

Recenzija kot »dialog z različnimi občinstvi«

Spoštovane bralke, spoštovani bralci!

O pomenu pisanja recenzij družboslovnih in humanističnih monografij v neoliberalnih pogojih nastajanja akademske vednosti, ki jo poganja imperativ kvantitativne akumulacije znanstvenih točk in citatov, je v eni izmed predhodnih števil DR/SSF razmišljal že moj predhodnik Klemen Ploštajner. Takole je povzel trenutni status recenzentskega dela: »Da je postopek recenziranja knjig vse bolj odrinjen na stranski tir, akt njihovega pisanja vse bolj razvrednoten, delo na njih pa prekarizirano, je zgolj odraz razgradnje akademske skupnosti v razmerah prisilne hiperprodukcije znanstvenih objav« (str. 11). Kolega Ploštajner ni ostal le na ravni kritične osvetlitve žal nezavidljivega položaja recenzentskega dela kot oblike akademske prakse, ampak je tudi izpostavil, da so recenzije knjig »pomembno orodje ohranjanja dialoške narave produkcije vednosti« (ibid.). Če povzamem s svojimi besedami: dialog je ključna prvina nastajanja akademske vednosti, recenzija knjig pa je kot »orodje dialoga z različnimi občinstvi« verjetno ena izmed najbolj dialoških form med akademskimi žanri (ibid.). V prvi vrsti je orodje dialoga med recenzentom/ko in avtorjem/ico/i recenziranega dela, v drugi pa med recenzentom/ko in širšo akademsko skupnostjo. A tisto, kar razlikuje recenzijo knjige od večine žanrov akademskega pisanja, je njena zmožnost, da lahko zaradi zelo kratke forme in komunikativnega sloga vzpostavlja dialog tudi z neakademske občinstvom. Prek kritične in poglobljene refleksije najnovejše knjižne produkcije namreč daje vpogled v najnovejša spoznanja tudi tistim bralcem/kam, ki niso nujno neposredno del akademske sfere.

Nekako tako bi ubesedil prve asociacije ob branju Ploštajnerjevega uvodnika in ob premišljevanju o uredniški viziji, ki ji nameravam slediti pri urejanju knjižnih recenzij. Tudi v prihodnje bodo recenzije v *Družboslovnih razpravah* pokrivalo širok spekter znanstvenih disciplin, avtorjev, založb in nacionalnih kontekstov z namenom vzpostavljanja bogatega intelektualnega dialoga, ki bo temeljil na vključenosti različnih glasov. Recenzentsko dejavnost morajo pri tem enako zastopati tako mlajši kot tudi že uveljavljeni/e raziskovalci/ke in profesorji/ice. Pisanje recenzij je za mlajše kolege/ice lahko ena prvih priložnosti za vzpostavitev lastnega glasu v akademski skupnosti. Enako pomembni so tudi glasovi že uveljavljenih sodelavcev/k, ki lahko zaradi dolgoletnega delovanja na določenem področju rigorozno presojujejo aktualno knjižno produkcijo.

Pluralizem glasov pa je treba zagotavljati tudi na ravni izbire knjig za recenzentsko obravnavo. Čeprav so recenzentski presoji najpogosteje podvržene knjige slovenskih založb, pa so zaželene tudi razprave o delih, ki izidejo v tujini,

še posebej če so jih napisali/e slovenski/e avtorji/ice. Prav tako so k pisanju recenzij vabljeni/e tudi tuji/e avtorji/ice. Z vključitvijo glasov zunaj nacionalnih okvirov bodo razširjene meje znanstvenega dialoga, obenem pa bo zagotovljeno, da relativna majhnost slovenske akademske skupnosti, za katero so značilni tesni kolegialni odnosi, ne bo pomenila ovire pri konstruktivnem in nepristranskem ocenjevanju znanstvenega dela.

Predstavljene uredniške smernice so bile deloma že upoštevane pri pripravi bloka recenzij knjig v tej številki reviji DR, ki prinaša obravnavo dveh zbornikov in dveh znanstvenih monografij. Nina Cvar recenzira zbornik *Artificial Intelligence, Social Harms and Human Rights*, ki je pomemben prispevek k razumevanju fenomena umetne inteligence z vidika prava in človekovih pravic. Lucija Klun kritično pretresa zbornik *Migrant Children's Integration and Education in Europe: Approaches, Methodologies and Policies*, ki ponuja analizo naslovne problematike v različnih nacionalnih kontekstih. Nina Perger pod drobnogled vzame monografijo Vlada Kotnika z naslovom *Trans(spol)nost: Arheologija trans/vednosti*, ki jo sestavljajo štiri sklopi na temo trans vednosti, trans zgodovin, trans teorij in trans medijev. Primož Krašovec pa se posveča monografiji *Za Marxa*, enemu najpomembnejših zgodnjih del Louisa Althusserja. Tudi v prihodnje bodo recenzentski bloki obsegali najmanj štiri besedila.

