DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Reading Differently
Expanding Open Access Definitions Towards Greater Knowledge Equity

Kiesewetter, Hanna Rebekka

Award date:
2023

Awarding institution:
Coventry University

Reading Differently:

Expanding Open Access Definitions Towards Greater Knowledge Equity

By

Hanna Rebekka Kiesewetter

PhD

March 2023

Reading Differently:

Expanding Open Access Definitions Towards Greater Knowledge Equity

Hanna Rebekka Kiesewetter

-

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the University's requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

March 2023

Coventry University

Certificate of Ethical Approval

Applicant:	Hanna Kiesewetter
Project Title:	Reading Differently: Expanding Open Access Definitions Towards Greater Knowledge Equity

This is to certify that the above named applicant has completed the Coventry University Ethical Approval process and their project has been confirmed and approved as Medium Risk

Date of approval:	23 Apr 2021
Project Reference Number:	P121406

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Writing this thesis was a shared undertaking that I cannot (and still have to) claim credit for. I have written, have been written and unwritten, in a form of profound co-authorship without a clearly marked beginning or end. This PhD has taken shape through the struggles, sufferings, labours, dedication, joys, and insights of others who I would like to credit in what follows. However, I most likely cannot avoid missing the names of some that have contributed to this PhD, and I hope that they will forgive me.

Thanks to everybody I quoted in this thesis: for bringing me to places real and imagined, for letting me explore a fragment of an ever changing universe, thoughts beyond my thoughts, languages beyond my own; for paving the ground for new encounters and relationships; for the 99 times you made me lose hope that academic publishing would ever become different and for the 100 times which you let me regain this hope.

Thanks to Janneke Adema and Samuel Moore (as well as Kaja Marczewska who accompanied the formation of this PhD at its very beginning): for being the most amazing, generous, and inspiring supervisors, mentors, cheering-up-ers, and friends. I'm incredibly grateful for all the time, patience, energy, ideas, thoughts, and heart you have invested in this PhD (and so far beyond it).

Thank you Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, and Stefano. Thank you for reading together, for your trust, for embracing the muddiness, for being open, generous, playful, smart, and inspirational despite. I hope our paths will cross again soon.

Thank you to Gary Hall and everyone working at the Centre for Postdigital Cultures at Coventry University, now and in the past. You have made me feel part of the team rather than silo-ing me off into PhD-dom. I am very grateful for this.

Thank you Janneke Adema, Simon Bowie, Gary Hall, Julien McHardy, Toby Steiner, and everybody else working with the *Community-led Open Publishing Infrastructures for Monographs* (COPIM) project's experimental publishing group for being wonderful friends and comrades. You have made (and you are continuing to work passionately and ceaselessly to further make) academia a great place to be.

Thank you Annavittoria Sarli, Anna Papoutsi, Ellena Savage, Maddalena Fragnito, and Zrinka Užbinec for being the most wonderful Lea House housematefriends. I couldn't have written this PhD without your care, love, and patience; without our kitchen conversations, without Tarot, without our nights in and out, without you letting me be strange, and without being strange together.

Thank you to all the pirates out there (and especially to Tomislav Medak and Marcell Mars): my PhD would have been different without you.

Thanks to everybody at Caneat in Stirchley, Birmingham: for the smiles, the chats, the coffees, the "coffee mug messages" (Kate & Edward!), and for making each day a bit brighter.

Thank you Aline, Alex K. & Alex K., Andreas, Andrew, Anna, Anthon, Berit, Cap, Carina, Chris, Claudia A. & Claudia S., Cristina, Daniel, Dorit, Dubi, Ethel, Gabriela, Gioia, Giovanni, Inga, Jamie, Janneke, Liv, Luc, Marco, Marie, Marius, Marta, Matti, Michael, Michi, Mirijam, Nina, Päde, Philipp, Rahel, Rizzi, Ronnie, Salome, Stefan, Stefano, Theres, Thöme, Ursina, Vanessa, and Yasmin: for being a home, for listening, for hugging, for being strict sometimes, for being a rock, for the inspiration, for the company, for the distraction, for the phone calls and messages, for letting me be someone else than my PhD-self.

Thanks to Barbara, Martin, David, and Simon Kiesewetter for loving unconditionally, for always being there, for being wise, for staying interested, for keeping up with my whimsies, for saying the right words at the right time. Thank you Bumä-Familie for what you are and for what I have become.

Thanks to Nigel Christian for being golden.

Abstract

This practice-based thesis is situated in the globalised sphere of digital knowledge production in the context of Open Access (OA) publishing. It is reading different accounts of the history of knowledge production and a broad variety of approaches to OA publishing – emerging in English and non-English speaking research cultures, in diverse economic, socio-political, and disciplinary contexts – together. As part of this reading, this thesis emphasises the dominant humanist tendencies in this discourse as well as the attempts to critique them. By doing so, it problematises persisting inequities in the field – what can be called a Eurocentric or neo-imperialist bias – and presents ways to create more diverse and equitable conditions for OA publishing today.

This thesis puts forward that increasing participation in the *processes and practices* of scholarly knowledge creation (such as research, writing, and editing) and sharing (such as reading and publishing) – and seeing this as an inherent part of OA publishing – is key to facilitating fairer conditions for OA publishing. The focus of many prominent approaches to OA publishing has instead been on extending access to *research outputs* (such as papers and books), thereby restricting OA publishing to the consumption of knowledge. To substantiate this claim, this thesis conceptualises critical OA publishing as a distinct OA tradition – reflective of a variety of strands within OA publishing – positioned within a longer history of "antagonist" theoretical and practical engagements with dominant (humanist) epistemologies. This genealogical positioning emphasises that critical OA advocates have always stressed that OA publishing should not only be about how readers consume texts, but also about who has access to, and controls the governance of, the means of knowledge production; it elucidates why this includes an attentiveness to the processes and practices of knowledge production as sites of struggle for knowledge equity and diversity; and it helps me to devise a novel *interventionist (reading) methodology.*

This methodology is one of the main outcomes of this thesis. It exemplifies and enacts how minimising the socio-cultural, behavioural, and linguistic barriers to participation in the processes and practices of knowledge production can advance knowledge equity and diversity. This methodology adds to critical experiments with writing, editing, and publishing conducted by critical OA advocates to facilitate fairer conditions for scholarship. It can be applied in various contexts of collaborative academic knowledge production (for example, research or writing). It has been devised based on the main insights from this thesis, it has been tested within two experimental online reading groups, *The Re-Reading Room*, and it is discussed in an experimental piece of writing.

Introduction

Research Context

The processes and practices of knowledge creation – research, writing, and editing, for example – and sharing – such as reading and publishing – are at the centre of what academics do.[1] These processes and practices frame how academics filter, engage with, and relate to knowledge, how they make sense of it, as well as how they write-up and convey their insights. These practices and processes also shape how academics relate with other agencies within knowledge production: institutions, texts, technologies, other scholars, and people outside of academia. One can think of how academics read in order to write; how they reference other authors in their publications in journals and books, take part in reading groups and social media discussions, and speak about their research at conferences; or how they engage (increasingly) in collaborative writing, editing, and review practices using digital writing platforms such as Google Docs or open source platforms such as HackMD.[2] The way in which researchers write and publish, where and how frequently they do so influences their careers across all disciplines and career levels. This is especially the case in those neoliberal institutional contexts in which successful participation in scholarly knowledge production is judged on the basis of individual research output, and is used as an incentive to reputation enhancement and career progression for individual researchers (Moore, 2019b).

Over the past decade Open Access (OA) publishing has proliferated as a framework for scholarly knowledge production. Research institutions, funding bodies, and governments have adopted OA mandates that recommend, or compel, researchers to make their peer-reviewed journal articles, long form writing (in books), and conference papers available in OA. In simplified terms, it can be said that OA publishing removes price restrictions to digitally published academic research so that anyone with an internet connection may access it (Moore, 2019a, b). However, since what frequently is

[1] I, in what follows, for the sake of brevity, often will refer to "knowledge creation and dissemination " as "knowledge production."

[2] HackMD is a collaborative open source collaboration platform and knowledge base.

considered as the beginning of OA publishing in the 1990s and 2000s,[3] there have been many different ideas about what OA publishing is and how it should be achieved. Large commercial publishers have increasingly discovered that OA publishing can be utilised as a business model to generate financial revenue. For example, by implementing a pay-to-publish model for OA research outputs in the form of Article or Book Processing Charges (APCs and BPCs), in which researchers or their institutions pay substantial amounts to publishers to make their research freely accessible (Guédon, 2008, 2017). Some OA advocates have focused on how OA publishing can reduce the cost of academic publishing (Mayor, 2004). Some have praised OA publishing's capacity to accelerate the distribution of scientific information, to ensure the visibility of publications, and to increase the number of citation per article (Eysenbach, 2006). Yet others have seen it as forming part of a movement that sets out to democratise global access to research (Willinsky, 2006, 2020).

The focus of many approaches to OA publishing in general, and to increasing access to scholarly research specifically, has been on removing price, legal and technical barriers to research outputs (such as papers and books). This focus is restricting OA publishing to the *consumption* of knowledge. Especially in the context of what I conceptualise as critical OA advocacy in this thesis, there have also been OA advocates who have stressed that OA publishing should not only be about how readers find and can consume texts, but also about who has access to, and controls the governance of, the means of knowledge *production* (Adema & Hall, 2013; Albornoz et al., 2017, 2018, 2020; Okune et al., 2019). Here, the discussion around OA publishing has been concerned with questions such as: who is able to participate in research, writing, and editing activities, under what conditions, in which ways, in which language(s), and according to which knowledge cultures and standards for knowledge creation (as embodied, for example, in writing and editing conventions).

The different motivations underlaying OA publishing that I discussed above, are, as Samuel Moore (2019b) stresses, "reflective of a range of business models and ethico-political positions, rather than a movement with a coherent ideological basis" (9). In other words, OA publishing is not one thing, it

[3] There are numerous genealogical considerations around OA publishing related to its various "flavours" (Willinsky, 2003). Some scholars acknowledge the importance of the Budapest (2002), Bethesda (2003), and Berlin (2003) declarations of OA to catalyse what appeared before as different spots of interest in the potential of digitisation to reduce price restrictions for scholarly publishing (see e.g., Mboa Nkoudou, 2020; Willinsky, 2006, 2020). This interest had been flaring up in diverse disciplinary and regional contexts. Moore (2017, 2019a) locates a pre-history of OA publishing in the early digital publishing practices of the humanities in the late '80s and early '90s, for example within journals such as *Surfaces* and *Postmodern Culture*. Others locate the origins of open access in the sciences, for example within science-based initiatives such as the pre-print server arXiv (1991) or the digital repository PubMed Central (1996) (Mandler, 2014; Severin et al., 2018), while others stress that the idea of sharing content for free has had a long pre-digital tradition, for example within scientific societies and their journals in the nineteenth century (Fyfe, 2020; Czisar, 2018; Guédon, 2017; Willinsky, 2006, 2020).

is understood and practiced differently within diverse ideological, epistemic, economical, and political contexts and communities of practice.

The way OA publishing is understood and approached within different communities of practice, situates these communities (and therewith the versions of OA publishing they promote) in relation to a larger context of what, by different stakeholders in academic communication, is evoked as a global sphere of academic publishing: for example, within arguments in which OA is promoted to accelerate innovation, impact of scholarship, and reputation for individual researchers globally (swissuniversities, n.d.; UKRI, n.d.). The "global-sphere of academic publishing" is a field in which, as I argue, there are persisting inequities in how knowledge production is administered and pursued. For example, several commercial publishing conglomerates including RELX, formerly known as Reed-Elsevier, as well as neoliberal universities, policy providers, and funding bodies, embed academic publishing within the logics of the knowledge-based economy. In this vision, scholarly publishing is assessed predominantly through an economic or market-based lens. For funders and universities, publishing – both in and outside of OA publishing – can promise financial return on investment, while for researchers it is promoted to offer opportunities for reputational reward and career progression.

In this context, there are various technological, infrastructural, and financial barriers that exclude certain communities from participating in global-scale scholarly knowledge production. See, for example, how many big publishers have now started to implement APCs and BPCs. This practice risks the exclusion of scholars from less affluent institutions and research areas, as well as early-career researchers, from publishing (Becerill-García, 2019, 2020). Additionally, global science, as promoted by large publishers, is increasingly unilingually English, which puts non-English speaking researchers at a disadvantage (Chen et al., 2019; Mboa Nkoudou, 2020).

Cultural and epistemic barriers are also responsible for the under-representation of certain researchers in the global scientific landscape. The bibliometric indicators (such as Elsevier's Cite Score or the (Journal) Impact Factor (JIF or IF)) promoted by large publishers to evaluate and compare research (and increasingly also researchers) globally are one such barrier. These metrics have been based on research quality standards deduced from Northern European and North American norms that are quintessentially positivist, in the sense that they emphasise objective observation and scientific method as the foundation of knowledge (Beigel, 2013; Beigel, 2018). These standards have directly influenced the submission guidelines of many international journals, especially English-language ones (Bouziane & Metkal, 2020). In a positivist understanding, writing neutrally and factually represents the social and natural world, while the writer's role is limited to the collection and interpretation of data (Blaikie, 2020). Research articles that do not conform to this understanding tend to be considered of lesser quality within this system and thus might risk

being declined by editorial boards (Knöchelmann, 2021). This marginalisation includes the outputs of contributors – some feminist or indigenous researchers, for example – that, in their research and writing, emphasise the importance of human experience and subjective perspectives for the acquisition of knowledge (Harding, 2002; Risam, 2019). When working within an academic reward and reputation system in which the publishing activities of academics is directly linked to generating monetary revenue or career progression, this marginalisation, among other things, results in an uneven distribution of the ability to speak and be heard globally and brings with it a potential loss of reputational and/or financial capital (Chan et al., 2020; Mboa Nkoudou, 2020).

I stress how the persisting inequities in commercial scholarly knowledge production in the humanities and social sciences are interrelated with Eurocentric perspectives that, as I argue, favour humanist epistemologies. These centre around the individual as a self-contained subject and emphasise notions such as human autonomy, reason, and control of the truth. A positive understanding of humanist epistemologies conceives of knowledge as objective and transcendental (and, hence, comparable according to uniform criteria) and a notion of the self-contained, rational, and singular author – able to represent an external truth through scientific reasoning and writing. Texts are here considered as authoritative and fixed, able to represent knowledge (or truth) free of contextual and subjective influences; while academic conventions – the way in which knowledge is written-up – are understood as mere matters of form and are assumed to be systems of representation and distinction (making the better, sounder, more innovative theory or claim).

These ideas shape and are shaped by the assessment and incentive structures within a large part of academic knowledge production today. Authors are understood in unity with their work: they are evaluated *at par* with their book, or text. Here, humanist ideas of the book, or text, as fixed, and the scholarly author – as a particular social identity, a rational and "measurable" subject – have become embedded within a reward system aligned with the idea of knowledge as a product. Concepts such as the book, or text, as static and the idea of the author as in unity with their work also remain the main reference on which copyright models and PDFs or ebooks are modelled.

Aims & Scopes

Taking this context as its starting point, this thesis sets out to problematise persisting inequities in the contemporary OA landscape and to suggest ways to create more diverse and equitable conditions for OA publishing. As a main argument, this thesis puts forward that enhancing participation in the *processes and practices* of knowledge production – and seeing this as a necessary part of OA publishing – is key to facilitating more equitable and diverse conditions in OA publishing.

To exemplify and enact how increasing the participation in the processes and practices of knowledge production can advance knowledge equity and diversity, this thesis proposes an *interventionist (reading) methodology* as one of its main outcomes. This methodology is focused on minimising the socio-cultural, behavioural, and linguistic barriers to equal and diverse participation in scholarly knowledge production. These barriers include the privileging of some ways of knowing over others and the insecurities of non-native English speakers in working environments dominated by native English speakers.

This thesis analyses the ever-changing and multifaceted OA landscape, while keeping a clear focus on issues of knowledge equity and diversity. In this thesis, I understand knowledge equity, on the one hand, as a reconsideration of what, in the wider context of academic knowledge production, has been deemed as valid knowledge. This reconsideration includes a problematisation of how certain communities, their knowledges, and knowledge practices, have – through imbalanced structures of power and privilege – been excluded from the discourse on what valid knowledge consists of (as well as from questioning the very nature of knowledge). On the other hand – while advocating for a pluralistic epistemological approach to knowledge building – knowledge equity strives to facilitate broad participation in this discourse, beyond barriers of cost, cultural, epistemic, and national borders (Gallagher & Blaney, 2021; Hall, 1997). By knowledge diversity I refer to a pluriversal approach to different knowledges (pluriversality has been proposed by Escobar (2018) as critique of Western-centric and humanist universalist approaches). This approach is stipulating that all knowledges are, in principle, valid and should co-exist in a dialogic relationship to each other. This idea is dependent on the possibility of diverse knowledge communities to define their own knowledges and the possibility to choose to actively take part in knowledge production on a local and global scale (Appadurai, 1996, 2000, 2006: Sen, 1985a, b).

In analysing the OA landscape under the focus of knowledge equity and diversity, this thesis poses and hopes to answer several questions regarding the ways in which OA publishing is predominantly being imagined and performed today. It does so with respect to the ways in which OA publishing is

positioned in relation to global-scale academic publishing in general; regarding the disputes that surround the past, present, and future of the OA publishing landscape; and in relation to the multiple ways in which scholars create and share their research. As part of this analysis, this thesis asks: What are the hegemonic politics, institutions, ideologies, and conventions that govern scholarly (OA) publishing in the humanities and social sciences? How are these dominant approaches to OA publishing situated in relation to commercial global-scale academic publishing and, consequently, in relation to the positivist interpretation of humanist epistemologies that the field has been dominated by? And how do these interrelations influence the way in which OA publishing is commonly conceptualised and theorised?

Against this background, in my thesis, I problematise the way in which certain dominant ideas about and approaches to OA publishing are interrelated with the commercial system of academic knowledge production. These visions of OA publishing have been promoted, amongst others, by some governmental agencies, policy providers, and funders such as the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) or the European Plan S (an initiative by cOAlition S, a consortium of national research agencies and funders so far largely based in Europe, attempting to align their OA policies). I show that actors like these do very little to formulate a clear position against commercial publishers' Eurocentrism. On the contrary, in some cases – through implementing, in their policies, their visions of OA publishing that are equally interrelated with humanist epistemologies – they may even contribute to some of the global power imbalances discussed previously. The same is true for more progressive liberal democratisation narratives emerging, since the early 2000s, around OA publishing in reaction to the ongoing commercialisation of the academic publishing landscape: humanist epistemologies are again the preferred hermeneutical basis upon which these approaches are conceptualised.

I show that the prevalence of humanist epistemologies as the hermeneutical basis upon which prominent ideas on OA publishing have been conceived – promoting an idea of knowledge as transcendental and universalist, for example – influences how a large part of OA publishing is overly focused on extending access to research outputs. Such a focus on research outputs, as I elaborate, runs the risk of ignoring the cultural and epistemic (who gets to speak, in which form and format), as well as linguistic (which languages are spoken) issues of marginalisation at play in the processes and practices that are part of knowledge production, specifically in the (humanist) ways in which they currently are predominantly performed.

However, as I stress, the visions and practices of commercial publishers and their connection to certain funder and policy-driven approaches to OA publishing are increasingly being critiqued in

practice from within what I, in this thesis, conceptualise as critical OA advocacy. With critical OA publishing I refer to an overarching framework reflective of a variety of strands within OA publishing – emerging at different times, in different geographical locations, and disciplinary backgrounds – following a range of motivations, business models, and ethico-political positions. What unites these different strands is, in the most general sense, their critique of the commercial publishing system, how certain approaches to OA publishing are connected to it, and the unequal relations of power maintained by this system. In consequence to this critique, critical OA publishing is positioned in an antagonistic relation to this system. For example, bibliometric indicators have been challenged through the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA); as well as by initiatives such as the Leiden Manifesto for Research Metrics, which advocates, among other things, for qualitative peer assessment rather than quantitative indicators (Hicks et al., 2015).[4] Additionally, organisations such as the Directory of OA Journals (DOAJ) and the Directory of OA Books (DOAB) reject rankings and aspire to index scientific and scholarly journals from all over the world according to their own quality control systems. In the case of the DOAJ, the basic standards for inclusion in this index list criteria such as the use of open licences, no fees for readers and authors, and immediate open access to all content (without embargo periods by means of which access to research output is temporarily restricted) (DOAJ, n.d.). With this, the DOAJ makes a case for actively fostering bibliodiversity.[5] As part of their antagonist positioning regarding the commercial sphere of academic knowledge production, scholar- and/or community-led initiatives in the field of critical OA publishing are also pushing forward a bottom-up, horizontal, collaborative, not-for profit ecosystem for international scholarly knowledge production. [6] By collaboratively setting up and sustaining horizontal OA

[4] The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) is aiming at eliminating the use of journal-based metrics, such as Journal Impact Factors, in funding, appointment, and promotion. Research, DORA stresses, should be acknowledged in all its cultural, linguistic, and epistemic diversity and consequently be assessed on its own merits rather than on the basis of the journal in which the research is published (DORA, n.d.). The Leiden Manifesto for Research Metrics proposes a shift in research evaluation, away from data analytics towards expert judgement. It was originally published as a comment in *Nature* and contains ten principles for the measurement of research performance (Hicks et al., 2015).

[5] Bibiliodiversity refers to the linguistic, cultural, methodological, and epistemic diversity of academic content and output, both on national and international levels. It emphasises the need for a variety of publications to be available to readers within a specific environment (for example, academia) and the importance of publishers and journal editors in fostering such a diversity. Within the for-profit logic in a part of the academic publishing sphere, the predominance of a few big commercial publishers, the dominance of English language publications, and humanism-centred writing standards as a main reference for academic writing – bibliodiversity is under threat (Giménez Toledo et al., 2019).

[6] Scholar-led is used to describe OA initiatives which are funded, governed, and managed by people working in the science sector operating on the basis of different, commercial and non-commercial, business models (Moore, 2019c). According to Steiner (2022) and Joy and Adema (2022), scholar-led includes not only researchers with an institutional affiliation but also explicitly researchers without affiliation, as well as other groups of people working in the science sector, for example, lecturers, librarians, and people working in research support services. Community-led is understood more broadly: it includes the larger community of OA stakeholders (for example, also non-academic publics) who are collectively working on the transformation of academic book publishing and emphasising the need to reorient publishing away from market concerns.

infrastructures, several initiatives including the consolidated repository, bibliographic database, and indexing system Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America and the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal (Redalyc), the cooperative communication infrastructure for scholarly publishing and open science, AmeliCA, and the Radical Open Access Collective, allow the scholarly community to retain control over the governance of publishing infrastructures. Redalyc was established in 2003 by the sociologist Eduardo Aguado López, the data scientist Arianna Becerril García, and the science communication scholar Salvador Chávez Ávila in the context of an academic research project at the Autonomous University of the State of Mexico (UAEM). Redalyc's aim has been to support journals in the transition to digital publishing "to give visibility and enhance the editorial quality of Social Sciences and Humanities journals from Latin America" (later also from Spain and Portugal) (Becerril García & Aguado Lopéz 2019, 8). Core principles of Redalyc include: an OA policy without publication or processing charges; the elimination of journal- and text-based metrics; as well as the support and promotion of local scientific approaches and linguistic diversity. Redalyc is supported by UAEM and, in 2022, received substantial funding from the UK-based Arcadia Fund (Redalyc, n.d.).

In 2018, Becerril García and Aguado López initiated AmeliCA that – in addition to and collaboration with Redalyc – consists of a cooperative cross-institutional infrastructure and platform that supports journals to operate without author or reader charges, by collectively sharing software, tools, hosting, and training services. AmeliCA, starting as an effort "conceived in the South and for the South" (Becerril García & Aguado Lopéz 2019, 14), has opened out towards all journals that work in support of an inclusive and equitable science communication ecosystem. It is positioned "in response to the financial sustainability crisis, the lack of recognition in current systems of science assessment and the exclusion of most journals from the region, which calls for new cooperative strategies so that various stakeholders of scientific communication may support, recognize and sustain Open Access" (AmeliCA, n.d.). AmeliCA is sustained by UNESCO, the Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO), Redalyc; and supported by the UAEM (Mexico), the Universidad de Antioquia (UdeA, Colombia). and the National University of La Plata (UNLP, Argentina).

The Radical Open Access Collective (ROAC) was formed in 2015. It consists of a community of around 70 international scholar-led, not-for-profit presses, journals and other open access projects providing mutual support. This support consists, among other things, of setting up a directory of academic-led presses and the creation of an information portal containing resources (from funding opportunities for open access books, over open-source publishing tools, to literature on OA publishing). Among the aims of the ROAC is to foster experimentation with and within forms and formats of humanities publishing and to support new and underrepresented knowledge cultures emerging around writing on niche topics, in spaces considered outside of the university or the global North and West (Radical OA Collective, n.d.).

In support of an alternative ecosystem for international scholarly knowledge production, various scholars, as well as scholar- and community-led and university presses an organisations (many of which are part of the ROAC) have started to explore new forms of digital scholarship. Among these presses are Mattering Press, Open Humanities Press, or Open Book Publishers), and initiatives such as RavenSpace – an initiative for digital publishing in Indigenous studies, created by UBC Press in partnership with the University of Washington Press, Indigenous and technology organizations, libraries, and museums. For example, they have experimented with novel approaches to collaborative, open, and horizontal scholarship, thereby challenging the humanist norms dominating conventional practices and processes of scholarly knowledge production (including individual authorship, or the fixity and linearity of text). Among other things, these scholars and presses have fostered experiments with the book's format and the way it is created, from multimodal publications to books that are published in different versions; or they strive to extend interactions around texts, through open peer review, social annotations, or collaborative writing and editing (Adema & Kiesewetter, 2022). In principle, open source tools and platforms, from Manifold, PubPub, and Scalar, to hypothes.is and BigBlueButton (BBB),[7] can offer scholars and presses enhanced opportunities to engage with these more open, horizontal, and collaborative formats, forms, and practices of scholarship.

The origin of critical OA's advocacy antagonist positioning in relation to established publishing systems is, as I argue in chapter 8 of this thesis, partially related to their common hermeneutical grounding of their approaches to OA publishing in a critique of dominant approaches to academic knowledge production (and the prevalence of humanist epistemologies in this field), and,

---

[7] Manifold is an open source publishing platform developed by University of Minnesota Press. It is used mostly by social science and humanities scholars to publish and read open-access books online (Manifold, n.d.). PubPub was initiated by the Knowledge Futures Group (founded in 2018 by MIT Press and the MIT Media Lab). It is an open source publishing platform supporting peer-reviewed scholarly journals and books, as well as publishing experiments created by, among other, university and library publishers, scholar-led presses, academic departments and research labs, and independent researchers (PubPub, n.d.). Scalar is a born-digital, free, and open source authoring and publishing platform. It is a project initiated by The Alliance for Networking Visual Culture (directed by the media scholar Tara McPherson) in association with the journal *Vectors* and the Institute for Multimedia Literacy (IML) at University of Southern California. It has been supported by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the U.S. based federal funding agency National Endowment for the Humanities. Scalar enables users to assemble audio-visual, image-based, and textual content from multiple sources and supports more experimental forms and formats of assembling and writing-up digital contents: for example, it supports non-linear formats, collaborative authoring, and reader commentary. Several presses and initiatives, such as the community-led Open Humanities Press and RavenSpace, have implemented PubPub and Scalar into their editing and publishing workflows. Hypothes.is is a community-led open source web-based annotation software that allows collaboratively annotating website contents and texts opened in a browser. BigBlueButton is an open source web conferencing platform.

consequently, in non-humanist or humanism-critical epistemologies (taking inspiration, for example, from indigenous, feminist, or post-humanist discourses). As I emphasise, the initiatives launched and the experiments conducted as part of critical OA advocacy, can open up the discourse around narrow definitions of OA publishing from extending access to research outputs towards access to (and control over) the means of knowledge production. This opening up also invites discussions about the participation in the processes and practices of knowledge production. The experiments proposed by critical OA advocates, raise important questions related to knowledge equity and diversity: for example about in how far and how the humanist norms and paradigms shaping the way in which research is currently predominantly being performed, made sense of, written up, and published contribute to exclusions from participation in knowledge production on the basis of socio-cultural and epistemic biases. The experiments performed by critical OA advocates offer opportunities to reperform these processes and practices in a potentially more equal and diverse way. In this thesis, I emphasise the performativity and importance of the approaches suggested within critical OA advocacy for establishing more diverse and equitable conditions for OA publishing.

However, for various reasons, the initiatives emerging in the context of critical OA publishing are often marginalised or not recognised as viable alternatives to dominant publishing ventures. The reasons for this include the persistent power of commercial approaches to OA publishing and the increasing complexity of the scholarly publishing landscape, which has led to authors, funders, and policymakers lacking "awareness of the diversity of models and initiatives that are available" (Chan et al 2020, 6). The marginalisation of critical OA advocacy contributes to the ongoing dominance of humanist epistemologies as the basis upon which prominent ideas on OA publishing are conceived and, related to this, also the persistent focus on extending access to *research outputs* within a large part of OA publishing.

