

Uvodnik k aprilski številki DR/SSF

Letošnjo prvo izdajo revije Družboslovne razprave začenjamo rahlo spremenjeni – na platnicah je namreč drugačna barvna shema kot v letu 2021, kar smo ob konstituciji sedanje uredniške ekipe že napovedali. Prav tako smo med gradivi na spletnih straneh revije posodobili Navodila avtorjem in avtoricam. V sodelovanju z Arhivom družboslovnih podatkov Fakultete za družbene vede smo namreč oblikovali konkretne smernice o hrambi, rokovanju in dostopu do empiričnih podatkov, na katere se prispevki sklicujejo.

Uredništvo tako avtorje in avtorice a) *spodbuja*, da zagotovijo odprti dostop do raziskovalnih podatkov, ki so plod njihovih raziskav in so jih uporabili v prispevkih, objavljenih v Družboslovnih razpravah; b) *priporoča*, da svoje raziskovalne podatke objavljajo v podatkovnih repozitorijih, središčih ali arhivih, skladno z relevantno zakonodajo in strokovnimi etičnimi merili; c) *svetuje*, da za objavo svojih raziskovalnih podatkov izberejo zaupanja vreden področni repozitorij, ki omogoča različne režime dostopa za različno (ne)občutljive podatke; in d) *priporoča*, da so podatki urednikom in recenzentom na voljo ob oddaji članka v recenzijo, vsem pa najkasneje ob izdaji revije. V uredništvu se popolnoma zavedamo specifičnih situacij, ko ideja odprtega dostopa časovno ne sovпада z delom in procesom pridobivanja podatkov, sploh v primeru daljših raziskovalnih projektov. Zato je, ne glede na odločitve posameznih avtorjev in avtoric, zapisano smiselno brati zgolj kot priporočila, ki nikakor niso obvezujoča. Več o zapisanem je dostopno na povezavi <https://www.sociolosko-drustvo.si/navodila-avtorjem/>.

Sicer pa prvo letošnjo številko uvajamo s petimi samostojnimi prispevki v dveh jezikih – slovenščini in angleščini – tako domačih kot tudi tujih avtorjev/ic. Številko odvarja prispevek v angleškem jeziku Berta Šalaja in Marijane Grbeša s Fakultete političnih ved Univerze v Zagrebu z naslovom *What is celebrity populism? The case of a Croatian singer Miroslav Škoro*. Prispevek, ki povsem po naključju sovпада z aktualno volilno kampanjo ob slovenskih volitvah v državni zbor, nudi konceptualen premislek o razumevanju populizma v kontekstu *celebrity* kulture in na študiji primera Miroslava Škora analizira ključne populistične prvine njegove volilne kampanje v času hrvaških predsedniških volitev tako s kvantitativnim kot kvalitativnim metodološkim aparatom. Sledi prispevek v slovenščini *Konzervirani nasmeh: Interpasivnost v sodobnem komuniciranju* Tadeja Praprotnika s Fakultete za humanistične študije Univerze na Primorskem, ki širitev interpasivnosti v komuniciranju med drugim razume kot posledico procesov družbenega pospeševanja, ki so ga intenzivirale digitalne tehnologije in imperativi omrežnih

medijev ter neoliberalne retorike izbire in odgovornosti. Ideje pospeševanja delno, a konceptualno na povsem drugačen način dopolnjuje še en prispevek v slovenščini z naslovom *Banalnost družbene škode: primer hitre mode*, v katerem sodelavka Inštituta za kriminologijo pri Pravni fakulteti Univerze v Ljubljani Katja Simončič idejo banalnosti zla Hannah Arendt konceptualno aplicira na primer hitre mode. S pojmom nemišljenja avtorica namreč problematizira vzpon hitre mode in nekritične potrošnje v času globalne kapitalistične ekonomije. Da se neoliberalnim zakonitostim trga težko upirajo tudi raziskovalne organizacije, problematizira prispevek v angleškem jeziku z naslovom *Structural positions, hierarchies, and perceptions of gender equality* sodelavk Znanstvenoraziskovalnega centra SAZU Jovane Mihajlovič Trbovc, Majde Črnič Istenič, Tanje Petrovič in sodelavca Andreasa Andreaua. Članek vzpostavlja režime neenakosti po spolu prikazuje znotraj različnih kategorij zaposlenih in med drugim opozori na intersekcionalnost razmerij, kjer v različna dojemanja enakosti spolov trčijo strukturni položaji, starost in prekarnost zaposlitvenega statusa. Številko zaključuje pregledni članek v angleščini Marka Hočevarja s Fakultete za družbene vede, ki – kot govori že sam naslov *A Literature review of the selected political economy issues of the COVID-19 crisis* – tematizira nekatere družbeno-ekonomske spremembe, predvsem na področju dela, v času epidemološke krize in obenem opozarja na spremljajoč vzpon družbenih neenakosti.

