Reviewer 1

Review Details: Cosmopolitics and The Commons ✕

Markus Deimann

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2025-02-25 07:19 PM

Recommendation: Revisions Required

1 - Self-evaluation report

As reviewer, please provide a self-evaluation report, in as many words as you see fit, which includes your perspective (your values and worldviews in relation to education and research at the time of the review of the article) and also if you wish your reasons for having chosen to review the article.
*

I have been approached to review the article. I am involved in the field of Open Education for over 15 years and I share many of its values such as social justice, equity. I also describe myself as a critical mind on digital and open education which means that I do not take assumptions for granted but engage in a critical discussion about it.

Your expertise in relation to the topic of the article.

3 - Confident ⌄

2 - Scientific dimensions

Does the content presented address important issues within the field of Open Education research and/or offer ideas for practice improvement ?
*

> 6 - Strongly agree ⌄

Is the contribution consistent throughout the different parts of the article ? *

i.e. is there deep alignment ?

> 5 - Moderately agree ⌄

Are aims clearly stated ? *

> 6 - Strongly agree ⌄

If this is a reflexive article, are the foundation and positionality of the author clearly stated ? *

> 6 - Strongly agree ⌄

If this is an empirical article, is the theoretical foundation clearly stated and justified ? *

> 7 - Not applicable ⌄

If this is a practice-based article, is the praxis (theory and practice) foundation clearly stated and justified ? *

> 7 - Not applicable ⌄

If this is a research article, is the main research question clearly stated? *

> 6 - Strongly agree ⌄

If this is a research article, is the research methodology and design appropriately chosen and rigorously implemented ?
*

7 - Not applicable	⌄

If this is a research article, are findings clearly described and backed with robust analysis and interpretation ?
*

7 - Not applicable	⌄

Are conclusions and interpretations presented clearly and justified? *

6 - Strongly agree	⌄

If instruments are used (e.g. survey, interview form, etc.), are they available in the appendices? *
○ Yes for all of them
○ No for none of them
○ Some are available
◉ Not applicable

If this is a research article, and if there is a dataset, is it openly accessible (i.e. available from Zenodo)? *
○ Yes
○ No
◉ Not applicable

Provide here any information you wish to bring to the attention of authors, related to your review of the "scientific dimension" section :

I would encourage the author to provide a critical discussion of the central premise of the article which is "publicly funded means openly licenced" in light of the recent book
D. Golumbia, Cyberlibertarianism: the right-wing politics of digital technology. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2024.
In this book there is a strong claim on the practices of Wikipedia. On page 8 Golumbia claims: "(…) the connotation that the "right" to obtain works of intellectual property without compensation to their creators was in some way aligned with human rights".
In my opinion the PFMOL-argument benefits from a more in-depth discussion on cyberlibertarian capture of open content.

I also encourage the author to take this publication into account:
P. Mirowski, „The future(s) of open science", Soc Stud Sci, Bd. 48, Nr. 2, S. 171–203, 2018, doi: 10.1177/0306312718772086.
Here, the topic is open science but there are learnings for the open education movement.

Another point is that it would be helpful to situate the PFMOL-argument in the context of neoliberalism in education as described in Chapter 6:
W. Brown, Undoing the demos: neoliberalism's stealth revolution. in Near futures. Brooklyn: Zone books, 2015.

On page 10 in the article, the author states that the "information super highway remains open". Here I would like to draw the attention to the recent incident regarding WordPress as discussed in this podcast: https://techwontsave.us/episode/249_the_corruption_of_open_source_w_tante

There seems to be some overlapping throughout the article with the field "Critical Digital Pedagogy". It would be interesting to contrast the two fields of open education and CDP to validate the central argument.

3 - Tables, Figures and language

Are visual artefacts self-contained (i.e. without the text)? *

Not applicable ⌄

Do visual artefacts have an added value ? *

◯ No
◯ slightly
◯ Yes
⦿ Not applicable

Is language an obstacle to understand the content ? *

⦿ No
◯ Slightly
◯ Yes

Provide here any information you wish to bring to the attention of authors, related to your review of the "Tables, Figures and language" section :

4 - Beneficiaries and impact

Are the beneficiaries of the content clearly stated ? *

i.e. for whom is the content of the article relevant (scholars, young researchers, citizens, decisions makers, etc.) ?

6 - Strongly agree ⌄

Is the potential impact of the content mentioned ? *

i.e. does the content of the article have societal impact beyond academic borders ?

- ○ No
- ○ Slightly
- ● Yes
- ○ Not applicable

Provide here any information you wish to bring to the attention of authors, related to your review of the "beneficiaries and impact" section :

The situation of open education is excellent. Yet, in the second paragraph of the introduction, there could be a more nuanced discussion about the overall impact of open education, not just the contrast between learning with open vs. closed content.

5 - Overall feedback

Please provide your overall feedback to start a constructive discussion with the author so that he or she can improve the contribution.
*

I think the overall approach of the article is comprehensive. To make it more compelling, I suggest to situate the central argument within the context of Cyberlibertarianism (Golumbia, Mirowksi), which is the playbook for the current harrowing developments in the US. To prevent open education from a neoliberal, cyberlibertarian capture, we should know their arguments and rhetorical tropes.

Reviewer Files

🔍 Search   **Upload File**

No Files

Recommendation

Set or adjust the reviewer recommendation.

