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In the introduction to *Learning in the age of digital reason* Petar Jandrić is inviting us – the readers – to a party. A party where Jandrić, rather than bringing old friends together, “want to link people who do not normally talk to each other, transgress disciplinary boundaries, and foster conversations that are unlikely to take place elsewhere” (xi). And I should say from the beginning: What an unusually refreshing, vivid and sparkling party that is. In 16 chapters, Jandrić takes the reader on a tour through six thematic sections: History and Philosophy, Media Studies, Education, Practice and Activism, and Arts, before the final Afterword. Each of the chapters is based on conversations, email exchanges and/or interviews with one or more dialogue partners exploring the role of learning, (digital) culture, arts, the Anthropocene, the Internet, politics, activism, (in)equality, education, knowledge and many other topics. In the section on History and Philosophy Jandrić engages in dialogues with Larry Cuban, Andrew Feenberg, and Michael Adrian Peters. The section on Media
Studies includes Fred Turner, Richard Barbrook and McKenzie Wark. In the section on Education Jandrić speaks with Henry Giroux, Peter McLaren, and Sián Bayne. The section on Practice and Activism features Howard Rheingold, Astra Taylor, and Marcell Mars and Tomislav Medak. In the Arts section the interlocutors are Paul Levinson, Kathy Rae Huffman, and Dmitry Vilensky of ChtoDelat. In the afterword Christine Sinclair and Hamish McLeod interview Petar Jandrić about the origins of the book and what he hopes the readers will take from it.

Here Jandrić states that the book is in many ways a collaborative enterprise or a work of collective intelligence. Obviously, the interlocutors are contributors to their own chapters, but equally in commenting on other chapters. Ana Kuzmanić has co-authored four of the chapters, Ana Peraiča has co-authored one chapter, and Christine Sinclair and Hamish McLeod have commented on large parts of the manuscript. Besides, almost all chapters have been previously published in academic and non-academic journals, which have provided wider public feedback and commentary that has been part of developing the book. Further, Jandrić mentions the guidance of Peter McLaren and Michael Adrian Peters in pushing him to develop the book and providing continued support and feedback. This feels important to mention as Jandrić argues that “this book looks beyond the current system of knowledge production and dissemination – it seeks new form of collective intelligence, and hopes to open new opportunities for individual and collective action” (p. 379). Clearly, the work is composed of the insights from the many contributors, who have graciously shared their thoughts with Petar, but also it seems appropriate to mention the meticulous and breathtaking effort of Petar in connecting with people, preparing the interviews, carefully revising and structuring the conversations, and putting it all together in the form of a book.
As Jandrić comments, the format of the book is deliberately different from the traditional academic book. Distinctively in that it does not pursue to develop a grand theoretical framework, propose a methodology, or establish a set of overarching principles. As Petar says in the Afterword:

This book challenges the dominant order of things. It was conceived out of my personal beliefs, and my comfortable employment situation, and the good people around me, and the magic which happened in communication with my interlocutors – more often than not, the convolution of these elements was sparked with a generous amount of luck. Many people will consider this non-scientific, and my response is: So what? If you want to read an analytic book, go and get one – this book is something else. (p. 360)

Each chapter is a dialogue that revolves around a set of topics – some specific to the individual contributor, others more generally about learning and education in the digital age, or about how the Internet, online communication and social media have impacted society and public debates. Far from being Socratic dialogues, where one of the conversation partners is led towards the understanding of a greater truth (or higher level of confusion), the dialogues are explorative and unfinished. There are no summaries or ‘so, in conclusion, what I draw from what you are saying is…’, but there are vivid, interesting dialogues about subjects that clearly matter to each of the participants in the conversations. It is like an excellent academic podcast, only in written form.

Each chapter is a rich tapestry of ideas and insights that emerge through the conversations, that are artfully and curiously carried forward by Petar and the interlocutors, through different communicational means. Some conversations have been conducted in synchronous face-to-face or online conferences—followed by briefer or longer mail-exchanges. Some conversations are primarily mail-exchanges, and others have been co-authored as shared online documents.
In this way the genesis of the book is also a testament to the possibilities offered by digital networks and new modes of scholarly collaboration. Some chapters are rich in references to academic work and resemble the pinnacle of how learning and knowledge construction can be unfolded through asynchronous dialogues, whereas others excel in the qualities of immediate here-and-now conversation.