Tokratni uvodnik pa zaključujemo s posebnim pozivom Uredništva recenzij knjig, ki bralce in bralke revije prijazno vabi k pripravi tematskih recenzij knjig z namenom, da bi z vpogledom v znanstveno publicistiko s področja epidemije in družbe bogatile nadaljnje številke Družboslovnih razprav. Podrobneje spodaj.

Vabljeni k branju in sodelovanju.

Urednici DR/SSF: Tanja Oblak Črnič in Natalija Majsova

Editorial Issue the April issue of DR/SSF

This issue of Social Science Forum comes with a slightly modified cover, which means that it is time for a new volume. As the editorial team promised at the start of its mandate, every volume of the journal has its own, special combination of colours. Moreover, the Journal's webpage features an updated version of the Instructions for Authors, which now include guidelines on data storage, handling, and access to scientific data used in the articles. Intended to encourage open access to the empirical data used in SSF publications, these guidelines were developed together with the Social Science Data Archive of the Faculty of Social Sciences.

Namely, the SSF Editorial Board: a) encourages authors to provide open access to empirical data arising from their research and used in papers published in Social Science Forum; while in addition, the editorial board: b) *recommends* that authors publish their research data in data repositories, centres or archives according to relevant legislation and professional ethical criteria; c) *suggests* that they choose a trusted discipline-specific repository for publishing their research data; the repository should offer varying access regimes for different types of (non-)sensitive data; and d) *recommends* they make the data they refer to available to editors and reviewers while submitting an article for review, and to the public upon publication of their article in Social Science Forum. The Editorial Board is naturally aware that in certain situations the idea of open access does not coincide with the work and process of data acquisition, especially with longer research projects. Therefore, the guidelines above may be seen as non-binding recommendations. More information is available at: <https://www.socioloskodrustvo.si/navodila-avtorjem/>.

In terms of content, this year's first issue comprises five diverse contributions in two languages (Slovenian and English) produced by a broad range of international authors. The issue begins with a contribution in English by Bert Šalaj and Marijana Grbeša from the Faculty of Political Science, University of Zagreb, entitled – *What is Celebrity Populism? The Case of the Croatian Singer Miroslav Škoro* – The article, which happens to have coincided with the electoral campaigns preceding the recent elections to the Slovenian National Assembly, offers a conceptual reflection on populism in the context of celebrity culture. The authors analyse the key populist elements of Miroslav Škoro's election campaign for the Croatian presidential elections, unpacking this case study using both quantitative and qualitative methodological approaches. In the following contribution written in Slovenian and entitled – *Canned Smile: Interpassivity in Contemporary*

Communication – Tadej Praprotnik from the Faculty of Humanities, University of Primorska, analyses the expansion of interpassivity in communication as, among others, an outcome of the processes of social acceleration intensified by digital technologies and the imperatives of networked media and the neoliberal rhetoric of choice and responsibility. These reflections of acceleration are partly – albeit from a very different conceptual perspective – complemented by the next article also in Slovenian – *The Banality of Social Harm: The Case of Fast Fashion* – Here, Katja Simončič, a research associate at the Institute of Criminology at the Faculty of Law of the University of Ljubljana, applies Hannah Arendt's notion of the banality of evil to the case of fast fashion. Relying on the concept of unthinking, the author problematises the rise of fast fashion and uncritical consumption in the global capitalist economy. The problem of neoliberal market laws as a challenge for research organisations is addressed in the following contribution written in English entitled – *Structural Positions, Hierarchies, and Perceptions of Gender Equality: Insights from a Slovenian Research Organisation* – by associates of the ZRC-SAZU Scientific Research Centre Jovana Mihajlovič Trbovc, Majda Černič Istenič and Tanja Petrovič and co-author Andreas Andreau. This article shows how established regimes of gender inequality affect various categories of employees. Among others, it underscores the intersectionality of work relationships, showing that structural positions, age and precarious status are entangled with different perceptions of gender equality. The issue concludes with a review article again in English by Marko Hočevár from the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana. As suggested by the title – *A Literature Review of Selected Political Economy Issues of the COVID-19 Crisis* – this contribution focuses on certain socio-economic changes, particularly in the field of labour, that took place during the pandemic crisis, while also drawing attention to the accompanying rise of social inequalities.

