

Drage bralke, dragi bralci!

Pred vami je spomladanska številka *Družboslovnih razprav*, ki je prišla iz tiska ravno pravi čas: poletje je navsezadnje obdobje, v katerem se ritem pedagoškega dela umiri ter se ustvari prostor za branje in pisanje. Zamik v izdaji je posledica sprememb v reviji sami: po odličnih dveh mandatih, v katerih sta se ugled in kakovost revije povečala doma in mednarodno, sta se glavni urednici Tanja Oblak Črnič in Natalija Majsova poslovili ter štafeto predali nama.

Tako je na mestu najprej zahvala: priložnosti, v katerih se prevzame projekt s takšno vizijo in renomejem, ki oba omogočata kontinuiteto, so resnično redke. Privilegij te konkretne priložnosti je plod natančnega dela preteklih glavnih urednic, Natalije in Tanje, in njenega uredništva, nenazadnje pa tudi vseh prejšnjih uredništev, ki so revijo vztrajno in z veliko mero skrbi gradila skozi desetletja. Ne glede na to, kaj in v kakšni obliki se predaja – prepoznana in pripoznana revija za področje družboslovne misli – pa sama logistika predaje terja svojo ceno, predvsem v obliki časovne zamude. Tako smo že v juliju, a vendarle z novo številko v roki.

Pri pripravi te številke so sodelovale kar tri skupine urednic_kov. Začeli sta jo nekdanji glavni urednici, končalo pa jo je novo uredništvo revije pod vodstvom Nine Perger in Jasmine Šepetavc, tehničnim urednikom Rokom Smrdeljem, urednico recenzij Anamarijo Šiša in spletnim urednikom Igorjem Jurekovičem. Potem sta tu še Kang Byoung Yoong in Rajesh Kumari, gostujoča urednika posebnega tematskega bloka, tokrat posvečenega temi korejske diaspore, ki spremlja znanstveni članek izven tematskega bloka.

Številko tako odpiramo s člankom »Diskriminacija prek povezave na podlagi oviranosti: neenaka obravnava in stigmatizacija neformalnih družinskih oskrbovalk pri delu in zaposlovanju«, ki obravnava pravno in družboslovno še vedno premalo prepoznan koncept diskriminacije prek povezave (*by association*). Avtorica pokaže, da se neenakost ne vzpostavlja zgolj neposredno, prek osebnih okoliščin posameznic_kov, temveč tudi posredno, prek skrbstvenih razmerij, v katera so ljudje vpeti. S tem prispevek pomembno prispeva k razumevanju dela, skrbi in enakosti v času, ko se skrbstvene obveznosti vse pogostejše prelivajo v delovna razmerja, institucije pa jih še vedno pogosto obravnavajo kot zasebno, ne pa tudi kot družbeno in politično vprašanje.

Osrednji del številke predstavlja posebni tematski blok, posvečen korejski diaspori. Prispevki v njem diasporo mislijo široko: ne le kot geografsko razseljenost, temveč kot izkušnjo pripadnosti, spomina, telesnosti, skrbi, izključevanja, kulturnih praks in vsakdanjih pogajanj o identiteti. Tako se korejska diaspora v pričujočih člankih tematizira skozi raznoliko polje praks, reprezentacij in zgodovinskih

izkušenj, ki segajo od glasbe, literature in filma do hrane, migracijskih zgodovin in biopolitičnih režimov.

Številka prinaša tudi štiri recenzije knjig, od tega tri v slovenščini in eno v angleščini. Med njimi sta dve avtorski monografiji, en znanstveni zbornik in ena uredniška monografija. Anna Lavizzari predstavlja najnovejšo knjigo Judith Butler *Who's Afraid of Gender?*, v kateri avtorica analizira sodobna gibanja proti »teoriji spola« ter pokaže, kako se pojem »spola« v političnih in kulturnih bojih vzpostavlja kot simbolni nosilec širših družbenih strahov. Mojca Šebart Kovač obravnava monografijo Zdenka Kodelje *Vednost o nevednosti: premišljevanja o šolstvu v času pandemije*, ki skozi filozofsko in družboslovno refleksijo odpira vprašanja odnosa med znanostjo, politiko in izobraževanjem v času pandemije covida-19. Tina Kogovšek recenzira drugi zvezek monografije Zdravka Mlinarja *Družboslovno raziskovanje med profesionalizacijo in podružbljanjem*, posvečen konceptu občanske znanosti ter njenemu pomenu za demokratizacijo raziskovanja in družbenega razvoja. Blaž Lenarčič pa predstavlja uredniško monografijo *Digitalizacija dela in življenja*, ki sta jo uredila Aleksandra Kanjuo Mrčela in Andrej Kohont, ter izpostavlja njeno interdisciplinarno in kritično obravnavo digitalne preobrazbe dela, ekonomije, politike, zdravstva in vsakdanjega življenja.