This, however, also makes the book a challenge to review. There are no central (hypo)theses or main arguments one can latch onto and critically assess or rejoice; neither for the book as a whole, nor for the individual chapter. In normal circumstances one could engage critically with the theses or central arguments being put forward in each chapter, and critically reflect on how well the introduction and concluding sections bring together and synthesize the main arguments. However, I believe that such a strategy would prove futile in bringing forth the strengths and insights of this piece of work. Therefore, I have chosen a different approach, where I will draw out, from my unique position and perspective, some themes that resonated with the perspective or ‘discipline’ I come from, and why I think readers with overlapping interests should read the book (and I think they should). Therefore, I shall briefly lay out where ‘I’m coming from’.

A view from the educational technology circuit
My educational background is interdisciplinary, as I graduated with a Master’s degree in ‘Humanistic Computer Science’ or what we have later come to call ‘Human Centered Informatics’ – an educational programme being a mashup between design studies, learning, systems development, formalization, and interaction design. I was particularly interested in the intersections between learning and technology. Broadly speaking I now work with e-learning, digital learning or educational technology, and more specifically I work within the area

As most graciously said by Siân Bayne, networked learning “was one of the first strands of work which took digital education seriously as a research domain” (p. 209) through the works of people such as Vivien Hodgson, David McConnell, Peter Goodyear, Chris Jones, and many others. Further, it is an area of research deeply concerned with critical, emancipatory pedagogies, collaborative learning and how networked technologies can promote democratic educational processes, diversity and inclusion (Beaty, Hodgson, Mann, and McConnell, 2002; McConnell, Hodgson, and Dirckinck-Holmfeld, 2012). Now, as it is critically explored in the book, particularly in the conversations with Larry Cuban (Chapter 1), Andrew Feenberg (Chapter 2), McKenzie Wark (Chapter 6), and Siân Bayne (Chapter 9), the broad area of Educational Technology is a field of research and practice that is heavily infested with techno-utopian ‘boosterism’, where new technologies are recurrently introduced as ‘paradigm shifts’ that will change, modernize or disrupt the very fabric of society and education at large.

Critically oriented areas of research have repeatedly spoken against these narratives and pointed to the ‘dubious promise of educational technologies’ (as the conversation with Larry Cuban is titled). More recently, (new) critical voices are starting to penetrate the wider field of educational technology, such as Neil Selwyn (Selwyn, 2014), Chris Jones (Jones, 2015), Ben Williamson
(Williamson, 2017) and of course Siân Bayne (Chapter 9). These voices are now also starting to come out to a broader audience, as they are engaging in public conversation through social media, blogs, and initiatives such as The Manifesto for Teaching Online (Digital Education Group, 2016) that is discussed in Chapter 9; or the work of Howard Rheingold (Chapter 10) on peeragogy and learning in digital commons. These voices build on and interact with the work of Henry Giroux (Chapter 7), Peter McLaren (Chapter 8), Andrew Feenberg (Chapter 2), Larry Cuban (Chapter 1), and Michael Adrian Peters (Chapter 3).

These are thinkers, who should have a much more prominent space within the educational technology circuit, but due to the increased specialization and compartmentalization of research, as is discussed in many chapters of the book, profound insights from one field often fail to leak into others. This is one of the reasons, why Petar’s party is important. Its insistence on trans- or postdisciplinarity, and bringing voices together, I believe, can help bring in much needed new and ‘old’ voices into the wider field of educational technology – a line of work Petar has also undertaken in a recently edited book Critical Learning in Digital Networks (Jandrić and Boras, 2015). These are perspectives that are sorely needed in a field saturated by ‘Silicon Valley magic’ and underpinned by the ‘Californian Ideology’, discussed in more depth in the conversations with Fred Turner (Chapter 4) and Richard Barbrook (Chapter 5).