Naj na koncu tega uvodnika prav vse lepo povabim k branju tega bloka kot tudi k soustvarjanju produktivnega dialoga, v katerega se lahko vključujete kot pisci/ke recenziranih knjig, kot njihovi bralci/ke ali pa preprosto kot spremljevalci/ke družboslovno-humanistične knjižne produkcije. Če naletite na pomembna tuja ali domača dela, za katera menite, da si zaslužijo pozornost, nas lahko nanje opozorite, tudi če jih ne nameravate recenzirati. Dobrodošle so tudi recenzije recenzij, ki lahko spodbujajo nadaljnje razprave o določenem delu. Vabljeni, da s svojimi predlogi, komentarji, uvidi in priporočili prispevate k uresničevanju predstavljene uredniške vizije – s tem boste prispevali k sooblikovanju takšne akademske skupnosti, ki kljub neizogibnim pritiskom po hiperprodukciji znanstvenih besedil ohranja pomembne dialoške prakse, ki so nujne za vitalen razvoj družboslovno-humanistične misli.

Rok Smrdelj,
urednik recenzij knjig, *Družboslovne razprave*

Literatura

Ploštajner, Klemen (2021): Poziv: recenzije monografij na temo epidemija in družba. *Družboslovne razprave*, XXXVIII (99): 11–17.

A book review as a “dialogue with different audiences”

Dear readers,

In a previous issue of DR/SSF, my predecessor Klemen Ploštajner reflected on the importance of writing book reviews in the social sciences and humanities in the neoliberal circumstances of academic knowledge production driven by the constant need to accumulate scientific points and citations. He described the current status of book reviews as follows: “The fact that the process of reviewing books is increasingly marginalised, the act of writing them devalued, and the work on them precariously positioned, merely reflects the degradation of the academic community in the conditions of forced hyperproduction of scientific publications.” (p. 11). However, my colleague Ploštajner not only remained on the level of critically highlighting the unfortunately unfavourable position of book reviews as a form of academic practice, yet also emphasised that book reviews are “an important tool for preserving the dialogical nature of knowledge production” (ibid.). To sum it up in my own words: Dialogue is a key element in the production of academic knowledge, and the book review, as a “tool for dialogue with different audiences”, is likely one of the most dialogic forms among academic genres (ibid.). Primarily, a book review serves as a tool of dialogue between the reviewer and the author(s) of the reviewed work and, secondarily, between the reviewer and the broader academic community. Yet, what distinguishes book reviews from most academic writing genres is their ability to engage in dialogue with non-academic audiences because of their concise form and communicative style. By providing critical and in-depth reflection on the latest books to emerge, such reviews also offer insights into the most recent findings to readers who do not necessarily come from the academic sphere.

This is how I would formulate my initial associations after reading Ploštajner’s editorial and pondering the editorial vision that I intend to adhere to while editing book reviews. However, in the SSF journal book reviews will continue to encompass a broad spectrum of scientific disciplines, authors, publishers, and national contexts, all with the aim of fostering a rich intellectual dialogue based on the inclusion of diverse voices. The activity of reviewing should be equally represented by both younger and established researchers and professors. For younger colleagues, writing reviews can provide one of the first opportunities to establish their own voice within the academic community. Equally important are the voices of already established colleagues who, because of their longstanding commitment to a particular field, can rigorously evaluate the current book production.

Ensuring a plurality of voices must also be a factor in the selection of books for review. While most reviews are of books published by Slovenian publishers, works published abroad are also welcome, especially if written by Slovenian authors. In addition, authors who are not from Slovenia are also invited to contribute reviews. Including voices from beyond national borders broadens the horizon of scholarly dialogue while assuring that the relative smallness of the Slovenian academic community, characterised by close collegial relationships, is not an obstacle to constructive and unbiased evaluation of scholarly work.

The editorial guidelines presented have already been partly taken into account while preparing the book review section in this issue of SSF, which covers reviews of two edited volumes and two monographs. Nina Cvar reviews the edited volume *Artificial Intelligence, Social Harms and Human Rights*, which provides a significant contribution to understanding the phenomenon of artificial intelligence from the perspectives of law and human rights. Lucija Klun critically examines the edited volume *Migrant Children's Integration and Education in Europe: Approaches, Methodologies and Policies*, offering analysis of the title topic in various national contexts. Nina Perger scrutinises the monograph *Trans(spol)nost: Arheologija trans/vednosti* by Vlado Kotnik, containing four sections covering topics related to trans knowledge, trans histories, trans theories, and trans media. Finally, Primož Krašovec delves into the work *Za Marxa*, one of Louis Althusser's most important early works. In the future, the book review section will continue to include at least four texts.

As I conclude this editorial, I would like to invite you all to engage in a productive dialogue in which you can participate either as authors of the books reviewed, as readers of the books reviewed, or simply as followers of social science and humanities book production. If you come across noteworthy books and edited volumes that you believe deserve attention, you may bring them to our notice, even if you have no intention of reviewing them. Reviews of reviews are also welcome since they can stimulate further discussions about a given book. You are encouraged to contribute to the realisation of the editorial vision presented here through your suggestions, comments, insights and recommendations. By so doing, you will be helping to shape an academic community that, despite the inevitable pressures of the hyperproduction of scientific texts, still maintains significant dialogic practices crucial for the vital development of social sciences and humanities thinking.

Rok Smrdelj,
Book Review Editor, *Social Science Forum*

References

Ploštajner, Klemen (2021): Poziv: recenzije monografij na temo epidemija in družba. *Družboslovne razprave*, XXXVIII (99): 11–17.