

Which Inclusive Globalization?¹

Sarita Albagli²

My presentation has as starting points two sets of propositions.

One is inspired by the statements of the French anthropologist of Science, Bruno Latour, for whom “For 50 years, what is called ‘globalization’ has in fact consisted in two opposing phenomena that have been systematically confused.” (Latour, 2018, p. 12).

Latour points out that, on the one hand,

“Shifting from a local to a global viewpoint ought to mean multiplying viewpoints, registering a greater number of varieties, taking into account a larger number of beings, cultures, phenomena, organisms, and people.” (Latour, 2018, p. 12).

This he calls “globalization-plus”.

On the other hand, according to him, today the term globalization

“is used to mean a single vision, [in fact] entirely provincial [...], representing a very small number of interests, limited to a few measuring instruments, to a few standards and protocols”. [It] “has been imposed on everyone and spread everywhere” (Latour, 2018, p. 13).

This he calls “globalization-minus”.

¹ This text was presented at the [COASPA 2019](#), held in Copenhagen from 24 to 26 September, 2019, as Keynote Speech of Panel 2 “Inclusive globalization – views from developing regions”.

² Collaborating Researcher at the Brazilian Institute of Information in Science and Technology (IBICT). Email [sarita.albagli\[at\]gmail.com](mailto:sarita.albagli[at]gmail.com) ORCID <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0030-8964>

My second set of propositions is based on the work that I and my research group³ have been developing on the role of open Science to social change. In order to do that, we have worked on conceptual frameworks and practical experiments⁴, which point out to the central role of an ethical and (bio)political framework.

It is from these propositions that I intend to bring some points of discussion – and above all questions – about the possible meanings of an inclusive globalization, and about the role of Science in this matter.

I have structured my presentation in four argumentative axes, as follows.

(a) My first point is that this debate must be situated in the context of urgency and complexity in facing the critical state of the world today, in particular the climate emergency. I propose that the emerging climate regime should correspond to a new regime of knowledge and information.

This brings into question the need and the viability to promote joined efforts for and dialogue on our endangered collective futures, as well as questioning the very concept of “global”.

A new category of global issues emerges – political, economic, social, migratory, environmental, the latter threatening the very life on the planet. On the one hand, everyone is under threat and has a duty to act on it; on the other hand, the causes and impacts of this crisis are not equally distributed, which means different conditions and responsibilities to tackle it.

³ Interdisciplinary Laboratory of Information and Knowledge Studies <http://www.liinc.ibict.br>

⁴ See particularly [the action research developed as part of the OCSDNet](#), whose main results are in Albagli, Parra, Fonseca and Maciel (2019). A [video](#) about the same project is also available.

This also imposes new tasks and challenges to Science. Science is called directly to action and to review its role and mode of operation. It is required not only new agendas (“what to do”), but above all new ways of intervention (“how to do it”). The current crisis corresponds to a crisis of solutions, which demands new ways of approaching problems, other knowledge bases, and also other ways of doing Science.

It should also be noted that most of humanity is excluded from major scientific infrastructure, or rather, it is included in an exclusionary mode. In quantitative terms, most Science is produced or at least made visible in the countries that concentrate just one fifth of the planet’s population. Therefore Science and Technology (S&T) research agendas have been dominated by issues that do not correspond to the needs and priorities of most of those located in less developed economies. This reveals the existence of “two scientific worlds”, and a new form of "peripheral" integration on the global stage (Annan, 2003).

Science and technology are thus at the core of major contemporary geopolitical inequalities at the world level.

At the same time, the current crisis of institutional representation and of representative democracy has also affected the public perception of Science. It has led to a movement of discredit in the methods and findings of scientific knowledge, thereby disqualifying its role and contribution to signaling, understanding and addressing contemporary critical issues and their solutions. This includes positions such as the denial of the current climate change and its anthropogenic causes, flat earth theory, opposition to vaccination, as well as reactions to scientific advances in ethnic, racial and gender issues, women's and mental health, drug policies, among other topics.

This scenario is even more dramatic, at least for most Latin American countries, particularly in Brazil today, with the drastic cutbacks and the unprecedented dismantling of the institutional infrastructure that supports public research and education.