With the aim of stressing the validity and importance of the approaches suggested by critical OA advocates, while, at the same time, problematising certain dominant versions of OA publishing, I show that the continued validity of humanist epistemologies (as well as their positivist understanding) within the way academic publishing in general and some approaches to OA publishing specifically have been conceived of is by no means self-evident.

As I discuss, humanist epistemologies have been both *promoted and contested* in the framework of specific political, socio-economic, and territorial power struggles. They are thus historically, culturally, and ideologically situated. For example, the universality of humanist epistemologies and their positivist understanding has been questioned by academics throughout the twentieth century, especially successfully within certain fields of critical feminist theory. An antagonist engagement with

humanist textual norms and paradigms and related ideas on authorship can also be traced back at least for five centuries. Proto-feminist publishing initiatives in the seventeenth century, as well as various feminist, queer Latin American, and Womanist publishing initiatives from the second half of the twentieth century, engaged in "experiments" with, relational, situated, and performative forms of author- editor- and readership, as well as with versioned and multi-agential publications. These initiatives were putting in question the fixity, and linearity of text, as well as dominant proprietary and individualistic authorship models. These interventions, as I stress in my thesis, cannot be considered as solely aesthetical or formal. Rather these interventions were a critique of the ideological, socio-political, economical, and institutional apparatus and of the dominant humanist norms and conventions of knowledge production, and an attempt to reperform these in a more diverse and equitable way.

During the discussion of the contested nature of humanist epistemologies, I ask questions such as: How did humanist epistemologies come to figure as a standard for how scholarly knowledge is created, assessed, and distributed in a global context? How have these epistemologies become the primary hermeneutical basis upon which prominent ideas on OA publishing have been conceived? How can various antagonistic pre-digital engagements with humanist epistemologies be interrelated with each other and how can they inform each other in meaningful ways? How are these antagonistic engagements with humanist epistemologies connected with critical OA advocacy today, or how can they be put in connection? How much can these interconnections emphasise the importance of the experiments with the processes and practices of knowledge production suggested within critical OA advocacy? And can such a connection provide conceptual and practical insights regarding how to facilitate greater knowledge equity and diversity (in addition to what already has been proposed by critical OA advocates)?

Embedding critical OA advocacy in a longer tradition of a theoretical and practical antagonist engagement with dominant (humanist) epistemologies is, as I argue, meaningful in two ways: First, this genealogical positioning helps to advocate for seeing the processes and practices of knowledge production as important sites of struggle for knowledge equity and diversity and for more explicitly positioning them as an inherent part of OA publishing. It does so in so far as it substantiates that critical OA advocates have always stressed that OA publishing should not only be about how readers can consume texts, but also about who has access to, and controls the governance of, the means of knowledge production; it elucidates why this includes an attentiveness to increasing the participation in processes, and practices of knowledge production and why this is important in the context of knowledge equity and diversity. Second, embedding critical OA advocacy within a longer history of antagonist engagements with humanist epistemologies leads to valuable insights regarding the

development of the interventionist reading methodology I propose as part of this thesis. The aim here is to exemplify how participation in the processes and practices of knowledge production can be increased by minimising the socio-cultural, behavioural, and linguistic barriers to participation. This methodology adds to critical experiments with writing, editing, and publishing conducted by critical OA advocates to facilitate more equitable and diverse conditions for scholarship.

As I further discuss in chapter 1 of this thesis, my analysis of the OA landscape and my focus on knowledge equity and diversity is framed by a New Materialist feminist and intersectional feminist perspective.[8] This perspective informs the way in which I approach my analysis of the persisting inequities in global-scale knowledge creation. For example, feminism has traditionally been critical of a positivist humanist understanding of the knower and knowledge as neutral, detached, static, and objective. Rather these have been interpreted as partial, transient, and relational. Consequently, the principle of "holding the world at a distance" (Barad, 2007, 87) underlying singular authorship models and modes of scientific argumentation and evaluation that are common in certain contexts of OA publishing, are untenable from a feminist position. Feminist academics such as Gloria Anzaldúa (1987), Janneke Adema (2015, 2021), Sarah Kember (2014b), or Cristina Rivera Garza (2013) also have emphasised how knowledge practices – such as writing, editing, or reading – can act both as a mode of discipline *and* as a potentially radical practice.

In relation to my feminist research perspective, I conceptualise my practice-based thesis as a form of *critical praxis.* In this praxis, I blend "abstract theorising" and "concrete doing" by self-critically reconsidering the reading, writing, and theorising that I conduct in this thesis. I do so, for example, regarding humanist paradigms that determine the way research is predominantly performed, written up, and shared (and, in turn shape the way a PhD thesis usually is delivered). These paradigms

[8] New Material feminisms combine aspects from feminism and New Materialism. They are closely related to, among others, feminist science and technology studies aiming to understand the roles of material and non-human actors in shaping social and political structures (while attending to issues of race, gender, sexuality, and ability) (Truman, 2019). New materialist feminisms challenge traditional (humanist) feminist theories and their focus on human experiences seeking to understand the ways in which these experiences are intertwined with the material world. They challenge also classical notions of positivism. For example, they do so through directly implicating researchers in the research process, attuning their attention to more-than-human agents, challenging representationalism, and recognising "that thinking-with theoretical concepts is also 'empirical' research" (Truman, 2019). A central tenet of new materialist thinking is that "matter" is multiple, self-organising, dynamic and inventive, moving between nature and culture, the animated and automated, bodies and environments. In Barad's words, "'matter' is 'a dynamic and shifting entanglement of relations, rather than … a property of things'" (2007: 224). As intersectional feminism I synthesise various positions of, primarily, women-of-colour that centre on the idea that different inequities (based on gender, class, race, or sexuality) can overlap in social identities while recognizing the historical contexts surrounding these issues (Crenshaw, 1989). The thinkers I, in this context, pay reference to in my thesis, among other things, stress the hybridity, inconsistency, and relationality of knowledge; the multi-locationality (or fragmentation) of subjects; and propose methodologies for organising ongoing struggle against economic, political, and intellectual intersectional oppression, among different communities in diverse contexts of marginalisation (see e.g. Alexander & Mohanty, 2010; Anzaldúa, 1987; Harding, 1991; Hill Collins, 1997; Sandoval, 1998, 2000).

include the idea of the humanist singular author in control of the truth, and (connected to this) the PhD thesis as an authoritative and static text. Scholarly reading practices – often driven by competition and utilitarianism, skimming texts with one's own publishing record in mind – also often remain tightly interlaced with an academic reward and reputation system in which notions of originality and authority, impact, discipline, and responsibility are grounded in humanist conceptions of the book and its author. In my thesis, I experimentally question these paradigms and perform them differently (in a more experimental, open, horizontal, and collaborative way, perhaps), while offering examples for other scholars how they can do so too. As part of this critical praxis, I experiment with forms of writing and, as well as with some existing genres and methods used in humanities (PhD) research (for example, the critical genealogy).

Among other things, in the chapter "Postscript," I perform a more relational approach to writing and to my own identity formation as a PhD student. In what I call a "post-oppositional genealogy" I theorise in a post-oppositional manner[9] (Keating, 2013) and read diffractively[10] (Dolphijn &van der Tuin, 2012) to participate in antagonist theoretical and practical engagements with humanist epistemologies and to embed critical OA advocacy into the longer history of these antagonistic engagements. In doing so, I especially emphasise the performative potential of such an approach by suggesting possible conceptual and practical insights on how to create more diverse and equitable conditions for OA publishing today.

On the basis of these genealogical (re-)considerations and some further insights from this thesis, I develop an interventionist reading methodology that exemplifies how facilitating wider participation in the processes and practices of knowledge production can bring about greater knowledge equity and diversity. With this reading methodology I contribute to the various facilitation methodologies and methods that, as I show in this thesis, have been proposed by critical OA advocates in their struggle for greater knowledge equity and diversity. This methodology can be applied in various contexts of collaborative academic knowledge production (for example, research or writing). I have collaboratively tested this methodology within two experimental online reading groups, titled *The Re-Reading Room*.[11] The reading methodology and *The Re-Reading Room* will be documented and discussed in the "Postscript," the experimental piece of writing that forms a crucial part of my thesis.

---

[9] Post-oppositional theorising (Keating, 2013), as I will further outline in chapter 1, strives to theorise broadly, for example, by including sources from different academic and non-academic fields, or more and less (or not) acclaimed theoretical works. Rather than comparing and weighing up these sources against each other, post-oppositional reading and theorising seeks to find unlikely connections and commonalities between them and is interested in the performativity of such an approach.

[10] Diffractive reading, as I will elaborate more in-depth in chapter 1, makes use of the serendipity and relationality of reading and thinking *with* and *through* texts rather than *about* them. As Dolphijn & van der Tuin write: "Diffractive readings bring inventive provocations; they are good to think with. They are respectful, detailed, ethical engagements" (2012: 50).

[11] Both these reading groups took the form of two-and-a-half-hour events.

Chapter Outline

My thesis is divided into three sections. Chapter 1, the "Conclusion," and the "Postscript" sit outside of this structure. **Section I** discusses persisting inequities in global-scale scholarly knowledge production. It sheds light on the dominance of humanist epistemologies in scholarly knowledge creation and circulation globally – in and outside of OA publishing – and it argues for the importance of problematising these epistemologies and their positivist interpretation in relation to this thesis' aim to bring forward more equitable and diverse conditions for scholarly knowledge production. **Section II** historically contextualises the dominance of humanist epistemologies in scientific knowledge production, while emphasising that these epistemologies have both been *pushed forward* and antagonistically *contested* as part of political, territorial, and economic power struggles (taking place, for example, in an imperialist, colonial, and patriarchal context). The historical overview this section consists of is different from the rest of the thesis, which focuses more directly on contemporary OA publishing. By, in this overview, underlining the disputed nature of humanist epistemologies, section II builds a connection between the various models of OA publishing introduced in sections I and III and their differing affirmative/positivist and antagonist relations with humanist epistemologies. In **Section III,** I provide an overview of contemporary critical OA advocacy and I conceptualise it as a distinct version of OA publishing embedded in the longer history of antagonistic theoretical and practical engagements with humanist epistemologies. I argue that seeing critical OA publishing as part of this longer history, can provide new conceptual and practical insights on the question of how to bring about greater equity and diversity in global-scale knowledge production within OA publishing.

The order of this thesis – moving back and forth between different times rather than deploying a chronological sequence – primarily owes to my ambition to, as much as possible, disentangle the intricate nature of the field of inquiry I engage with in my thesis. See OA publishing itself, for example: rather than being a movement connected with a historical point of origin, a coherent ideological basis, a set of values, and specific practices, it has been understood and performed differently in various communities of practice – it has been a site of hegemonic struggles. One of these struggles is embodied in the divergent ways in which the scope of OA publishing is understood: while in the currently dominant conceptualisations of OA publishing its scope is restricted to extending access to *research outputs*, some critical OA advocates, including myself in this thesis, argue that, in fact, OA publishing should include a broader consideration of the way in "which research is published and made open in the context of a broader project of scholarly communication reform" (Moore, 2019a, 171).

In **chapter 1,** I position my thesis in a cultural studies context that is informed by a twenty-first-century intersectional and New Materialist feminist lens. In this chapter, I contextualise my practice-based study as a form of critical praxis that experimentally questions the hegemonies in scholarly knowledge production and aims to perform them differently, while inviting other scholars to do so too. This invitation, in my thesis, is embodied, for example, in the interventionist reading methodology and an appropriate set of methods that I have developed as part of my critical praxis. It is focused on reducing barriers to participation in knowledge creation and can be adopted by those that strive to enable more equitable and diverse conditions for scholarly knowledge production, both within OA publishing or outside of it.

Section I of this thesis consists of chapters 2, 3, and 4. In **chapter 2,** I analyse the global sphere of academic knowledge production and how it is controlled by a few commercial players (mainly big publishers). I show that this sphere yields a Eurocentric (neo-colonial and neo-imperialist) bias that results in a preference for humanist epistemologies of science and connected positivist ideas about writing up and assessing knowledge. This preference, as I argue, produces barriers that prevent certain communities from participating in global-scale scholarly knowledge production. In **chapter 3,** I discuss how some of the large-scale approaches to OA publishing pushed forward by research institutions, funders, and policy makers, do not, in a determined way, confront this Eurocentric bias manifested within commercial approaches to scholarly publishing. Instead, as I argue, these approaches contribute to a normalisation of OA publishing as a top-down mandated commercial system. This normalisation, among other factors, leads to a lack of recognition of alternative, more critical forms of OA publishing. Additionally, in the context of dominant approaches to OA publishing – within funders' and policy driven versions, as well as within certain, more progressive liberal democratisation narratives emerging, since the early 2000s, around OA, as I posit in **chapter 4** – humanist epistemologies are again the preferred hermeneutical basis upon which these approaches are conceptualised. This preference, as I discuss, among other things, keeps the focus within a large part of OA publishing on extending access to *research outputs*. This obfuscates the cultural, epistemic, and linguistic issues of marginalisation at play *in the predominantly humanist processes and practices* that dominate a large part of global-scale knowledge production.

Section II consists of chapters 5 and 6. In **chapter 5** I discuss how imperialist and colonial political, territorial, and economic power struggles have been integral to, amongst others, (educational) institutions. These, in turn, have helped the establishment and universalisation of humanist (colonial and patriarchal) knowledge systems – including assumptions on what valid knowledge is and how it should be written-up and conveyed – that support the production of a particular kind of identity and

subjectivity. Moreover, I discuss how these humanist epistemologies have continued and continuing dominance in scientific knowledge production and how they have found their way into certain narratives of OA publishing, even into supposedly progressive, liberal approaches emphasising the democratic potential of OA publishing. As I emphasise, they have done so despite having been extensively questioned by non-humanist or humanist-critical scholars (for example, different feminist theorists) in the twentieth century. In **chapter 6,** I show how certain proto-feminist and early anti-colonial grassroots initiatives that emerged in the seventeenth century, as well as various feminist, queer Latin American, and Womanist publishing initiatives from the second half of the twentieth century, have been antagonistically positioned against the humanist enclosures of knowledge production at their time. I focus on three cases: the interventionist editing practice of Mary Ferrar, Anna Collett, and their sisters at the religious group Little Gidding in rural England in the seventeenth century; indigenous oral forms of "writing back" from the eighteenth century onwards, and Kitchen Table Women of Color Press launched 1981 in Chicago by feminist and lesbian of colour academics, writers, and artists. My analysis focuses on the writing, editing, reading, and publishing experiments these initiatives initiated; how they engaged with more relational, situated, and performative forms of author- editor- and readership, as well as with versioned and multi-agential publications; and how they thereby challenged humanist norms and paradigms in order to increase participation in knowledge production. I show that these initiatives can be put in conversation with each other across time and space. Relating these different projects to each other, enables a carving out of an alternative, antagonist and humanist-critical history of knowledge creation and sharing stretching from early anti-colonial and proto-feminist initiatives in the seventeenth century, to the experiments of feminists-of-colour in the second half of the twentieth century.

Section III consists of chapters 7 and 8 in which I analyse and showcase various traditions of what I conceptualise, in this section, as critical OA advocacy. In doing so, I would like to emphasise the importance of these approaches, specifically in answer to the question of how OA publishing can contribute to more just and equitable conditions for knowledge production. In **chapter 7,** I embed critical OA narratives in a longer history of the antagonist theoretical engagements with humanist epistemologies discussed in chapter 5. With this, I provide an alternative humanism-critical genealogy of critical OA publishing (rather than seeing it as part of the liberal democratisation discourses some conceptualisations of OA publishing have emerged in, for example). This alternative genealogy sheds a different light on the scope of OA publishing. Among other things, this scope within critical OA advocacy is shifted – beyond the prominent focus on readership and consumption of research outputs – towards who has access to and controls the governance over the means of knowledge production. This shift includes also the promotion of a wider participation in the

processes and practices of scholarly knowledge creation and circulation. In **chapter 8,** I analyse the implications of this shift in perspective on the way OA publishing is practiced and on what the main challenges (as well as opportunities) are when advocating for more equal and diverse approaches to global-scale knowledge production. As part of this analysis, I discuss, among other things, various experiments with collaborative, open, and horizontal academic book and text production, as they are being performed within critical OA publishing as a challenge to the humanist paradigms persistently dominating conventional digital practices and processes of scholarly knowledge production (including individual authorship, originality, and the ownership of research). These experiments, as I argue, embody an antagonistic gesture that is similar to the pre-digital practices of early anti-colonial, proto-feminist, and Womanist initiatives (discussed in chapter 6) and remain important today in an OA landscape in which a focus on research outputs tends to conceal cultural, linguistic, and epistemic barriers to equal and diverse participation in knowledge production. In this chapter, I show that the promotion of a wider participation in the processes and practices of scholarly knowledge production includes, among other things: a reconsideration of the accessibility of the technologies through which knowledge production is performed (including a focus on who has the ability to use these technologies); context-specific socio-cultural adaptations of established editing and publishing workflows, editor- and authorship-functions, as well as divisions of labour; and the invention of new methodologies and methods to facilitate a more horizontal, equal, and diverse participation.

In the chapter **Postscript** – positioned after the conclusionary chapter of this study playing against the prevalent idea of a PhD thesis as a whole, a "work" delineated by a clear beginning and end – I propose, discuss, and document an interventionist reading methodology that I have devised which practically contributes to the critical OA advocates' struggle for greater knowledge equity and diversity in scholarly knowledge production. I have developed this methodology on the basis of the insights of this thesis (provided in a concise way in the chapter "Conclusion") and with the help of additional resources from, amongst others, feminist critical pedagogy and fiction writing. I have collaboratively enacted and tested this methodology through two reading groups, titled *The Re-Reading Room*, with other academics and non-academics from different disciplinary backgrounds and countries. A documentation of *The Re-Reading Room* will be provided in the "Postscript" too. In facilitating these engagements, I paid specific attention to the social, cultural, linguistic, and behavioural barriers that determine who can and can't interact with a text. As I argue in my thesis, addressing these potential barriers and collaboratively negotiating and contesting them is key to enhancing equity and diversity in knowledge creation and sharing.

Original Contribution to Research

My original contribution to knowledge consists of the following three elements:

First, this thesis offers the only conceptualisation and in-depth overview of critical OA perspectives by interrelating diverse approaches to OA publishing emerging in different disciplinary contexts in Europe, Canada, Latin America, and Africa within one overarching concept. The lack of awareness of these alternatives – for example among funders, policy providers, and scholars – has contributed to the dominance of (primarily) commercial visions on OA. By proposing critical OA publishing as a distinct OA tradition conjoining alternative approaches to OA publishing originating in different communities of practice, this thesis strengthens the visibility of these approaches and emphasises their relevance for addressing persistent issues of inequity in global-scale knowledge creation.

Second, this thesis opens up the discourse around narrow definitions of OA publishing as a way to leverage access to research outputs in the form of academic texts and books. Rather, as I posit, OA publishing should be framed more widely to enable a broader, more diverse participation in, and governance of, the infrastructures, technologies, processes, and practices of knowledge production. These latter aspects have been rarely acknowledged within dominant discourses on OA publishing, even though, as I argue, they are an indispensable part of what OA publishing is and should be about, at least when it is concerned with knowledge equity and diversity.

Third, in this thesis, I develop and apply a novel reading methodology that can be applied in different knowledge production contexts. With this methodology, I contribute to critical experimentation with the forms and formats of academic knowledge production in the context of critical OA publishing. Through proposing and then enacting this methodology as part of this thesis, I explore ways of facilitating collective online engagements with knowledge production that are actively geared at minimising the socio-cultural, behavioural, and linguistic barriers to more diverse and equal participation in scholarly knowledge production. These barriers can occur in digital collaborations through the inconsiderate use of (open source) technology purely focused on operational and technical concerns, while neglecting the socio-cultural factors at play in these collaborations. As I argue in this thesis, this methodology can help scholars to release the full potential of (open source) technologies in the context of knowledge equity and diversity.

Chapter 1: Theoretical Framework and Methodology

This study is situated within the humanities, in a cultural and media studies context. I see these disciplines through a feminist lens. I recognise feminism as polyphonic and entangled: as "feminisms." In relation to my research topic and as a way to further evolve my research, my emphasis has been on twenty-first-century intersectional Womanist and women-of-colour as well as New Materialist feminist perspectives. I do not consider drawing up rigid boundaries between these feminisms as productive.[12] Rather, I aim to underline that these feminisms, in the context of globalisation, have been interrelated in a generative, sometimes argumentative, dialogue with each other, with post- and decolonial positions, with anti-racist and intersectional critical theory, with environmental activism, disability rights advocacy, and LGBTQIA+ theory. Cultural studies scholarship itself owes a part of its critical ambition and socio-cultural sensitivity to its close interrelation with Women-of-colour, post-humanist, and New Materialist feminist perspectives, as well as with post- and decolonial ones – not least thanks to scholars such as Stuart Hall and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak.

As I outline more in depth in this chapter, feminist theory has provided me with the conceptual background to recognise and question the uneven distribution of power in scholarly knowledge production. It has informed my methodology – that I define as a *critical praxis* – and it has given me the methods to intervene into and reperform dominant forms of knowledge production in a potentially more ethical way.

Understanding Science and Knowledge

An idea that I will stress throughout this thesis is that knowledge creation and sharing are agential, situated, entangled, and relational acts: it matters what knowledge gets produced, by whom, when, how, and where – because knowledge production is integral to all "worldly configurations" (Barad, 2007; Haraway, 1997).

[12] A dialogic employment of Womanist feminism and of-colour-feminism (and its decolonial positioning) with New Material feminism has been contested. For example, in certain post- and decolonial discourses New Material or post-humanist feminisms have been criticised as an offspring of Enlightenment-based humanism. For example, Mignolo and Walsh (2018) have criticised New Materialism (as well as related post-humanist positions), due to its origin in Western theory, as a continuation rather than an affirmative critique of modern European humanism.

New Materialist theory challenges human-centred perspectives, emphasising the agency of non-human entities (such as natural forces or technologies) in shaping the world. Elaborating the problematics of the (positivist) humanist belief that scholarly representation neutrally reflects the social and natural world and is, therefore, distinct from that which it seeks to represent, Karen Barad (2007) discusses "reality" as an ongoing and inseparable entanglement of the material world and the discursive practices through which one makes sense of this world. In other words, reality is a dynamic process of entanglement and differentiation, where matter and meaning co-constitute each other. As a researcher, writer, and reader, one is "always already involved in modes and ways of being and, therefore, implicitly committed to a surrounding world from which we come to act and which constrains our actions, … our situatedness" (Aigner & Cicigoj, 2014, 46). As Donna Haraway (1988) stresses, consequently, all knowledge and every knower's perspective is partial not "for its own sake but, rather, for the sake of the connections and unexpected openings situated knowledges make possible … Situated knowledges are about communities, not about isolated individuals" (590).

These ideas place the scholar as an inherent part of the worlds' becoming rather than outside of it, while humanist knowledge systems, on the contrary, support the principle of "holding the world at a distance" (Barad, 2007, 87). They do so, by insisting on a disjunction of the knower and the known. Here, science is considered a neutral, objective, specifiable, and hence surveyable terrain that is concordant with observation, consistent with previously confirmed knowledge, and thus – at least in a positivist interpretation of humanism – independent from the personal or social attributes of the scientific researcher, the implied "knower" of nature's order. This subject, in humanist thought, is unitary and coherent and able to represent this order through observation, analysis, and representation. As Sandra Harding (2002) stresses, in a humanist context, scholarly practices (such as researching, writing, or publishing) primarily are considered systems of representation (making theories, hypotheses, claims).

The recognition that all knowledge and every knower's position is situated and thus partial, transient, and relational makes humanist systems of knowledge and knowing – as well as their universalisation as the standard against which scholarship is performed and evaluated globally – untenable from a New Materialist and post-humanist feminist position. As Rosi Braidotti (2018) emphasises, there is no standard concept or definition of knowledge, knowing, or authorship. These concepts change between different knowledge cultures, institutional or political arrangements: they are, thus, contingent (Adema, 2015). It is against this background that two of the central questions that I address in this PhD have emerged: Why and how have humanist epistemologies come to dominate how in certain global-scale contexts, scholarly knowledge is created and shared? And what revisions and contestations of these humanist epistemologies have been developed – both in the past and the present, from inside and outside, of OA advocacy?

The entangled, shape-shifting, and relational nature of everything implies that scholarly acts of observation, analysis, and representation induce a "cut." This cut produces temporary separations and stabilisations within life's infinite becoming (for example, separations between what comes to "matter" (or is being considered) in a research context and what is not) (Barad, 2007; Kember & Zylinska, 2012; Law, 2004). Cuts, as Haraway (1988) and Barad (2007) specify, are not just passive representations of reality but active processes that shape and produce reality, while also entailing a temporary stabilisation of the (scholarly) self, as a social identity. They thus are agential acts wherein agency – the capacity to act – is not an inherent property of humans (Barad, 2007). Cuts are made from the specific locations one finds oneself in and becomes what one is through intra-actions[13] with the actions of others (may these be machinic, technological, infrastructural, "natural," or human); from the environments which actively shape one's possible actions and affordances (for example, institutional contexts); and the differential matterings going on in the world (Aigner & Cicigoj, 2014; Barad, 2007; Rouse, 2015, 2016). Cuts are thus always intertwined with power and politics.

As I will discuss in more depth in chapter 7, New Materialist theory, along with post-humanist perspectives, has been influential for some cultural studies scholars to delineate, among other things: their relationship with their scholarly practice, as well as with the dominant institutions, norms, and paradigms that govern this practice (and, by extension, also shape the cultural studies scholar as a social identity). New Materialist feminism, among other theories, has influenced the cultural studies argument that practicing scholarship involves not only the acknowledgement of different, situated and dynamic processes of mattering by which worlds are enacted into being. Rather, it also asks scholars to actively engage with the *modes of mattering* composing the world in its becoming – in other words, with ethical and political questions (Adema, 2015; Kember, 2014a, b).

As Adema (2015) discusses, it is by way of responsible decisions enacted within (scholarly) practice – not least by carefully considering in which way to conduct and publish research, where, when, with whom, and in what form, as I will discuss in chapter 7 and 8 – that one can cut differently, more ethically perhaps (Adema, 2015). In this context, experimentation, processual, open to ambivalence, uncertainty, and risking a plurality of possibilities (Weber, 2000), has figured as an important means to drive such a responsible and careful scholarly practice.

In this context, scholarly practices, rather than mere systems of representation, have been considered as practices of intervention: for example, into the predominant ways in which scholarship gets performed today (Adema, 2015; Kember, 2014a, b; Hall, 2008; Zylinska, 2005). Such an

[13] Intra-action is a term coined by Barad. With this term she critiques the term "interaction" that depends on existing bodies that act with each other. Barad understands the capacity (or agency) to act not as an inherent property of humans but as a "dynamism of forces" in which all elements are inseparably entwined, exchanging, forming, and diffracting (Barad, 2007).

intervention can, as I discuss more in depth in chapter 8, include challenging humanist ideas of authorship as possessive and individual (and, connected with this, the unitary and coherent author-subject) and reperform these in a potentially more relational and open way.

The considerations outlined above have informed the way in which I, in my thesis, see and apply feminist theories as a critique of and intervention into humanist epistemologies. Producing critical theory, as one of the outcomes of this thesis, I want to expose the often hidden operations of power in academia and how they are connected with the humanist epistemologies that remain a large part of scholarly knowledge production. In my theoretical framework, I have aimed to make these interrelations more explicit and open them up to be affirmatively challenged and transformed.

However, the effects of power are also implicated in my own positioning and acting. This aspect of self-reflexivity emerges from three interrelated ideas discussed above: Firstly, all theorising done must start from the recognition that theorising always develops in "conversation" with others: it is relational. Secondly, any subject position is partial. Therefore, I can only describe this real world by theoretical approximations of what constitutes the real, "modified by encounters with others and objects, including those we treat as evidence or source" (Johnson et al., 2004, 95). Thirdly, the need for a theorising that is (self-)critical also arises from the relationship between knowledge and power. Any position is potentially a place of power and authority. This insight originates in two connected points: on the one hand, that a speaker's location is epistemologically significant (Haraway, 2017) and, on the other, that certain "privileged locations are discursively dangerous" (Alcoff, 1995, 100). A discursive danger emerges because speaking about and for others, as I do throughout this thesis, is problematic as it inevitably involves acts of re-presentation – be it in the sake of "subject construction" or "object formation" (Spivak, 1988). Acts of representation cannot be separated from historical power inequities and the ways in which they are, for example, operating through contemporary ways of doing and sharing scholarship.[14]

This points towards some of the challenges that it was necessary to be aware of while developing this research, in terms of the methodology and methods I chose and in terms of employing these. For example, how do I make cuts in and through my scholarship in ways that represent knowledges of diverse origin ethically, i.e., without putting them into a pre-conceived values-based or hierarchical relationship with one another? How do I develop appropriate representational strategies (for example, when writing-up my research) that allow a more equitable distribution of the ability to

[14] As Alcoff writes: "the practice of speaking for others is often born of a desire for mastery, to privilege oneself as the one who more correctly understands the truth about another's situation or as one who can champion a just cause and thus achieve glory and praise. And the effect of the practice of speaking for others is often, though not always, erasure and a reinscription of sexual, national, and other kinds of hierarchies" (1991: 29).

speak and be heard, while trying to avoid complicity with historically grown cultural and geographical hierarchies? And where do I position myself as a scholar in relation to my critical ambition?