Čeprav se prispevki v številki lotevajo različnih tem, metod in empiričnih polj, jih povezuje občutljivost za razmerja med institucijami in vsakdanjim življenjem, med pripadnostjo in izključevanjem, med teorijami in vsakdanjimi izkušnjami ljudi, ki jih izbrana teoretska orodja obravnavajo, v njih razbirajo to, kar se izkušnji vsakdanjosti pogosto izmika, tj. družbeno v institucionalnem, infrastrukturnem in strukturnem smislu. Tako je številka v raznovrstnosti vsebin, ki jih daje na voljo v branje, dober začetek novega obdobja naše revije.

Ob prevzemu uredniškega dela si želimo, da bi *Družboslovne razprave* ostale prostor kritične, kakovostne ter odprte družboslovne in humanistične razprave in misli, ki je zahtevna do same sebe. Revija ima dolgo zgodovino, v kateri je mogoče videti jasno linijo, ki jo želimo nadaljevati: objavljati besedila, ki niso zgolj relevantna v strogem znanstvenem smislu – tj. vzpostavljanja in nadgrajevanja teoretskih misli, aparatov in orodij, ki jih uporabljamo, ko mislimo svet, ter pridobivanja empiričnih uvidov –, temveč tudi družbeno odzivna. Vsled pogojem znanstvenega polja, ki terjajo *počasno misel*, ima družboslovje – kakor nekje frustrirano ugotavlja sociolog Pierre Bourdieu – navado, da na prizorišča družbenega prispe pozno, in to še posebej velja za svet takšne hitrosti, kot ga živimo. Vendar znanstvene revije – kakor misliva, da velja, zahvaljujoč preteklim uredništvom, tudi za *Družboslovne razprave* v preteklosti, in upava, da tudi v prihodnje – predstavljajo pomembno priložnost za to, da družboslovna misel ni *prepozna*.

Hkrati pa v uredništvo vstopamo z zavedanjem, da se zaostrejuje tudi pogoji znanstvenega dela. Pritiski k objavljanju kot ključnemu merilu znanstvenega – tako raziskovalnega kot pedagoškega dela –, mednarodna vidnost, projektno financiranje in časovne ekonomije raziskovanja pomembno oblikujejo znanosti notranje pogoje, v katerih nastaja ta specifični vidik znanstvenega dela, ki se materializira v znanstvenih besedilih in ki nikakor ni edini element znanstvenega dela, se pa kaže kot njegov najbolj pomenljiv element. Ob tem ne velja spregledati niti širšega družbenega konteksta, ki tendira k temu, da v tehtnih družboslovnih premislekih razbira manj relevantnosti in teže, kakor tem premislekom pritiče.

Prav zato se nam zdi toliko pomembneje ohranjati revijo kot prostor branja v najbolj polnem pomenu te besede – torej branja, ki vstopa v dialog z besedili, branja, ki se s strani besedila pusti nagovoriti in tudi izzvati, ter nenazadnje tudi branja, ki z veliko mero skrbnosti besedilo samo tudi izzove in izziva. Odgovornost za odnosnost tega tipa je stvar predvsem znanstvene skupnosti, zagotovo pa tudi premišljenega uredniškega dela ter dialoga med avtoricami_ji, recenzentkami_i in bralkami_ci.

Novo uredništvo tako nadaljuje staro poslanstvo družboslovja, ki si prizadeva za krepitev počasne misli, vendar misli, ki zavoljo lastne počasnosti – slednjo terja skrbno ravnanje s kompleksnostjo sveta, v katerem živimo – ne bo nič manj aktualna.

*Želimo vam prijetno branje.
Nina Perger in Jasmina Šepetavc
glavni urednici*

Dear readers,

Before you is the spring issue of *Social Science Forum*, which has come out in print at just the right time! Summer is, after all, a period when as the rhythm of pedagogical work slows down, space for reading and writing opens up. The delay in publishing the issue is due to changes at the journal itself. After completing two excellent terms, during which the journal's reputation and quality rose considerably both domestically and internationally, the editors-in-chief Tanja Oblak Črnič and Natalija Majsova stepped down, passing the baton on to us.

This makes it appropriate to begin with thanks: for the truly rare opportunity to take over at the helm of a project with such a vision and reputation, both of which enable continuity. It is a wonderful moment to lead a journal known for the meticulous work of Natalija and Tanja and the editorial board, not to mention all of the editorial boards that came before them, seeing the journal being steadily built with great care over the decades. And, like with any hand over of any distinguished series – a well-recognised and acknowledged journal in the area of the social sciences – the logistics involved also caused a time delay. Thus, this new issue in hand has appeared in July.

