

Prvo letošnjo številko vpljujeta obsežnejša, sicer zelo različna, a po svoje dopolnjujoča se članka. Oba obravnavata ključna vprašanja o nekaterih predpostavkah socialnega dela. *Bernard Stritih* piše o prostovoljnem delu, ki se je pri nas kljub zadržanosti oblasti začelo že pred časom in je v tisti, lahko bi rekli pripravljalni fazi doseglo vrhunec v delu z otroki; avtor je eden izmed ključnih udeležencev in sooblikovalcev tega projekta. O tem več v eni od prihodnjih številk, v tem članku pa avtor zastavlja nekatera splošna vprašanja o usmeritvah prostovoljnega dela, ki naj ne bi streglo potrebam oblasti, ampak strank, tako da jih (v skladu z zamislico Pabla Freire) pripravi za aktiven vstop v družbeni dialog.

Stalna naloga vsake znanosti je preverjati svoje predpostavke. Če tega ne počne, obstaja resna nevarnost, da zapade na eni strani intuicizmu (tako da npr. pojmi, ki so nastali in se razvili v določenem kontekstu za določeno rabo, pretrgajo s svojo zgodovino in postanejo »samoumevni«, ali da se podobni termini, ki so nastali v različnih kontekstih in za različno rabo, zlijejo v nespecifičen »zdravorazumski« pojem) in na drugi strani golemu tehnicizmu (v stilu »ni važno, kako postopek razlagamo, pomembno je, da deluje«). Oboje je redukcija, ki oropa znanost prav tistega, kar jo dela znanost. *Srečo Dragoš* se v svojem prispevku loti tega problema v izpeljavah, relevantnih za socialno delo, s področja fenomenologije.

Enigma ustvarjalnosti zaposluje mislece že zelo dolgo, a njihove razlage so pogosto enako skrivnostne in ohlapne kakor sam pojem ustvarjalnost. Problem je podoben vprašanju inteligence. Je to dejanska (merljiva ali opisljiva) lastnost ali razsežnost koga ali česa, ali pa je zgolj hipotetični konstrukt, ki zapolnjuje vrzeli v našem (ne)razumevanju miselnih in delovnih procesov (če je to dvoje mogoče ločevati)? Tudi *Milko Poštrak*, ki obravnava antropološke in sociološke razlage ustvarjalnosti, nakazuje njihovo heterogenost, celo dvoumnost.

K praktičnim problemom socialnega dela nas vmeta naslednja prispevka. *Metoda Mikuljan* piše o pripravi ljudi na starost, kar je nedvomno problem, ki zahteva temeljiti razmislek na različnih ravneh, saj je povezan z življenjskimi okoliščinami v današnjem času naplohu. Poznajo ga zlasti razvite družbe, kjer je način življenja močno individualiziran, še hujši pa je seveda tam, kjer je »razvitost družbe« bolj delna in se visoka stopnja individualizacije povezuje z nizkim življenjskim standardom.

Drugi prispevek iz tega okvira je napisal *Luj Šprohar* in opisuje avtorjeve osebne izkušnje z izgubovida. Seveda je treba eseji - na kar navsezadnje posredno opozori sam avtor - brati »simptomalno« in ne kot »casus«, se pravi, ne kot znanstveno poročilo, ampak kot tekst, v katerem se zgoščajo, premeščajo, povnijo itn. številne determinante avtorjevega življenja. Specifične prikrajšanosti zaradi določene osebne okoliščine (slepote) se prepletajo s spontanimi poskusi njihove premostitve ali kompenzacije, in prav te imajo za naše razumevanje te okoliščine posebno vrednost.

Vsa omeniti velja še naslednje prispevke in tej številki: osebne izkušnje s študenti na praksi predavateljice s šole za socialno delo v Dortmundu *Marie Pooth*, sicer redne gostje Visoke šole za socialno delo v Ljubljani, in poročilo *Mojce Urek* o praksi študentov VŠSD, ki je v preteklem letu stekla po novih pravilih in s poudarjenim položajem.

Na koncu številke so med Dokumenti objavljeni tudi indeksi vseh prispevkov v tem časopisu v prejšnjem letniku.

*

Vodilni slovenski jezikoslovci in jezikoslovke so pred kratkim odgovorili na vprašanje, kako naj v slovenščini vpeljemo obojespolno izražanje, ki ga danes uporabljajo povsod, kjer so se zavedeli, da navajanje zgolj moškega spola (zlasti v javni in uradni rabi) na simbolni ravni vzdržuje diskriminacijski odnos do žensk. Naši lingvisti in lingvistke so ugotovili, prvič, da bi bilo tako izražanje prenatrpano in nepregledno, in drugič, da je tako ali tako nepotrebno, ker moški spol, rabljen na splošno, zastopa obo spola. Če se s prvim še lahko strinjam - če bi bili dosledni, bi moralo npr. na začetku tega razdelka