Understanding Theorising

Conducting my scholarly practice with the conviction that it requires a self-critical commitment to a more ethical involvement in the representation of "others," while trying to refrain from a values-based and hierarchical way of doing so, I decided to theorise non-oppositionally. This decision is based on the recognition that, as the intersectional feminist theorists Gloria Anzaldúa (1987) and Ana Louise Keating (2013) emphasise, an oppositional framework of critique tends to perpetuate the very systems that it strives to overcome. As Keating (2013) remarks, as soon as a dichotomous framework defines reality – and, by extension, knowledge, ethics, and truth – in limited, mutually exclusive terms "the collaborative negotiation and building of new or other opinions and truths" (6) becomes impossible. This, as she stresses, limits "our options and strangle[s] our imaginations" (2013: 6).

However, negative or oppositional modes of critique are frequently found within the scholarship I analyse and discuss while developing the theoretical framework that accompanies this thesis. For example, oppositional thinking runs through various contemporary discourses on OA publishing: Theorists such as Kelty (2008, 2018) and Tkacz (2015) claim that OA publishing, since its emergence, has embodied the neoliberal ideals of efficiency, transparency, and global competitiveness, while for others, especially for theorists in the early 2000s (Willinsky, 2006), OA publishing stands for the progressive potential of social justice and emancipatory politics. These positions tend to ignore that the range in which OA publishing is conceptualised and performed reflects a broader spectrum of positions and practices rather than one unified movement (Hall, 2008; Moore, 2017, 2019). Additionally, certain post- and decolonial literature depicts the globalisation of knowledge production as a monodirectional mass acculturation driven by "the West" (Mignolo, 1995). Only by replacing "Western realities" with an essentialised "local" notion of indigenous and traditional knowledge, this argumentation goes, can the subaltern subject become a hegemonic subject. This discourse ignores that, as for example Beigel (2018) emphasises, by fostering the interaction between diverse knowledge cultures, globalisation has also led to productive interactions among different knowledges: across institutional, disciplinary, geographical, and linguistic differences. Binary-thinking often runs through the debate on new media too, where a distinction is upheld between new media, which are seen as interactive and fluid, and old media, such as the book, which are seen as stable and fixed. However, such a positioning, as Kember and Zylinska stress,

overshadows that "the inherent instability of the 'old medium' of the book never disappeared altogether… it just became obfuscated" (2012: 5).

In my theorising, I try to not repeat these modes of argumentation. Instead, I bring diverse theories, genres, places, and temporalities into proximity with one another: among other things, by means of diffractive reading used as a main method to collate, analyse, and discuss textual sources as I will elaborate in what follows. Diffractive reading works along affirmative lines recognising their entangled nature rather than starting from a pre-established ethico-theoretical position and understanding different philosophies or theories as isolated entities (van der Tuin, 2011). For example, when choosing materials to engage with and ways in which to analyse them (amongst others, in my conceptualisation of critical OA advocacy as a distinct framework for OA publishing or in the experimental piece of writing that forms part of this thesis), I recognised the lineage, relevance, and potential of ideas and theories that have been forged in what is often deemed outside of academia (within, among others, para-academic, artistic, or activist realms) or peripheral to or outside of the discourse on OA publishing (for example, those emerging in the context of what I conceptualise as critical OA publishing in this thesis). In doing so, I intended to theorise transversally and "globally" in ways that "produce connectivity …. (albeit a tense or uneven one) rather than an absolute alterity" (Alexander & Mohanty, 2010, 10). In other words, instead of trying to compare the different sources that I am engaging with (weighting them up or underlining the differences between them), I am affirmatively building upon them in a way that I consider is an alternative to opposition-based scholarship. In doing so, I try to account for the partiality and the limits of knowledge, including my own, as partiality is "reminding us [or me] that … if we don't know what we don't know, then we might not even know what we know" (Ahmed, 2010, xvii).[15]

Regarding the at times simplistic and sometimes oppositional terminology I employ in this thesis, due to a lack of alternatives, I have tried to outline the limited expressiveness of terms such as "centre" and "periphery," or "Global North" and "Global South" throughout this thesis (a discussion of these terms and a rationale for using them in the way I have done within this thesis is delivered in

[15] This recognition has injected my theorising with intellectual humility (Keating, 2013). In being humble, I had to acknowledge that what I might consider as dominant (for example, the humanist paradigms influencing scholarly knowledge production) might only be dominant under a specific set of conditions and within a specific historical geography and dispositive of "oppression" (Katz, 1996). At the same time, what has been considered radical within critical academic practice in my specific context (determined heavily by the post-structuralist and avantgarde scholarship of the 1970s the cultural studies discourse hinges upon) might have a long and extensive history beyond the temporal and spatial limitations of metropolitan debates (see for example Spivak 1987, 1990). For example, as Méndez Cota (2020) remarks, in a Mexican context, critical experiments with technologies, forms, and formats of knowledge production have a history that is less tied to academic publishing or avant-garde scholarship (and its often humanist-critical perspective). Rather it stems from extra-academic engagements, such as grassroots organising around the various manifestations of structural violence.

footnotes or in the main text when they are first mentioned). Where possible, I have chosen precise geographical locations (such as countries or regions) over generalisations.

Understanding Positionality

At this point, my own positionality also requires critical discussion. This includes acknowledging that – due to my Swiss and German origin, my educational background in a humanist tradition, my current doctoral position at a Western university, and my ambition to earn money as an academic – I do not stand outside the realm of the epistemological Western hegemony I seek to critique. Indeed, mine (as anyone else's) are particular and interrelated locations for the production of critical knowledge. There is a tension between the stated interventionist ambition of my study and the (external and circumstantial) institutional, cultural, and economic frameworks and the expectations that need to be fulfilled in order to earn a PhD degree, as well as my own (subject) position within this constellation.

The university – as a physical and epistemological location, as well as a "sense of belonging" (Fitzpatrick, 2019, 7) – has for centuries been integrally connected with interests of political, economic, and cultural domination and vice versa. In the context of European imperialism, the university has been defined and legitimised by the exclusion of certain kinds of knowledge and their pertaining practices, for example activist, feminist, and indigenous ones, from the category of what is considered "intellectually valid" (Windle, 2017, 370). As M. Jacqui Alexander and Chandra Talpade Mohanty (2010) stress, this boundary-making of the university with regards to knowledges and communities has led to the creation of apparently distinct spaces where the former is privileged over the latter: scholarly vs. activist knowledges, scientific vs. indigenous knowledges, etcetera. As Joel Windle (2017) elaborates, this subjugation also amounts to the production of social identities: dominant values and knowledge systems support the production of a particular kind of subjectivity. In contemporary Western academia, the ongoing dominance of humanist paradigms interwoven with an increasingly competitive sphere of scholarly knowledge creation and circulation (and the specific value system inherent to it, as well as the limits to what counts as science, knowledge, or theory), (re)produces a specific kind of social identity, namely that of the academic scholar. It ultimately also produces my own identity, that of a PhD student.

I am only partially able to move beyond this social identity. Through writing my thesis, I have performed and stabilised my identity as humanist author by reproducing "certain dominant discourses that function to shape how a graduate student is to author a dissertation" (Adema, 2015,

25). For example, I have delivered this thesis primarily as a single-authored, mostly linearly structured, static, long-form argument formatted as a PDF, while adhering to the formatting rules, style guides and humanist-inspired textual quality standards of UK academia (for example, in terms of how to structure and conduct a valid argument).

However, while being aware of my limited agency in this constellation, I am also aware that, even though these dominant systems have a strong ordering effect, they are not monolithic. This insight owes to cultural studies theorists such as Stuart Hall (2010[1980]), post-hegemonic scholars such as Alberto Moreiras (2001), Gareth Williams (2002), and Arturo Escobar (1995, 2018), as well as intersectional feminist scholars such as Sandra Harding (1991, 2002) and Chandra Talpade Mohanty (1984) whose work I draw on in my thesis. These theorists expand on the Marxist philosopher and political theorist's Antonio Gramsci's (1975[1929]) idea on cultural hegemony to analyse power structures, social inequities, and the role of culture in maintaining and challenging dominant systems. For Gramsci (1975[1929]), in brief, cultural hegemony refers to the dominance of a particular group over society not only through economic and political mans but also through the control and manipulation of cultural institutions – such as education, media, religion, and the arts – which serve the construction and dissemination of dominant culture (including values, beliefs, ideologies, and norms). These institutions maintain the status quo and ensure the consent of the subordinated groups: they help a dominant culture to become widely accepted and regarded as the "common sense" of thinking and organising society. Hall (2010[1980]), Harding (1991, 2002), and Mohanty (1984) emphasise the role which discursive practices, or systems of language and representation – for example within research, writing, and publishing – play in perpetuating the interests of the dominant culture and shaping reality.

As Gramsci (1975[1929]), elucidates, cultural hegemony works by marginalising alternative ideas and practices through silencing and discrediting voices of dissent. In the context of intersectional feminism, cultural hegemony is seen to perpetuate the domination of patriarchal cultures, while disempowering those at the intersections of multiple marginalised identities. It reinforces an idealised and normative vision of femininity – often relying on white, middle-class, cisgender women – or humanity – predominantly centred around white males – and thus neglecting the experiences and struggles of women from diverse backgrounds (Harding 1991, 2002; Mohanty 1984). Escobar (1995, 2004, 2018) specifically critiques the universalising tendencies of hegemonic discourses of development, which often view Western modernity as the only legitimate path for societies to develop and progress. He argues that this hegemonic perspective erases the diverse ways of knowing, being, and relating that exist in different cultures and societies.

As Gramsci further emphasises, cultural hegemony is not a passive acceptance by the subordinate groups but is maintained through the active consent and internalisation of these dominant ideas. For example, such an active consent or internalisation might occur in the way in which I, by researching for this thesis, may accept prominent visions of OA publishing – i.e. the ones that focus on extending access to *research outputs* in the form of papers and books – as generally valid and thus neglecting the ones that have framed OA more widely (i.e. as a way to enable a broader, more diverse participation in, and governance of, the infrastructures, technologies, processes, and practices of knowledge production). Or in the way in which I might perpetuate hegemonic (in the case of this thesis humanist) notions of the linearity and fixity of texts as well as hegemonic (humanist) concepts of individual and competitive authorship that have come to figure as the standard against which scholarship is performed and evaluated (Collins & Milloy, 2016; Mrva-Montoya, 2015).

For Gramsci, understanding cultural hegemony helps to uncover the mechanisms through which dominant groups maintain their privilege and control, offering potential avenues for resistance and social change. In this vein, Hall, Harding, and Mohanty have emphasised that cultural hegemony is not a monolithic structure but is rather a continuous struggle, a temporary and contingent process involving active negotiation and contestation of meaning. Consequently, hegemony is always incomplete. Escobar (1995) introduces the idea of post-hegemony to challenge the notion that one group can fully dominate and control society. He instead suggests that in the current globalised context, power relations are more complex and fragmented and various cultural practices, knowledges, and ways of life coexist and interact to create a fluid and constantly shifting social terrain in which and dominant cultures can be questioned and challenged. In consequence to their considerations, these scholars underscore the agency of individuals in challenging the dominant ideology, shaping their own social realities, resisting domination, and envisioning alternative futures and thereby disrupting and potentially transforming cultural hegemony and the power structures it produces. For example, Harding (1991, 2001) and Mohanty (1984) propose to dismantle and challenge cultural hegemony by acknowledging and centring the experiences of marginalised women, amplifying diverse narratives, questioning dominant cultural norms and standards, and promoting inclusivity and equal representation. Post-hegemony too highlights the importance of acknowledging and valuing local and marginalised knowledge systems and epistemologies, and alternative modes of organising societies (Escobar, 1995, 2004, 2018). As Escobar writes, it is in the creative emancipatory responses formulated within movements engaged in a context where modernity cannot anymore provide solutions to the issues it has created where one can find “a novel logic of the social, based on self- organizing meshworks and largely non-hierarchical structures. They tend to show emergent properties and complex adaptive behaviors that movements of the past, with

their penchant for centralization and hierarchy, were never able to manifest" (Escobar, 2004, 210). Furthermore, New Material and intersectional feminist researchers such as Anzaldua (1987), Haraway (1988), and Harding (1991), as well as cultural studies scholars such as Wright (2003) have stressed the importance of the university itself as a place "where issues of difference, representation and social justice, and even what constitutes legitimate academic work are being contested" (2003: 808). These scholars also have emphasised the ability of subjects to develop agency within these systems to contest dominant knowledge and knowledge practices in a creative way.

It is exactly the transformative potential of plural and heterogeneous modes of marginalised antagonistic struggle, the possibility of creating alternative narratives and social orders, as well as my own agency as a scholar in shaping these narratives that I strive to affirm in this thesis. Consequently, I have understood the work I have done as part of my PhD degree as a way to develop creative agency and an opportunity to contribute to knowledge equity and diversity by performing scholarly research, theorising and writing differently by promoting and enacting academic knowledge production in a potentially more open, diverse, inclusive way.

As I will explain in what follows, I do so, among other things, by means of what I call a feminist, post-oppositional genealogy. Developing this genealogy, I have attempted to evoke an alternative – non-humanist or humanism-critical history of knowledge creation. In this vein, I have foregrounded various antagonist engagements with humanist epistemologies originating inside and outside of the academy, inside and outside of the OA discourse, in different contexts of marginalisation, at different times, in different institutions, and in different global regions: for example, those developed in academia within critical theory since the 1950s and within the collective practices and processes of (primarily) women's anti-hegemonial organising since the 17th century. In my thesis, I emphasise the performative potential of such an alternative history regarding knowledge equity and diversity in academic knowledge production and dissemination, especially also in the realm of OA publishing. Additionally, I have tried to not casually repeat established humanist paradigms such as a linear and secluded understandings of texts, or possessive individual forms of authorship. Instead, I have engaged with more relational, fluid, and open-ended forms of analysis, sense-making and writing – for example, in the context of this thesis as part of an experimental piece of writing (see chapter "Postscript") or within two experimental online reading groups, *The Re-Reading Room* – in order to, at least partially, temper my authoritative voice as an author of this thesis.

In other words, I have used my research to build a "better" theory in my field of research. Yet, intervening into the unequal power dynamics that get reproduced in dominant humanist forms of scholarly knowledge creation and sharing – and aiming at a broader change of research culture by inviting others to do so too (by means of the interventionist methodology I have developed for this

thesis) – remained the primary goal of this study. In this regard, as I will discuss next, the methodological framework through which I developed my study is crucial.

Methodology: A Critical Praxis

Against the background of the previous discussion, I framed the methodology I employed as part of my PhD research as a (self-)reflective, interventionist, and potentially transformational *critical praxis.* A critical praxis involves a blend of theory and practice. It is between "abstract theorising" and "concrete doing," without presuming the primacy of either. In other words, I considered the work that I did in this thesis as an ongoing and open-ended process of awareness and reflection in action (Freire, 1972; White, 2007; Zuber-Skerrit, 2001). Praxis, when formulated like this, directly connects to some of the main concerns of both the feminisms I employ and cultural studies: in their emphasis on power inequities and their focus on doing cultural studies and feminism as a way of intervening in and reperforming the hegemonial politics, norms, conventions, and practices that govern scholarly knowledge creation and communication (Adema, 2015, 2021; Hall, 2002, 2008; Kember, 2014a, b).

Developing my critical praxis as part of my PhD studies – while researching, theorising, and writing – and developing it in a way that could be adopted by future PhD students and scholars, has been an inherent part of the theoretical framework that accompanies this thesis and vice versa. This theoretical framework can be seen as a way to critically analyse the larger political, financial, epistemic, and socio-cultural conditions and relationships that constitute academia, the humanities, and the PhD thesis itself (and by extension myself as a PhD student) (Adema, 2015). This approach implied that I self-critically reflect on my own scholarly behaviour while conducting the research for this PhD thesis. I did this in order to understand my position and to see how I – through my own practice of theorising and representing knowledge – could still (unwillingly or unknowingly) be contributing to the hegemonic structures and asymmetrical relations of power in knowledge production that I have wanted to confront in this thesis. This is the basis upon which, as I argue, it becomes possible to experimentally reperform and transform these power relations. In other words, I consider knowledge production as a field of praxis and a space of experimentation to question the hegemonies in scholarly knowledge production with the intent to perform them differently, more ethically maybe, and to invite other scholars to do so too.

Engaging in experimentation, as I mentioned previously, enabled me to avoid mere repetition of established humanist paradigms facilitating my exploration of more interconnected, dynamic, and unrestricted styles of writing, and to some extent, mitigated the dominance of my authoritative voice as the author of this thesis. Experimentation also enabled me to tentatively propose an

interventionist reading methodology for creating more diverse and equitable conditions for OA publishing today. As part of this methodology, I propose a set of methods focusing on reducing socio-cultural, epistemic, behavioral, and linguistic barriers to participation in the processes and knowledge production.

In what follows, I will, in more detail, discuss how and in which ways my thesis can be seen as a practical critique of the political, financial, epistemic, and socio-cultural conditions under which humanities knowledge is currently being produced and distributed. As part of this discussion, I will consider these questions: What are the concrete implications of the model of critical praxis I have developed as part of this thesis regarding my own practice of researching, analysing, theorising, writing-up, and sharing knowledge? What are the potentials and pitfalls of such a praxis? And how can others engage in a similar way?

Theory and Practice: A more Ethical Relation?

The theoretical framework supporting this thesis helped me to define my field of research. It helped me to think more closely about the relationships and tensions between the topics I engaged with as part of this PhD thesis. These included the historically uneven power relations within (presumably global-scale) scholarly knowledge production; the role dominant, especially also humanist, epistemologies have played in shaping and perpetuating these; and the way different approaches to OA publishing have been positioned in relation to global-scale scholarly knowledge production and the dominant epistemologies pushed forward in this context. Constructing the theoretical framework also helped me to foreground several anti-hegemonic attempts to critique dominant tendencies in knowledge production, including those developed within proto-feminist and early anti-colonial grassroots initiatives from the seventeenth century onwards; those performed by Womanist publishing collectives in the second half of the twentieth century; and the contemporary critical digital experiments with book forms and formats, authorship models, and practices such as research, writing, editing, and distributing in the context of OA publishing. The analysis of these experiments helped me to further frame and pursue my own critical praxis, taking inspiration from these anti-hegemonic textual engagements. It also helped me to conceive of and further develop the interventionist reading methodology that I will discuss in what follows. It is simultaneously a product of my critical praxis and a model, or invitation, for other scholars to engage with a similar praxis within their own scholarship seeking to enable more equitable and diverse conditions for scholarly knowledge production, as part of OA publishing or outside of it.

Theorising from a Broad Knowledge Base

To theorise non-oppositionally and to make cuts in and represent research as ethically as possible, an acknowledgement needs to be made about how the (re)sources my reading and theorising were based upon are as much marked by absence as by presence. As I discuss in this thesis, the "global English-language knowledge base" as it is administered and assembled through the predominant academic publishing systems, is skewed. Additionally, while English is positioned as the academic *lingua franca,* a vast repertoire of important non-Western scholarship, published, for example, in French or Spanish, has never been translated into English (Chan et al. 2020). Furthermore, some of the sources I was interested in consulting were locked behind paywalls.

Consequently, navigating these conditions involved certain ethico-political considerations and decisions around, among other things, technical, linguistic, and epistemological issues within searching, ordering, and reviewing these materials. Thanks to my specific background – my upbringing in the multi-lingual Swiss education system; my previous research around pirate libraries; and my current research on OA publishing – I was able to assume a certain agency in making these decisions. This agency is one that others – for example those lacking similar language skills or those lacking knowledge about how to find books outside of established infrastructures – cannot equally assume. Aiming to include theory originating both in the Global North and Global South, [16] I engaged with research written in both Spanish and French;[17] due to the underrepresentation of non-English content in Western repositories I expanded my research towards repositories situated in the Global South such as the Latin American library platform SciELO initiated in Brazil**;** and to circumvent article and book paywalls, I often looked for sources on pirate and shadow libraries.

I am convinced that my research has benefitted from this broad, perhaps more diverse and inclusive, theorising. However, I am aware that others are not in a position to assume the same amount of

[16] In what follows, I understand the Global North not first and foremost as a geographical location, but rather as a condition determined by one's access to resources and financial and cultural capital. The Global North can be conceptualised as a node of concentration of resources, of the legitimacy that the volume of those resources provides, as well as of subjects that benefit from being in closest proximity to this node (Santos, 2015). I understand the Global South a political place constituted by "capitalism, colonialism, patriarchy, and all their satellite-oppressions [which are] increasingly more specialized in the transnationalization of suffering" (Santos, 2015, 10). Consequently, I would like to embrace De Sousa Santos' broad appraisal of the Global South: "The historical injustice of colonialism and slavery; the sexual injustice of patriarchy, gynophobia, and homophobia; the intergenerational injustice of hatred against the young and against sustainable models of development; the ethnic-racial injustice of racism and xenophobia; and the cognitive injustice committed against the wisdom of the world on behalf of the monopoly of science and the technologies sanctioned by science" (Santos, 2015, 13/14).

[17] All the translations of these sources into English in this thesis are my own.

agency in dealing with and forcing open (at least to a certain extent) the distorted knowledge base that for many scholars serves as the most evident basis upon which to build their research. I therefore – as a marginal note, only – want to stress that in order for others to assume a similar agency, a cognitive and cultural shift has to happen which is as much a topic of school teaching (for example, regarding language skills) as it is a topic of researcher training (for example, regarding critical research perspectives, tools, and methodologies).

Theorising with Others

The way in which I am attempting, through my theorising, to open out towards different voices and to represent them in my theoretical framework (for example, by shedding light on various antagonist, anti-colonial and proto-feminist, publishing initiatives), is based on a set of assumptions. Namely, it is based on the presumed desirable effect that such a widening of perspectives will have. As Sarah Ahmed (1998) argues, it is important to not lose sight of who is defining desirable effects for whom. Representing and investigating these presumably more emancipatory cultures can lead to the mystification of "others" reinforcing historical power disparities rather than confronting them.[18] Consequently, Ahmed argues that a feminist ethics of representation should not be for or about "the other", but rather this ethics involves "responding to the particular other in a present that carries traces of the past, as well as opening up the future" (Ahmed, 2002, 572).

My intention while developing my theoretical framework and critical praxis has not been to overcome issues of representation and related problems (such as notions of authoritative authorship) once and for all. In fact, overcoming these issues is impossible. However, I understood my practice as a field that requires a self-critical commitment to a more ethical involvement in the representation of "others," despite the impossibility of achieving this (fully). As Johnson et al. write in this regard: "Praxis means taking our own and other's theories seriously enough to seek to act and live by them ... Drawing theory closer to practice may bring knowledge to account at the bar of politics (where it already has a place as witness), but also summons politics to the bar of knowledge" (2004: 92).

[18] Grewal and Kaplan (1994) have made the point that, for example, Rich's feminist politics of location (1986) has often been taken up by liberal feminism as a superficial celebration of global sisterhood based on diversity, while ultimately remaining an act of Western imperialism. To fortify this critique, Grewal and Kaplan criticise the analysis of the K'iche' (a part of Maya peoples) human rights activist and feminist Rigoberta Menchu's testimonial biography *I, Rigoberta Menchú* (1983) as undertaken by Meese in her book *(Ex)Tensions: RE-Figuring Feminist Criticism* (1990). Grewal and Kaplan admonish that Meese, in her effort to transcend differences between women and the gaps between theory and practice, appropriates Menchu's text by granting "theory status" to all "activist intent" regardless of the situation or struggle this activist intent might emerge from. However, such a notion, as these scholars stress, "might matter only to those who have the social power to discriminate between critical and cultural practices" (Grewal & Kaplan, 1994, 147).

Shaping my theoretical framework and critical praxis, against this background, I experimented with diverse ways of "cutting" more responsibly and ethically:

Firstly, I have strived to question my singular speaking position. I did so, by, in the chapter "Postscript," engaging in more experimental ways of writing (I further discuss this writing experiment at the end of this chapter). Within this experimental approach, I tried to write from where I am (Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017), while situating myself within a relational, embodied, layered, dialogic, and "unruly" approach to textual representation and becoming. As part of an experimental text, I conjoined theoretical resources, the insights from my analysis of pre-digital and digital antagonistic writing, editing, and publishing practices, and experiences from what can be considered outside of the realm of this thesis: resources from face-to-face encounters and digital gatherings related to my teaching position at Sandberg Institute in Amsterdam; voices from literature and voices in my head; memories, fears, and hopes. Within this experimental piece of writing, I introduce, contextualise, and document the interventionist reading methodology that I suggested as part of my theoretical framework. This methodology was collaboratively performed and tested as part of two online reading groups titled *The Re-Reading Room* (which I will discuss more in depth in what follows). In my experimental piece of writing, I analyse and share the collaborative insights generated during *The Re-Reading Room.*

This way of sense-making and representation – positioned, in this thesis, as a "Postscript" after the conclusion chapter – is not so much based on humanist premises of analytic argumentation and neutral representation. Rather, this writing embodies a commitment to the inherently collaborative nature of texts as well as the pertaining practices of knowledge creation, while acknowledging the situated, hybrid, relational, and open-ended character of my knowing and subjectivity.

Secondly, developing my theoretical framework and critical praxis in an attempt to "cut" more responsibly and ethically also involved the direct meeting, or engagement, of myself with "others." By engaging a diverse range of participants (from different academic hierarchy levels, from various disciplines, linguistic, and geographic contexts, from in and outside of academia), I embraced such an encounter within *The Re-Reading Room*, calling attention to the relational or dialogic aspect of this engagement, while simultaneously pointing out the impossibility of speaking with one singular, detached voice. I understood *The Re-Reading Room* as a "strategic device" (Bonsiepe, 2000), as an act of collaborative (self-)re-examination able to convey, share, and "test" insights from my PhD, specifically the critical theoretical framework and praxis I have developed in and through my thesis.

In turn, these reading groups enabled testing and further co-development of the experimental interventionist reading methodology I am proposing in this thesis.

The methodology of critical praxis also triggered questions around the need to adapt some of the existing methods and genres prevalent in humanities (PhD) research, specifically the literature review, the historical analysis, and the critical genealogy. How can these be transformed in order to support the feminist cultural studies framework this PhD adheres to? Experimentation pointed a way forward for engaging with questions like these and it formed the main mode in which I have been interrogating and reperforming the fields that my critical praxis centres upon.

Methods: An Experimental Approach

Diffractive Reading: Interacting Differently with Sources

Reading, in this thesis, has been a central linchpin between all the other activities, or sub-fields, that I have been concerned with – including writing, theorising, analysing, and interpretating. I understand reading as important within my critical praxis, as a site in which issues of accessibility, participation, representation, as well as what constitutes legitimate academic work can be experimentally questioned, negotiated, and reperformed toward the ideals of diversity and equality. This is why I have explored experimental approaches to reading in my own analysis, interpretation, and theorising. Additionally, as I further elaborate at the end of this chapter, I chose the reading group as a location to situate and collaboratively test and discuss the methodology I have implemented as part of my theoretical framework.

As Guillory (2008) remarks, reading is intrinsically related to humanities scholarship. He points out that in many humanities' disciplines (such as literary scholarship, history, or cultural studies) "[i]ntensive reading in the scholarly context is defined by the practice of rereading, or, in the … favorite term of art, 'close reading'" (2008: 13). Through reading, Guillory continues, humanities scholars move through a large quantity of material quickly – by "skimming" and "pecking" – to find relevant texts and passages. Getting distracted is not a problem for Guillory but an intrinsic quality of how humanities scholars work. As Edmonds discusses, openness to distraction "facilitates knowledge creation in conversation with and between sources, bringing together disparate times and places, authors and forms of source material, frames of reference and layers of insight, harnessing peripheral vision as much as central focus to create the conditions for serendipitous discovery" (2018: 1). Like Edmonds, Guillory (2008) and Howe (2002) also describe reading as a relational,

situated, and performative activity in which multi-voiced dialogues – for example, between scholars and books, books and books, and scholars and scholars – and unlikely juxtapositions between different sources, can provoke the emergence of new or different points of convergence. Rebei (2004), in a similar vein, emphasises the importance of variables such as "a reader's gender, race, historical, geographical, and cultural background, and level of education" (52). As she further remarks, "these variables contribute to and affect the act of reading because readers from different historical, geographical, and cultural backgrounds not only read differently but also are bound to do so" (52).

