A possibility to think about the evolution of our writing practices from the crisis
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For some years now I have been insisting in spaces of editors, with friends, university management and in the intimacy of my home, on the need to reflect on the processes of measurement, not only from Minciencias in Colombia but in general, an issue that has cost me the disdain of some close to me and the appreciation of others-others that for me have been very important.

These questions that I have asked myself about the suffering that has been having to measure us as journals in unequal conditions, are directed towards the how and the for what of these measurements, because

(…) These reflections were marked by the sensitivity that I have in participating in academic scenarios and listening to some colleagues publicly question the way scientific journals are measured in Colombia, but also those who endorse it; and I say that it generates sensitivity because it is the martyrdom with which we journal editors are faced on a daily basis (Arias, et al, p.147)

And, I continue to insist on this matter because our behavior seems to be almost pathological in privileging bibliometric logic over the public utility of knowledge counting. Member of the Colombian Network of Publishers and Accounting Mag (Gómez-Zapata, 2019, p.35). I continue to insist that we are confusing the meaning of our writing practices and, therefore, that of our publications. Gómez-Morales also insists (2018) when he states that the state “(…) formulates science policies whose
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social and cultural consequences are overlooked by confusing the indicator with policy goals” (p.273).

This tragic context of the journals and the editors that we have been emphasizing in different spaces, generates, once again, concern for me to the extent that our practices continue to attend to the same logics of individuality, reticence, lack of solidarity and little empathy with the sense of our presence in the universities; Nor does the pandemic we are living through today, which has not been seen in the world for a little over 100 years, leave us with important lessons to change our place and the usefulness of what we do, of what is written in the journals we run as academic-political platforms that can change the world we live in.

I must confess that I had hoped to write about the change that COVID-19, has produced in us, which I began to call “the crisis”, but I must also confess that I am skeptical about that possibility of change, since I see in everyday life the same practices of little empathy and lack of solidarity of those who live with us. I would think that our role as magazine editors and writers is not exempt from such practices. I continue to think about the nonsense that traps us as academics, but I appeal to mobilize our conscience, because “(...) if we are not conscious, we cannot decolonize our ways of thinking, of seeing the world, of living. And it is this emergence that puts in tension the sense of our academic and writing work” (Gómez-Zapata, 2020, p.38).

Now, after having complained enough and reiterated my concern and dissatisfaction with what was raised at some point by my colleague Fredy León Paime in his “Letter to the Accounting Editor” (2016), I think it is appropriate to move towards possibilities of awareness, as I already stated, but also towards practices of constant conversation and discussion with our work teams, with friends and with opponents; I appeal to conversation (Quijano, 2016) as an immeasurable possibility of reflection, since this laborious and courageous work that we publishers do in our daily lives requires contexts of constant reflection that sometimes only the conversation with “tinto” allows.

We have the immense possibility of rethinking our academic, writing and publishing practices based on what we have experienced in 2020. We are also committed to being able to recognize our mistakes and our contribution to the co-construction of expert knowledge through the written text, but also to recognize in us that capacity to generate pedagogical actions to contribute to the understanding and transformation of concrete realities in communities where experience and doxa prevail, always with academic and epistemic solidarity.

---

1 I put it in an allegorical way.
2 Pandemic unleashed in 2019 in the city of Wuhan (China) and known as Coronavirus disease (COVID 19), highly infectious and has claimed the lives of nearly 2 million people worldwide.
3 Public Accountant from the National University of Colombia and a great friend, who is always busy and aware of these issues.
4 This is what the cup of coffee is called in Colombia.
This pedagogical invitation, always academic-political, is with the firm intention that we think from our own possibilities to believe in others, to contribute to improving our lives and those who accompany us, so that our writing is a window always open to humility, humanity, empathy, but above all, solidarity. This is my commitment as editor of En-Contexto and my invitation, from the affection, for those who want to join.
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