Sent from my Iphone
What also stands out in the book is the degree to which we have indeed become a digitally saturated society. This is playfully and ironically explored in the conversation with Peter McLaren (Chapter 8). As a Marxist-Humanist, McLaren powerfully argues against corporate-capitalism, questions how (digital) technologies often become tools of oppression or exploitation, and
inquires how (social) media indulge us in corporate commodity culture. Petar writes how his exchanges with Peter McLaren often took the form of brief emails with pictures, small stories sent all times of day and night, and from around the world, and carrying the characteristic ‘Sent from my Iphone’ signature. As Petar comments, half the exchanges had been written via Peter’s smartphone, and Peter remarks:

I loathe technology, and yet, like many others, I am addicted to it. I hate cell phones, except for use in emergencies, yet I have an iPhone which I check regularly. I hate the Internet, yet I spend time on the web each day checking what I have found to be reliable sources and authors.” (p.190).

I do not mention this story to ironically satirize or ridicule, but rather to highlight a sentiment that is strongly present in all the chapters: an underlying ambivalence towards how technology and the digital affect us, and a simultaneous recognition they constitute essential parts of our reality and everyday life. Although Paul Levinson (Chapter 13) argues that we can choose not to use the technology, I wonder: Do we realistically have an opt-out button?

There is clearly a strong sense in the chapters, that technological development and ‘the digital’ will not necessarily become a force of benevolent change which will democratize the world and heighten equality. All chapters are notably reflexive in avoiding either utopian or dystopian technological determinism. So often as Petar will ask the interlocutors: ‘How will the digital affect education, research, society, public debate etc.’ the answer becomes a variation of: ‘You know, that really depends…’. And this is doubtlessly one of the strong qualities of the book! Rather than conversations being one-sided examples of vacuous techno-determinist booster/doomster rhetoric, each chapter presents nuanced, complex discussions of the role of the digital in contemporary
society. Further, these discussions dig deeper into the materiality and the deeply entangled relations between technology/the digital and the society. In educational technology – and more broadly – there is a tendency to view the ‘digital’ or ‘technology’ as a force of its own, as something that can be detached or disentangled from the societal mess and impact (positively) on society or education.

For example, such assumptions are engrained in the notion of ‘technology enhanced learning’ and in discourses often associated with the ‘Californian ideology’ where technology – be it MOOCs, algorithms or AI – are portrayed as pure, rational technological fixes to a ‘broken educational system’ – a system that can be rationally re-engineered through value-unstained, incorporeal, immaterial, techno-scientific innovation (Watters, 2015). However, many of the chapters – and in particular chapters2, 4, and 8 – explore the deeply material underpinnings of ‘the digital’, whether through critiques of ‘immaterial labour’ or exploring how the physical infrastructure of the Internet and mobile technologies are heavily dependent on material labour and natural resources, drawing the ethereal phantasm of ‘the digital’ closely into discussions of the Anthropocene (chapter 6). While such complex and advanced understandings of technology are common in e.g. critical theory, socio-material, or post-humanist accounts, the chapters of the book are an excellent introduction to these lines of thinking that are often horrifically absent in wider debates within Educational Technology.

**Grab the stick!**

Referring to the uneasiness and ambivalences surrounding the promises of digital technologies laid out in the previous section, the book could easily be thought to resort into a more dystopian position. However, this is far from the case. While the ambivalences could lead into apathy, stasis or even a sense of
double-bind ‘damned if you do, damned if you don’t’, the book offers refreshing perspectives on activism, critical/public pedagogy and how art can play a role in helping us see and act differently in the world (chapters 13, 14, and 15). Many chapters also carry a strongly positive sentiment that we can ‘occupy’ the uses of technology in education and society at large, from the historical accounts of pirate radio in Barbrook’s conversation (Chapter 5); the role of technology as part of activism and social change in the Eastern Europe explored by Marcell Mars and Tomislav Medak (Chapter 12); to the ‘Grassroots Lessons and Strategies against 21st Century Capitalism’ explored by Astra Taylor through the notions of Un-schooling and Un-work (Chapter 11).