However, as I want to put forward here, reading in contemporary academia – because of, for example, the increasing mono-lingualism and the skewed global English-language knowledge base that forms the basis of much academic writing and reading in Western academia – often evolves within relatively narrow confines. As Sedgwick (1997) and Guillory (2008) additionally stress, due to both the increased quantity of digitally available text and the heightened institutional pressure on academics to deliver outputs, reading is often driven by competition and utilitarianism: one skims texts with one's own publishing record and its potential reward in mind. Sedgwick (1997) calls this way of reading paranoid: a reading knowing in advance what to find; a violent act – assimilating others to protect oneself from danger, for example from scholars making the "better" argument and getting cited more widely. What becomes clear here, is that contemporary reading practices tend to remain interlaced with an academic reward and reputation system in which notions of originality and authority, impact, discipline, and responsibility are grounded in humanist conceptions of the book and its author.

Against this background, I employed diffractive reading as a main method of collating, analysing, and discussing textual sources. Diffractive reading intervenes into dominant critical paradigms of reading, including the idea of text as static and authoritative, notions of singular and self-contained authorship in control of the truth, the placement of the reader outside of the text, and the idea that one text can exist detached from the other. Experimenting with reading, in this case, might delineate a critical engagement with, intervention into, and a partial way out of paranoid impulses (without ever entirely being outside of these impulses). As part of this diffractive reading, I have read different accounts of the history of knowledge production and, especially, of OA publishing together. I have done so, to acquire an overview of the historical and contemporary landscape and discourse by engaging with multiple positions. I have not read these narratives in opposition to each other. Rather, diffractive reading resonates with the post-oppositional "bricolage" way of theorising I have embraced in this thesis in so far that it "breaks through the academic habit of [oppositional] criticism and works along affirmative lines [as it] is not based on a comparison between philosophies as

closed, isolated entities, but on affirming links between … schools of thoughts" (van der Tuin, 2011, 22). As van der Tuin posits, different readings represent different "agential cuts" in the world-text-reader constellation. In my analysis, I have laid emphasis on the humanist tendencies in the discourse around knowledge production and sharing as well as the attempts to critique them. Exploring different ideas and approaches to OA publishing – both more prominent and more marginalised ones – I have analysed how they emerged out of specific struggles, conflicts, alliances, and exercises of power. In this analysis, I have been keen on presenting a more heterogeneous and entangled vision of OA publishing moving beyond the afore mentioned binaries and dominant narratives implicated in the discourse. In this vein, I have been discussing various approaches to OA publishing together exploring where distinct visions for OA publishing have emerged and where differences and similarities between them have arisen. Especially, I have focused on exposing the (humanism-based) value systems that lie behind certain dominant definitions of and approaches to OA but also behind (related) prevalent ideas on books, scholarship, scholarly practice, on how these have been contested over time, and how this influences the past, present and future of OA publishing – emphasising the performative character of such a reading for future debates on OA related to knowledge equity and diversity.

As Dolphijn and van der Tuin remark "[d]iffractive readings bring inventive provocations; they are good to think with. They are respectful, detailed, ethical engagements" (2012: 50). Diffractive reading makes use of the serendipity and relationality of reading and the performativity of text. In the context of New Materialism, Hepler et al. (2019) describe how diffractive reading "happens when we lean into the accidental and unaccounted for" (3). In this sense, reading diffractively helped me to establish unlikely juxtapositions and connections. This includes connections that I have arisen as part of my genealogical work that I will describe in the next subchapter. For example, as part of this genealogy, I have established links between: experiments with relational, situated, and horizontal forms of author- editor- and readership, as well as with multi-agential publications performed by proto-feminist and early anti-colonial grassroots initiatives in the seventeenth century; Womanist and Latin American queer-feminist writing, editing, and publishing in the second half of the twentieth century; and interventions into predominant (humanist) modes of scholarly knowledge production performed within critical OA advocacy.

A Feminist, Post-Oppositional Genealogy

The historical analysis I conducted in this thesis is also genealogical. This thesis starts with a diagnosis of the current situation by looking at the landscape of academic publishing, especially OA publishing, raising – in chapters 2 and 3 – a number of important questions in terms of knowledge equity and diversity. I then use historical materials to analyse how different – more prominent and more marginalised – contemporary OA practices and institutions have emerged out of specific power struggles: For example, as I discuss in chapters 3 and 4, this includes the power struggle around the positioning of OA publishing in relation to the economic agendas of large commercial publishers; and it includes, as I elaborate in chapters 4 and 7, the power struggle around humanist knowledge systems – the way in which these have been reinforced and contested over time. My analysis also discusses how these struggles, as well as the conflicts and alliances emerging as part of them, have informed the current definitions of and approaches to OA publishing.

In this historical analysis, I have focused especially one those that have been marginalised in these conflicts: This includes proto-feminist and early anti-colonial grassroots initiatives in the seventeenth century; Womanist and Latin American queer-feminist writing, editing, and publishing undertakings in the second half of the twentieth century; and interventions into dominant (humanist) definitions, institutions, and practices of scholarly knowledge production performed within critical OA advocacy. By diffractively reading these initiatives together, I tried to carve out an alternative history of knowledge production on the basis of critiques of humanist epistemologies, norms, and paradigms that stretches over five centuries – this approach is exemplified in chapters 6, 7, and 8 of my thesis, as well as within my experimental writing in the "Postscript."

My genealogical approach owes to Alexander and Mohanty's (1997, 2010) version of feminist genealogy, which focuses on the political and economic impacts of universalist and normative neoliberal, neo-colonial, and neo-imperialist globalisation trajectories. These impacts are analysed across different epistemic, cultural, and geographical locations. Alexander and Mohanty, in their analysis, foreground different collective practices of women's oppositional organising for more differentiated approaches to globalisation, in different contexts of marginalisation around the globe. While several of the approaches to genealogy that are situated in similar fields as this study, Foucault's method of material-discursive genealogy plays an important role (see Adema, 2015; Moore, 2019b), the feminist genealogy I have chosen, in brief, expands on Foucault's work by affirmatively critiquing it. It does so by focusing on historically and culturally situated phenomena, paying particular attention to how gender, race, and class shape the cases under analysis. Hartsock's

(1990, 1996) critical work on Foucault can illuminate two central arguments that have motivated this expansion: on the one hand, as Hartsock argues, Foucault's theory of power is formulated from an epistemological perspective of domination and not from the perspective of the subordinated — for example, women, people-of-colour, and queer and colonised people. Therefore, as she argues, his theory cannot account for the experience of marginalised subjects. Furthermore, as she admonishes, Foucault's analysis of power does not sufficiently theorise the structural dimensions of inequality. As she writes: "Domination, viewed from above, is more likely to look like equality" (1996: 39).

Even though formulated as a comparative approach, Alexander's and Mohanty's study is framed as relational too. As they write: "To talk about feminist praxis in global contexts would involve shifting the unit of analysis from local, regional, and national culture to relations and processes across cultures. Grounding analyses in particular, local feminist praxis is necessary, but we also need to understand the local in relation to larger, cross-national processes" (Alexander & Mohanty, 1997, xix). They furthermore emphasise the performative aspects of their genealogy: "Our use of words like 'genealogies' … is not meant to suggest a frozen or embodied inheritance of domination and resistance, but an interested, conscious thinking and rethinking of history and historicity, a rethinking which has women's autonomy and self-determination at its core" (1997: xvi).

Following Alexander and Mohanty, when carving out an alternative history of knowledge production, I have foregrounded various antagonist engagements with dominant (in the framework of my analysis humanist) epistemologies. For example, as I mentioned previously, those developed within critical theory and within the collective practices and processes of (primarily) women's anti-hegemonial organising, in different contexts of marginalisation, at different times, in different institutions, and in different global regions. Conceptualising critical OA publishing as part of a humanist-critical tradition that since centuries has been set up in antagonistic relationship with humanist knowledge systems and emphasising their importance for greater knowledge equity and diversity in academic knowledge production and sharing, I aimed to bring about a ''revaluing of values'' disturbing "what was previously thought immobile; … [fragmenting] what was thought unified; … [showing] the heterogeneity of what was imagined consistent with itself'' (Foucault, 1991: 82). I wanted to effectuate such a revaluing of values especially regarding prominent ways of defining OA publishing (namely as a way to mediate the consumption of research outputs) including a problematisation of who has come to define what OA is and should be about.

In consequence to these considerations, I argue that embedding forms of critical OA publishing within a longer history of antagonist theoretical and practical engagements with humanist epistemologies, can shed a different light on what the main challenges (as well as opportunities) are when advocating for more equal forms of knowledge creation – and the potential role OA publishing

can play in establishing this. For example, it can help to emphasise why it is important to open up the discourse around narrow definitions of OA publishing focused on increasing the visibility and *consumption* of academic texts and books towards a focus on enabling a broad and diverse participation in processes and practices of knowledge production which is, as I argue, a precondition for confronting cultural, linguistic, and epistemic issues at play in the way research is predominantly performed, written-up, and conveyed in contemporary academia. Contributing to the visibility and greater acceptance of this wider framing of the scope of OA publishing has been one of the main aims of this thesis.

The Re-Reading Room

The Re-Reading Room, consisting of two one-off online reading groups I hosted in January and February 2022, functioned as a way for me to put up for discussion one of the central theoretical claims of this thesis and is also embodied in the interventionist reading methodology that I have developed: namely, that a more considerate facilitation of the participation in practices and processes of knowledge production can lead to potentially more diverse and equitable conditions in the context of OA publishing. It also helped me to collaboratively enact, test, and find perspectives to further develop the proposed methodology and a pertaining set of methods that exemplify ways in which such a participation could be facilitated. I have developed this methodology on the basis of, amongst others, the insights of this thesis (provided in a concise way in the chapter "Conclusion").

The two reading groups were attended by 21 people in total. The participants were from Belgium, France, Germany, Holland, Italy, Mexico, Portugal Serbia, Switzerland, the UK, and the U.S.[19] Among them were artists, librarians, publishers, scholars (PhD students, early career researchers, and professors from the fields of art history and theory, literature studies, architecture, media and cultural studies, anthropology, political sciences, and critical education studies), and staff from OA infrastructure providers. The text I chose to read and discuss during the two iterations of *The Re-Reading Room* was an excerpt from Cristina Rivera Garza's *The Restless Dead: Necrowriting and Disappropriation* (2020) in which the author discusses (re)writing (as well as certain forms of reading) as a form of *disappropriation,* "exposing the incomplete, processual nature of any text" and its inherently collaborative nature (Adema et al., 2021).[20]

[19] Originally, I also invited participants from India, Australia, and from African countries but the time difference between the continents and scheduling conflicts of some invitees prevented a larger trans-continental engagement.

[20] The participants of the reading group were also provided with the Spanish original *Los muertos indóciles: necroescritura y desapropiación* (2013).

The setting chosen for proposing testing this methodology was that of an online reading group: in principle, a conventionalised space for academic encounters that often evolves in quite narrow geographic, linguistic, and disciplinary fields – for example, within PhD communities or research groups situated at specific institutions. As de Mourat et al. elaborate, academic formats "evoke the institutions and practices of the academic world. On the one hand, they summon a shared framework for thinking, reading, and writing; connecting specific institutions, infrastructures, and activities. On the other hand, they contain diverse and differentiated expectations depending upon disciplines, countries, and schools of thoughts" (2020: 103). The tenor within reading groups based in Western academia is determined by humanist norms and "paranoid" (Sedgwick, 1997) ways of engaging: "Read vertically, the traditional/humanist column echoed the confines of space and time into a material presence: in such a reading group, you are in attendance in a particular room at a particular time to meet with particular people with a particular text prepared, ready to co-confirm what is knowable" (Hepler et al., 2017: 6).

As I want to emphasise, these pre-conditions indicate that the digital reading group can function as a potentially insightful site to question, negotiate, and reperform issues of openness, accessibility, and participation in established forms of knowledge production, under the premise of finding ways to increase diversity and equality, and to broaden what is considered to constitute legitimate academic work. What furthermore points towards the relevance of a critical consideration of reading is that, as Striphas (2008) stresses, the complexity and critical interventionist potential of reading has remained notoriously underrated. However, as I wanted to stress by choosing the reading group as a specific site of experimentation, a reconsideration of reading (or the ways in which knowledges are approached, perceived, interpreted, transmitted, and performatively enacted through reading) as a socio-material practice is important when focusing on knowledge equity and diversity. Specifically, in a time in which scholars, thanks to the internet, can more easily engage with materials emerging in different disciplinary, cultural, and epistemic contexts and can more easily collaborate with a diverse range of individuals and communities. As Horava (2015) remarks, digital forms and formats spark new ways of understanding and expand how we "create meaning and develop knowledge," while Hayles urges that now "it is time to rethink what reading is and how it works in the rich mixtures of words and images, sounds and animations, graphics and letters that constitute the environments of twenty-first-century literacies" (2010: 78).

To engage a range of participants beyond the narrow confines academic encounters often evolve in (de Mourat et al., 2020)**, I, as mentioned previously, consciously invited participants from different academic hierarchy levels, from various disciplines, from in and outside of academia, different languages and regions**. Taking into consideration that some of the participants were situated outside

of academia, in junior positions, and in under-funded institutions, the participants received a small financial compensation for their time. I do not – for reasons of anonymity – mention the full names of the participants here or in any other context of this PhD.

To host *The Re-Reading Room*, I employed collaborative open source tools and platforms, such as the conferencing platform Big Blue Button (BBB) and the social annotation tool hypothes.is. However, in my thesis I argue **that behavioural, epistemic, and linguistic barriers might disable an equal and diverse exchange among the various agencies engaged in processes of knowledge production**. This argument is related to my insight, that – even though open source publishing tools and platforms can offer scholars enhanced opportunities to facilitate more accessible, diverse, and horizontal knowledge exchanges – the participation in practices of knowledge creation and sharing, due to these barriers, are not a given, even if technological and operational barriers are removed. For example, non-native English speakers can feel insecure and inferior in exchanges dominated by native English speakers; behavioural patterns related to gender, class, and race prejudices can emerge in online collaborations; or "factual" scientific knowledges, ways of knowing and arguing can in certain contexts of collaboration become prioritised over more embodied, experimental, and experiential knowledges and ways of knowing.

In designing the reading methodology and facilitating the reading activities during *The Re-Reading Room,* I focused on minimising these barriers and devised ways to overcome these. Drawing, among other things, on my insights from the analysis of community-building, -engagement, and facilitation practices used by pre-digital publishing initiatives and in the context of critical OA advocacy I employed a set of methodological tools and procedures that are explained and discussed in the chapters "Conclusion" and "Postscript." These tools and procedures include: an **editable "code of conduct"** shared with all the participants prior to the reading group taking place (to outline some of the social inhibitions and inequity issues that often remain unacknowledged in online spaces to create awareness around them); **grounding and "digital campfire" exercises** were used to root the participants in their bodies, and their geographical and cultural settings, and to evoke a certain sense of spatiality and intimacy during the online meeting; a series of r**eading protocols** helping participants, among other things, to go beyond conventional humanist ways of interacting with and around texts – such as trying to intellectually analyse or grasp it, while opening up the possibility to employ different modes of interrelating with the text; as well as **the possibility to give feedback and interact with one another** in different ways, for example, in written or spoken form, in various languages.

To collect data during *The Re-Reading Room*, I engaged the participants in informal discussions – which I scheduled in during the reading group – which focused on how the experience of the

encounter relates to the aims of open access publishing. The discussion also addressed questions on how alternative, experimental forms of reading, in the context of OA publishing, could help to achieve greater knowledge equity and diversity. I also encouraged participants to send their feedback after the reading group, via email. I analyse, further discuss, and interpret this data as collected as part of and after *The Re-Reading Room,* in the chapter "Conclusion." Further analysis, along with documentation, is provided in the experimental piece of writing, the "Postscript," I describe at the end of this chapter. The chapters "Conclusion" and "Postscript" also share tentative insights into how the critical methodology that I developed for and as part of this thesis has been received by the participants and puts forward suggestions (many made by participants) about how this methodology could be applied beyond the setting of reading groups and practices, for example, to support collaborative research, writing, and editing engagements.

What needs to be acknowledged here too, are some things that have taken place while I have written this PhD. These are inherently entangled with this thesis' becoming by, for example, influencing the methodology I have proposed. These things are, amongst others: the COVID-19 pandemic that coincided with the first half of my PhD scholarship; the position as a tutor and lecturer in experimental writing and publishing I held at the Studio for Immediate Spaces (SIS) MA course at Sandberg Institute, Amsterdam before and during the first half of my PhD; as well as the (re-)reading of fiction I engaged with while writing (including authors such as Billy-Ray Belcourt or Virginia Woolf). During the COVID-19 pandemic, I attended different experimental online reading groups, such as the *Slow Reading Club* (hosted by the dancer and choreographer Bryana Fritz and the artist Henry Andersen) which aimed at multi-sensorial collaborative reading experiences. Some of the reading protocols used during *The Re-Reading Room* are versions of methods employed by Bryana and Henry. I experimented with these methods also prior to *The Re-Reading Room*: for example together with Anna Lorenz, Nina Jäger, and Jamie Allen (my co-editors of *continent.* journal) with whom I co-founded the *attend* reading group; with Dubravka Sekulić with whom I co-curated and co-hosted the *Reading Together* online reading group for the Haus der Kulturen der Welt (HKW) in Berlin; as well as with the students of Studio for Immediate Spaces MA course. At the Sandberg Institute, I also was part of the *Hear!Here!* study group for teaching staff. We hosted and attended a series of critical pedagogy workshops (for example, with Clare Butcher, Cissie Fu, Ayesha Ghanchi, and Storm Vogel) where I was introduced to methods used in open education and radical feminist and de-colonial pedagogy, for example, grounding exercises. These sources were crucial for the development of the reading methodology as one of the main outcomes of this thesis, though they do not form part of my theoretical framework. However, I reference and discuss them in the "Postscript," the experimental piece of writing that forms part of this PhD thesis.

Experimental Writing

In an experimental piece of writing, included in the "Postscript" at the end of this thesis, I present, document, and discuss the interventionist reading methodology that I have devised as part of my theoretical framework. In addition to this, I embed this methodology in the larger context of resources from feminist facilitation and organisation theories, including critical pedagogy, and auto-critical feminist practices of fiction writing and theory production.

By writing experimentally, I additionally pushed (beyond) the limits of my own authoritative voice and subject position as the author of this thesis (a position that I have previously identified as problematic in relation to greater knowledge equity and diversity). I did so by trying to enact more relational approaches to knowledge creation and (my own) identity formation as a PhD student (but also my identity as a critical feminist scholar and white woman). In this vein, I emphasised the positionality, partiality, and fluidity of my subject position, as well as the inherently multi-temporal, social, non-linear, and open-ended character of analysis, interpretation, and representation.

In my writing I have exemplified this through the different voices, temporalities, and events that are interwoven with each other in the same textual layer (set in the same font, without being visually distinctive from each other). Here past, present, and potential future events, voices stemming from theoretical considerations, emerging in a more personal realm, and manifesting during *The Re-Reading Room*, written, spoken, thought and imagined words, mingle to embody the situated, dialogic, relational, open ended, and messy character of all processes of knowledge creation. In attempting to further emphasise the dialogic and relational character of knowledge and knowing, I refrained from using pronouns other than "you" and relinquished in-text references: as a result, my writing appears as a conversation rather than as a discussion, critical analysis, and contextualisation of references.

At the same time, I tried to make manifest the limits, or, in fact, the impossibility of fully acknowledging this relationality and communality within the confines of singular authorship, or a single-authored PhD thesis. In this vein, a set of interjacent voices or echoes form part of the experimental piece of writing and constantly remind myself (and the readers of this thesis) of the futility of my struggle for more just forms of representation. In other words, through this experimental piece of writing, I have embodied the contradictions and doubts related to the tensions that emerge from the stated critical and interventionist ambition of my praxis – for example, to enable more diverse, equal and communal and open forms of knowledge production – and the institutional, cultural, and economic frameworks and expectations of a PhD.

The “Postscript” – positioned after the “Conclusion” chapter – plays with the common format of the PhD thesis as a whole, a “work,” delineated by a clear beginning (the “Introduction” chapter) and end (the “Conclusion” chapter). Through the “Postscript,” I aimed to partially un-work the “work-ness” of my thesis, thereby questioning the prevalent (humanist) notions of the text, the publication, and the book as static, bound, and authoritative.

SECTION I

INEQUTIES IN SCHOLARLY KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION, THE MARGINALISATION OF CRITICAL OA PUBLISHING, AND THE FOCUS ON RESEARCH OUTPUT

Chapter 2: The Commercial Monopolisation of the Academic Publishing Sphere

Academic publishing today is increasingly monopolised by a handful of large commercial publishers, including Elsevier (formerly known as Reed Elsevier and now forming part of the RELX Group), Wiley-Blackwell, Springer, and Taylor & Francis (Albornoz et al., 2018; Chan et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2019). Alongside other corporations, for example data analytics companies such as Clarivate, these big publishers have incrementally expanded their realm beyond their traditional publishing role by directing their strategy towards other ways of generating income (Aspesi & Brand, 2020; Chen et al., 2019).[21] For example, they have focused on acquiring and integrating scholarly infrastructure including online teaching platforms, reference managing software, careers posting and funding databases, as well as services and tools that measure, compare, and assess research output. In the case of Elsevier – which is, according to Claudio Aspesi et al. (2019), the largest publisher in terms of journal revenues – the company owns systems for evaluating and validating research quality and impact as well as platforms through which researchers' data is analysed and stored, including Pure, SciVal, and Mendeley.[22]

In this chapter, I take a closer look at this system, in which a few commercial global players (mainly publishers) have come to dominate the way publishing is approached and realised globally. As part of this analysis, I provide an overview of the global sphere of knowledge production as envisioned,

[21] The traditional role of the publisher includes the editing, design, layout, marketing and distribution of publications.

[22] Pure aggregates and curates research information from, for example, researchers, research centres, projects, outputs, professional activities and events to showcase and promote research at a university. SciVal can be used to visualise and benchmark research performance and analyse research trends. The online reference manager Mendeley is used to bookmark references. As Elsevier argues, data from Mendeley reflects reading and can thus be used to measure reader impact, since bookmarking might reflect reading and thus can "reveal how often certain Mendeley users (all users or specific status groups such as lecturers, librarians, professors, researchers or students) have read (bookmarked) papers published by authors from certain institutions" (Bornmann et al., 2021).

administered, and upheld by large commercial publishers (for example, through their control of major publishing infrastructures such as databases), pricing models (including article and book processing charges), and publishing outlets (such as journals). I will investigate if and how certain mechanisms and tools implemented by these publishers (for example, the norms used to evaluate and assess scientific output), have influenced scholarly knowledge creation and sharing, the way in which research is performed, made sense of, written up, and delivered. Especially, I will study the potential linguistic, cultural, and epistemic effects (which languages are spoken, who gets to speak, in which form and format), as well as the economic consequences (who profits in terms of symbolic and financial capital) the dominance of a few commercial publishers provokes in the landscape of academic knowledge production. In this context, I am to also showcase and discuss the concern voiced by some critical OA scholars that this system bears neo-colonial and neo-imperialist characteristics (Albornoz et al., 2018; Beigel, 2013, 2018; Chan et al., 2020). As part of these critiques academics such as Knöchelmann (2021) have stipulated that the commercial sphere of academic publishing is promoting forms of *testimonial injustice*. Testimonial injustice is one of the two forms of epistemic injustice conceptualised by Miranda Fricker.[23] As she defines it: "[t]estimonial injustice occurs when prejudice causes a hearer to give a deflated level of credibility to a speaker's word; hermeneutical injustice occurs at a prior stage, when a gap in collective interpretive resources puts someone at an unfair disadvantage when it comes to making sense of their social experiences" (2007: 1). Testimonial injustice, so Knöchelmann (2021) discusses, is inherent in the commercial sphere of academic publishing in that certain communities are excluded from participating in global-scale academic knowledge production.

[23] Epistemic injustice (Fricker, 2007) is injustice happening on the basis of knowledge and knowing, it occurs through institutions and practices in which knowers engage in order to know (and be acknowledged and heard in their capacity as knower). It includes, for example, the discrimination and wronging of particular knowers as knowers based, among other things, on prejudice about knowers due to their social or ethnical background, gender, race, accent, fluency of language etcetera. Epistemic injustice occurs, when academic communication systems, curricula or disciplines are "structured in ways that systematically ignore, distort, and/or discredit particular intellectual traditions" (Pohlhaus, 2017, 13).[24] The alignment of scholarly publishing with the developments and interests of the commercial international book trade, however, goes back as far as the emergence of the printing press (and specifically also with the mechanisation of printing processes in the nineteenth century). As Adema (2015) discusses, decisions on what to publish often were based on economic considerations. As Adema specifies: "the book trade came first, a state of affairs that did not always benefit academic authors nor the emerging system of scientific scholarship" (2015: 127). At the same time, as Fyfe stresses, a "non-commercial ethos of scholarly publishing" (2020: 157) has historically persisted as an alternative to commercial ventures – for example within professional associations – using alternative sources of income to support the circulation of research, such as donations by private individuals, government, and industry as well as international systems of publication exchanges amongst scholarly institutions that both published research and maintained research libraries. Consequently, as Adema (2015), Fyfe (2020), and Moore (2019b) make clear, the commercial character of OA publishing and the antagonistic movement against it, are historically constant elements within hegemonic struggles taking place within academia – and within academic publishing itself – for centuries. However, despite considerations such as those put forward by Adema, Fyfe, and Moore, many discussions on OA's past, present, and future tend to start from a binary position; they render OA publishing either as a continuation and augmentation of or a response to and departure from commercial or neoliberal trajectories in scholarly communication.

A Distorted Knowledge Base

The accelerated proliferation and expansion of profit-oriented publishing models aimed at establishing and consolidating a word-wide market for scientific knowledge production goes back to the end of the Second World War.[24] This development, as Jean-Claude Guédon (2008) and Eileen Fyfe et al. (2017) have illustrated, coincided with the rise in the number and size of universities and the emergence and spread of English as the scientific *lingua franca* that spurred the internationalisation of science. Narratives of globalisation and their promise of a world-wide market for scientific publications, appealed to *scholars* competing for scientific merit and *universities* striving for expansion and (world) leadership, but also to *publishers* expecting higher revenues.

These expansionist moves led to the introduction of global infrastructures, policies, and tools to enable and mediate international assessment and the comparison of research venues (such as journals) and outputs (such as articles), all of which formed the basis for scientific competition. For example, Eugene Garfield's Science Citation Index (SCI), launched in 1964, proposed a way of ranking journals in a database guided by a metric based on the ratio of citations a journal receives annually compared to the number of articles published by that journal in the previous two years (Guédon, 2008; Piron et al., 2021). This metric is called the (Journal) Impact Factor (JIF or IF). The resulting ranking gets published once a year and is now widely used to analyse the publication records of academics and judge their merits for promotion.

The SCI evolved into the Web of Science (WoS) which today is owned and run by the analytics company Clarivate. In 2004 Elsevier founded Scopus and Cite Score which, like the IF, calculate citation counts from indexed items. With this Elsevier challenged the WoS monopoly on subscription-

[24] The alignment of scholarly publishing with the developments and interests of the commercial international book trade, however, goes back as far as the emergence of the printing press (and specifically also with the mechanisation of printing processes in the nineteenth century). As Adema (2015) discusses, decisions on what to publish often were based on economic considerations. As Adema specifies: "the book trade came first, a state of affairs that did not always benefit academic authors nor the emerging system of scientific scholarship" (2015: 127). At the same time, as Fyfe stresses, a "non-commercial ethos of scholarly publishing" (2020: 157) has historically persisted as an alternative to commercial ventures – for example within professional associations – using alternative sources of income to support the circulation of research, such as donations by private individuals, government, and industry as well as international systems of publication exchanges amongst scholarly institutions that both published research and maintained research libraries. Consequently, as Adema (2015), Fyfe (2020), and Moore (2019b) make clear, the commercial character of OA publishing and the antagonistic movement against it, are historically constant elements within hegemonic struggles taking place within academia – and within academic publishing itself – for centuries. However, despite considerations such as those put forward by Adema, Fyfe, and Moore, many discussions on OA's past, present, and future tend to start from a binary position; they render OA publishing either as a continuation and augmentation of or a response to and departure from commercial or neoliberal trajectories in scholarly communication.

based bibliometric databases and indices (Stahlschmidt & Stephen, 2022). Both Clarivate and Elsevier stress that their bibliometric databases are comprehensive, in terms of the range of represented disciplines and forms of research output, such as conference papers, abstracts, books, and journals. These companies also emphasise the scholarly expertise with which the databases are created, which makes them, as Elsevier claim, trustworthy. As they write, their customers can be "confident in [the Elsevier/Scopus way of] progressing research, teaching or research direction and priorities — all from one database and with one subscription" (Elsevier, n.d.(a)). The business interest of these companies in maintaining trust in content and the database are intrinsically related, as Aspesi et al. (2019) discuss: "none of these companies shows any inclination to abandon its traditional content business, and for sound reasons. These businesses are very large relative to the overall size of either company, and failure to sustain their profitability would have severe consequences for their respective valuations. In addition, without content these companies would have a much harder task building credible data offerings".

