

## GUEST EDITORS' NOTES:

*Irena Šumi and Hannah Starman*  
*Institute for Ethnic Studies, Ljubljana*

---

This compilation of eleven short articles is the work of the members of the Open Society Institute sponsored HESP ReSET project entitled *Postcolony and postsocialism<sup>1</sup> contexts in social scientific writing and teaching*. Our work on the project began in August 2003, and will continue until the end of September 2006. It brings together a group of nineteen junior university teachers from ten countries in Southeastern Europe (Albania, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Kosova, Macedonia, Romania, Serbia, and Slovenia) and one from Moldova, and a group of seven resource persons from Poland, Slovenia, the United Kingdom and the United States. We would like to first express our gratitude to the editors of the AEER for hosting us, and to thank all the contributors for their fine work.

The articles present various themes that our project members jointly study and debate in order to reach critical, and hopefully also novel perspectives on how social sciences analyze and interpret the realities of life in what is commonly categorized as postcolony and postsocialism contexts. In doing so, the authors featured in this issue of AEER either address the re-thinking exercise directly (Buchowski, Šumi, Vacarescu, Wildcat) or choose to do so through critical presentations of their own research. This in itself takes quite a span: from war trauma and misogyny in post-war Bosnia

(Husanović); the rather convulsive state of affairs in Romology in Europe and Slovenia (Janko-Spreizer); the ideologies of nation and its demographic perseverance in Slovenia (Knežević-Hočevár); perceptions of literary postmodernism in contemporary Romania (Mihalache); dilemmas of reconciliation of cultural and ethnic difference in Macedonia (Muhić); philosophical views on Romanian folklore and its representations inside and outside the Romanian public (Popoveniuc); to Antisemitism in the ten new members/candidate states of the European Union (Starman).

What may not be readily observable from the pieces presented is to what degree we have, within our project, profited from exercising our rather ambitious goal of paralleling rather than directly comparing two vast (and ever increasing) bodies of social scientific production on postcolony and postsocialism respectively. As we wrote in our project's plan (<http://www.inv.si/hesp/project.htm>),

The production of both post-colony and post-socialism social science can ... be seen as analogous and structurally comparable for a number of reasons: both base their respective problem fields in a singular, global political process; both organise their perspective, and position their points of view, along a clear, although differently conceptualised, contrast between (Western) metropolises and (non-Western) peripheries; both employ, and produce, generalisations on a global scale.

We hope that the issue provides a pleasant and informative read.

---

<sup>1</sup> As a group of scholars, we decided to use the noun form of these words wherever possible for reasons of analytical correctness: once you name something postcolonial or postsocialist, you tag it, while e.g. 'postsocialism context' refers to a political reality that does not necessarily assume that phenomena under investigation are per se 'postsocialist.' In other words, the adjective form describes the situation as objective whereas the noun expresses the distance from such objectifying practices.