Together with discussing the role of critical pedagogy or public pedagogy (particularly explored in chapters 2, 6, and 8), these chapters urge readers to critically reflect on the purpose of education and our own role as educators. They make it clear that the book is not a descriptive, detached and analytical account of ‘the current state of affairs’, but equally a call for action.

We may often feel trapped between utopian and dystopian narratives, or between the overstated expectations and the realities of digital technologies in education (and beyond). A story that is often used in conjunction with explanations of ‘double bind’ is the Zen master telling his students: ‘If you say this stick is real, I will beat you. If you say this stick is not real, I will beat you. If you say nothing, I will beat you.’ An impossible situation that is resolved only when one of the students stand up, grabs the stick and breaks it. While the book is not inviting us to grab and break education, it is certainly formulating alternative and interesting pathways for how to re-think the role of education through arts, critical pedagogy, and technology. It is an invitation to move beyond thinking of education as a matter of acquiring skills and competences for the labour market – a severely limited and restrictive view of education, that nevertheless seems to be an internationally widespread and dominant policy
trend. It is a call for us as educators to engage in pedagogy as an enterprise of empowering students to become critical and engaged citizens. Equally, it is a call for educators to transgress the classroom or lecture hall and think of education as public engagement, and an opportunity for opening spaces of critical collective dialogue on how we may envision and enact a more just and more equal society. This is a tremendous challenge for education, and this book is an excellent outset for initiating such important debates! Now go read it!

**Juha Suoranta, University of Tampere, Finland**

The real strength and beauty of Petar Jandrić’s fifteen conversations in *Learning in the Age of Digital Reason* is that they bring together some of the most recent and interesting insights in education, media studies, philosophy and arts. Thus the book can be read in many ways: I can pick one article in the morning and another in the afternoon, focus on one of the five sections at a time, or use it more as a handbook by selecting my topics and themes of interest. All of the conversations generate something original, but also contain overlapping theme of which I have decided to concentrate on descriptions of knowledge commons, “open and collaborative digital environment” (Michael Adrian Peters, p. 40), “peer learning and collaboration” (p. 47), “ethics of sharing and collaboration” (p. 49), and “peer-to-peer as a form of collective intelligence” (p. 55) of the Internet.

My impression is that although the question of digital collectivism, collaboration and the basic tenets of peer-to-peer learning and sharing are thoroughly surveyed and developed in the book, yet acritical look pertaining the politico-economical prerequisites of the digital universe is needed. In this review I am referring to Marx and Engels’s statement that “[f]ree activity for
the Communists is the creative manifestation of life arising from the free
development of all abilities of the whole person” (Marx & Engels, 1932, p. 242)
in my search for the preconditions of collaborative digital education and
learning freed from capitalist creed. Perhaps I am not as pessimistic as
McKenzie Wark who refers to the history of the Internet as follows:

In early versions of the Internet that I first learned, unequal exchange was not even
technically possible. People would tolerate you being around, but if you did not
contribute something useful, they would ignore you. So you had to find out ways to
earn your keep in a collective space. But that is gone away. To me, platform
cooperativism would be going back to things that have been lost. (p. 134)

And, indeed, there are scholars who want to believe that “going back to things
that have been lost” in terms of collectivism and collaboration is actually going
back to the future. I think I belong to them, for I believe that much of the
current debate crystallizes into a concept of commons. Commons refer to such
necessities as clean water, food and shelter, without which it is impossible to
survive not to mention to live a life worth living. It also means universal health
care and free public education that help people to act in a society and try to
achieve their goals in life. Furthermore, commons must include access to the
Internet, experience of digital sharing and collaboration, so that people will
have an opportunity to fully participate in educational, social and political
processes.

In trying to understand the age of digital reason (digitalization, digital learning
environments etc.) we need to look beyond the surface phenomena and try to
see the undercurrents. One possibility is to focus on the most used (and
misused) concepts of the debate pertaining digitalization. One of them is
freedom. To understand the specific meanings of freedom in the digital realm
we have proposed a schema or typology of three different types and uses of freedom (Suoranta and Vadén, 2010, p. 159–167). In constructing the typology we have assumed that ‘freedom’ is a generative category and element of the digital sphere (both in digital technology, hard and software, and its uses in different areas of human conduct) surrounded by variations of capitalist ideologues and capitalist real politics.