The expansionist trajectories of a handful big commercial players have been under critique. The way in which these publishers – through expanding their service portfolios – have moved into core research and teaching activities has been a focus of that critique. This augmentation of influence, Aspesi et al. (2019) argue, leads to a loss of researcher control over these areas and entails ethical, legal, and reputational risk to institutions (for example, the collection of massive amounts of data about faculty and students is – in terms of data protection – problematic). Another cause for worry is that these companies, "based on their recommendations and metrics, can privilege their own content as well as researchers that participate within their integrated systems. … [This] has direct implications for the power and control that publishers have over the content and methodological approach of the research being produced" (Chen et al., 2019).

The journals and databases large publishers promote as a comprehensive representation of global academic research output are, in fact, distorted, as I discuss in what follows. Within their publication systems these publishers privilege research and researchers from certain geographical regions, disciplinary origins, and linguistic backgrounds over others. This is problematic, as big publishers such as Elsevier continue to be trusted among scholarly institutions and communities and remain important components of the scholarly research ecosystem (for example, their metrics are used as the basis for university rankings and to evaluate the output of researchers). This influences, as I discuss in the next subchapter, institutional and individual decision making on what is published, where, and how (Chan et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2019; Knöchelmann, 2021).

Clarivate Analytics' and Elsevier's assessment, evaluation, and selection processes have resulted in the under-representation of particular disciplines, geographic regions, and languages in the journals included in the portfolios of these large publishers, as well as in WoS and Scopus. These include primarily English content and are heavily focused on North America and Europe and on the "hard" sciences, while non-English language research, research from the Global South, and from the arts, humanities, and social sciences, remains underrepresented (Chan et al., 2020; Mboa Nkoudou, 2020; Stahlschmidt & Stephen, 2022; Tennant, 2018). One of the reasons for this is that a large number of journals, especially in the Global South, only exist physically; they do not circulate digitally (Moba Nkoudou, 2020). Furthermore, the pay-to-publish model put forward by many commercial publishers excludes researchers from less affluent institutions and underfunded research areas, as well as junior academics, from publishing in their higher-ranking journals (Chan et al., 2020; Tennant, 2018). Additionally, global science as promoted by large publishers is increasingly unilingual English (Piron et al., 2021). Consequently, databases such as WoS or Scopus include only very few non-English journals (Mboa Nkoudou, 2020). As Schöneberg (2018) stresses: "publications receive less recognition if not published in (mostly) English 'high-ranked' journals and publishers. Vernacular language is [therefore] rarely acknowledged as 'academically relevant'."

For these and other reasons the practices of large commercial publishers have been proactively criticised and opposed from within the scholarly community, including by critical OA advocates. For example, Elsevier has been boycotted by some academics, including those from the University of California. Instead of agreeing to a deal that aimed to charge both journal subscription fees and Article Processing Charges (APCs), the university refused and lost its access to Elsevier journals.[25] However, an agreement between the publisher and the university was found nonetheless after Elsevier agreed upon a transformative agreement.[26]

Several community- and scholar-led initiatives in the context of critical OA publishing have set up their own publishing infrastructures to wrestle back control from large publishers and provide an alternative to their practices. This includes initiatives such as Science Afrique and *Grenier des savoirs* that aim at strengthening the position of diverse communities of African researchers in the international publishing landscape (Science Afrique, n.d.). Both these projects have emerged from

[25] In the 1970s several large publishers have started to introduce progressively higher journal subscription costs disproportionally overstraining library budgets, which resulted in libraries not being able to subscribe to all the content they require (Eve, 2014; Moore, 2019). Since then, the journal subscription costs set by large publishers have been increasingly shifted towards a pay-to-publish model for academic OA output – in the form of Article or Book Processing Charges (APCs and BPCs) (Becerill-García, 2019, 2020).

[26] By means of transformative agreements former journal subscription fees are repurposed to include a reading fee, covering access to subscription content, and a publishing fee, a mechanism to make some or all outputs OA if the *author* is affiliated with the subscribing institution (Hinchliffe, 2019; Farley et al., 2021).

the Open Science in Haiti and Francophone Africa (SOHA) action-research project that has formed part of the Open and Collaborative Science in Development Network (OCSDNet). This network is funded by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) in Canada and the Department for International Development (DFID) in the UK. It consists of twelve researcher-practitioner teams from the Global South "interested in understanding the role of openness and collaboration in science as a transformative tool for development thinking and practice" (OCSDNet, n.d.). These teams, in their projects, are supported by OCSDNet's board of four External Advisors and a Network Coordination Team. The SOHA project was initiated 2015 by the Senegalese scientific communication scholar Diéyi Diouf and the late anthropologist Florence Piron who was based in Canada. SOHA focused on several universities in Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Haiti, Madagascar, Mali, Niger, Democratic Republic of Congo, Senegal, and Chad with the objective to understand barriers to the adoption of open science by post-graduate students; support the creation of local training tools open science; test the feasibility of institutional repositories and science shops; and create an interdisciplinary network of information and discussions on Open science in Haiti and Francophone Africa (OCSDNet, n.d.(b)). The idea of the Science Afrique platform was initiated in 2018 in response to the results and insights of SOHA and has been developed in partnership with organisations such as the International Laboratory for Action-Research on Cognitive Justice, Open Science and the Commons (LIRAJ), the Science and Common Good Association (ASBC), the Association for the Promotion of Open Science in Africa and Haiti (APSOHA) and the Interdisciplinary Research Centre on Africa and the Middle East (CIRAM). The Science Afrique platform offers free open source research tools and support and training, as well as free support and hosting of scientific journals, blogs, and research groups made available under a Creative Commons CC-BY-SA license that allows contents to be reused, remixed, and translated as long as the source is acknowledged (Science Afrique, n.d.).

The *Grenier des savoirs* is a platform conjoining multidisciplinary journals in French, focusing on themes of importance to French-speaking Africa and Haiti. The *Grenier des savoirs* was initiated and is supported by Science Afrique. The *Grenier des savoirs* offers free web hosting, management, distribution, and strategic support to so far ten member journals in order to improve their visibility and achieve international listing in the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ). The aim of the Grenier des savoirs is "to combat the invisibility and low accessibility of African and Haitian knowledge in the academic world and in society in general" (Science Afrique, n.d.). The peer-reviewed journals that are members of the *Grenier des savoirs* – situated in diverse fields including linguistics, urbanism, and education – are required to be full open access under a CC BY-SA licence, refrain from author fees, and adhere to the principles of cognitive justice, such as multidisciplinarity, epistemological pluralism, multilingualism, the fight against sexism in science, and the social relevance of articles. Another example is the platform AmeliCA, which I introduced previously. It

provides a cooperative infrastructure for scientific communication for journals from Latin America and the Global South. AmeliCA emphasises the importance of refraining from author and reader fees and argues for responsible metrics that "value publication by their own merits and not by where it is published." It also stresses that it is necessary to not apply one overarching editorial style but to respect – within the selection of journal contributions, various editing and assessment procedures: "knowledge per field …. Especially, as regards Social Sciences and Humanities" (AmeliCA, n.d.).
All these projects support the pledge of the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), which aims to eliminate the use of journal- and text-based metrics and promotes alternative tools and processes for research assessment, while calling for a broader representation of researchers in the design of research assessment practices (DORA, n.d.).

The use of alternative metrics, I stress, is not only a valuable contribution towards a potentially greater diversity of research outputs. These metrics additionally help to emphasise that different research traditions and cultures have different approaches to authorship, research quality, and, consequently, to awarding recognition for research findings. However, the dominant publishing systems that I discussed in the previous paragraphs, assess successful participation in scholarly knowledge production on the basis of individual research output, promising, as an incentive, reputation and career progression to individual researchers. This idea is integrally linked to a positivist understanding of humanist epistemologies. Such an understanding emphasises the originality, authority, and impact of research output parallels humanist notions of the individual author-genius. Even if co-authorship has become more common in the sciences, "when evaluated by tenure and review committees, co-authorship seems to pass only as a kind of extension of the single author norm" (Arbuckle & Maxwell, 2019, 9). Such an idea, as I elaborate in chapters 6 and 8, is in tension with the more open, collaborative, and horizontal approaches to scholarly knowledge creation and circulation that I want to showcase and put forward in this thesis.

The dominance of humanist science and authorship models interwoven as they are with an increasingly competitive sphere of scholarly knowledge production, might be one reason why institutions (including universities) and members of the academic community have come to believe that their needs are congruent with those of the large publishers (Yarkoni, 2016; Tennant, 2018; Bargheer & Verdicchio, 2020). [27] This contributes to a situation in which, despite the criticism

[27] A (fictional) conversation between a scholar and a non-scholar written-up by Tennant (2018) can reveal, albeit in an exaggerated fashion, the appeal that publishers' narratives of trust have within the scholarly community: Academic: "This research paper has been published and therefore is scientifically valid." / Non-academic: "But it's paywalled. I can't access it. How do I know it's valid?" / Academic: "Because it has been peer reviewed." / Non-academic: "Can you show me the peer reviews?" / Academic: "No. But it was done by two experts in the field."/ Non-academic: "Which experts?" /

towards large publishing companies, WoS and Scopus continue to be trusted among scholarly institutions and communities (Bornmann et al., 2021; Tennant & Breznau, 2022). They also remain important components of the scholarly research ecosystem providing the basis for university rankings and for bibliometric research used to measure and evaluate the "output" of researchers, institutions, and countries, while influencing which research is read and built upon (Albornoz et al., 2019; Chan et al., 2020; Piron et al., 2021).[28]

It is clear from the above discussion that global knowledge creation as envisioned, shaped, and maintained on the basis of the interests of a few corporate publishers, is not able to reflect and represent the scholarly community in its geographical, economic, disciplinary, and linguistic diversity. As I discussed, there are technological, infrastructural, financial, and linguistic components that are responsible for the underrepresentation of certain forms of knowledge in global databases and, consequently, rankings (Albornoz et al., 2018; Beigel, 2013, 2018; Chan et al., 2020). Additionally, as I point out in what follows, there is a danger that publishers also directly impact the way in which research is performed, made sense of, written up, and delivered. This, as I argue, might contribute to further inequities on the basis of cultural and epistemic criteria.

Testimonial Injustices

In this subchapter, I will investigate in how far the influence that large commercial publishers – next to controlling publishing infrastructures, pricing models, and publishing outlets – also extends towards the *content* of research and the way it is created. Asking this question here is key to the development of the argument I am making in this thesis. Namely that more attention must be paid to the role that processes and practices of knowledge production play in contributing to asymmetrical relations of power in publishing.

Leslie Chan et al. (2020) and Jon Tennant (2018) note that quality standards for journals have been dominantly established by wealthy "elite" publishers situated in the Global North. Measures to

---

Academic: "We don't know. But it's in a top journal." / Non-academic: "Why is it in a top journal?" / Academic: "Because it has a high impact factor, so is highly cited." / Non-academic: "Why does that make the research better?"/ Academic: "Trust me. I'm a scientist".

[28] For example, the *Times Higher Education's World University Rankings* is a partnership with Elsevier; the web application *Excellence Maps* developed by researchers at the Max Planck Institute that visualises the performance of institutions is using Scopus and Mendeley data; and the SCImago Journal Rank (SJR) originating from research done at the University of Granada is based on the WoS.

establish and maintain these standards include external markers such as the IF, as well as norms regarding peer review, citation formats, and writing and rhetorical styles. The latter concern the content of the articles themselves as well as the way research is written-up and made sense of. Regarding quality markers such as the IF, Tennant (2018) remarks how "librarians but also scientists, often assume that if these quality markers are absent or not recognisable [because they align with different, lesser known, quality standards], then the journals are of lesser or even questionable quality. This assumption is wrong but it continues today."

In relation to this, bibliometric indicators have been based on "objectively" defined research quality standards, that have historically been deduced from Northern European and US-style natural sciences – hence they bear a Eurocentric-bias (Beigel 2013, 2018; Beigel et al., 2018): Namely, bibliometric indicators suggest that scientific output such as data and texts, as well as the criteria to judge these outcomes by, apply equally everywhere and, hence, are comparable – at least, within a certain discipline or field.[29] Such an idea is based on a positivist interpretation of humanist epistemologies that understand science as concordant with observation and consistent with previously confirmed knowledge, while knowledge is seen as transcendent and thus independent from the personal or social attributes of its protagonists.

As I elaborate in chapter 5, humanist epistemologies have been defined in opposition to "minority," "local," or "native" supposedly outdated ideas such as the ones promoted within indigenous communities (in certain indigenous cultures knowledge has been understood as embodied, partial, and relational) (Simpson, 2011, 2014; Smith, 1999). According to the positivist variant of humanist epistemologies, the results of science (including the texts by which these results are conveyed) and the practices of knowledge production, are understood as mere systems of representation (theories, hypotheses, claims) representing a "truth" external to the knower, rather than, for example, being conceived as practices of intervention (Canaragajah, 2002; Harding, 2002).

Similar humanist standards that serve as the basis for research evaluation, have arguably also influenced the submission guidelines of journals and, consequently, the evaluation of journal submissions by boards that are – at least in English-language higher-ranking journals – often predominantly Anglophone (Fredericks, 2011; Knöchelmann, 2021; Piron et al, 2017). Consequently,

[29] An example from medical science reveals the flawed nature of the insistence on an overarching global mode of scientific knowledge production: certain diseases – for example stress disorders and heart defects – have other characteristics in different regions. Furthermore, differences in technologies, infrastructures, human and financial capital determine how local scientific communities (as well as, in certain regions, knowers of traditional and alternative medicine) interact with, treat, and investigate these diseases. The regionality of diseases and medicine, however, is not reflected in academic publishing where "the impact of a journal is measured and understood by metrics that use the world as their denominator" (Bruyns & Lamanna, 2018).

these humanist standards also define the way in which research is made sense of, written up, and delivered by researchers.

As the Springer Nature guidelines (Springer Nature, n.d.) for abstract writing reveal, the required abstract structure is mostly defined along the "five moves" of abstract writing, as defined by Hyland (2000): the formulation of introductory information, as well as information on the purpose, the method, the product (result), and the conclusion of a research article. Abdelmajid Bouziane and Fatima Metkal (2020), in their comparative analysis of research papers from different disciplines written in Arabic, French, and English discuss, abstract writing (and scientific argumentation in general) differs widely between research cultures, disciplines, geographies, and languages. These researchers emphasise that these "five moves" are rooted in a European (in this case, mostly British English) positivist humanist writing tradition by which all "writers should abide" (240). According to Bouziane and Metkal, the description of the aim and purpose of a paper is an essential element of abstract writing in all three languages. Information on the methodology is also part of most of the analysed abstracts. Yet the anticipation of the conclusion and the results are seldom included in the non-English papers under analysis. Bouziane and Metkal relate these different patterns of argumentation to the diverse scientific cultures and discursive communities the analysed papers emerged within. As they stress, the more aware researchers are of an European writing tradition, the closer both their English and non-English abstracts are to these conventions. Furthermore, the closer abstracts are to European traditions, the more likely it is that a submitted paper will be accepted by an Anglophone journal.

Pérez-Llantada (2012), in her analysis of scientific knowledge production and communication (in physical, biomedical, and social sciences as well as the humanities) in an increasingly globalised landscape, offers additional insights in how English-tradition textual conventions can disadvantage non-English native scholars. A she remarks, humanities scholars originating from non-English speaking cultures – for example in French, German, Portuguese and Spanish languages – described their writing style as "dense, elaborate, and non-synthetic [in comparison to] simplicity and conciseness of style in prestigious English-medium publications" (129). Adhering to English norms, as interviews conducted by Pérez-Llantada reveal, by non-English native scholars was perceived particularly difficult because of their situatedness in culture specific intellectual traditions, ways of thinking and arguing, and writing conventions. As a Spanish-speaking scholar stated: "In [English] we use long sentences and paragraphs, sometimes too pompous, and this is totally different from the more straight-to-the-point, short sentences in English academic writing" (129). Another scholar remarked that a "deviation from the standard language was occasionally opined by reviewers as an excessively grandiloquent expression" (127). Consequently, as further stated by one of the

interviewed academic: “[i]n the globalization world you should recognize that you’re speaking to a wider audience and so you have to control your syntax, your vocabulary, avoid idioms and metaphors, but it’s not my style, not my personality”(126). As it reveals from these statements, compliance with rhetorical conventions (for example, in abstract writing and argumentation) as well as with the editors’ expectations (for example related to genre or discipline) – across the sciences and the humanities – can matter in terms of article evaluation, assessment, and acceptance. Hanauer and Englander (2011) emphasise that cultural and linguistic differences sometimes “render nonnative English speakers’ manuscripts to be considered ‘poor’ or ‘awkward’ when they are reviewed by journal editors,” while Krlev and Spicer (2022) identify an “issue of epistemic respect” in anonymous peer-review processes.

As Marcel Knöchelmann (2021) remarks in relation to this: “Journals in the Global North [and their publishers] hold power to the shibboleth to establishing knowledge: English language, specialised terminology, citation networks, and their modes of application in highly specialised discourse communities” (76). Consequently, English-language publishers – and to a smaller extent also English-speaking researchers – act as gatekeepers of what is considered “internationally valid” knowledge and what is not.

Due to the increasing competitive pressure in the academic publishing field, driven by anxieties over “falling behind” in science and losing the ability to contribute to the global knowledge base – non-English-speaking countries are introducing incentive policies in Higher Education that are directed at fostering increased participation in an international scientific landscape. Such a participation in this context often gets equalised with publication in WoS or Scopus indexed journals.

English and non-English Global South journals also increasingly try to join Global North publishers and to be included in primary indexing databases such as the WoS or Scopus, while databases (such as, for example, SciELO) employ Clarivate Analytics to create a journal citation index inside the WoS (Albornoz et al., 2018; Beigel, 2013; Chan et al., 2020; Raju et al., 2020).

Additionally, some editorial boards of non-English language journals tend to model their editorial policies, their submission and writing guidelines after European (humanist) discourse conventions (Rio Riande et al., 2022; Lujano, 2022). These conventions, especially when understood in a positivist manner, have come to be considered carrying higher prestige and scientific significance and have been positioned as a universal reference for “scientifically relevant” output. They thus promise journals and journal contributions a higher chance to take part and be heard in what by dominant commercial actors in the academic publishing sphere, as well as by neoliberal institutions such as universities, is evoked as a global context of academic knowledge production (Tietze & Dick, 2009).

On the researchers' side, the monolingualism and the dominance of Western models of science and knowledge in the global publishing landscape, effects the conduct of their research and the way in which they write-up their findings. Traditionally, humanities scholars have been less interested in "high core/global, internationally recognized, impact factor publications" (Pérez-Llantada, 2012, 110) and article metrics. However, as Schuh (2009) remarks, in German speaking Europe, publishing in esteemed and top-ranked peer-reviewed English-language journals, special issues, and anthologies has become increasingly important for early career humanities scholars. Boehm (2009) sees this trend related to the increasing competition in humanities disciplines in which scholars are evaluated on the basis of their research output and its numeric evaluation. Here, institutional preferences interwoven with a presumed need to compete globally, force researchers to choose to publish in "broken" English while trying to adopt Western modalities of research as well as Western norms of scholarship (such as those embodied in Springer Nature's abstract writing guidelines for example). The process of writing in English, as Hanauer and Englander (2009) remark, is not only time consuming – for example, it often involves intricate translation processes and multiple rounds of revision before and after submission – but it also tends to force scholars into "simplify their ideas because of an inability to express them in English … and feeling dissatisfied with their English version." Furthermore, many international journals state that submitted papers need to be of interest to a large and wide-ranging readership (Elsevier, n.d.(b)), which has the effect that "some researchers no longer focus on 'local' topics because they won't get published in 'international' journals" (Tennant, 2018). According to Mauranen, Hynninen, and Ranta (2010), the space of academic scientific research publication in English is dominated by scientists who are not native English speakers, yet it is still influenced by Anglophone scientists. As Huttner-Koros and Perera (2018) remark:

> Because access to this space is controlled linguistically, it deprives scientists from language backgrounds other than English from participating equally, including scientists from other post-industrial European nations [Van Leeuwen et al., 2001]. Evidence suggests, for instance, that scientific research conducted in Germany, France and Switzerland, that was not published in English, did not receive due recognition in Science Citation Indices; presuming, thereby, an exclusivity for English in academic science communication (3).

In this context, scholars such as Bondi (2005); Nickerson (2005), and Mauranen (2007) advocate – while, in principle, affirming the importance of English as a scientific *lingua franca* (for example, due to its capacity of bringing different research cultures into dialogue) – for a "hybridisation" of English. Nickerson (2005) suggests that researchers increasingly use – and are in the process of developing – their own hybridised linguistic strategies in English that are similar, or related, to those of their first

language. Bondi emphasised that contemporary scientific English – used as it is by researchers from diverse local cultural, epistemic, and linguistic origins communicating in an increasingly globalised landscape – as such already is a hybrid language that is characterised by different underlying traditions or worldviews. For Mauranen (2007) this scientific English embodies a hybrid carrying a discourse in which, as Pérez-Llantada (2012) writes, "anglophone normative rules merge with culture-specific linguistic features instantiating a rich variety of non-normative writing styles" (192). What would be important in this context, is a heightened awareness for the need of "epistemic respect" (Krlev & Spicer, 2022) among English-language editorial boards and within peer-review procedures. This is: "showing esteem when an argument is original, sound and striking, no matter where it originated … [showing] appreciation for an argument and weigh it critically, even when the argument is at some distance to their own thinking and experience" (Krlev & Spicer, 2022).

However, such an epistemic respect as I showed previously, is not guaranteed in the way scholarly research output is assessed and evaluated. Furthermore, as Huttner-Koros and Perea (2018) suggest, the pervasiveness of English as a *lingua franca* does not only lead to "words and ideas which have been used in other languages to describe, share and inform understandings of the world would gradually be lost" but also to "clear instances of identity conflict … that non-Anglophone scientists grapple with when they relocate permanently to first language English societies" (Huttner-Koros & Perera, 2018). As Chan et al. argue, consequently: "This [all] reduces intellectual diversity and contributes to the homogenization of science and creativity. Ultimately, it leads to what Vandana Shiva calls the 'monoculture of the mind'—where Eurocentric and patriarchal knowledge structures are reflected and reproduced" (2020: 5). Researchers such as Paasi (2015), and Knöchelmann (2021) classify this as a form of testimonial injustice emphasising that the ability to speak and be heard globally is not equally distributed among the academic community.

This injustice emerging in the commercially driven global sphere of publishing, includes three forms of marginalisation, described by Paasi (2015): discrimination based on the origin of scholars; marginalisation due to the lack of inclusion and citation in Anglophone journals; and exclusion due to the predominance of English in scholarly knowledge creation and communication. This form of injustice reinforces, according to Paasi, the "supposedly inferior quality of knowledge produced in non-Anglophone social spaces" (2015: 515). Even though I agree with Chan et al. (2020), Knöchelmann (2021), and Paasi (2015), I would like to add an additional thought to Paasi's assessment here: it is not only knowledge produced in "non-Anglophone social spaces" that is considered of lesser quality when Eurocentric humanist academic discourse conventions (the rules for how knowledge is made sense of, argumentatively constructed, and written-up) are applied as a norm. The dominance of humanist discourse conventions does not only affect the decision making of

non-English speaking scholars (publishing in English or non-English journals) forcing them to adopt these discourse conventions. Rather, as I further elaborate in chapters 5 and 6, these conventions affect also non-humanist indigenous ways of knowing that tendentially refuse the binary set-up of reality (which humanist thought identifies as objective, rational, and reasonable) and dreams or imagination (which humanist thought disqualifies as subjective, magical, or pagan); as well as experimental, experiential, or embodied ways of knowing as brought forward, for example, by feminist researchers critical of humanism (or, at least, its positivist use within scholarly knowledge production) (Anzaldúa, 1987; Chan et al., 2020; Lujano, 2022).

The prevalence of humanist standards and discourse conventions and the positivist way in which a large part of scholarly discourse and practice have come to depend on them is by no means necessary or inevitable. These standards and conventions are rooted in epistemologies that – historically, for example in a colonial and patriarchal context, and in the course of the contemporary consolidation of globally commercialised sphere of academic knowledge creation – have gotten expanded as global references for theorising science and knowledge and, consequently, for how scholarly knowledge should be created and shared. These exclusions result from this preference, even though they have an intersectional character, by scholars such as Chan et al. (2020) and Mboa Nkoudou (2020) seen to be affecting researchers from the Global South the most. This is why, as I discuss next, a debate has emerged around if certain forms of OA publishing – such as many of the models of open access publishing envisioned by commercial publishers – can be regarded as neo-colonial and neo-imperialist.

A Neo-colonial and Neo-imperialist Streak

As I have discussed previously, in the sphere of academic knowledge production, dominated by a few large publishers, a combination of infrastructural, financial, and epistemic barriers has led to the exclusion of scholars from academic discourses based on their disciplinary, cultural, epistemic, and linguistic location. However, as I argue in what follows, this exclusion works along territorial borders too. In this context, the control of the academic sphere of knowledge production by a few large companies reveals the somewhat contradictory effects of globalisation. On the one hand, these large commercial publishers suggest that there is such a thing as an overarching global mode of scientific knowledge production. This comes to the fore in their claims that research topics, scientific research outcomes (data and texts, as well as the criteria to judge these outcomes by, apply equally everywhere and, hence, are comparable (at least, within a certain discipline). On the other hand,

location, the geographical place in which knowledge gets produced – for example, due to financial, technological, and linguistic barriers and the bias of databases, metrics, rankings, and editorial policies – becomes a factor that influences academic recognition, renumeration, and who is "allowed" to make "global" knowledge claims at all (Beigel, 2013, 2018; Beigel et al. 2018; Hurrell & Sengupta, 2012; Vessuri, 1986).

As Chan et al. (2020), Moletsane (2015), and Okune et al. (2019) make clear, and as I have illustrated previously, these exclusions bear an intersectional character. They do so in so far as they affect "knowledges, ways of knowing and epistemologies; and scholarly knowledge from marginalized groups of people in Western [and/or] English-speaking science, such as women, minorities, Indigenous scholars, non-Anglophone scholars" (Chan et al. 2020, 8). Furthermore, they also tend to marginalise knowledge holders outside the academy, including young people and activists (Moletsane, 2015). Researchers situated in the Global South are disproportionally affected by this system (Chan et al., 2020). Due to these hierarchic geographical North-South relations the academic publishing landscape as envisioned and mediated by large commercial publishers, has been identified as bearing neo-colonial[30] and imperialist[31] characteristics (Chan et al., 2020; Knöchelmann, 2021; Mboa Nkoudou, 2020). In what follows, I will further substantiate this claim.

An interesting question to ask here is when such forms of (neo-)colonial imperialism have emerged and how they have become dominant, even normalised, in certain contexts. As I discuss more in depth in chapter 5 of this thesis, these forms have long roots starting with the colonialisation of the Americas, Asia, Africa and the South Pacific from the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries. In these contexts, the imperialist struggle for political, territorial, and economic control was strongly related to epistemic subjugation that served the establishment of the dominance of colonial and patriarchal regimes connected to the "subjugation of one people by another for the advantage of the dominant one" (Alatas, 2000, 23). For example, (educational) institutions and, in turn, humanist knowledge

[30] The notion of neo-colonialism embraces both the idea that colonialism includes territorial, economic, political, and epistemic components and that it is structural and persisting (Dussel, 2002; Mignolo, 1995). The idea of the coloniality of knowledge describes the ongoing limits on access to the creation and dissemination of knowledge while alternative epistemes – especially the ones of knowledge holders in the Global South - or ways of knowing are excluded, diminished, or negated (Canaragajah, 2002; Mignolo, 1995; Santos, 2015). The ideas of neo-colonialism and the coloniality of knowledge are interwoven with and must be seen in relation to previous and concomitant discourses such as the critique of colonialism (Césaire, 2000[1955]), the decolonisation of knowledge (Fanon, 2007[1961]), Orientalism (Said, 1978), Eurocentrism (Wallerstein, 1974), as well as critical pedagogy (Freire, 1972). I further reflect on these discourses in chapters 5 and 7 of this thesis too.

[31] The expansionist neoliberal trajectory as exemplified in the strategies of commercial publishers to align academic research globally from the perspective of neo-colonialism and the coloniality of knowledge, is considered a form of twenty-first-century imperialism (Alexander & Mohanty, 2010).

systems, have helped the production, of a particular kind of (supposedly more valid) science, knowledge, identity, and subjectivity (Said, 1978: Spivak, 1999; Smith, 1999).

More recently, in the course of the consolidation and expansion of a global academic publishing sphere since after the Second World War (including the emergence of "internationally recognised prestige" as a quality marker in the 1960s (Beigel, 2013) – English language and dominant (humanist) models of science and knowledge have been promoted as universally valid and autonomous. Fernanda Beigel (2013, 2018) writes that the promotion of the myth of an autonomous and universal "world science" (mediated by a metropolitan centre, where global scientific standards are established and "exported," for example through bibliometric indicators and prevalent discourse conventions, to "dependent" peripheral regions) has produced the opposite idea of "peripheral science."[32] In the Western political and academic discourse, peripheral scientific communities have often been regarded as lacking autonomy and the ability to produce valid scientific knowledge: for example, because they were, in these contexts, considered as permanently under siege by the state, by political instability, or by their intellectual dependence on dominant (humanist) research cultures and epistemes (Beigel, 2013; Beigel et al. 2018).