The solution to these problems requires new forms of relationship between Science and society.

Nevertheless, crises may also (and may not) open up new opportunities.

The question is to what extent does the pressure for alternative development styles lead Science to be permeable to other values and practices, or even motivate paradigmatic shifts in Science power structures. More specifically, if there is room for a global thinking in this context; what does it mean; and what role should it play. The ethical-political question that is posed there is: what counts? And who counts?

I will return to this point later on.

(b) My second point is that the challenge of a global Science involves more than having access to or circulating contributions of scholars from different parts of the world. It also involves the recognition of other epistemologies and narratives, as well as the contributions both from the peripheries and “from below”.

Since the end of 1960s, criticisms were directed at the role of the dominant scientific and technological patterns, especially in the last two centuries, in the deterioration of the planet's environmental conditions.

Questions have also been raised about the epistemic universality of established Science. Many point out that Western scientific paradigms have promoted invisibility and created obstacles to the development and

recognition of other and more diverse scientific trajectories and types of knowledge that could make room for more sustainable development roads.

The thesis of a "universal" thought (as equivalent to modern Western Science) has been contested, giving way to the idea that knowledge has a perspective character, that regimes of truth and epistemic authority are formed based on institutional rules conditioned by power relations and cultural biases (Foucault 2002 [1973]).

In this context, a set of counter-hegemonic views on knowledge and Science has emerged, expressing, in Michel Foucault's words, a true "insurrection of subjected knowledge" (Foucault, 2003 [1997]).

It originates from various lines of thought inspired by and inspiring social movements – from environmentalism to feminist and queer theories⁵, anti-racist, postcolonial⁶, decolonial⁷, and subaltern studies⁸, the pedagogy of the oppressed (Freire, 2005 [1970]) the ecology of knowledges and the epistemologies of the South (Santos, 2014).

Part of these lines of thought assumes that contemporary scientific knowledge must be situated within historical geopolitical asymmetries. This is the case of the post-colonial perspective and its "decolonial inflection" from the Latin American thought. The latter proposes the notions of "coloniality of knowledge" and of "geopolitics of knowledge" (Mignolo, 2002), expressing how colonialism constituted a globalized system of power that reverberates in the contemporary mode of scientific production.

⁵⁵ Such as Donna Haraway, Judith Butler, Lelia Gonzalez, Sandra Harding, Michelle Murphy...

⁶ Such as Aimé Césaire, Frantz Fanon, Albert Memmi, Edward Said, Homi Bhabha...

⁷ Such as Aníbal Quijano, Enrique Dussel, Walter Mignolo...

⁸ The subaltern studies have roots in Indian thinkers, such as Ranajit Guha, Dipesh Chakrabarty e Gayatri Spivak.

It has also been disputed certain conceptions used to describe the global geopolitical structure, such as developing and developed countries and regions which expresses a clear hierarchy in the global system, based on the imposition of an ideal and idealized development style.

The notions of Global South and Global North, Eastern and Western societies have also been criticized. In this respect, Edward Said (1978) had already argued that the East was forged by the West, as an 'invention' that kept aside (as an externality) the Otherness of the non-Western societies. We could think from this same perspective of the North-South division.

In all cases, these are categories that suffer from the same inadequacy, as they homogenize very diverse and heterogeneous economic, political and social realities into totalizing and monolithic overarching blocks.

Some of those counter hegemonic theoretical frameworks prefer non-essentialist or determinist approaches about geopolitical positions, arguing that they should serve as open fields for formulating and enunciating other ways that would allow them to reconstruct their own narratives.

Overall, these lines of thought have sought to make visible the worldviews and epistemic frames of traditional peoples, vulnerable populations, socially stigmatized groups, lay expertise, and also peripheral Science, valuing their role to face the present planetary crisis. They propose to promote what they consider to be cognitive justice, paradigm-other, and border thinking, among others terms.

Hommi Bhabha (1994) mobilizes the idea of knowledge hybridization which implies that other and 'denied' knowledge *infiltrates* the dominant discourse and destabilizes the basis of its authority and rules.