The first stage of freedom consists of those forms of digital media in which we can chat and shout, create our identities and profiles, and submit our opinions. It is the world of social media in all its varieties. Facebook, YouTube, Instagram and Twitter are the current mega players (November, 2017). The first stage of freedom usually denotes free speech within the confines of formal freedom; as explained by Žižek (2004c): you are free in so far as you do your things in a given (digital) space and in a pretty much given tone. Exception to the rule was the Arab Spring where information and communication technologies were used as means and as catalysts for political and social mobilization. More often it is however the case that freedom of the first degree does much less than that: you can speak, write and shout, or endlessly scroll Facebook posts and Instagram photos without effects than perhaps social media addiction.

The second stage of freedom refers to the peoples’ collaboration in digital sphere. They are encouraged to learn from each other, borrow other’s ideas, develop and reinvent them. They are inspired “to be cultural producers, active agents for whom knowledge is linked to not simply a broader awareness of literary, cultural, and scientific treasures but to an expansion of one’s sense of individual and social agency” (Henry Giroux, p. 154). This is the world of users and producers who establish their start-ups in digital commerce. Most of the people (in the West) have access to the Internet and they use their chances to collaborate. It is almost as if Marx’s dictum “from each according to his ability,
to each according to his needs” was true, but not quite. All is good if everyone lives by the book and uses their talent to create and produce new apps and games and other digital scum, that is, they don’t cross the boundaries of formal freedom, which “is said to be achieved through the rule of law and the safeguarding of people’s rights of property and contract” (Carter, 2011, p. 486).

It is precisely these very coordinates and conditions (especially the fundamental idea of private ownership) that are the problem in the third stage of freedom. For, in contrast to the formality of the second stage of freedom, third stage of freedom operates with the concepts of actual freedom. As Žižek states, “freedom is ’actual’ precisely and only as the capacity to ’transcend’ the coordinates of a given situation, to ’posit the presuppositions’ of one’s activity (as Hegel would have put it), i.e. to redefine the very situation within which one is active.” (Žižek, 2001) Eric Weiner has captured the idea nicely:

It is not enough to be free to speak, if those who are speaking do not have the power to create the conditions in which they can be heard. Likewise, it is not adequate to be free to choose if the choice about what choices can be made has already been made by someone else. This level of freedom is for suckers; it is for those who choose unquestionably between Coke and Pepsi, but never think about who decides what goes into the machine. (Weiner, 2007, p. 260.)

In the third stage of freedom it is not enough to have free access to the Internet, to be creative in digital platforms and publishing one’s political opinions, works of art, or scientific results freely; another condition must be met, too: energy resources and Internet services must be owned someone else than corporations, that is, by the state or by the peoples’ cooperatives.

Are there any working examples of the third stage of freedom then? One example in the level of state apparatus was Venezuela who nationalized its
natural resources in the spirit of the Bolivarian revolution. As we were told, the country not only had substantial natural resources of oil, but also the political leadership and will to use those resources for the peoples’ well-being, and not for the benefit of foreign investors. The government even launched its own program to build ‘Bolivarian computers’ with free Linux operating system in order to “promote technological development” and increase the country’s technological independence (Carlson, 2007).

Another example in the community level is the city of Detroit in which 40 percent of its inhabitants are entirely without access to the Internet. Various organizations partnered to build community wireless local area networks to those neighborhoods without access to the Internet. In addition to wiring and access they aimed at improving peoples’ participation, enhancing common ownership, and creating healthy communities (see http://detroitcommunitytech.org/). This type of local, grassroots ‘from below’ work and digital platforms are an alternative to commercial and profit-oriented ‘from above’ digital business. It means that it is not fully exposed to the forces of capital accumulation. As media theorist Christian Fuchs puts it, “[t]hey are working-class social media because they are collectively owned and controlled by the immediate users. Activities on these media are not digital labour (that is exploited), but digital work” (Fuchs, 2014a, p. 343 italics in original).