pisati »vodilni slovenski jezikoslovci in vodilne slovenske jezikoslovke« (pustimo ob strani sporno izvedenko za ženski spol) in nastala bi tudi zadrega, kako ohraniti obojestransko diktijo pri glagolu -, pa se z drugim nikakor ne moremo, saj je ravno v tem razlog za veljavno obojestranskega izražanja. Kar strokovnjakinje in strokovnjaki za slovenščino po vsem videzu spregledujejo ali zanemarjajo, je dejstvo, da ima vsaka ustaljena raba svoj začetek in razlog - da jezik ni dan enkrat za vselej, temveč se spreminja tudi iz jeziku zunanjih razlogov. Z drugimi besedami: kakor se je to, da moški spol zastopa obo spola, začelo, tako se lahko glede na rabo tudi neha ali spremeni. Pri tem ne bi bilo slabovo, če bi prebrali Poštrakov prispevek in v njem Wittgensteinovo opombo: jezikovna pravila so arbitrama (kljub temu, da imajo zgodovino, ni mogoče o nobenem reči, da je bolj zakonito kakor katero drugo), zato ni razloga, da bi kakšno bolj upoštevali kakor kakšno drugo. Iz tega seveda ne moremo izpeljati, da so jezikovna pravila nepotrebna (saj bi s tem prenehala vsaka možnost komunikacije), lahko pa rečemo, da so slovenisti in slovenistke v svojem odgovoru branili bolj določeno ideologijo kakor jezik. Kakorkoli, Socialno delo bo še naprej podpiralo obojestransko izražanje, tudi kadar ni povsem dosledno, saj je le v tem upanje, da se bo sčasoma ustalilo na način, ki ne prezahteven ali neberljiv.

Editor's notes

The first issue this year is introduced by two extensive, quite different, yet complementary papers. Both deal with some key presumptions in social work. *Bernard Stritih* writes about voluntary work, which in spite of the reservations on the part of the authorities had begun some time ago and has in that, as it were, preparatory phase reached a climax in the work with children; the author himself is one of the key participants and creators of the project. We shall have more on that in one of the future issues. Here, the author deals with some general questions of the directions in voluntary work, which should not serve the needs of the authorities but those of the clients, by preparing them to actively enter the social debate (in accordance with the ideas of Pablo Freire).

The permanent task of every science is to check its own presumptions. If this is not done, there is a grave risk that it may incur, on the one hand, intuitionism (as, for instance, the notions that emerged and developed in a certain context for a certain use break with their history and become »self-understood«, or as two or more similar terms that have emerged in different contexts and for different uses merge into a non-specific »common sense« notion), and on the other hand, sheer technicism (of the kind »it does not matter how we explain a procedure, the important thing is that it works«). Both of these reductions bereave the science of the very feature that makes it a science. *Srečo Dragoš* deals with this problem in derivations, relevant for social work, from the field of phenomenology.

The enigma of creativity has been engaging thinkers for a very long time, and their explanations are often just as mystifying and vague as the notion of creativity itself. It is similar to the problem of intelligence. Is it an actual (measurable or describable) feature or dimension of something or someone, or is it merely a hypothetical construct to fill the gaps in our (mis)understanding of mental and working processes (if the two can be set apart)? *Milko Poštrak* considers the anthropological and sociological explanations of creativity, and he, too, indicates their heterogeneity, even ambiguity.

The next two contributions return us to the practical problems of social work. *Metoda Mikuljan* writes about how to prepare people to old age. It is doubtlessly a problem which demands a thorough scrutiny on several levels, as it is related to the living conditions of our time in general. Developed societies are particularly familiar with it, as their way of life is very individualised, but it is even worse where the »development of society« is only partial - where a high degree of individualisation is found together with a low standard of living.

The other paper in this context by *Luj Šprohar* describes the author's experience of losing sight. This essay, of course, is to be read »symptomally« rather than as a »case«, i. e., not as a scientific report but as a text in which the many determinants of the author's life are condensed, displaced, externalised etc. The specific deprivations on account of a certain personal condition (blindness) are intertwined with spontaneous attempts at their overcoming and compensation, and these are of particular value for our understanding of the condition.

At least worth mentioning are also the following contributions from this issue: personal experiences with students on placement written by *Maria Pooth*, a lecturer at the school of social work in Dortmund, Germany, and a regular guest at School of Social Work in Ljubljana, and a report by *Moja Urek* on the placement for the students of the School in the previous year when new regulations were applied and the placements obtained an emphasised position in the training of social workers.

Finally, among the Documents, indexes of all the contributions of the previous volume are published.

The leading Slovenian linguists have recently answered the question of how to introduce two-gender diction into our language, as it is evident that using only the masculine supports, on the symbolic level, the discriminatory attitude towards women (especially in public, or official, use). Our linguists (of both genders) have ruled that, first, to change that would make our language crammed and difficult to follow, and second, it is in any case unnecessary, since the masculine, used in a general way, represents both genders. If we may agree with the first - as a change of gender in Slovenian necessitates changes in almost all accompanying words such as adjectives, numerals and verbs -, we can hardly accept the second, for it contains the very reason for using both genders. What these experts for Slovenian seem to be overlooking or neglecting is the fact that every settled use has a beginning and a reason - that a language is not given once and for all, and that it may change for reasons exterior to the language. In other words: just as the feature of the masculine to represent both genders has emerged, it may also die out or change, according to its use. It would be helpful if those learned ladies and gentlemen read Milko Poštrak's paper, and in it, Wittgenstein's note: linguistic rules are arbitrary (albeit they have a history, it cannot be said that one is more lawful than another), so there is no reason to obey one more than another. This, however, does not entail that linguistic rules are unnecessary (it would make communication impossible) but we may say that the Slovenists in their response defend a certain ideology rather than the language. In any case, this journal will continue to support the two-gender diction, even if it cannot be absolutely consequent, because it is the only hope that it will eventually settle without being too difficult or unreadable.