We wish to conclude this editorial with a special call from the Book Reviews Editor, who warmly invites readers to submit a book review for an upcoming special issue, which aims to enrich Social Science Forum with an overview and discussion of various aspects of scholarship about the COVID-19 pandemic.

More details may be found below.

DR/SSF Editors Tanja Oblak Črnič and Natalija Majsova

Poziv: recenzije monografij na temo epidemija in družba

Akademsko skupnost in njena teoretska produkcija vznikata, se konstituirata in tudi razvijata prek različnih oblik dialoga. Prvi je dialog same s sabo v okviru argumentirane izmenjave pogledov in tez, ki šele prek kolektivnega presojanja lahko pridobijo teoretski status, predvsem pa svojo uporabno vrednost. Celo več, brez dialoga ni akademske skupnosti in brez nje ne more biti teoretske produkcije. Ostaja ji le nepreizkušen in neovrednoten nabor izjav, vatli presojanja pa postanejo zunajakademska merila znanstvene odličnosti. Druga oblika dialoga je odnos med akademsko skupnostjo in svetom. To ne pomeni le empiričnega preverjanja tez, ampak predvsem ohranjanje nenehnega dialoga z objektom svojega preučevanja – družbo. Brez tega je teoretska produkcija izolirana in prazna, hkrati pa tudi ni zmožna proizvajati vednosti, kajti ta vznikata ravno v stiku med akademsko skupnostjo in družbeno dinamiko. Kot je v *Sociološki imaginaciji* opozarjal že Mills: akademska skupnost brez stika z družbeno dinamiko postane ali dvorna veda, se pravi tehnoznanost, ali pa »neroden primer nerelevantne dolgoveznosti« (str. 58).

Ravno zaradi teh »pogojev možnosti« obstoja akademske skupnosti se recenzije knjig kažejo ko pomembno orodje ohranjanja dialoške narave produkcije vednosti. Recenzije so oblika preišljenega, kritičnega, a tudi spoštljivega soočenja z avtorskim delom, s čimer ponazarjajo, da se pisanje monografije ne zaključuje z njenim tiskom, ampak da je to le ena stopnja v procesu skupne teoretske produkcije. Recenzija tako ni zgolj odziv na delo ali njegov ponovni premislek, kot bi lahko sklepali iz etimologije besede, ampak gre za svojstven prispevek k razvoju vednosti. Zaradi svoje krajše, zgoščene oblike in dostopnega sloga pisanja pa so recenzije tudi pomembno orodje pri komuniciranju znanosti širšemu občinstvu ter krepitvi povezave med družbo in akademsko skupnostjo. Recenzije nimajo zgolj predstavitvene funkcije, ki je vse pre pogosto zreducirana na predstavljanje znanstvenih dosežkov nerazsvetljeni javnosti, ampak morajo biti zamišljene in delovati kot orodje dialoga z različnimi občinstvi.

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. Hiperprodukcija, ki je vpeta tako v logiko kvantificiranja znanstvene produkcije kot tudi način kariernega napredovanja v akademiji, je vodila v atomizacijo tako proizvajalcev kot tudi vednosti same. Prvi so atomizirani zaradi eksistencialne nujnosti po zasledovanju osebnih dosežkov, druga pa zaradi razpada akademskega polja na kup ločenih in izoliranih poddisciplin z lastnim sistemom hiperprodukcije

revij in objav. Dodaten dejavnik je tudi nekritična globalizacija znanosti, ki na periferiji globalnega sistema le redko vodi v odpiranje in bogatenje domače produkcije, veliko pogosteje pa v razkroj lokalne akademske skupnosti. Znanstvena skupnost tako razpade na izolirane, v lastno hiperprodukcijo ujete monade, ki zaradi časovne stiske in eksistencialne nuje opuščajo dialoška načela produkcije vednosti. Recenziranje knjig, ki so jih kvantificirana znanstvena merila v precejšnji meri razvrednotila, zato vse pogosteje postaja pozabljena in zanemarjena praksa, ki je prepuščena tistim na začetku akademske poti.