Isabelle Stengers talks about a “cosmopolitics” (Stengers, 2010) as a way to promote and respect an “ecology of practices” (Stengers, 2005) as a basis to epistemic pluralism.

All those propositions may open up new ways to re-situate Science as a creative and open endeavor.

(c) My third point proposes to establish a dialogue between this debate and the issues raised by the open Science movements.

Almost 20 years after the Budapest Open Access Initiative⁹ (BOAI, 2002), the open Science debate poses new agendas and issues for scientific production and communication. Scientific journals, in particular, are challenged to renew their practices, criteria and formats, considering aspects such as: access to data; open peer review; alternative metrics; adoption of more friendly formats to content and metadata retrieval; attribution of (co) authorship and acknowledgment of the contribution of citizen scientists; open infrastructures, among others (Appel & Albagli, forthcoming).

Thus we understand open Science as a movement of movements, a process under construction, that mobilises different (and sometimes conflicting) interests and points of view (Albagli, 2014).

In this sense, similarly to other social change processes, open Science and open access have been affected and redirected by reaction and counter-reaction forces. On the one hand, there are the pressures and demands for expanding speed and the means of collaboration in research, by opening its results. On the other hand, powerful economic agents -- commercial publishers in particular -- reposition themselves in this new scenario. They

⁹ <https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org>

have developed new business strategies in order to maintain, or even extend, their profit rates, as well as their protagonism in decision-making systems that affect the circulation of Science, and thus the conditions of scientific production.

I will not go into detail here, because I believe this topic will be further addressed in the next presentations of this panel¹⁰.

Suffice it to say that those new business models, especially open access by charging authors, have had uneven repercussions contributing to increase the asymmetries between the scientific systems of the different countries. It should be noted that, over the past 20 years, while European countries and the United States – the Global North -- have maintained a system of scientific publications combining commercial and non-commercial publishers, in Latin America most scientific journals have been publicly funded, keeping open access free of charge to authors and readers (Appel & Albagli 2019).

In Latin American countries, therefore, the main risk is that the article processing charge (APC) model prevails and their open access policies migrate to a centrally commercial model. It is argued that while in the advanced economy, the interest is to maintain research conditions by expanding open access publications, even if in the commercial hybrid model, in Southern countries, the main challenge is to expand research conditions while maintaining open access publications free of charge and with autonomy in its governance (Debat & Balbini 2019).

¹⁰ Panel 2 “Inclusive globalization – views from developing regions”, with presentations of Fernanda Beigel (Argentina), Robin Crewe (South Africa) and Shahid Jameel (India) at the [COASPA 2019](#).

Another emerging business model in scientific publishing has been the provision of paid services by commercial publishers or companies associated with them in verticalized structures for the development of tools and platforms of data extraction and analysis, as part of an emerging data or platform capitalism (Chen, Posada & Chan 2019). Scientific journals (that is their authors and readers) have increasingly produced data used to support monitoring and evaluation processes that subsidize research reward and funding mechanisms.

In addition to the economic dependence caused by this business model, there is also a risk of increasing subordination of academic communities, especially in peripheral economies, to evaluation criteria and methodologies guided by external and even algorithmic parameters, often far from their interests and realities.

To a large extent, the so-called internationalization-based quality criteria determine these parameters and feed into these businesses.

In this respect, Cameron Neylon (2018) criticizes what he calls the dominance of the “performance of excellence rather than excellent performance”¹¹. In the post he produced for Scielo's 20th Anniversary, Neylon points out that:

“Our systems of research evaluation systematically privilege what is seen as ‘international’ – which is really code for ‘North Atlantic’ [...]. “The arrogation of ‘excellence’ to the North Atlantic centres of traditional prestige [...] represent[s] a neo-colonial process imposing new and inappropriate forms of quality assurance, with the implicit goal of creating a new cycle of dependency (usually referred to ‘creating new markets for

¹¹ Vessuri et al. (2014) had already problematized the implications of the duality of excellence and quality criteria on the position of Latin American countries in international competition regimes on Science.

services') on systems built for and within the North Atlantic region.”
(Neylon, 2018)

The so-called Global South does not want to be transformed into mere data producers - as raw material for what is called an advanced Science - nor into mere consumers of paid products and services derived from value-added data.