According to Beigel (2013), peripheral scientific communities have also contributed to the reproduction of the myth of the sovereignty of "world science." In peripheral countries, as I discussed in the previous subchapter, the adoption of global standards and international research agendas has been mediated and furthered by neoliberal state agencies within these countries devoted to scientific and cultural excellence. This ambition to be included in "world science" is embodied in the endeavour of Global South journals to be included in global commercial databases often in the name of national progress, development, and prestige, (Beigel, 2013; Méndez Cota, 2020). Additionally, the fetishisation of high-ranked journals in peripheral regions, as Méndez Cota (2020) stresses, gave rise to the idea of the "export-oriented academic intellectual" able to overcome the financial, linguistic, and epistemic barriers impeding a publication in these journals.

In the context of discourses on neo-colonialism and the coloniality of knowledge, scholars such as Syed Farid and Syed Hussein Alatas[33] came to define the academic dependency of peripheral regions Beigel and Méndez Cota describe as a form of intellectual or academic imperialism. As Syed Hussain Alatas (2003) remarks in this regard:

[32] Periphery is not to be understood here as a fixed site, but rather as a condition determined by limited access to e.g. (cultural) capital, and the distance to the "centre" (often the Global North) as a node of dominance (Santos, 2015).

[33] The Malayan sociologist Syed Farid Alatas is the son of Syed Hussain Alatas, a politician and social scientist.

> Academic imperialism is a phenomenon that is analogous to political and economic imperialism. Generally, imperialism or empire-ism is understood as the policy and practice of the political and economic domination of colonial by more advanced nations since the sixteenth century through military conquest and subjugation. Defined in this way, imperialism is equivalent to colonialism. To the extent that the control and management of the colonized required the cultivation and application of various disciplines such as history, linguistics, geography, economics, sociology and anthropology in the colonies, we may refer to the academe as imperialistic (600).

However, as Beigel (2013) emphasises, certain decolonial theorists have further reproduced the myth of the sovereignty of "world science" by assuming a simple dichotomy between complete autonomy on the side of the West, and complete heteronomy on the side of the non-West. Such a diagnosis implies that peripheral communities have been passive victims of mass acculturation, and that they can exit from this by identifying an essential, non-Western origin of science and knowledge. This assumption has aggravated binary and hierarchic North-South relations, while the existence of a centre/periphery dichotomy is unsupported by empirical evidence. Rather, Beigel's (2013) research into Latin American globalised research cultures shows that there is no absolute sovereignty and no absolute lack of sovereignty on either side. What she finds is a diversity of knowledges as well as forms and formats of scholarly knowledge creation and sharing emerging in specific contexts – within and across institutional, disciplinary, geographical, and linguistic differences. This diversity, as Beigel states, is a result of once oppositional and once affirmative relations between researchers situated in Latin American, European, and American cultures, for example.

Attempts to globalise academic knowledge production through publishing, consequently, as I stress, do not only bear the danger of reinforcing existing global inequities. Rather, globalisation also has contributed to the emergence of new alternative spaces of knowledge creation and circulation making possible collaborations and interactions on local, national, regional and transnational scales – be it South-South or South-Nord/Nord-South. Antagonist reactions to centre-driven approaches towards globalisation, or internationalisation, do not have to result in a peripheral scientific "disconnection," a closing off from Euro-American science. Rather, the internationalisation of the sciences should evolve hand in hand with dominant and subordinate areas (Beigel, 2013; Beigel et al., 2018). Including, as Beigel emphasises, by "fighting global resource and recognition imbalances to incorporate the broader world's social experiences and thoughts, building multi-centred fields with multiple theoretical perspectives" (2013: 15). Indeed, attempts in this direction, as I discuss in chapter 7, have been undertaken within critical OA advocacy, for example the Latin American

database AmeliCA, the pan African publishing platform Continental Platform, or the Radical Open Access Collective that brings together scholar- and community-led presses from all over the world.

As I have argued in this chapter, power disbalances in the global sphere of academic publishing are embodied in the underrepresentation of certain forms of knowledge, disciplines, and geographical regions in high-ranked academic journals, and, consequently, global databases (such as WoS or Scopus), and rankings. In relation to this, I emphasised that English content and the "hard" sciences are dominant, while non-English language research, contributions from the arts, humanities, and social sciences, as well as knowledge from the Global South, remain underrepresented. I have shown how the pay-to-publish model put forward by many commercial publishers causes severe barriers for less affluent institutions, underfunded research areas, and junior academics to publish in higher-ranking journals. Similarly, the dominance of English as a scientific *lingua franca* makes it difficult for non-English journals to be listed in databases such as WoS or Scopus, while non-English speaking researchers searching for international recognition are effectively forced to publish in English – often at the cost of complexity or originality of their articles. Additionally, measures to establish quality norms regarding writing or rhetoric styles that concern the article itself, are highly biased. Standards are based on a positivist understanding of humanist theories of science and knowledge in which the latter is understood as detached, impersonal, and universal and is prioritised over situated, relational, and fluid modes of knowing (for example, indigenous, experimental, or embodied ways of knowing). Writing standards for journal submissions are conceived on the basis of a humanist (predominantly English) European research culture. As I discussed, the closer researchers are to humanist epistemologies and the more aware they are of European, specifically also English, writing conventions, the more likely it is that a submitted paper will be accepted by an Anglophone journal.

The dominance of these epistemologies – in combination with economic, infrastructural, and linguistic barriers – causes severe distortions in the landscape of academic knowledge production, namely, in the form of testimonial injustice, which excludes certain communities from participating in global-scale scholarly knowledge creation and sharing. These exclusions bear an intersectional character, while disproportionally affecting knowledge holders from the Global South. This justifies the critiques that position certain forms of academic publishing – such as the ones envisioned by a few big publishers – as neo-colonial and neo-imperialist.

Continuing my critical analysis of the globalised sphere of academic publishing under the focus of knowledge equity and diversity in the next chapter, I ask how certain powerful actors within OA publishing – for example, funding agencies and policy providers – position themselves in relation to the commercial approaches to scholarly knowledge production I discussed on the previous pages.

How do these actors relate to the neo-colonial and neo-imperialist agendas pushed forward by some big publishers? And how do these relations influence the way in which OA publishing is commonly conceptualised and theorised?

Chapter 3: OA Publishing and the Commercial Sphere of Academic Knowledge Production

National funding bodies (such as UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) or the Swiss National Research Foundation (SNF)), state ministries (such as the German Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF)), and research associations (such as cOAlition S, a consortium of national research agencies and funders), increasingly have implemented OA mandates. By means of these mandates they are recommending that researchers make their research outputs (peer-reviewed journal articles and data, conference papers, books) available as OA. Through their recommendations, these actors significantly influence how OA publishing is understood and implemented within the academic community: by universities, within disciplines, and by individual scholars.

In this chapter, I expand the critical discussion of the academic publishing landscape towards the sphere of contemporary OA publishing. In the first part of this chapter, I investigate the positioning of funding bodies and policy makers – as well as of widely supported initiatives such as the European Plan S and common measures to facilitate a transition to OA such as transformative agreements – in relation to the economic interests and the neo-colonial and neo-imperialist agendas of large commercial publishers.[34] In the second part of this chapter I enquire the effects that this positioning has on the OA landscape: How has it informed the dynamics within the field of OA publishing – for example between different strands of OA publishing and the way in which their ideas have become implicated in prominent definitions of and approaches to OA publishing? How do these approaches relate to knowledge equity and diversity? Are they affirming, or rather challenging, hierarchical North-South relations, financial, technological, and epistemic barriers to participation?

[34] It is important here to not confuse the funders- and policy driven approaches to OA publishing in relation to commercial publishing (and the examples I use to support my argument) with *all* funders- and policy-driven intents to support OA publishing. For example, the research project *Community-led Open Publication Infrastructures for Scholarly Monographs* (COPIM) that I consider pertaining to critical OA advocacy, is in large part supported with government funding (Research England Development (RED) and UKRI) and it supports the UK's OA policy (including the UK's Research Evaluation Framework (REF)), (COPIM, n.d.). Similarly, the OCSDNet is funded by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) in Canada and the Department for International Development (DFID) in the UK (OCSDNet, n.d.(a)).

An Alignment of Interests

Some national research assessment frameworks, for example the UK's Research Evaluation Framework (REF), have laced the injunction of an OA policy directly with the ability of the issuing country to persist within a competitive global scholarly landscape, to score industry partnerships, and obtain funding.[35] The former Head of Unit for Open Science Policy at the European Commission, Jean-Claude Burgelman (2019), refers to OA publishing as a means to generate "better return on investment from public funding" while promoting the importance of an "academic nationalism" for bringing forward and profiting from OA publishing. As he remarks: "opening up the knowledge base could even generate more innovation." To bring forward OA globally, and to enable a thorough "opening up of the knowledge base" Burgelman suggests the adoption of a "geo-specific access model," where access to OA output would be restricted to (rich) countries which have OA infrastructures and policies in place. This would force countries who haven't done so yet to invest in OA, Burgelman argues (quoted in: McKie, 2019) – no matter these countries' financial situation or the state of technological infrastructure or digital literacy.

The national strategy for OA publishing devised by swissuniversities, the association of Swiss universities (together with the State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation (SERI) and in collaboration with the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF)) is more cautious towards putting forward competitive national scientific interests: opening up access to research results, swissuniversities state, will help to promote collective knowledge and serves "the progress of humanity and thus the common good, nationally and globally" (swissuniversities, n.d.). Both the UK and the Swiss national OA strategy explicitly include their negotiations and collaboration with large commercial publishers such as Elsevier, Springer Nature, and Wiley as an important focus in their OA agendas (UKRI, n.d.; swissuniversities, n.d.). These collaborations, as mentioned in the previous chapter, include transformative agreements negotiated between institutions.

A similar agenda is recommended and pursued by the European Plan S. Many publishers, universities, and libraries consider transformative agreements as the best option for reorienting the business model underlying scholarly publishing towards a transition to a fully open access ecosystem (Schimmer et al., 2015; Wise & Estelle, 2019). However, rather than substantially transforming the

[35] The website of the REF 2021 (ref.ac.uk) lists among the REF's purposes, "to secure the continuation of a world-class, dynamic and responsive research base across the full academic spectrum within UK higher education… [and] [t]o inform the selective allocation of funding for research."

market, so-called “transformative agreements” shift a portion of subscription investment to funding OA publishing without influencing the overall business structure (Becerill-García, 2019, 2020). For example, hierarchical North-South relations and financial barriers persist. They do so in so far as less affluent institutions and underfunded research areas, especially in the Global South, cannot afford transformative agreements (Babini & Debat, 2019; Farley et al., 2021; Noûs, 2021).

Exclusions of certain institutions and research areas are indeed knowingly accepted by some of the wealthier players in the OA landscape from fear of losing out on the profitable monetary and reputational business of academic knowledge creation and circulation driven forward by large publishers. cOAlition S Executive Director Johan Rooryck (2019) remarks that “pursuing transparent, transformational agreements and transparent pricing …. Plan S encourages commercial publishers to regain the trust that they squandered.” To critiques suggesting a lack of distance of initiatives such as Plan S to commercial publishers’ agendas Rooryck replies: “[t]ry as we might, however, we cannot wish the commercial publishers away,” highlighting that one better cooperates with them.[36]

Initiatives such as Plan S, national strategies such as those promoted by swissuniversities and the UKRI, and ideas of “transparent pricing” and “transformative agreements,” show how national OA strategies and large policy initiatives do not only cooperate with but also are shaped according to the interests of a few corporate publishers. This is rather than showing an interest in responding to or representing a global academic community in all its diversity. They refrain from taking in a critical stance towards the business practices and trajectories of big commercial publishers, including how these publishers control a large part of global academic knowledge production. As Becerill-García (2019) remarks: “It’s discouraging to admit that the main critique of Plan S is accurate: it is a Eurocentric proposal that aims to remove paywalls to achieve open access, but which does not seek to reduce the earnings and concentration of power over academic publishing enjoyed by a small number of commercial publishers.” Similarly, in reference to the German Projekt DEAL, a coalition for enabling transformative OA agreements with corporate publishers, Chan et al. argue:

[36] As Aspesi and Brandt (2020) write regarding the continuing allure of commercial publishers: “In response to the concerns of its critics, Elsevier would argue that it enjoys record revenues and profitability for the following reasons: it manages itself well, researchers want to be published in their journals, it funds activities for Open Science and for integrity in research more than any other publisher, and it sells data analytics services because the academic and research communities need them.” And indeed, this argumentation does not only impact the national OA strategies but also, as I discussed in the previous chapter, the scholarly community. For example this becomes visible in the importance attributed to highly ranked journals, as well as to the bibliometric research used to measure and evaluate the “output” of researchers, institutions, and countries (Tennant, 2018).

> That model has been designed through economic or market-based lenses that see it offering financial return on investment for funders, universities and libraries. This view normalizes the treatment of knowledge as a commodity, viewing the production and dissemination of science as a means of being economically competitive. This reasoning, typical of the knowledge-based economy, feeds into the growing trend of nationalism and regionalism, with European nations and the EU willing to make deals with multinational publishers to secure their presence in research outputs (2020: 5).

The power structures in scholarly communication – as established by a few large commercial publishers – remain unchallenged in some contexts in which OA publishing is promoted. Most institutions and academics continue to be forced to compete for reputation and reward in what is evoked by prominent OA slogans and narratives around global competition and trust as a single uniform global (but now increasingly OA) market. All the while the concentration of power remains with commercial publishers, large-scale OA policies and universalising OA publishing deals will fail to create viable routes to a more diverse landscape of OA publishing. Policy instruments such as transformative agreements create entry barriers for researchers who are affiliated with less well-resourced institutions, such as those located in the Global South. As Chan et al. (2020) remark, large publishers keep their structural dominance and receive heavy investment and public attention.

The interwovenness of the agendas of big commercial players and many national, policy- or funder-driven approaches to OA publishing, as well as the prominent positioning of their agendas within national or supra-national OA policies (which leads to more public attention for their positionings), means that other approaches to OA publishing are marginalised. Crucially, this includes what I conceptualise as critical OA publishing (often taking the shape of small-scale, local and community-driven OA initiatives). As I discuss here as well as in chapters 4 and 7, these critical OA publishing approaches could offer an alternative to the commercial, funder-, and policy-driven publishing ventures I described on the previous pages. Yet, for various reasons – presented below – these initiatives often do not get recognised as offering a progressive alternative.

Hermeneutical Injustices

Many scholar- and/or community-led initiatives (some of which I discuss more in depth in chapter 7), position themselves as alternatives to universalist global approaches to OA publishing. For example, organisations such as AmeliCA in Latin America and networks such as the Radical Open Access

Collective (ROAC) argue for a bottom-up, horizontal, collaborative, not-for profit knowledge production ecosystem. In support of such an ecosystem, they themselves employ bottom-up principles of collaborative organisation that respect the diverse material, economic, geographical, and cultural settings of their members, situated as they are, in the case of the ROAC for example, in different European, Latin American, Asian and African countries, as well as in Australia, Canada, and the U.S.. Members of the ROAC provide mutual logistical and promotional support, and exchange best practices, for example regarding financing models. On an international scale, as Moore explains, each member remains embedded in their particular community of practice, while the network in its entirety is "reflecting a nuanced publishing praxis that is sensitive to the working practices of particular scholarly communities" (2019b: 129). In other words, by cooperating in a multi-centred field, by admitting different stakeholders in OA publishing (such as scholars, publishers, and libraries) as members, and by promoting a wide-range of theoretical, epistemic, and practical perspectives on publishing, all while fostering a non-hierarchical exchange between their members, these networks contribute to epistemic diversity (Adema & Moore, 2018; Barnes & Gatti, 2019) within an international publishing ecology.

An important element in the organisational philosophy of these initiatives is the principle of *scaling small* (Adema & Moore, 2018, 2021; Barnes, 2018; Barnes & Gatti, 2019) which argues for a commitment to bibliodiversity in scholarly publishing (Knöchelmann, 2021). Adema and Moore (2021) describe scaling small as an alternative organisational principle for governing community-led publishing projects. This organisational principle is, "based on mutual reliance, care, and other forms of commoning. Termed 'scaling small', this principle eschews standard approaches to organisational growth that tend to flatten community diversity through economies of scale. Instead, it puts forward the idea that scale can be nurtured through intentional collaborations between community-driven projects that promote a bibliodiverse ecosystem while providing resilience through resource sharing and other kinds of collaboration."

Following the same collaborative and horizontal approach, international research projects such as the *Community-led Open Publication Infrastructures for Monographs* (COPIM) project, in which I have collaborated as a Research Fellow in the Experimental Publishing working group, aim to collaboratively build "community-owned, open systems and infrastructures to enable open access book publishing to flourish" (COPIM, n.d.).[37] COPIM's international team includes over 30

[37] Several such systems and infrastructures have resulted from the project over its three-and-a-half years course: the *Open Book Collective*, a community of publishers, publishing service providers, and research libraries working together to enable a more sustainable future for open access book-length and long-form scholarship; *Opening the Future*, a collective subscription model for libraries; best practices and tools for community governance, for experimental book publishing in the humanities, and for the preservation and archiving of books and associated content (e.g. video, audio files etc.); as well as the open metadata system *Thoth.* The services, tools, and best practices emerging from COPIM do not only invite cooperation but also their global replication, re-use and adaption.

researchers – involving, amongst others, media and communication scholars, economists, social scientists, developers, and librarians – scholar-led and University Presses such as Open Humanities Press, Open Book Publishers, and Mattering Press, and infrastructure providers such as the UK Joint Information Systems Committee (Jisc) and the Directory of Open Access Books (DOAB). COPIM has been funded by Research England (UKRI) and Arcadia. Projects such as COPIM, as I mentioned in the introduction chapter and elaborate in depth in chapter 8 by means of several case studies, as part of their efforts to establish a more open and horizontal environment for monograph publishing also invite a critical reconsideration of the practices and processes of knowledge production in the context of OA publishing. They do so by experimenting with more open, collaborative, and experimental forms of scholarship, while critically reconsidering the dominant humanist research, writing, and publishing paradigms (such as individual authorship, concepts of originality, and the ownership of research), for example.

Yet, for various reasons, community-led initiatives such as the Radical Open Access Collective, COPIM, and the OCSDNet, are often marginalised or not recognised as viable alternatives to the commercial, and certain funder- and policy-driven publishing ventures I described on the previous pages. As I discussed, even though the trustworthiness of large publishing companies has been contested, their arguments around quality and branding, highlighting integrity in research, comprehensiveness of databases, as well as the scale and reputation of their journals continue to be alluring for funders, institutions, and scholars alike (Yarkoni, 2016; Tennant, 2018; Bargheer & Verdicchio, 2020).[38] Additionally, as Chan et al. (2020) point out, due to the ongoing attractiveness of these arguments and due to the increasing complexity of the scholarly publishing landscape, "authors, funders and policymakers [simply] lack awareness of the diversity of models and initiatives that are available" (6). Moreover, the increasingly managerial and platformised competitive and commercial scope of globalised knowledge creation and sharing has contributed to the normalisation of certain forms of OA publishing as a means of capturing monetary and reputational revenue. Pia et al. (2020) remark that scholarly communication has with this entered a new phase of "control and capitalisation to include continued corporate extraction of value and transparency requirements designed by managers, entrepreneurs, and politicians."

The enclosure of scholarly knowledge production in general and OA publishing specifically within a neoliberal framework has led to the normalisation of OA publishing as a means of generating monetary revenue or career capital. This has advanced to the extent that many scholarly institutions

[38] For example, Elsevier (n.d.(a)) interweaves arguments of branding, quality, trust. and scale by claiming: "We offer a wide range of open access options to fit the diverse needs of institutions, funders, academic societies, and researchers around the world. We listen to our customers and collaborate with them to achieve their research goals. We do so without ever compromising on the things they trust us for: quality, rigorous peer review, and research integrity."

and academics conflate OA with commercial models for academic knowledge production. They furthermore see it as inextricably interwoven with assessment mechanisms and the quantitative horizon of metrics rendering scholarly knowledge a remunerative asset for corporate players (Pia et al., 2020; Eve & Gray, 2020). Consequently, as Eve and Gray point out, many scholars encounter OA as "a product of a need to comply with systems of bureaucracy and finance, rather than any genuinely critical [experimental] engagement with scholarly communication practices in the digital age" (2020: 7). This is a tendency that erodes or stifles the sense of agency among the scholarly community regarding the ways in which scholarly knowledge creation and distribution is pursued.

At this stage of the argument, I consider it important to briefly introduce Moore's (2017, 2019b) concept of OA publishing as a boundary object (Starr & Griesemer, 1989). As Moore stresses, OA publishing is conceptually multiple, in so far that it

> represents a multitude of positions and strategies but is generally recognisable across cooperative communities of practice … what this means is that open access cannot be painted with a broad brush as a single movement or project that a group of advocates are trying to implement. Some voices shout louder than others, and others are better at influencing policy, but this should not be confused with a homogenous community of zealous advocates all pulling in the same direction, as many argue (Moore, 2017).

Therefore, as Moore writes, theorising OA as a boundary object makes it possible to conceptualise OA as a process without fixed meaning and continually open to interpretation and re-interpretation. However, boundary objects do not escape hegemonic struggles, such as the ones I discussed in this and the previous chapter. For example, discussions around how OA should be economically sustained, or if globally uniform approaches mediated by top-down regulations and policies are needed or not. As Moore (2017) continues, "the important thing is that the diversity of approaches makes open access useful, rather than enclosure at a general policy level".
This multiplicity is indeed often overshadowed by the dominance of commercial approaches to academic publishing and the way in which they have come to be interwoven with the prevailing institutional, funder and scholarly perception on what OA publishing is and how it should be pursued. Policy makers can see the collaboration with large publishers as unavoidable, while many academics have come to believe that their needs are best served by large publishers. However, this by no means implies that this diversity of approaches towards OA is non-existent or has decreased in reaction to a progressive commercialisation of their field of engagement. Rather, paraphrasing Moore, some voices have been shouting louder than others and have influenced large-scale policies more than

others, which has led to a distorted representation of the OA landscape in which the dominant presence of commercial publishers in the sphere of academic knowledge creation and sharing is seen as standard. This distortion is exemplified by the marginalisation and underrepresentation of more critical approaches to OA publishing, such as the ones I mentioned above.

Drawing on Fricker (2007) and Knöchelmann (2020), this ignorance can be considered a form of *hermeneutical injustice*. Fricker defines hermeneutical injustice as the second form in which epistemic injustice occurs. According to her, it emerges at a stage which is prior to testimonial injustice. Namely, it happens when individuals or communities are disadvantaged because there is a lack of shared understanding and interpretation of their social experiences. As Knöchelmann (2020) elaborates: "An exclusive expansion of a particular social group's interpretive schemes results in hermeneutical oppression of those social groups which are [implicitly] included in the collective, but excluded from contributing" (12-13). In other words, critical OA publishing approaches are implicitly included within the global-scale approaches to academic (OA) publishing I discussed in this and the previous chapter. For example, all academics around the globe – including the ones advocating for critical approaches to OA publishing – are expected to compete in a single, uniform global publishing market that is – rather than being affirmed in its existence through scholarly experience – merely evoked through dominant arguments around scale, global impact and reputation pushed forward by commercial players, and certain funders- and policy-driven approaches to OA publishing At the same time, the epistemologies, the interpretative schemes critical OA advocates base their approaches towards OA publishing upon, as well as their experiences of scholarly knowledge creation and circulation – and, consequently, the strategies, politics, and practices they put forward – are not reflected in and through dominant publishing practices. This neglect includes the argument put forward by critical OA advocates that differences and plurality among OA and research cultures and approaches should not be elided to produce a coherent global exchange; or their favouring of bottom-up, community-led modes of governance of the tools and platforms for knowledge production; or their attention to the *processes and practices* of knowledge creation and sharing as part of their struggle for knowledge equity and diversity.

Related to this insight, and due to the central position this thesis gives to the processes and practices of knowledge production, I next want to pay some more attention to the way in which certain funder- and policy-driven approaches to OA publishing disable a thorough examination of how large commercial publishers dominate the way in which research gets made sense of, written up, and represented through texts, as well as with the testimonial injustice this dominance produces. The reason for this neglect is, as I discuss, due to their focus on research *outputs*.

A Focus on Research Outputs: Problematic Constrictions

An output focus is embodied in many policy recommendations. These "usually deal with access to and dissemination of research outputs (still largely in journals and books). Promotion of these policies has tended to focus on the benefits, such as increased visibility and citations, paying little attention to the burden and the risks—particularly for knowledge-holding communities on the margins or scholars from the Global South" (Chan et al., 2020, 5).

Such a focus on outputs means that OA publishing primarily deals with the mediation and redistribution of access to scholarly outputs via techno-legal and financial means. This focus carries the belief that successful participation in the scientific discourse is defined by the *availability* and *impact* of research outputs. This implies that all research output can be made widely available for consumption and re-use (for example, through investing in computers and providing stable internet access and by means of Creative Commons (CC) licences[39]). It furthermore implies that research outputs (as well as their authors) can be measured, compared, and ranked along globally uniform criteria on the basis of citations and impact. What is reflected in these assumptions is the humanist idea of knowledge as transcendental and universal (and, hence, comparable on the basis of uniform criteria); a notion of the author – able to represent and external truth through scientific reasoning and writing – as in unity with their work (the author is measurable along with their work); the text is considered to represent knowledge (or truth) free of contextual and subjective influences; while academic discourse conventions – the way in which knowledge is written-up – are considered mere matters of form and are assumed to be systems of representation and distinction (making the better, sounder, more innovative theory or claim).

These ideas tend to be employed by and work in favour of the big commercial publishing companies. They have informed also the ways in which OA publishing is understood by some national associations of research institutions, such as swissuniversities, the German Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF), the UK governmental OA policy, and international policy initiatives such as Plan S. The way that swissuniversities (n.d.) stress that the findings of (multi-national) research teams "serve the progress of humanity and thus the common good, nationally and globally [therefore] OA aims to open access to research results and promote collective knowledge" is exemplary of this, as is the BMBF (n.d.) statement that all scientists will benefit from the easy and quick access to research made possible through OA publishing. Similarly, the UK government's OA statement emphasises that OA makes "the published outputs of research widely and freely accessible to all, under conditions that allow maximum reuse. OA is central to the UK Government's ambitions for research and innovation" (UK Government, n.d.).

[39] Creative Commons offer a variety of licences that determine the terms for the sharing and distribution of work.

The prominent discussion on the main routes to OA – namely green, gold, and more recently also diamond (or platinum) OA – tends to assume a similar output focus. In brief, green OA offers access to research via repositories or self-archiving online. Gold OA means scholarly works are made instantly open to the public by the publisher, sometimes requiring a pre-publication fee (such as article or book processing charges (APCs and BPCs) (MacKey-Mason, 2016). Diamond (or platinum) OA ensures both publication of and access to scholarly materials without author or reader fees (Becerill-Garcìa et al., 2021).

As I discuss in chapter 4, the focus on the accessibility of research outputs was already implied in early formulations of OA publishing, as seen with the influential Budapest (2002), Berlin (2003), and Bethesda (2003) initiatives. It has also been an inherent part of the progressive, pro-democratic OA advocacy of researchers such as John Willinsky (2006).

The vision that is expounded through this output focus, as Moore points out, "merely focuses on the public accessibility of research objects, rather than on the broader ways in which research is published and made open in the context of a broader project of scholarly communication reform" (2019b, 171). Such a broader project, according to Moore, would also include critical experiments with common research and publishing processes and practices under the focus of broad and equitable participation. In a similar vein, Mrva-Montoya remarks: "while the open access publishing model is certainly transformational, it is driven by experimenting with the new business, distribution, and permission models rather than with a new format of scholarly communication practice" (2015: 321-322). Instead, Mrva-Montoya suggests that experimentation with digital, networked, and open publishing technologies, forms and formats should be a key element of OA publishing in support of its central tenets such as enhanced interaction and engagement with scholarly research and its sharing with broad audiences.

However, as I have shown in the first chapter of this thesis, the way in which large commercial publishers dominate how research gets made sense of, written up, and represented through texts – by positioning humanist epistemologies as the globally normative reference for all academic knowledge creation – is precisely why it is necessary that there is a critical consideration of this dominance within a broader project of a scholarly communication reform. It strengthens the argument for a critical rethinking of dominant academic research cultures (including the way in which research is written-up, assessed, and incentivised).