Three groups of editors helped to prepare this issue. The early work was done by the already mentioned editors-in-chief and completed by the new incoming editorial board of the journal, led by Nina Perger and Jasmina Šepetavc, with technical editor Rok Smrdelj, reviews editor Anamarija Šiša, and web editor Igor Jurekovič. Also contributing are Kang Byoung Yoong and Rajesh Kumari, guest editors of the special thematic section on the Korean diaspora, which is accompanied by a scholarly article outside the thematic section.

This issue commences with the article "Discrimination by association based on disability: unequal treatment and stigmatisation of informal family carers at work and employment", which looks at the still insufficiently recognised legal and social-scientific concept of discrimination by association. The author shows that inequality is not established only directly, through individuals' personal circumstances, but also indirectly, via the care relationships in which people are embedded. In this way, the article importantly contributes to understanding work, care and equality in an era when care responsibilities are increasingly spilling over into employment relations, while institutions often continue to view them as a private matter, not a social and political issue.

The central part of the issue is the special thematic section focused on the Korean diaspora. The contributions in this section conceive of diaspora broadly: not simply as a geographical dispersal, but as an experience of belonging, memory,

embodiment, care, exclusion, cultural practices, and everyday negotiations of identity. In the articles, the Korean diaspora is hence thematised through a diverse field of practices, representations, and historical experiences, ranging from music, literature and film to food, migration histories, and biopolitical regimes.

This issue also includes four book reviews, three in Slovene and one in English. The reviewed publications comprise two single-authored monographs, one edited volume, and one research collection. Anna Lavizzari reviews Judith Butler's *Who's Afraid of Gender?*, in which Butler examines the contemporary anti-gender mobilizations and argues that "gender" has become a symbolic object onto which broader social anxieties are projected. Mojca Šebart Kovač discusses Zdenko Kodelja's *Vednost o nevednosti: premišljevanja o šolstvu v času pandemije* (*Knowledge on ignorance: Reflections on education during the pandemic*), which offers a philosophical and sociological reflection on the relationship between science, politics, and education during the COVID-19 pandemic. Tina Kogovšek reviews the second volume of Zdravko Mlinar's *Družboslovno raziskovanje med profesionalizacijo in podružbljanjem* (*Social science research between professionalisation and social engagement*), focusing on the concept of citizen science and its contribution to the democratisation of research and society. Finally, Blaž Lenarčič presents the edited volume *Digitalizacija dela in življenja* (*Digitalisation of work and life*), edited by Aleksandra Kanjuo Mrčela and Andrej Kohont, highlighting its interdisciplinary and critical perspective on the social implications of digitalisation.

Even though the contributions in this issue consider different topics, methods, and empirical fields, they are connected by a sensitivity to the relationships between institutions and everyday life, between belonging and exclusion, between theories and the everyday experiences of the people addressed by the selected theoretical tools, which reveal in those experiences what often eludes everydayness itself: the social in the institutional, infrastructural, and structural sense. Therefore, in the diversity of the contents available for reading, this issue represents a promising start of a new period in the life of our journal.

Our goal as we take over the editorial work is for *Social Science Forum* to remain a space of critical, high-quality, and open social-scientific and humanities discussions, while being insightful and intriguing. There is a clear line in the journal's long history that we wish to continue: publishing contributions that are not only relevant in a strict scholarly sense – for establishing and developing the theoretical ideas, apparatuses and tools available for use while thinking about the world, and in gaining empirical insights – but are also socially responsive. As sociologist Pierre Bourdieu once observed with a little frustration, the conditions of scholarship demand *slow thought*, which means there is a habit of arriving *late*

to the scenes of the social, and this is especially true in a world moving as quickly as it does today. Yet scholarly journals – like *Social Science Forum* – given all the good work preparing it in the past, yet also in the future – are a valuable opportunity for social-scientific thought not to be *too late*.

Simultaneously, we join the editorial board knowing that the conditions of academic work are also under greater strain. Pressures to publish as a key measure of scholarly work – both research and pedagogical – international visibility, project-based funding, and the temporal economies of research all have a substantial influence on the internal conditions of science under which this aspect of scholarly work (the one materializing in texts like the journal) is produced. This is by no means the only element of scholarly work, although it appears as its most meaningful one. We must also not overlook the broader social context, which tends to attribute less relevance and weight to careful social thinking that such thinking deserves.

Precisely for this reason, we find it all the more important to preserve the journal as a space of reading in the fullest sense of the word. Namely, reading that enters into dialogue with texts, reading that allows itself to be addressed and challenged by the text and, not least, reading that, with great care, also challenges the text itself. Responsibility for this kind of relationality belongs above all to the scholarly community, albeit certainly also to thoughtful editorial work and to dialogue among authors, reviewers and readers.

The new editorial board thus aims to continue the old mission of the social sciences: to strengthen *slow thought* – yet thought which, despite being slow as required by careful engagement with the complexity of the world we live in, will be no less timely.

We wish you all pleasant reading.
Nina Perger and Jasmina Šepetavc
Editors-in-chief