Zato se v uredništvu zavzemamo za povrnitev pomena in vrednosti recenzentskemu delu in procesu. Skozi urednikovanje revije nenehno iščemo načine za okrepitev položaja recenzij ter za krepitev njihovega dialoškega formata in funkcije. Recenzij ne vidimo kot prežitek preteklosti ali kot zapostavljen dodatek k »izvirnemu« teoretskemu doprinosu v obliki člankov, ampak kot osrednji del revije in tudi kot ključno prakso snovanja akademske skupnosti. Politike spodbujanja pisanja recenzij s strani še neuveljavljenih raziskovalcev in raziskovalk ne dojemamo kot procesa razvrednotenja, ampak – ravno obratno – kot obliko širjenja polja dialoga in omogočanja vstopa novih glasov ter s tem bogatenje znanstvene razprave. Ravno tako odločitve za omejevanje recenzij na pisce in piske v slovenskem jeziku ne razumemo kot zamejevanje produkcije vednosti, ampak kot obliko krepitve lokalnega dialoga, ki ima v drugih pisnih forumih omejene priložnosti za razvoj. Družboslovne razprave želijo tako na svoj način prispevati k razvoju močne lokalne akademske skupnosti.

Z namenom spodbujanja izmenjave pogledov in krepitve dialoga med različnimi glasovi smo se odločili za preizkušanje novih pristopov k postopku produkcije recenzij. Običajno prakso recenziranja izbranih del z zelo raznolikimi tematikami bomo v decembrski številki nadomestili z osredotočenostjo na družboslovno produkcijo na temo epidemije covid-19. Epidemija kot travmatičen in prelomen dogodek je sprožila množico različnih odzivov. In znanstvena produkcija od te hiperprodukcije nikakor ni bila izolirana. Ta produkcija, ki je občasno tudi oportuna ali terapevtska, ravno zaradi svoje množičnosti in raznolikosti kliče po bolj celostni obravnavi na enem mestu. S posebnim blokom recenzij monografij na temo covid-19 želimo različnim javnostim ponuditi delen vpogled v znanstveno produkcijo na tem področju, predvsem pa želimo spodbuditi dialog med različnimi avtorji in avtoricami ter njihovimi deli.

Zato vabimo vse, da nam predloge monografij, ki bi jih recenzirali, posredujete do **1. julija 2022** na elektronski naslov **BookRevDR_SSF@sociolosko-drustvo.si**. Pri izboru del si lahko pomagata s seznamom del, ki smo ga pripravili v uredništvu in je dostopen na naslovu <https://www.sociolosko-drustvo.si/pozivi/>.

Urednik recenzij knjig: Klemen Ploštajner

Seznam knjig, ki so predlagane za recenziranje

- Bambra, Clare, Lynch, Julia, in Smith, Katherine E. (2021): *The Unequal Pandemic: COVID-19 and Health Inequalities*. Bristol: Bristol University Press. 198 pages. <https://policy.bristoluniversitypress.co.uk/the-unequal-pandemic>
- Davis, Mike (2020): *The Monster Enter: COVID-19, Avian Flu and the Plagues of Capitalism*. London: Verso. 224 pages. <https://www.versobooks.com/books/3947-the-monster-enters>
- Fatsis, Lambros, in Lamb, Melayna (2021): *Policing the Pandemic: How Public Health Becomes Public Order*. Bristol: Policy Press. 148 pages. <https://policy.bristoluniversitypress.co.uk/policing-the-pandemic>
- Gerbaud, Paolo (2021): *Politics after Populism and Pandemic*. London: Verso. 288 pages. <https://www.versobooks.com/books/3774-the-great-recoil>
- Lupton, Deborah (2022): *COVID Societies Theorising the Coronavirus Crisis*. New York: Routledge. 166 pages. <https://www.routledge.com/COVID-Societies-Theorising-the-Coronavirus-Crisis/Lupton/p/book/9781032060569>
- Maçães, Bruno (2021): *Geopolitics for the End Time: From the Pandemic to the Climate Crisis*. London: Hurst Publishers. 240 pages. <https://www.hurstpublishers.com/book/geopolitics-for-the-end-time/>
- Mavelli, Luca (2022): *Neoliberal Citizenship Sacred Markets, Sacrificial Lives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 304 pages. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/neoliberal-citizenship-9780192857583?q=covid&lang=en&cc=us>
- Mitropoulos, Angela (2020): *Pandemonium Proliferating Borders of Capital and the Pandemic Swerve*. London: Pluto Press. 144 pages. <https://www.plutobooks.com/9780745343303/pandemonium/>
- Tooze, Adam (2021): *Shutdown: How Covid Shook the World's Economy*. New York: Viking. 368 pages. <https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/669575/shutdown-by-adam-tooze/>
- Wallace, Rob (2020): *Dead Epidemiologists: On the Origins of COVID-19*. New York: Monthly Review. 260 pages. <https://monthlyreview.org/product/dead-epidemiologists-on-the-origins-of-covid-19/>