Fuchs has also pointed out, in accordance with the idea of the third stage of freedom, that all the critical scholars of the world, artists, educators, librarians, journalists, and cultural workers, should unite and seek for the communist Internet, which he describes as follows:

The communist Internet is an association of free producers that is critical, self-managed, surveillance-free, beneficial for all, freely accessible for all, fostering wealth
for all, co-operative, classless and universal. On the communist Internet, there is no profit and no advertising and there are no corporations. In a communist Internet age, programmers, administrators and users control Internet platforms by participatory self-management. Network access is provided free to all and there are no corporate Internet service providers. Internet literacy programs are widely available in schools and adult education in order to enable humans to develop capacities that allow them to use the Internet in meaningful ways that benefit themselves and society as a whole. All humans have free access to web platforms, computer software and hardware. Computing is non-profit, non-commercial, non-commodified and advertising-free. There is no corporate mediation of Internet communication; humans engage more directly with each other over the Internet without the mediation by corporations that own platforms and exploit communicative labour. (Fuchs, 2014b, p. 242)

I think that learning in the age of digital reason benefits from including the idea of the communist Internet to its agenda. For, as Fuchs states, an overall communist class struggle is needed to back up the success of info-communism and the development of a classless Internet. Otherwise “some of the characteristics of info-communism, such as the principle of free access and free content provision and online mass collaboration, are absorbed by capitalism, which thereby destroys the communist character of info-communism.” (Fuchs, 2014b, p. 248.)

I am afraid that all the fine ideas and practical illustrations presented in *Learning in the Age of Digital Reason* cannot flourish and be accomplished in today’s capitalism and the capitalist Internet, for capitalism is a class society. The capitalist Internet is a class-structured Internet: corporations and other central actors dominate attention, symbolic, social and material benefits. A just society is a classless society. A just Internet is a classless Internet. (Fuchs, 2014b, p. 257)
We will not be truly triple free from the constraints of capitalism until the following three preconditions are met: we own and control our renewable energy sources and energy plants, realize and use our political power to overthrow the military-industrial-congressional complexes all over the world, and build the information society with the guaranteed net neutrality and the Internet that serves all the people. Corporate logic, whether in the form of liberal capitalism of the West or authoritarian capitalism of the East, must be broken first—and one of the most crucial point of departure is not to invent another start-up entrepreneurship but to begin to figure how to abolish the nightmarish working conditions of digital labor and precariat all over the world.

Derek R. Ford, DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana, USA

After I first skimmed through Petar Jandrić’s latest book I felt a sense of relief. I had been excited about engaging with the text, but the semester was coming to a (crashing) end, and I needed some respite from the drudgery of academia. I wasn’t expecting to suffer through the book in any way, but I was gearing up for a standard dense and difficult academic form of text. What I quickly found, however, was that while the book’s content is dense and even at times difficult, the form assumed by the content makes it easy to engage. It’s not only that the book is a collection of dialogues between Jandrić and a range of other thinkers and doers, but that the dialogues take the form of exploratory and probing conversations. Jandrić refers to the book as a party of sorts, and indeed the text provides a party-like atmosphere that invites in the reader as a kind of spectator, one that has little choice but to be actively eavesdropping on what’s going on.

In an academic world in which we seem to be increasingly silo-ing off into smaller and smaller sub-concentrations and specializations (while the world is
doing the opposite), *Learning in the Age of Digital Reason* bucks this trend and defiantly pushes outward from the author’s own position within education and technology studies, to encompass a breathtaking scope of topics. It’s not a boring or homogenous party, by any means. Taken together, all of this may be the reason why the book is included in Michael Peters’ *Educational Futures* series with Sense: the book’s form and content read as aspirations or a particular kind of educational future. I’d like to frame this review as a response to this aspiration, and to acknowledge and address (to varying degrees) the promises and potential limitations of it.