At the same time, the debate on Open Science expands, or rather, transcends, the so-called scientific field, as formulated by Pierre Bourdieu (1976).

It has been noticed that Open Science does not concern only the potential and facility for generating and circulating information and knowledge within scientific communities – that is, in a new form of scientific productivism. It also implies the overthrowing of hierarchies, of established sources of authority and of reputation. Resuming the discussion of the previous item of this presentation, Open Science supposes the greater porosity of Science in its dialogue with other types of knowledge considering the broad spectrum of actors and spaces for producing knowledge, and for formulating different questions (Albagli, 2014).

In this sense, the traditional notions of popularization of Science give way to the idea of knowledge co-production, advocating for more horizontal relations between distinct epistemic bases, valuing the fertility of their mutual affections. Citizen Science itself is urged to move toward an extreme citizen Science (Stevens et al., 2014).

Therefore the very idea of openness is under dispute. One must question: opening for whom? And under what conditions?

What is at stake is not merely the quantitative dimension of openness – to focus on access – but its qualitative aspect - the kind of knowledge we want to produce.

This has clear reflections on the geopolitics of knowledge and on the kind of globalization we should pursue.

(d) My fourth and last point takes up the initial question about which inclusive globalization we are referring to. Here I will reinforce the thesis of a common Science or a Science of the common.

Going back to my first point – the current global crisis, the roles of a global thought, and the clash between a globalization-plus perspective and a globalization-minus one -- we must face the fact that there is no consensus about what the planet should be, nor about the meaning of living and being together.

Life -- the right to existence and the possibility of a variety of modes of existence -- constitute the very body of an ecology of knowledges, as a source of creativity and as a condition for designing future alternatives.

An ecology of knowledges corresponds in its turn to an ecology of powers. As much as deforestation and forest fires annihilate the biodiversity stocks, the ongoing war against indigenous and traditional communities -- but also against migrants, social minorities, black and poor people -- also annihilates socio and knowledge diversity. Both are requirements for facing the current planetary crisis.

This is not only an academic debate. It has significant repercussions both in the field of politics and of policies. Development policies and knowledge policies are increasingly intertwined.

On the other hand, there is no single solution and policy prescription; instead there are a myriad of alternatives that could take different forms for different societies in different places and times.

This is a crucial issue if we want to promote the great conversation in Science. Such conversation indicates going beyond an ethics of coexistence between different epistemological matrices towards a perspective of polyphony, of communication in its original etymological sense of “becoming common”.

In this sense, the Spanish researcher Antonio Lafuente proposes the term “common Science” (Lafuente & Estalela, 2015). For him, *common* implies not only the sense of common goods -- the commons --. *Common* is above all a relational concept. It mainly refers to the “in between”, the relationship with diversity, with the other.

Common might also mean the ordinary, that which is not sacred or hierarchically superior, different again from the idea of commons, which contains the symbolism of the sacred – of earth, water and of knowledge itself¹².

For Lafuente and Estalela, “The goods we want to protect are not knowledge itself, but the plurality of forms of socialization it promotes. [...] The commons would then be a historically differentiate way of producing knowledge, community and commitment.” (Lafuente & Estalela, 2015, p. 33).

This supposes to broaden and deepen our theoretical and conceptual frameworks in order to further develop a point of view based on the perspectives, characteristics and potentialities of different socio-territorial

¹² On this issue see also Albagli et al. (2019).

contexts. Our task should be to create open spaces and open infrastructures in which the diversity of lines of thought and ways of being can speak and can be heard, recognizing and considering the different actors and visions, not only the dominant or institutionalized ones, but also the 'peripheral' / the emerging ones.

Science needs this criticism. Above all the Science that dictates standards, parameters and protocols and which dominates infrastructures worldwide. Making explicit these existing tensions, conflicts and differences can be a road to the construction of a common world and a common future.

