order of sensation that is homelessness rather than being disappeared within discourses of 'problem solving' and housing shortage.

Other bodies we came to know all too well, stuck as Todd Russell and Brant Webb were in a mine, frighteningly deep underground. Jason Bainbridge shows us the ways in which that story got folded back into larger ideas of news and entertainment with a purpose that Niall Lucy and Steve Mickler might have us ask is or is not indicative of one order of postmodernity.

There are also within this lively volume two essays—one by Grant Farred and one by Graeme Turner—that have very particular things to say about our disciplinary home, cultural studies. Farred argues that cultural studies is and always has been diasporic and further suggests that 'cultural studies is most revealing in its political and literary articulation when it is not read, as many of its advocates claim, contextually'. While the diaspora may be its own context this could be a useful corrective to an excessive reliance upon context containing in and of itself a total meaning. Turner turns us to the pulse of the discipline itself: How are we currently teaching cultural studies? Have we made the kind of discipline we sought to displace through the way we are currently teaching it? In terms of the homefront of a discipline, what and how we teach will decide a great deal about the direction of the discipline and the formation of future scholars in the field. Is there a change blowing in? A front moving through?