Revisions Required ▾

Reviewer 2

Michael Adrian Peters

Strengths
1. **Theoretical Innovation**:
   - The paper makes a significant contribution by linking **cosmopolitanism** and **cosmopolitics** to open education, a novel approach that bridges political

philosophy and educational practice. The critique of the policy mantra "publicly funded should mean openly licensed" as reflecting "weak moral cosmopolitanism" is thought-provoking and adds depth to policy debates.
   - The appropriation of **Leonelli's (2023) framework** (openness as sharing vs. openness as judicious connection) to distinguish between global/situated forms of open education is compelling. This duality effectively categorizes Open Educational Resources (OER) as global/universal and Open Educational Practices (OEP) as relational/local, offering clarity to often-overlapping concepts.

2. **Timeliness and Relevance**:
   - The focus on tensions between universalist cosmopolitan ideals (e.g., global citizenship) and localized imperatives (e.g., decolonization, equity) addresses critical gaps in open education discourse. This aligns with contemporary debates about social justice and inclusion, making the paper highly relevant.

3. **Structural Clarity**:
   - The logical progression from outlining open education to critiquing cosmopolitanism and proposing a cosmopolitical framework demonstrates strong organizational coherence. The abstract suggests a well-structured argument that balances theoretical critique with practical implications.

Weaknesses and Areas for Development
1. **Empirical Grounding**:
   - The paper appears heavily theoretical, relying on conceptual frameworks without empirical evidence or case studies. Incorporating examples of how cosmopolitics manifests in open education (e.g., regional OER adaptations, decolonized curricula) would strengthen its applicability.

2. **Resolution of Tensions**:
   - While the abstract surfaces tensions between universalism and localized justice, it does not explicitly detail how a cosmopolitical perspective resolves these. A deeper exploration of mechanisms for balancing global/local priorities (e.g., governance models, community-driven licensing) is needed.

3. **Risk of Dichotomy Oversimplification**:
   - The binary framing of OER (global) vs. OEP (situated) risks oversimplifying their interplay. For instance, OER can be locally contextualized, and OEP often relies on global infrastructures. Nuancing this relationship would avoid reductive categorization.

4. **Practical Implications**:
   - The conclusion advocates for educators to adopt a cosmopolitical lens but lacks actionable guidance. How might educators operationalize this perspective? Recommendations for policy, pedagogy, or institutional support would enhance impact.

Key Recommendations
1. **Deepen Engagement with Decolonization/Equity**:
   - Explicitly address how cosmopolitics intersects with decolonial praxis. For example, explore how Indigenous knowledge systems challenge or align with cosmopolitan ideals in OER/OEP.

2. **Incorporate Case Studies**:
   - Use examples like UNESCO's OER Recommendations (global) paired with regional initiatives (e.g., Open Education Latin America) to illustrate cosmopolitical dynamics.

3. **Clarify Cosmopolitical Agency**:
   - Define the role of educators as "cosmopolitical actors" navigating global/local tensions. What competencies or ethical frameworks would this require?

4. **Policy Implications**:
   - Discuss how institutions and governments might reconcile "openly licensed" mandates with localized justice (e.g., licensing flexibility, community consent protocols).

Conclusion
Farrow's paper is a timely and theoretically rigorous intervention in open education research. By introducing cosmopolitics, it advances discussions about the field's political dimensions and offers a fresh lens for reconciling universalist aspirations with situated practices. However, its impact hinges on addressing the lack of empirical grounding and providing clearer pathways for implementation. With revisions emphasizing praxis and nuanced examples, this work could become a cornerstone for reimagining open education's role in a fractured yet interconnected world.

Score: Strong potential for publication with moderate revisions (e.g., 7/10 in current form).

Keywords: The chosen keywords are apt and reflect the paper's core themes. Ensure they are consistently threaded throughout the manuscript.
Audience: Scholars of open education, policy stakeholders, and practitioners invested in critical pedagogy and global justice.

Final Note: Given the Open University's leadership in open education, leveraging institutional case studies could further bolster the argument's credibility.

Reviewer 3

Helen Titilola Olojede

The annotated file was shared with the author.
1.   The arguments could be better arranged, articulated and substantiated for clarity. When this has been done even if one disagrees with the position of the article regarding cosmopolitics and not cosmopolitanism, the article would have been better well put together that disagreeing with the logic would be difficult.
2.   Accept with minor revision

Specific comments in a very first version of the text were following:
"I struggle to see the import of this section to the development of the argument for cosmopolitics." (3.1.2)
How can we make sense of the commitment to social justice in light of cosmopolitanism? Is cosmopolitanism a form of social justice, or does it take away from the specificity and particularity of claims to social justice?
"These questions are germane and need some answers. If properly articulated, it could be part of the justification for the need for cosmopolitics"
Moral cosmopolitanism struggles to accommodate the non-human as innately valuable.
"This requires justification and proper explication while emphasising the need to rather move to cosmopolitics"
I suggest a concept of cosmopolitics that can facilitate this realignment for open educators.
"There is an extensive argument on the commons, good job. However, fundamentally, there is a need to articulate in clear terms and probably with sectional heads the strengths and weaknesses of cosmopolitanism with justification for the need for cosmopolitics."
"Cosmopolitics? So, how do you respond to the arguments against cosmopolitics?"
AI providers have exhibited disregard for intellectual property rights, utilizing copyrighted content scraped from the internet to train language models. This practice raises concerns about the integrity and sustainability of the commons, as AI-generated materials, which are not currently copyrightable, effectively launder copyrighted content into the public domain.
"Is cosmopolitanism not better suited for the GenAI age than cosmopolitics even as its impact on the commons is still unfolding?"