REFERENCES

- Albagli, S. (2015). Open Science in Question In: S. Albagli, M.L. Maciel, & A. H. Abdo (Eds.). *Open Science, Open Issues*. Brasília: Ibict; Rio de Janeiro: Unirio. Available at <http://livroaberto.ibict.br/handle/1/1061>
- Albagli, S., Clinio, A., Parra, H., & Fonseca, F. (2019). Beyond the Dichotomy between Natural and Knowledge Commons: Reflections on the IAD Framework from the Ubatuba Open Science Project In L. Chan, & P. Mounier (Eds.) *Connecting the Knowledge Commons: from Projects to Sustainable Infrastructure*. Elpub 2018; Open Edition Press. Available at <https://books.openedition.org/oep/9029>
- Albagli, S., Parra, H., Fonseca, F., & Maciel, M.L. (2019). Open Science and Social Change: A Case Study in Brazil. In L. Chan, A. Okune, B. Hillyer, D. Albornoz, & A. Posada (Eds.). *Contextualizing Openness: Situating Open Science*. University of Ottawa Press. Available at <https://www.idrc.ca/en/book/contextualizing-openness-situating-open-science>.
- Annan, K. (2003). A challenge to the world's scientists. *Science*, 299, 1485.
- Appel, A.L, & Albagli, S. (2019). The adoption of Article Processing Charges as a business model by Brazilian Open Access journals. *Transinformação*, 31. doi <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/2318-0889201931e180045>

Appel, A.L., & Albagli, S. (forthcoming). Acesso aberto em questão: novas agendas e desafios.

Bourdieu, P. (1976). Le champ scientifique. *ARRS*, n. 2, p. 88-104.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Debat H. & Babini, D. (2019). Plan S in Latin America: A precautionary note. *PeerJ Preprints* 7:e27834v2
<https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.27834v2>

Chen, G.; Posada, A., & Chan, L. (2019) Vertical Integration in Academic Publishing: Implications for Knowledge Inequality In L. Chan, & P. Mounier (Eds.) *Connecting the Knowledge Commons: from Projects to Sustainable Infrastructure*. Elpub 2018; Open Edition Press. Available at: <https://books.openedition.org/oep/9068>

Foucault, M. (2002 [1973]). *A verdade e as formas jurídicas*. Rio de Janeiro: Nau Editora.

Foucault, M. (2003 [1997]). *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976*. New York: Picador.

Freire, P. (2005 [1970]). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum. Available at: https://commons.princeton.edu/inclusivepedagogy/wp-content/uploads/sites/17/2016/07/freire_pedagogy_of_the_oppressed_ch2-3.pdf

Lafuente, A., & Estalella, A. (2015). "Ways of Science: public, open, and commons." In S. Albagli, S., M.L. Maciel, & A.H. Abdo (Eds). *Open Science, open issues*. Brasília: Ibict, Rio de Janeiro: Unirio. Available at <http://livroaberto.ibict.br/handle/1/1061>

Latour, B. (2018). *Down to Earth: politics in the New Climatic Regime*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Mignolo, W. D. (2001). The Geopolitics of Knowledge and the Colonial Difference. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 101(1), 57-98.

Neylon, C. (2018). The Local and the Global: Puncturing the myth of the "international" journal [online]. *SciELO in Perspective*, 2018. Available at: <https://blog.scielo.org/en/2018/09/03/the-local-and-the-global-puncturing-the-myth-of-the-international-journal/>

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Santos, B. S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide*. London: Paradigm Publishers.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). 'Can the subaltern speak?' in C.Nelson, & L.Grossberg (Eds.). *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Urbana,IL: University of Illinois Press.

Stengers, I. (2005). *Introductory Notes on an Ecology of Practices*. Cultural Studies Review, (11) 1, March.

Stengers, I. (2010 [2003]). *Cosmopolitics v. I and II*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Stevens, M., Vitos, M., Altenbuchner, J., Conquest, G., Lewis, J., & Haklay, M. (2014). Taking Participatory Citizen Science to Extremes. *Pervasive Computing*, April-June.

Vessuri, H., Guédon, & J-C. & Cetto, A.M. (2014). Excellence or quality? Impact of the current competition regime on Science and scientific publishing in Latin America and its implications for development. *Current Sociology* 62 (5): 647-65. doi <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392113512839>.