A scholarly communication reform is required to battle the severe distortions in the academic publishing landscape in the form of testimonial injustice, which are excluding certain communities from participating in global-scale scholarly knowledge production. Especially, a critical re-evaluation of common (humanist) knowledge practices – for example regarding who can participate in these

practices and processes, in which language, and based on whose cultural and epistemological terms – is needed when seriously considering how OA publishing can advance knowledge equity and diversity. In other words, the issues that OA publishing has to deal with in in order to approach knowledge diversity and equity on a global scale – whether it is in the context of a broader reform of scholarly research culture (or communication as Moore (2019b) suggests) or through a new form of scholarly practice as Mrva Montoya (2015) puts forward – are issues that go beyond the mediation and redistribution of universal accessibility to scholarly outputs via techno-legal and economic means. These issues, as I mentioned previously and discuss more in depth in chapter 5, are cultural and epistemic (who gets to speak, in which form and format), as well as linguistic (which languages are spoken). They are related to the colonial and patriarchal "legacy" of the humanist epistemologies (and correspondent theories of science, knowledge, and knowing) that have prominently shaped global knowledge creation and sharing. Humanist epistemologies have been historically used to advance distinctively European models of knowledge at the cost of, for example, certain indigenous or some feminist epistemologies and ways of knowing (Anzaldúa, 1987; Canaragajah, 2002; Harding, 2002; Smith, 1999). Science, scientific publishing, as well as practices such as research, writing, and publishing have figured as an important means to further (but also to contest, as I show in chapters 6 and 8) the advancement of dominant (in the context of this research humanist) epistemologies. And they continue to do so within the writing, evaluation, and assessment norms of the globally operating publishers that I discussed in this chapter, and, consequently, in every-day scholarly practice.

As I elaborated in this chapter, certain funder- and policy-driven approaches to OA publishing supportive of commercial publishing models, have done little to confront – and in fact have perpetuated and aggravated – neo-colonial or neo-imperialist patterns within global-scale knowledge creation and circulation. The complicity of some funders and policy-makers with the business approach of commercial players has driven the normalisation of OA publishing as a way to generate monetary revenue or career capital. This normalisation, as I discussed, is responsible for what I have diagnosed as a distortion of the academic publishing landscape: through both testimonial injustice (for example, by knowingly accepting the exclusion of researchers from certain institutions and research areas from academic discourses, by implementing costly instruments such as transformative agreements) and hermeneutical injustice. This form of injustice tends to, as I explained in this chapter, overshadow, devaluate, or dismiss more critical approaches to OA publishing that potentially could provide a viable, globally more diverse and equal alternative to the commercial publishing ventures I described on the previous pages. Additionally, many of the approaches to OA

publishing I introduced in this chapter are too often focused on the techno-legal and financial side of enhancing the accessibility of research outputs.

As I argued, this focus, on the one hand, overshadows and disables perspectives on, and the critical re-evaluation of, the control that large commercial publishers have over the content of research, as well as over the way in which research gets made sense of and written up, and the inequities resulting from this control. On the other hand, it runs the risk of ignoring the cultural, epistemic, and linguistic issues of marginalisation at play in the (humanist) ways in which research is currently predominantly performed, made sense of, written up, and delivered.

In consequence to the analysis conducted in this chapter, I consider questioning certain funder- and policy-based approaches to OA publishing and their connections with the competitive and commercial sphere of academic publishing as a key step towards greater equity and diversity in academic knowledge creation and sharing via OA publishing. However, as I argue in the next chapter, what needs equal critical attention are certain progressive narratives that have emerged around OA publishing – for example those that, on the basis of the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI) (2002), put forward a democratic vision for OA publishing. As I discuss, the approaches to OA publishing proposed as part of this vision, are not dissimilar (and are, in fact, related) to the ones put forward by commercial actors and are supported by the prevailing industry- and funder-driven approaches that I discussed in the previous two chapters.

Chapter 4: A Democratic Vision for Open Access Publishing

The first version of the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI, 2002)[40] was written by multiple authors, among them Peter Suber, Jean-Claude Guédon, John Willinsky and Leslie Chan, whose strong influence on the discourse on OA publishing remains today. The BOAI's intention was to define OA publishing as a movement and to communicate its benefits to a diverse field of "professional associations, universities, libraries, foundations, and others to embrace open access as a means of advancing their missions" (BOAI, 2002). OA advocates such as Guédon (2008, 2017) and Thomas Hervé Mboa Nkoudou (2020) have used the BOAI as a basis to both formulate a democratisation of knowledge through OA publishing and to assess OA's potential to democratise (or bring about wider participation in) academic knowledge creation and sharing. The idea of democratisation conceived on the basis of the BOAI has emerged from one of its central phrases that OA publishing, as a new publishing mode, bears the potential to "share the learning of the rich with the poor and the poor with the rich …. [a]nd [to] lay the foundation for uniting humanity in a common intellectual conversation and quest for knowledge" (BOAI, 2002). The authors of the BOAI defined OA publishing in the following way: ''By 'open access' to this literature, we mean its free availability on the public internet … without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself" (2002) (one may find similar terms in: Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities, 2003; Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing, 2003).

John Willinsky, in his book *The Access Principle* (2006) was one of the first OA advocates to make the idea of OA publishing as inherently democratic explicit. Promoting a similar argument around and definition of OA publishing as the authors of the BOAI (2002), Willinsky argues that OA publishing would facilitate the broad circulation of knowledge within the academic community and beyond and would help to globally anchor the democratic "right of access to the fruits of inquiry and study" (2006: 207). A wide accessibility of digitised research output stands, according to Willinsky, at the basis of a knowledge democracy in which "the body of research as a whole can serve as a public resource, helping people to articulate and understand the different positions being taken, as well as the points of disagreement" (2006: 132). Almost fifteen years later, Mboa Nkoudou (2020) remarks: "it must regrettably be admitted that open access (OA) has not fulfilled the lofty ambitions set out in

[40] The BOAI has been further developed since 2002, with its latest iteration in 2022. This version has been based on the UNESCO Recommendations on Open Science (2022) offering more specific conceptualisations of OA publishing and recommendations towards its realisation. These have a strong focus towards diversity, equity, quality, usability, and sustainability of research (BOAI, 2022).

the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI) in 2002. Instead of reducing publication costs, accelerating the circulation of scientific information, ensuring the visibility of scientific publications, and promoting barrier-free access to scientific information, OA now often seems to reinforce and to create new inequalities" (2020, 25).

In this chapter I critically discuss some of the democratisation narratives that emerged around the BOAI or were formulated at the same time. Especially I investigate their potential to contribute towards greater equity and diversity within knowledge production in the form I suggest it in this study. As part of this analysis, I discuss the positioning of these democratisation narratives in relation to the ideas about OA publishing forwarded by commercial actors that remain in parts unchallenged within the prevailing industry- and funder-driven approaches. Especially, I will ask how these democratisation narratives resonate with or contest the Eurocentric, positivist interpretation of humanist epistemologies (and, consequently, humanist ideas of science, knowledge, creating and distributing knowledge). These, as I have shown previously, has served as a basis for many prominent approaches to academic publishing in general, and OA publishing especially. What effects do these relations have on the contemporary publishing landscape, on prominent OA institutions, definitions, and practices? And in how far do they affirm and challenge the epistemic and hermeneutical injustices I discussed before?

Contextualising the Success of the BOAI

I start this chapter by critically contextualising the BOAI (2002), its wider reception, and the uptake in of similar arguments by diverse OA advocates, against a background of critique that identifies parts of OA publishing as neo-colonial and neo-imperialist. OA experts such as Mboa Nkoudou (2020), Costa et al. (2016), and Vessuri (2003) admonish the prominent position of this declaration among other formulations about the potential of OA publishing to bring about more equity and diversity within global knowledge production. To paraphrase Moore (2017) once again, the broad uptake of the BOAI (2002) can at least partially be related to the fact that the voices behind the BOAI and those driving its reception "have shouted louder than others" (Moore, 2017), as I discuss in what follows.

Mboa Nkoudou remarks that "the Budapest meeting opened the gate to a cascade of similar summits ending every time with declarations, plans, or programs for open access. From 2002 to the present day, most of these major meetings have taken place in Western countries and under the impetus of the actors from these countries" (2020: 27). Indeed, similar argumentations as the ones

emerging in the Budapest (2002), Berlin (2003), and Bethesda (2003) initiatives have been taken up widely. Next to finding their way into the historical and contemporary discussion on the democratising potential of OA publishing (Guédon, 2008, 2019; Mboa Nkoudou, 2020; Willinsky, 2006), these initiatives have also influenced discourses on the technicalities of implementing OA publishing (Bosman & Kramer, 2018; Eve et al., 2017), and have informed the ways in which OA publishing is understood by national associations of research institutions such as swissuniversities and the BMBF. Other declarations, formulated at the same time, have had a comparatively marginal impact on the wider discourse on OA publishing (Costa et al., 2016; Vessuri, 2003). These include the "Declaration of Science and Use of Scientific Knowledge" (Paris/Cairo, 1999) and the "Scientific Agenda - Framework for Action" (Paris/Cairo, 1999) both originating from the UNESCO World Conference of Science held in Budapest (1999), the Santo Domingo Declaration (2003) and the Brazilian Manifesto to Support Open Access to Scientific Information (2005).

The more widely cited Budapest, Bethesda, and Berlin (BBB) agreements have thus overshadowed other, less widely acclaimed ones. On the face of it, the BOAI and similar declarations owe most of their visibility and success to factors related to their origin in and uptake in Western academic contexts and institutions. Mboa Nkoudou (2020) similarly suggests that a lack of awarded epistemic value might have been attributed to the geographical or linguistic context of emergence of the above-mentioned more marginalised initiatives. Additionally, a lack of funding and technological infrastructures might have prevented the Paris and Cairo, the Santo Domingo, and the Brazilian manifesto from being communicated more widely. Finally, the absence of powerful OA advocates and scholars from wealthy institutions among the signatories of these less acclaimed initiatives might also have had an impact. However, various other, interrelated factors also played a role in the lack of uptake of these frameworks and declarations. For example, the agreements set up in Paris and Cairo employed a broader open knowledge or open science perspective on equity in global knowledge production, while only peripherally touching upon OA publishing specifically. Their peripheral position with regards to the wider OA discourse might thus have caused their marginal position. Furthermore, as Costa et al. (2016) remark, the contents of the Santo Domingo and Brazilian declarations were primarily based on the previous BBB initiatives and might thus have been understood as their regional variants rather than as declarations in their own right.

However, the Paris and Cairo declarations addressed several issues and possibilities with respect to the creation of more equal and diverse forms of global-scale knowledge production that I consider crucial for the question underlying this thesis: For example, the Paris and Cairo, as well as the Santo Domingo and Brazilian documents, emphasised the importance of the co-existence, diversity, and

dialogic relationship between different locally, culturally, and epistemically situated knowledges and, consequently the sovereignty of all knowledges. In this vein, the "Scientific Agenda - Framework for Action" (1999) has emphasised that international science frameworks and policies for exchange and sharing must respect the "multiplicity of conditions for scientific research, of perceptions of science, and also of problems, needs and possibilities to apply scientific knowledge … [as] [i]nternational science is ideally built upon the plurality and diversity of contributions that all nations can make to the scientific endeavour, in regard to their own capacities, needs and interests" (Cetto et al., 2000, 468). This is a focus that makes one-for-all approaches (such as the ones driven forward by commercial publishers, as well as by certain versions of funder- and policy-driven OA publishing) to global scale knowledge creation and sharing untenable.

The Paris and Cairo as well as the Santo Domingo and Brazilian documents further stressed the important role of a sustainable development of science regarding aspects of human well-being, environmental care, and peace. Additionally, these documents explicitly addressed historically grown intersectional discrimination at play in the processes and practices of academic knowledge production. For example, they admonished the underrepresentation of women and indigenous people (as well as their epistemologies, their ways of making sense of and writing-up their results) in academic research, evaluation, editing, and writing. As the authors of the "Scientific Agenda - Framework for Action" (1999) pointed out, what needs to be addressed are "barriers which have precluded the full participation of other groups, of both sexes, including disabled people, indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities" (Cetto et al., 2000, 263). Addressing these barriers, the authors of the "Agenda," claimed, is of special importance as "traditional and local knowledge systems as dynamic expressions of perceiving and understanding the world, can make and historically have made, a valuable contribution to science and technology, and that there is a need to preserve, protect, research and promote this cultural heritage and empirical knowledge" (Cetto et al., 2000, 263)

Vessuri (2003) points out that the "Declaration of Science and Use of Scientific Knowledge" and the "Scientific Agenda - Framework for Action" played an important role in the formation of what can be called a distinct, primarily scholar-led, Latin American approach to OA publishing that indeed highlights similar key issues for approaching global-scale knowledge equity and diversity. For example, Latin American OA advocates call for knowledge equity and diversity, as well as a broad and inclusive participation in all processes and practices of knowledge creation and circualtion (Alperin, et al., 2008; Babini, 2019; Becerril-García & Aguado-López, 2018). As Raju and Badrudeen (2022) remark, several elements included in these two documents (such as the sovereignty of all knowledges and the importance of citizen participation), have influenced the ways in which some scholars and initiatives in African countries – including Raju and Badrudeen themselves – have

understood OA publishing. In chapter 7 of this thesis, I conceptualise these Latin American and African traditions as part of a larger sphere of critical OA advocacy that also includes approaches to OA publishing that emerged in the context of Western academia.

The marginalisation of initiatives such as the Paris and Cairo documents (as well as of critical OA advocacy promoting similar values as these documents) within subsequent – both more progressive and more conservative – prominent formulations of OA publishing, can be considered an effect of what I outlined as hermeneutical injustice in the previous chapter. Critical OA advocates, as I further elaborate in chapter 7, have based their approaches towards a more equal and diverse sphere of knowledge production by means of OA publishing on a politics that is fundamentally different from the liberal democratic rhetoric I discuss in this chapter and, arguably, more complex. Namely, their OA politics has been conceived on the basis of non-humanist or humanist-critical epistemologies (for example, indigenous, feminist, or post-humanist ones). The complexity of these non-humanist or humanist-critical epistemologies (and their relative distance from humanist ones) might have made them less easily adoptable in commercial and large-scale funder and policy driven contexts. These should be seen as being among the reasons why the more progressive and antagonist OA politics as formulated in the context of critical OA advocacy around the same time the BOAI was drafted, has fallen behind: due to this declaration's powerful positioning and wide uptake.

The Alleged Democratic Ethos of Science

The emergence of the BOAI, its early reception by OA advocates such as Willinsky (2006) coincided with increasing concerns among the scholarly community about the accelerated economic consolidation of the academic publishing landscape by a few big players since the end of the Second World War. This advancement put smaller publishers – for example, university presses that emerged with the aim to publish specialised research that could not find a commercial outlet (Adema, 2015) – increasingly under pressure. This is a development that gave rise to the idea of a "scholarly communications crisis" as a result or by-product of the continuing marketisation of the for-profit academic publishing sector (Davis, 1995; Douglas, 1990; Eve, 2015; Guédon, 2017). In this context, profit-driven academic publishers continuously increased journal subscription prices "under the assumption that libraries would subscribe to any content that appeared to be reputable" (Buranyi, 2017). Due to the double function of scholarly publishing both credentialing academics and conveying knowledge, libraries "soon became locked into a system of subscribing to journals that their academics wanted to both read and publish in, meaning that journal publishers could easily

raise the prices in the knowledge that libraries were likely to continue subscribing" (Moore, 2019b, 50). This led to the so-called "serials crisis," in which libraries had difficulty subscribing to all the content they require (Eve, 2015). The rise of journal subscription costs, as Darnton (1999) feared, would affect the humanities specifically. He points out that due to the serials crisis and "in order to maintain their collections of periodicals, libraries have cut back drastically in the purchases of monographs. Faced with the decline in orders from libraries, university presses have virtually ceased publishing in the fields for which there is the least demand."

Against this background, scholars such as Willinsky have promoted OA publishing as "a direct and immediate [democratic] response to this state of affairs [the pervasive commercialisation] in scholarly publishing" (2006: 36). OA, as Willinsky states, "is concerned with increasing free access to more of the research literature for more people …. [it] is acting on a scholarly tradition that has long been concerned with extending the circulation of knowledge …. [and] it is a response, as well, to the conjunction of two conflicting current events in the history of scholarship, one impeding and one accelerating that circulation" (2006: xii). The first event, for Willinsky, is the increase in journal prices, the second is the advent of the Internet and digital publishing.

Guédon emphasises that the BOAI's (2002) central phrase "an old tradition and a new technology have converged to make possible an unprecedented public good", pointed out the age-old foundations and the democratic ethos of science communication "that emerged with the Scientific Revolution [where] thanks to new possibilities offered by print technology, a distributed form of human intelligence had begun to scale up in the seventeenth century" (2017: 2). In a similar vein, Willinsky stresses that "the open access movement is but the most recent chapter" (2006: 5-6) of the democratisation of science, as it is carrying forward "the continuing [democratic] life and legacy of print culture" (2006: 36). To emphasise how OA publishing after the BOAI continued the democratic legacy of print by means of the "new technology," Guédon (2017) refers to the work of a fellow early OA advocate, Stevan Harnad, who with his concept of "scholarly skywriting" (1991), was promoting

the idea to distribute pre-prints via FTP repositories.[41] This text, alongside the "Subversive Proposal" (1995) authored by Harnad, situates the claim for OA publishing in a counter-hegemonic rhetoric.[42]

The insistence on a fundamental association between scholarship, free sharing, and democracy is based on a long-running liberal-humanist tradition as expressed by Christine Borgman (2007), for example.[43] According to her, the tradition of sharing work with one's peers through publication has sustained the scholarly communication system for several centuries and is embedded in the scientific process (or "ethos") itself. As she argues, science has benefitted from the "open exchange of ideas" and its success depends on "wide and rapid dissemination of new knowledge so that findings can be discarded if they are unreliable or built on if they are confirmed" (2007: 35).

Similarly, Willinsky stresses that, "a [scholarly] commitment to the value and quality of research carries with it a responsibility to extend the circulation of such work as far as possible and ideally to all who are interested in it and all who might profit by it" (2006: xii). Additionally, Willinsky stresses that the new technology offered by the internet and the World Wide Web continue the democratic "legacy of print culture" and would make scholarly work "widely available to knowledgeable and interested readers, and as it weathers critique and garners praise in the process, stands as the work's claim to qualify as knowledge" (2006: 6-7). A broad availability of scientific knowledge – on the basis of the idea that a bigger amount of knowledge in circulation makes it possible to gain a better understanding of the world – according to Willinsky (2006), would make its wide and democratic critical negotiation possible and would hence increase its quality. As he further emphasises,

---

[41] FTP (File Transfer Protocol) FTP is a network protocol for transmitting files between computers. FTP repositories allow multiple users to store and access files.

[42] Harnad (1991) considers the state of scientific publishing as being on the "brink of intellectual perestroika," while the whole process of scholarly communication is undergoing "a revolution comparable to the one occasioned by the intervention of printing." As he makes clear, the potential role of electronic networks in scientific publication goes far beyond providing searchable electronic archives for electronic journals. Rather, sharing files on the internet would allow extension of the prepublication phase of scientific inquiry by enabling informal discussions and various rounds of peer-review, while proceeding more quickly, interactively, and globally. This will, Harnad argues, "substantially restructure the pursuit of knowledge." As he stresses furthermore, scholarly knowledge creation might become more participatory "though perhaps also more depersonalized, with ideas propagating and permuting on the net in directions over which their originators would be unable (and indeed perhaps unwilling) to claim proprietorship." However, as he suggests, as an individual compensation for the diminished proprietorship, the internet will, in turn, "allow much greater intellectual productivity in one lifetime."

[43] The humanist dimension of liberal humanism emphasises the importance of individual freedom, dignity, reason, and rationality, and it promotes the idea that all individuals have the power to make their own choices and determine their own destiny. Liberal humanism values the pursuit of knowledge, education and personal development as the basis to make choices. It emphasises the importance of human rights and equality for creating a just and fair society (Habib, n.d.). Scholars such as Appadurai (2000, 2006), Mbembe and Meintjes (2003), or Dirlik (2002), have pointed out some of the main problematics of liberal humanism: for example, how it is based on the assumption that everyone is equally free and has equal access to education, resources, and opportunities; or how it depends on a narrow (humanist) and Euro-centric definition of reason, rationality, and freedom which can exclude other ways of knowing and understanding the world.

extending the circulation of knowledge via OA publishing public (non-academic) realm could help citizens to realise and make use of their right to know in order to gain a broader and better understanding of the world as a basis for fuller participation in democratic decision making.

Similar ideas on the inseperability of scholarship, free sharing, ethics, and democracy can already be found in the first half of the twentieth century, in the work of the American sociologist Robert K. Merton. As Merton's ideas have directly influenced some of the democratisation discourses in the context of OA publishing, I consider it useful to discuss his ideas around science, knowledge, as well as practices of knowledge production more in depth.

In his work Merton, being increasingly preoccupied with the "willingness" – achieved often under coercion – of German academics to serve the Nazi regime, tried to draw a strict division between "real," i.e. democratic and ethical science, and unethical and anti-intellectual non-science (Merton 1938, 1942, 1973). "Real" science, as Merton argues – even though not adhering to formalised ethical guidelines – derives its norms and values from practices and attitudes that are widely shared among scientists (implicitly "all" scientists in the world). According to Merton, the ethos of science contains four main elements. It states that scientific knowledge is "universal," "communalist", disinterested, and sceptical.[44] The first principle, the "universality of scientific knowledge," implies that valid knowledge – even though "the cultural context in any given nation or society may predispose scientists to focus on certain problems, to be sensitive to some and not other" (1973: 271) – is not a matter "of national taste and culture." Rather, for Merton, scientific knowledge is impersonal, universal, and objective and thus independent from the "personal or social attributes of their protagonist; his race, nationality, religion, class, and personal qualities are as such irrelevant" (1973: 270). Hence, as Merton continues, scientific knowledge is concordant with observation and its consistency with previously confirmed knowledge.

As I want to argue, Merton's ideas on knowledge are underwritten by a positivist understanding of humanist models of science. According to this idea, science is a confined, specifiable, and hence surveyable terrain that is concordant with observation and consistent with previously confirmed knowledge. The subject of science, the implied "knower" of nature's order, is unitary and coherent and able to convey this order through forms of representation, such as writing and publishing. As such, in a humanist scientific culture, to borrow Harding's words: "Sciences [as well as pertaining practices such as research, writing, and publishing] are fundamentally systems of representation (theories, hypotheses, claims) rather than practices of intervention, and thus sciences are analytically

[44] The principle of "disinterestedness" implies that science should limit the influence of bias as much as possible and should be done for the sake of science, rather than self-interest or power. The principle of "organised scepticism" implies that science asks for more rigorous verification of its subjects than any other field. This norm points towards the value of sharing and public discussion, contestation, and validation.

and politically isolatable and autonomous from technologies and their uses" (2002: 92). Valid scientific knowledge, as Merton (1943, 1973) further argues, must be open to comparisons, and to critical examination and contestation.

A similar idea is echoed in Willinsky's (2006) argument emphasising that OA publishing, by making scholarly knowledge widely available (so it can be critically discussed), would both increase the quality of knowledge and help citizens to make use of their right of participation in democratic decision making in an informed manner. The way in which knowledge is understood here – as universal, objective, and hence comparable (as well as contestable) based on uniform criteria – echoes Merton's positivist neglect of the social, cultural, and historical factors that shape scientific research (Haraway, 1988). A similar idea is implied in the BOAI's central claim that OA publishing is the foundation upon which all humanity could engage in a "common intellectual conversation and quest for [all] knowledge" (BOAI, 2002). What furthermore is alluded to especially in Willinsky's (2006) argument is the liberal (humanist) idea that, in principle, everyone has the individual freedom and the ability – on the basis of the right to knowledge, education, and personal development – to make choices for themselves while participating in the decision-making process and to have a democratic say in how their society is governed.

For Merton, the scientific community (scientists are attributed a universal subject position here), based on his second principle of the "communality of scientific knowledge," is essentially supportive of a wide availability of knowledge, and they share the responsibility to increase its circulation. Merton writes with the conviction that the "substantive findings of science are a product of social collaboration and are assigned to the community … [and] democratization is tantamount to the progressive elimination of restraints upon the exercise and development of socially valued capacities" (1973: 273). Hence, according to Merton, the democratisation of knowledge production liberates science from forces that have put the unrestricted and free sharing of knowledge under duress (and hence also have threatened democracy that is presupposed on knowledgeable citizens). This threat occurs when democratic, universal and free access to both knowledge and academic career opportunity is not guaranteed anymore "on grounds other than lack of competence" (i1973: 272). As Merton (1942, 1973) specifies, restraints put on science include nationalistic bias, class ideology, or proprietary claims upon knowledge. Examples are commercial actors taking over scholarly knowledge production and communication or the increasing interrelation between research output and academic status that drives the scholarly reputation economy (1973: 274). However, for Merton, the ethos of communalism and disinterestedness is shared among the entire academic community, which prevents biases from taking over.

These ideas of Merton are echoed in the claims made by Guédon (2017) and Willinsky (2006) I introduced previously. For example, in the way in which they have positioned OA publishing as a direct (and democratic) response to the increasing commercialisation of the academic publishing sphere, a phenomena which risks disabling the circulation of knowledge and thus would put restraints on the capacity of citizens to participate in democracy by enclosing it behind paywalls. In the course of their argument, both Guédon and Willinsky stress the importance of knowledge as a public good and the importance that print technology had in securing the wide circulation of this good. Willinsky especially emphasises, by reference to Merton's principle of the "communality of scientific knowledge," that ensuring such a wide circulation is "integral to the scientific ethos" (2006: 41). For him, OA publishing is just the next step in a long-standing scholarly sharing tradition including the printing press, study circles in the seventeenth century, public libraries and schools, and open universities in the twentieth century. What unites these different initiatives and puts them in closeness to OA publishing, according to Willinsky, is their democratic streak, including "efforts to improve access to knowledge" and to "ensure that a greater proportion of the population was able to exercise its right to know what is known" (2006: 30). As Willinsky further emphasises, even in cases where state or philanthropic funding for these initiatives was not a given, scientific and local communities insisting on their right to "come together to establish collections … such was their determination to access this knowledge and literature" (2006: 30). Willinsky, on this basis, appeals to the ethos of all scholars in the face of digitisation and OA publishing stressing that "given the current transformation of journals from print to online formats, is that researchers, scholarly societies, publishers, and research libraries have now to ask themselves whether or not they are using this new technology to do as much as can be done to advance and improve access to research and scholarship" (2006: xii).

In the work of Merton, Guédon, and Willinsky a positivist understanding of a (humanist) idea of science and a (liberal) democratic politics[45] are conceptually linked. As Dussel (2002) and Grosfoguel (2002) point out, such a connection is both triumphalist and exceptionalist: a humanist idea of science alone is assumed in possession of those characteristics that are able to advance scientific, social, and political progress. Harding (2002) additionally emphasises that the positioning of "real

[45] In liberal democracy (a representative democratic form of government), basic principles of liberalism and democracy are combined. It is based on the democratic idea that people should have the freedom to make choices about their lives, while also having a say in how they are governed (while the government is held accountable to the people through periodic elections. The liberal component of liberal democracy emphasizes the importance of individual freedoms and rights. Overall, liberal democracy is a system of government that seeks to balance individual freedoms and democracy, while also protecting the rule of law (the idea that all citizens and institutions (including law-makers themselves) are accountable to the same law) the rights of all citizens, and individual property (Hardin, 2003; Losurdo & Elliott, 2014)

science" as inherently democratic in opposition to presumably anti-democratic commercial agendas or (historically) "private mystical experiences, secret, elite or conspiratorial processes, or dogmatic political assumptions generate beliefs" (89) has been a recurrent motif within modern Western science and the positivist theorising of its democratic potential. Since the beginnings of modern science in Europe in the Enlightenment period, as Harding discusses and as I elaborate more in depth in chapter 5, science has been considered to consist of value-neutral and universally valid facts "that are beholden to no cultural or political ideologies and thus eventually can defeat those traditional beliefs and superstitions that provide fertile ground for antidemocratic forces" (2002: 89).

I analyse the interrelation of (liberal) democracy and the ideas of OA publishing implied in the BOAI, as well as Guédon's, and Willinsky's claims more in depth at the end of this chapter. However, first, I discuss what the ideas on OA publishing that I have been discussing here imply regarding how the scope of OA publishing is conceptualised.

Balancing Individual Freedoms and Democracy through OA publishing

While scientists aim to be recognised for their contributions to knowledge, so Merton argues, their shared democratic ethos is stronger than individual self-interest or careerism. In fact, he states that this ethos implies that science and its principles must be defended – by scholars, presses, and funders alike – against external threats, to defend the individual right to knowledge and education as on which the ability to take part in democracy is predicated. In their defence of scholarly values, Merton argues, scholars, presses, and funders should collectively govern and make use of new technology to make the free and unrestricted circulation of knowledge possible (1973: 276). Where needed, these efforts should be supported by the democratic "political apparatus" as well as by policies and legal means. Regarding the latter, Merton stresses that property rights in science should be "whittled down to a bare minimum by the rationale of the scientific ethic. The scientist's claim to 'his' intellectual 'property' is limited to that of recognition and esteem which, if the institution functions with a modicum of efficiency, is roughly commensurate with the significance of the increments brought to the common fund of knowledge" (1973: 273).