The transdisciplinarity of the book allows for the creation of new lines of thought within each interview and within the book as a whole. Jandrić begins with questions about the scholarship of the interviewee(s), which gives the reader some simultaneous theoretical and autobiographical ground on which to stand. It sets the stage in specific ways, of course, that are motivated by Jandrić’s interests, which allows the book to stand as a totality. One of these threads is deschooling, about which Jandrić questions Larry Cuban, Andrew Feenberg, McKenzie Wark, Henry Giroux, Peter McLaren, Astra Taylor, Marcell Mars and Tomislav Medak, and Dmitry Vilensky. From this we get a complex rendering of the concept. For example, Cuban points out that deschoolers overlook the school’s critical function as a public space, which is interestingly affirmed by Astra Taylor who was unschooled. Taylor writes that, while she is grateful she was unschooled, she “lacked a larger community” (p. 227) as a result.

Each conversation gets the most interesting when Jandrić lays out questions that almost take the form of a test. For example, he asks Andrew Feenberg, “Please clarify links between technology and democracy” (p. 22); to Michael Peters he asks, “Please position the transformation from the mass society characterized by
one-way analog technologies to the network society characterized by digital media in a wide(r) historical context” (p. 43). This is what makes Jandrić’s party *educational*: it is a party structured in part around the logic of the transdisciplinary test. It’s like Jandrić is a partying proctor. While they have a bad name these days—because they’re associated with the deadening standardized ones—tests are crucial to all forms of production: we test our ideas, we test our love, we test our friendships, and through these tests we come to various kinds of knowledge.

These tests are completed but they are left ungraded. There’s rarely any feedback. Thus, the broad scope of the book, while promising, is simultaneously limiting. There’s just too much ground to cover, too many questions to ask. In a way, this seems to be symptomatic of the digital age in which we are constantly bombarded with images, deluged with data, and overwhelmed with affect. How to make sense of it all? To be fair, the quest for overarching frameworks to understand and act in the “digital age” is one of the functions of the book. It delivers some answers. But how to translate these answers—this data—into meaningful action, particularly if the book is, as its blurb says, “firmly at the side of the weak and the oppressed?” To do this, we need to *grade* the tests, and we need to produce out a rubric. It may be that Jandrić is too humble to do so, or that he will insist that it is a collective effort. I would agree that any grading has to be collective, but an individual book can surely contribute to that collective effort.

Another related element is needed to transform knowledge and ideas into meaningful action aimed at “critical emancipation,” as the book’s blurb puts it: antagonism. Engaging with this party I feel like Jandrić is too deferential of a host. Of course, academia can be a brutal place, and there is too much bullying and animosity, and it’s usually petty. Antagonism is something different. It’s a
productive endeavor that clarifies, pushes, draws lines, and seeks a partisan understanding. Perhaps if academia is marked by too much animosity, Jandrić’s book is marked by too much good will. I’ve had the pleasure of meeting Jandrić in person and have recently begun col(labor)ating with him on a few projects, so I know that he can be quite critical—and in fact it is precisely this reason that I value his friendship so much.

In the book’s concluding chapter, which is fittingly an interview of Jandrić about the book and his own work, the reader finally gets a sense of what is behind the questions. Jandrić relays his thoughts on history and progress, feminism and technology, academia and publishing, and even monsters. I hope that this concluding chapter isn’t the end of the book. I learned a lot reading it, but I want to know more. What I’m after is not more information, but more synthesis, and more clarity. How do we work out the contradictions between the interviewees? For example, Henry Giroux trumpets the role of the “public intellectual” (which he considers himself), while in an earlier chapter Fred Turner dismisses this category, writing that a new kind of intellectual is emerging who doesn’t publish but builds networks (p. 71). Many interviewees use the term “neoliberalism,” but McKenzie Wark says that’s not a “helpful description” (p. 112). Richard Barbrook tells Jandrić the Internet was “initially built by academics, hackers, and hobbyists” (p. 89), but Feenberg tells him it was “conceived by the U.S. military” (p. 28), as does Fred Turner (p. 62). Because of his almost encyclopedic knowledge, drive, and passion, Jandrić is exactly the type of thinker and doer who can help us navigate this territory.
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