Slovenske

- Podjed, Dan (2020): *Antropologija med štirimi stenami: Spoznavanje družbe in sebe med pandemijo*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC. 152 strani. <https://isn2.zrc-sazu.si/sl/publikacije/antropologija-med-stirimi-stenami>
- Žerdin, Ali (2021): *MMXX: Leto nevarne bližine: Kaj je šlo v Sloveniji narobe med epidemijo covid-19*. Ljubljana: UMco. 304 strani. <https://www.bukla.si/umco/mmxx-let-nevarne-blizine.html>

Call for Contributions: Monographs Dealing with the Topic of the Pandemic and Society

The academic community and its theoretical production emerge and are constituted and developed through various forms of dialogue. The first is the dialogue of the academic community with itself, which occurs within the framework that allows for the exchange of substantiated views and theses, which can only gain theoretical status and, most importantly, applied value through joint assessment. Moreover, without dialogue there is no academic community, and without an academic community there can be development of theory. What simply remains is a set of statements that are neither proven nor evaluated, while extra-academic criteria of scientific excellence serve as a gauge for assessment. Another form of dialogue is the relationship between the academic community and the world. This not only implies the empirical validation of hypotheses, but also, and above all, the effort to maintain a continuous dialogue with the subject of study: society. Without this, the development of theory is not just isolated and empty, but unable to produce knowledge arising from the contact between the academic community and social dynamics. As Mills notes in *The Sociological Imagination*: without having contact with social dynamics, the academic community becomes either a courtly science, i.e. technoscience, or a “clumsy piece of irrelevant ponderosity” (p. 26).

It is these “conditions of possibility” determining the academic community’s existence that make book reviews an important tool for preserving the dialogical nature of knowledge production. Reviews are a form of thoughtful, critical, yet also respectful confrontation with another’s work; this demonstrates that the writing of a monograph does not end when it is published, which is only a stage in the process of joint theoretical production. Namely, a review is not merely a response to a particular work or its reconsideration as the etymology of the word might suggest, but a unique contribution to the development of knowledge. Their shorter, concise form and accessible writing style mean that reviews are also an important way of communicating science to a wider audience and strengthening the connection between society and the academic community. Accordingly, reviews not only have a presentational function, which is all too often reduced to presenting scientific achievements to an unenlightened public, but must be conceived of and act as a tool for ensuring dialogue with a range of audiences. The process of reviewing books is being increasingly pushed out to the side lines,

the act of writing a review is ever more devalued, while working on reviews has become precarious; all of this simply reflects the academic community's disintegration in conditions that dictate the forced hyperproduction of scientific publications. The hyperproduction, embedded in the logic of quantifying scientific production and ingrained as part of career advancement in academia, has led to the atomisation of both producers and knowledge. The former are atomised by their existential need to pursue personal achievements, and the latter due to the academic field's fragmentation into a number of separate and isolated subdisciplines, which in turn have their own systems leading to the hyperproduction of journals and publications. Another factor is the uncritical globalisation of science, which on the periphery of the global system rarely results in the opening of domestic production and enriching it, but more often causes the disintegration of the local academic community. The scientific community thus dissolves into isolated monads trapped in their own hyperproduction, which abandon the dialogical principles of knowledge production under both time and existential pressures. Book reviewing, which has been significantly devalued by quantified scientific criteria, is hence becoming an increasingly forgotten and neglected practice, one that is left to those at the beginning of their academic career.

For this reason, our editorial board is committed to restoring the importance and value of the work and process of book reviewing. While editing the journal, we are constantly looking for ways to strengthen the position of reviews and to enhance their dialogical format and function. We do not regard reviews as a relic of the past or a neglected addition to the 'original' theoretical contribution in the form of articles, but as both a central part of the journal and as a key practice for building the academic community. We do not view the policy of encouraging the writing of reviews by not yet established researchers as a tendency towards their devaluation, but on the contrary as a form of expanding the field of dialogue and enabling the appearance of new voices, thereby enriching the scientific debate. Likewise, the decision to restrict the submission of reviews by authors writing in Slovenian is not considered a factor confining the production of knowledge, but as a form for strengthening local dialogue that in other written forums sees limited opportunities for development. Such sociological discussions are thus aimed to contribute in their own way to the development of a strong local academic community.

To encourage the exchange of views and strengthen the dialogue among different voices, we have decided to experiment with new approaches to producing reviews. The usual practice of reviewing selected works covering a wide variety of topics will be replaced in the December issue, which will focus on social science production relevant to the topic of the COVID-19 pandemic. The

traumatic and far-reaching event of the pandemic has triggered a multitude of diverse responses, and scientific production has clearly not been isolated from this hyperproduction. It is because of the multitude and diversity of these works that this production, which is occasionally also opportune or therapeutic, calls for a more comprehensive approach that enables the topic to be dealt with in a single place. With a special block of reviews focused on monographs dealing with COVID-19, we wish to offer different audiences partial insights into scientific production in this field, and in particular to promote dialogue between different authors and their works.

We therefore invite anyone to send us proposals for the review of monographs by **1 July 2022** to this e-mail address **BookRevDR_SSF@sociolosko-drustvo.si**. To select works, authors may use the list prepared by the editorial board available at <https://www.sociolosko-drustvo.si/pozivi/>.

Reviews Editor: Klemen Ploštajner

List of Books Proposed for Review

- Bambra, Clare, Lynch, Julia, and Smith, Katherine E. (2021): *The Unequal Pandemic: COVID-19 and Health Inequalities*. Bristol: Bristol University Press. 198 pages. <https://policy.bristoluniversitypress.co.uk/the-unequal-pandemic>
- Davis, Mike (2020): *The Monster Enter: COVID-19, Avian Flu and the Plagues of Capitalism*. London: Verso. 224 pages. <https://www.versobooks.com/books/3947-the-monster-enters>
- Fatsis, Lambros, and Lamb, Melayna (2021): *Policing the Pandemic: How Public Health Becomes Public Order*. Bristol: Policy Press. 148 pages. <https://policy.bristoluniversitypress.co.uk/policing-the-pandemic>
- Gerbaud, Paolo (2021): *Politics after Populism and Pandemic*. London: Verso. 288 pages. <https://www.versobooks.com/books/3774-the-great-recoil>
- Lupton, Deborah (2022): *COVID Societies Theorising the Coronavirus Crisis*. New York: Routledge. 166 pages. <https://www.routledge.com/COVID-Societies-Theorising-the-Coronavirus-Crisis/Lupton/p/book/9781032060569>
- Maçães, Bruno (2021): *Geopolitics for the End Time: From the Pandemic to the Climate Crisis*. London: Hurst Publishers. 240 pages. <https://www.hurstpublishers.com/book/geopolitics-for-the-end-time/>
- Mavelli, Luca (2022): *Neoliberal Citizenship Sacred Markets, Sacrificial Lives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 304 pages. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/neoliberal-citizenship-9780192857583?q=covid&lang=en&cc=us>
- Mitropoulos, Angela (2020): *Pandemonium Proliferating Borders of Capital and the Pandemic Swerve*. London: Pluto Press. 144 pages. <https://www.plutobooks.com/9780745343303/pandemonium/>
- Tooze, Adam (2021): *Shutdown: How Covid Shook the World's Economy*. New York: Viking. 368 pages. <https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/669575/shutdown-by-adam-tooze/>
- Wallace, Rob (2020): *Dead Epidemiologists: On the Origins of COVID-19*. New York: Monthly Review. 260 pages. <https://monthlyreview.org/product/dead-epidemiologists-on-the-origins-of-covid-19/>

Slovenian

- Podjed, Dan (2020): *Antropologija med štirimi stenami: Spoznavanje družbe in sebe med pandemijo*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC. 152 strani. <https://isn2.zrc-sazu.si/sl/publikacije/antropologija-med-stirimi-stenami>
- Žerdin, Ali (2021): *MMXX: Leto nevarne bližine: Kaj je šlo v Sloveniji narobe med epidemijo covid-19*. Ljubljana: UMco. 304 strani. <https://www.bukla.si/umco/mmxx-let-nevarne-blizine.html>