Willinsky (2006) remarks that a "principled" approach to OA publishing evolves in two ways. These include "the practical matters of digitizing scholarly journals" as well as the "extending the research capacities of developing nations, increasing public rights of access to knowledge, and furthering the policy and political contributions of research" (xiii). Similarly to Merton, Willinsky emphasises the role of democratic institutions to enable the unrestricted circulation to knowledge. He additionally stresses that digital technologies – the newest technologies at disposal (Merton,

1973) – would make it possible to, in the context of OA publishing, share research more effectively and broadly than in print, as it would enable everyone with a stable internet connection to access research (2006: xiii). He furthermore asserts that the workflows associated with digital technologies – for example, the relatively low cost of copying, transmitting, and storing documents – would help to remove price barriers to digitally published research and thus improve the circulation of knowledge in terms of affordability. Furthermore, as he points out, the free digital circulation of knowledge would make it easier for scholars situated in different areas of the globe to read each other's texts and to collaborate in common research projects (2006: ixx).

Copyright, for Willinksky, is another important element to be considered to facilitate the free and unrestricted circulation of knowledge. According to him, "authors … have a new range of options for protecting their rights, not just out of concern for public interests, but out of unmitigated self-interest and vanity, as well" (2006: 41). As he argues, liberal copyright regimes (including licences such as CC BY that require attribution to a work's author) help to anchor scholarly knowledge in the public realm, while also catering to "academic vanity" (the aim to be recognised and esteemed for one's contribution to knowledge). OA publishing, according to Willinsky, must appeal to academic vanity because it "is associated with increased citations for authors and journals, when compared to similar work that is not open access" (2006: 22). However, as he is convinced, with the increase of research made openly available the citation advantage of OA publishing will vanish, while "the research impact, in the sense of an increased contribution, will continue" (2006: 23). Similarly to Merton he puts forward a classical liberal democratic argument here. In this view, preserving individual self-interests does not contradict the democratic ethos nor does it harm the thriving of democratic societies – it rather contributes to the common interest, as long as individual freedoms and democracy are held in balance.

The focus within Willinsky's (2006) work on OA publishing is predominantly on how techno-legal improvements could increase access to research *outputs.* Additionally, copyright can mediate the terms and conditions under which these outputs are made available. A similar idea is implied in the BOAI that defines OA publishing as the free availability of scientific literature without financial, legal, and technical barriers. While Willinsky sees "the inevitable persistence of a digital divide [the inequal access to digital technology such as the internet, computers, or smartphones] based on persistent economic inequities" (2006: 31) as the main factor restricting OA publishing from flourishing, the authors of the BOAI (2002) too acknowledge the persistence of barriers that are inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself.

Reducing the existence of potential barriers –- cultural, linguistic, social, and epistemic – to the mere financial, technological, and legal (re)distribution of the access to (and consumption of)

research output, these conceptualisations prevent a critical re-evaluation of common scholarly practices of knowledge production. However, as I stress in this thesis, such an evaluation is needed for a serious consideration of the question on how OA publishing can contribute to more knowledge equity and diversity. As I elaborated previously, a focus on research outputs has also been encapsulated in the expansionist agendas of neoliberal capitalism, informing the ways in which OA is understood by national associations of research institutions such as swissuniversities, the BMBF, the UK government's OA policy, international policy initiatives such as Plan S, and in discussion on the main routes to OA publishing (e.g. green or gold) as I touched upon previously. The ideas promoted within the democratising narratives around OA publishing, have directed the focus on to the mere financial and techno-legal availability of research outputs as the primary goal of OA publishing.

Must this Democratic Vision be Questioned?

The positivist theorising of the liberal democratic potential of humanist epistemologies, as well as liberal democracy itself have been criticised widely in academia in the context of the discourse on cultural hegemony – not least by critical OA advocates, as I discuss more in depth in chapter 7. For example, some critical OA advocates (see Hall (2008) and Adema & Hall (2013)) have based their considerations around OA publishing on theorists such as Chantal Mouffe and Jean-Luc Nancy.

Mouffe (2000) argues that liberal democracy is flawed because it prioritises individual freedom over the collective will, leading to a lack of meaningful political engagement and the rise of populist movements. She underlines the pluralist character of liberal democracy by proposing an alternative: agonistic democracy. This model embraces conflict and disagreement as necessary for a vibrant democracy in so far that individuals and groups with opposing views are encouraged to perpetually engage in respectful debate and contestation of power, rather than being silenced or marginalised. Nancy's (2006) critique of liberal democracy focuses on its inability to address the systemic inequalities that exist within society. He argues that liberal democracy is too focused on individual rights and freedoms, ignoring, especially, the socio-economic factors that create inequalities. According to Nancy, true democracy requires a shift towards a more collective and participatory approach to politics. He proposes that democracy is not simply a static state to be achieved and maintained, but rather an ongoing and dynamic process that requires active participation from all members of society. Nancy argues that the democratic process is a constant negotiation and renegotiation of power, as individuals and groups engage in ongoing discussions and debates to determine the best way forward for society. He emphasizes the importance of creating spaces for dialogue and deliberation, where all voices can be heard and all perspectives can be considered.

At the heart of Nancy's and Mouffe's ideas is the belief that democracy is not a fixed or predetermined concept, but rather a fluid and evolving one that must be continually reimagined and redefined by the people who participate in it. This requires a willingness to embrace change and uncertainty, and a commitment to ongoing engagement and collaboration, rather than a reliance on preconceived notions of what democracy should look like.

Other critical OA advocates (in their critiques of the global inequities in dominant approaches to OA publishing) have heavily related on scholars such as Arjun Appadurai (1996, 2000, 2006) and Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2015). These theorists have – together with, for example, Aziz Choudry (2020) and Radha D'Souza (2009) – criticised the progressive political rhetoric of liberal democracy as part of a politics of inclusion and broad-based unity that has been dominating leftist discourse (in academia and outside of it) since the Cold War period. These theorists stress how, within a liberal discursive setting, terms such as "human rights," "freedom," "democracy," "inclusion," and "justice" have been – while implicitly remaining dependent on a narrow (humanist) and Eurocentric definition of reason, rationality, and freedom – universalised and, with this, de-historicized, de-contextualized, and de-politicised. With this, terms such as "democracy," and "justice" as D'Souza (2009) and Appadurai (2006) stress, have been progressively disconnected from the situated and practical performance and definition of these concepts. Consequently, a liberal leftist political rhetoric has continuously undermined "the importance of [perpetual practices of and within] concept-formation and differentiated and ongoing struggle for social change" as appearing in contexts not considered in humanist democracy discourses (D'Souza, 2009, 26).

In other words, the universalisation of a certain idea of science and knowledge and its interrelation with a specific idea of democracy has led to the marginalisation of the "democratic" politics – or better, struggles for greater equity – of subjects that have been submitted to gender, sexual and racial oppression. Or, as De Sousa Santos writes, such a perception of democracy excludes other ways to achieve a more just and equal society: namely those that are based on "the experiences of large, marginalized minorities and majorities that struggle against unjustly imposed marginality and inferiority" (2015: ix).

While the democratisation narratives based upon a positive interpretation of humanist epistemologies that I discussed in this chapter have proliferated widely, initiatives such as the "Declaration of Science and Use of Scientific Knowledge" (Paris, Cairo 1999) and the "Scientific Agenda - Framework for Action" (Paris, Cairo 1999) have remained less acclaimed. The same is true for the politics pushed forward by critical OA advocates (in parts formulated around the same time the BOAI was drafted). These OA advocates have formulated their politics on non-humanist or

humanist-critical epistemologies (taking, for example, inspiration from indigenous, feminist, or post-humanist discourses). This, as I argue in chapters 5 and 7, has made them less prone to appropriation in commercial and large-scale OA contexts.

The converse conclusion is that the universalist liberal humanist political rhetoric – formally committing to equality, diversity and inclusion while neglecting cultural, linguistic, and epistemic barriers that might prevent these – underlaying the idea of democracy as pushed forward in the BOAI and within the argumentation of scholars such as Willinsky, has furthered the uptake of these arguments within the wider discourse on OA publishing. It also has made it easier for certain commercial players, funders, and policy makers to tap into the democratisation arguments emerging around the BOAI to coat their undertaking with a "patina of legitimacy" (Fraser, 2019, 15). Such a move is, for example, visible in the altruistic liberal storytelling that frames the Swiss national strategy for OA publishing as communicated by swissuniversities, which, similar to the BOAI, stresses that OA publishing will serve the progress of humanity in its entirety and the common good (understood as *all* knowledge).

Due to the marginalisation of critical approaches to OA publishing, the more holistic understanding of the scope of OA publishing these OA advocates have proposed (including cultural, linguistic, and epistemic questions, such as who is allowed to contribute to knowledge production and how) and, related, their the attentiveness to processes and practices of knowledge production, has also been marginalised. For these reasons, as I have shown in this chapter, the democratisation narratives that have emerged around OA publishing bear little potential to contribute towards greater equity and diversity within knowledge creation and sharing in the way I want to suggest in this thesis. In contrary, these narratives have led to the perpetuation of similar hermeneutical injustices as the ones that I critiqued previously in relation to commercial, funder- and policy-driven approaches to OA publishing.

As I want to conclude here, what has to be critically discussed regarding the question of how and in how far OA publishing can contribute to greater equity and diversity in knowledge production, is a critical consideration of the humanist epistemologies that have formed the primary hermeneutical basis upon which prominent and wide-spread conceptualisations of and approaches to OA publishing have been theorised and conceived. What is needed is a critical reassessment of how these humanist paradigms came about and how a large part of the (Western) scholarly discourse and practice (both within and outside of OA publishing) has come to depend on their positivist interpretation. Such an assessment also requires consideration of how these paradigms of science and knowledge have been challenged and contested over time, as part of OA advocacy and separate from it. This is what I focus on in the following chapters.

SECTION II

THE CONTESTED NATURE OF HUMANIST EPISTEMOLOGIES

Chapter 5: (De)Institutionalising Humanism

Humanist epistemologies – assumptions about the human as a reasonable, rational, and unitary subject able to recognise truth through observation and analysis – are inherently related to ideas about the nature of modern science, about what scientifically valid knowledge and ways of knowing are. These epistemologies have also influenced the way knowledge is conventionally written-up, evaluated, and distributed. The dominance of humanist epistemologies in definitions of modern science (as well as a positivist interpretation of these epistemologies) has also effected OA publishing and the way this has been theorised and approached (including in those discourses that focus on access to and the democratisation of knowledge, as I have shown in the previous chapter). However, the rise and subsequent dominance of humanist epistemologies has by no means been necessary; it is contingent, that is, it could have been and could be otherwise. As I will show in this chapter, it has been the result of political, territorial, economic, and epistemic power struggles, conflicts, and alliances.

By focusing on these power struggles, conflicts, and alliances in this chapter, I analyse how humanist theories of science and knowledge are not as politically, economically, and culturally neutral as they are commonly perceived to be in those parts of the discourse on OA publishing I discussed previously. In the first part of this chapter, I focus on how humanist epistemologies have emerged and taken effect in relation to the political, socio-economic, and institutional interests of those who have promoted them and have historically constructed them as the dominant ones, especially in the

context of colonialism.[46] However, humanist theories of science as well as their positivist use have also been challenged over time, for example within critical feminist, anti-colonial, and globalisation critical discourses in the twentieth century, which I discuss in the second part of this chapter.

As part of this analysis, I investigate how humanist theories of science – despite this contestation – have come to lie at the basis of some forms of OA publishing and if they can be interrelated with the neo-colonial and neo-imperialist tendencies that OA publishing can inhabit: Has the wide acceptance and proliferation of humanist epistemologies and their positivist interpretation within concepts of modern science led to specific ideas about how knowledge should be written up and conveyed? And to what extent have these ideas, today, been embodied and are still perpetuated within common assumptions about academic notions of the nature of the text (or book) and the author, as well as within dominant research, writing, assessment, and publishing practices inside and outside of OA publishing?

Humanism & Modern Science

To analyse the emergence and promotion of humanist theories of science – understanding scientific knowledge as neutral, detached, and representative of the "truth," and the knower as a self-contained and rational individual, for example – in the context of specific political, socio-economic, and institutional interests, it is worth engaging more in depth with the critical discourses on globalisation and the academic dependency of peripheral regions that I first introduced in chapter 2. As I wrote previously, these discourses emerged in the second half of the twentieth century in the context of a wider critical consideration of the relations between the former European colonial powers and the ex-colonies. Scholars who align themselves with this discourse tend to position globalisation as a mechanism of 21st century imperialisms (specifically neoliberalism) and stress the

[46] While I focus on the context of colonialism in my thesis, it mustn't be ignored that in late Medieval and early Renaissance Europe – when humanism started to take shape in opposition to the idea of God as the sole source of human values and truth – a secularisation of religious textual practices already began to take shape with the rise of universities, among other things. Illich (1996), using reading as an example describes, how, in the thirteenth century, a distinction between the "light of faith" and the "light of reason" lead to two kinds of textual engagement. On the one hand, reading as a spiritual – finding God in/as wisdom through reading – often "carnal," embodied, and communal practice (see monastic readings where monks engaged in reading aloud together moving their bodies in the text's rhythm, for example). And, on the other hand, scholastic (proto-humanist) forms of reading as an individualistic activity, a silent intercourse between a rational self and a page – presupposing the "right to periods of silence, as well as the existence of echo-chambers such as … academies" (Illich, 1996, 3) – with the aim of getting acquainted with a larger number of authors in order to maximise knowledge, and find the "light of reason." The latter, as Illich writes, came to be the "the goal of initiation of clerics and enlightened anti-clericals, of humanists and scientists alike" legitimising their participation in Western scholastic institutions (1996: 3).

interrelation of political and economic imperialism with intellectual, or cognitive, imperialism (Alatas, 2000, 2003; Appadurai, 1996, 2000; Dirlik, 1997; Mbembe & Meintjes, 2003; Mohanty, 2003). In addition to these discourses, I want to highlight a range of feminist perspectives that will help to further complicate some of the claims emerging from these critical academic dependency and globalisation discourses.

Alatas points out that imperialism is a "cluster" of different aspects connected to the "subjugation of one people by another for the advantage of the dominant one" (2000: 23). Imperialism, according to him, consists of political, economic, social, and intellectual elements. As he remarks, intellectual imperialism during the colonialisation of the Americas, Asia, Africa and the South Pacific began with "the setting up and direct control of schools, universities and publishing houses by the colonial powers" (601). Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), similarly to Alatas, discusses how the transplanting of learned societies, universities, and libraries from Europe into colonised countries allowed the organisation and embedding of traditional local interests, concerns, and practices into the infrastructural, institutional, and epistemic matrix of Western modernity. Alatas (2000) further elaborates: "They expected us to employ without question the methods of analysis that were current abroad. They expected us to be interested in topics of interest to people abroad. In running organizations, they expected us to do the same" (26). In other words, colonial power, according to Alatas and Smith, worked through the institutions governing knowledge creation and sharing. These pushed forward humanist (or modern) ideas of science as a distinctive method as well as a distinctive metaphysics and epistemology demanding a critical attitude toward, or an ignorance of, traditional beliefs and traditional ideas on knowing and knowledge (Harding, 2002).

An example of a colonial institution that has directly served the interrelation of humanism with modern science and helped its dominant position (in this case, in what is called today the U.S.), is the American Philosophical Society (APS). In the second half of the eighteenth century the APS, based on a proposal by Benjamin Franklin, suggested that the male English scholars living in the various colonies should form "The American Philosophical Society who are to maintain a constant Correspondence on Divinity, Metaphysics, Moralls, Politicks, Grammar, Rhetorick or Logick" (Conklin 1947, 2). Franklin pointed out that the scope of the APS should include: "all philosophical Experiments that let Light into the Nature of Things, tend to increase the Power of Man over Matter, and multiply the Conveniences and Pleasures of Life" (APS, n.d.).

The scope of the APS as described here is exemplary of the humanist idea of modern science as "real" science, opposed to systems of knowledge and knowing that were assumed to be inferior. Adopting a humanist model of science, Franklin believed, would contribute to the intellectual as well

as economic thriving of the colonies. In this vein, he wrote the "Idea of the English School" in 1750. This text emphasised the importance of English literature, history, rhetoric, moral and natural philosophy for the moral education and intellectual development of the population of the colonies. These subjects were, Franklin argued, to be widely spread by making scholars, students, and school children in the colonies read works by Enlightenment authors including Tillotson, Milton, Locke, Addison, Pope, Swift, "the higher Papers in the *Spectator* and the *Guardian*," as well as translations of Homer and Virgil (Conclin, 1947, 32).[47] The aim was to encourage the spread of canonical humanist literature among the population in the colonies. The APS encouraged and financially supported the foundation of English schools, colleges, and universities, and academic, clergy, and community libraries. From the 1770s onwards, the "literary program" promoted through the APS started to be less literary and more technical. This literature was supposed to not only morally and intellectually educate but also support the cultivation of certain "improving" methods of farming, breeding livestock, medical treatment, and the mining of natural resources to strengthen the colonies economically.

In a similar vein, Thomas Babington Macaulay, who served on the British Supreme Council in India, was responsible for the introduction of Western institutional education in India. In 1834, Macaulay wrote a memorandum titled "Minute Upon Indian Education" in preparation for the legislative *English Education Act* released by the Council of India in 1835. In his "Minutes" Macaulay argued that support for the publication of books in Sanskrit and Arabic should be withdrawn, while – among the institutions for traditional education – only the Madrassa at Delhi and the Hindu College at Benares should be further funded. However, students should no longer be supported in their studies at these institutions. Rather, Macaulay suggests, the money released through this shifting of funds should be used to support education in Western subjects and Western methodology.
Even though Macaulay, as Losurdo and Elliot stress, in his book *The History of England* (1849-61) "acknowledged that the English colonists in India behaved like 'Spartans' confronting 'helots,' we are dealing with 'a race of sovereigns' or a 'sovereign caste,' wielding absolute power over its ' serfs' ….

[47] Despite the expression of educational ambitions and policies in the colonies in various official documents and statements, their actual implementation was far more patchy than, for example, Franklin's considerations might suggest. As Whitehead (2007) discusses related to the example of India (while emphasising similar characteristics in other colonies), even though a uniform education policy for India was outlined in 1851, its implementation (often supported by government funds) was entrusted to a variety of provincial governments, local colonial secretariats, Christian missions, and the local population, and it was not uniformly applied. Furthermore, education was not compulsive and was, as Whitehead remarks "based on parental capacity to pay. As a consequence education always reflected the ubiquitous British social [patriarchal and] class system" (2007: 164). Consequently, the sons of the English and indigenous elite were frequently educated in special schools, while the rest of the population was not schooled at all or rarely progressed beyond elementary school. However, as I want to point out here, the patchiness of the educational system in the British colonies by no means contradicts that the educational system in British colonies was widely influenced by traditional English educational practice, including the perpetuation of humanist epistemologies as well as class divisions.

[but Macaulay's acknowledgement] did not prompt any doubts about the right of free England to exercise dictatorship over the barbarians of the colonies" (2014: 250). Rather, Macaulay in his "Minutes" expresses his conviction in the superiority of the Western European culture and the English language and their inherent interrelation with socio-political and economic progress. As Macaulay writes:

> I have read translations of the most celebrated Arabic and Sanscrit works ... I have never found one among them who could deny that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia. We have to educate a people who cannot at present be educated by means of their mother-tongue. …. [English in contrast] … abounds with … full and correct information … In India, English … is spoken by the higher class of natives … [English] is that which would be the most useful [also for the rest of] our native subjects …. The [rhetorical] question now before us is simply whether we shall countenance …. medical doctrines which would disgrace an English farrier [and] astronomy which would move laughter in girls at an English boarding school (1965[1835]: 107).

The ideas of Franklin and Macaulay amount to a conception of modern science based on what today can be recognised as the positivist interpretation of humanist science "equalised with logical thinking, scientific reasoning and taken to be both a cause and an indicator of human progress itself" (Harding, 2002, 90). Smith (1999) mentions common attitudes or patterns within such a trajectory, including the universalisation of European realities, assumptions, and experiences within scientific theory. This has rendered the experiences, beliefs, and theories of colonised populations irrelevant (in the case of the above cited examples, the devaluation of ancient farming methods or medical knowledge or the ridiculing of approaches to history or astronomy) and has led to the subordination of traditional knowledges to the "rational knowledge" produced in the West (for example, by positioning Western science as the only one able to "led light into the nature of things" and to "increase the power of man over matter," which expresses one of the central claims of a humanist epistemology, namely the division between (human) mind and matter).

Knowledges, ways of knowing, and subjectivities that differ from humanist ones – such as indigenous, peasant or popular knowledge systems – have been stereotypically rendered as "instinctual", pagan," and "local," as seen in Macaulay's argument. These ways of knowing were deemed incapable of being a credible alternative to what exists globally and universally (Alatas, 2000; Santos, 2015, 2018; Windle, 2017). Alatas (2000) discusses how historical universalisation and normative positioning of humanist theories of science as the only valid ones – within scientific

training, its presentation in learned societies, or within publishing in journals – instituted the belief that only the knowledge borne of the European Enlightenment is valid.

Alatas (1977), Said (1978), and Smith (1999) emphasise the role literature (as well as reading and writing) has played in the production of a specific notion of the human and human subjectivity – as a self-contained individual in control of the truth – as well as in establishing Europe as the subject and the colony as the object of knowledge. As these scholars show, European literary production played an important role in collecting, classifying, representing, and widely distributing views about the "colonial other" – either idealising the "exotic" or ridiculing and belittling "savage" cultures and minds (Said, 1978). In a similar vein, Alatas (1977) analyses the origins and function of the myth of the indolent, dull, backward, and treacherous native represented in literature used to justify colonial subjugation as a cause of and reason for human progress. These works were then fed back to those who had been colonised: libraries in the colonies and curricular literature in schools and universities played an important role in this development (Smith, 1999).

In consequence to considerations like these, Braidotti (2018) stresses that Europe should not be understood as a geopolitical location only, but also a universal attribute of the human mind – rational, self-contained, and analytical – that can lend its quality to any suitable objects. As she remarks: "Europe as universal consciousness posits the power of reason as its distinctive characteristic and humanistic universalism as its particularity …. [this consciousness] continued to define the subject of European thought as unitary and hegemonic and to assign him (the gender is no coincidence) a royal place as the motor of social and cultural evolution" (23).

Several scholars have emphasised the interrelation between geographic location and the material, financial, epistemic, and linguistic barriers to participating in academic knowledge creation and circulation and how the oppressive hierarchical structures of the past are actively performed in and through (humanist) knowledge systems in the present. For example, Wallerstein proposes the world-systems analysis (1974) – a division of the world into core countries, semi-peripheral countries, and peripheral countries – to show how social science research has been structured based on European approaches since the mid-nineteenth century. In a similar vein, Spivak (1990) and other members of the Subaltern Studies group deconstruct the entirety of European social theory and the humanities, and their Eurocentric bias. Garreau (1988) points out that dominant and seemingly universalist models of, and approaches to, social science have established their "truths" primarily based on inputs from Western scholars, while input from Third World researchers has remained marginal, for which he mainly blames the academic publishing system. Analysing the *International Encyclopedia of*

the Social Sciences Garreau stresses that 98.1% of the authors were based at North American or European universities.

Despite its usefulness as an analytical framework for explaining some of the power disparities in globalised systems of academic knowledge production, the clear distinction between core and peripheral countries or dominant and subordinated knowledges must be regarded sceptically, as it will become evident in the next subchapter. Not least feminist theorists have complicated the binary and boundary making between peripheral and dominant locations and humanist and non-humanist knowledge systems. However, critiques that emphasise tendentially binary global power relations in contemporary scientific publishing as well as in certain forms of OA publishing cannot be dismissed. As I emphasised in chapter 2, academics working in the current scientific publishing system are enticed to compete in what is duped as a single, uniform global OA market in which the defining power remains with Western commercial publishers, large-scale OA policies and universalising OA publishing deals formulated predominantly in the West. Scholars such as Beigel (2013, 2018) emphasise that "objectively" defined research quality standards have historically been deduced from a positivist interpretation of humanist ideas that understand science as concordant with observation and its consistency with previously confirmed knowledge, while knowledge is seen as transcendent and thus independent from the personal or social attributes of its protagonist. Similarly, Chan et al. (2020) point out that beyond factors such as nationality and language, other factors tend to lead to the marginalisation of certain scholars from the scientific (mainstream) discourse. Knowledges and ways of knowing that come from outside a humanist European scientific tradition have often been excluded. Forms of scientific reasoning that are analytic, objective, and rational, as Chan et al. (2020), Lujano (2022), and Rio Riande et al. (2022) argue, have been favoured – mainly by male, anglophone editorial boards – over forms of reasoning that refuse the binary set-up between reality and dreams or imagination, for example. Chan et al (2020), Paasi (2015), and Knöchelmann (2021) discuss how the exclusion of certain communities from scientific discourses can be considered a form of testimonial injustice.

In conclusion: the distinctive (humanist) criteria foundational for the idea of modern science must be considered as specific knowledges proposed at a specific time, within specific geographical, epistemological, and disciplinary locations and contexts or emergence and application. In other words, all science, and consequently knowledge, is ultimately local knowledge. This is one of the main insights my critique of historical and contemporary humanist epistemologies hinges upon. For what reasons then – despite the obvious biases that I just discussed and despite their contestation, which I showcase next – have humanist theories of science become dominant within the academic discourse and (OA) publishing? And why have they come to even form part of supposedly progressive

alternatives to commercial, neo-colonial or neo-imperialist trajectories, such as the democratisation narratives I discussed in the previous chapter?

Complicating the Absoluteness of Imperialist Subjugation and the Universality of Humanist Epistemologies: A Feminist Perspective

As well as criticising the geo-spatial logics and the material, social, economic, and political conditions that contributed to the advancement of modern science, feminist researchers have further complicated imperialist "patterns of systematic knowledge and systematic ignorance" (Harding, 2002, 100). Crenshaw (1989), Harding (1991, 2002), McClintock et al. (1997), Mohanty (1984), and Smith (1999) have stressed the centrality of gender categories in Western expansionism, by exploring the intersections of race, gender, and sexuality in colonial, imperialist, and globalised contexts.

Anzaldúa (1987), Harding (2002), and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (2011, 2014) have pointed out the reliability and validity of marginalised knowledge forms, despite their "lack" of criteria and features such as replicability or universality, as desired by modern humanist science. They have emphasised that marginalised knowledges and ways of knowing have, both in and outside of academia, persisted until today thanks to their active protection and positioning as part of an ongoing struggle for self-determination beyond imperialism. These considerations put into perspective the incomplete and patchy nature of the "colonial project" that I outlined above.

By theorising hybridity and the fluidity, inconsistency, and relationality of subject positions, subjectivities, and knowledges, Sandoval (1998, 2000), Stoler (1995), and Bhabha (1994) – as well as New Materialist and post-humanist feminists such as Barad, Braidotti, and Haraway – challenge the idea of human essence, of a unified self and an integral individual, by highlighting the interdependence of different (for example, marginalised and dominant) subject positions. In doing so, they make the idea of the purity of colonial (or colonialised) subjectivity or identity untenable. At the same time, they contest the idea of the neutrality and objectivity of the humanist subject as well as of the knowledges this subject produces (and in turn is produced by).

In a similar vein, Anzaldúa (1987) and Hill Collins (1997) describe this multi-locationality (or fragmentation) of subjects – for example, regarding the position of women in colonial contexts, or regarding the position of women of colour in white, masculine academic disciplines, or black women in male-dominated black liberation movements and feminist struggles dominated by white women – as "mestiza," "nepantla" (Anzaldúa 1987), as well as "outsider within" positions (Hill Collins, 1997). Sandoval (1998) describes this multi-locationality as a "differential consciousness …. with oppositional movements of identities and ideologies in which the self sways, but is not fixed …

remains ambivalent" (153). Lugones conceptualises the streetwalker theorist that "keeps both logics in interpretation but valorizes the logic of resistance as she inhabits differentiated geographies carrying with others contestatory meanings to praxical completion" (2003: 218).

As I discuss more in depth in chapter 6, feminist-of-colour concepts such as "mestiza," "nepantla," "outsider within," and "streetwalker"– similar to, for example, Braidotti's (2011) "nomadic subject" or Haraway's (1988) situated knowledges – are not only to be understood as a critique of humanist epistemologies in general and their positivist understanding especially (for example, as a critical theory of multiple, situated, and relational subjectivities and knowledges as well as of individual and communal subjectivation). Rather, "mestiza" and "nepantla" also have – in the twentieth century and presumably much longer – served as a methodology for organising ongoing oppositional struggle against economic, political, and intellectual intersectional oppression, among different communities in diverse contexts of marginalisation.[48]

The above discussion shows that the absoluteness of colonial subjugation, the universality of humanist epistemologies, and their positivist theoretisation in modern science have been widely questioned in twentieth century academia. The prominent positioning of these epistemologies, therefore, is by no means necessary. As Harding stresses, the universalisation and normative positioning of humanist theories of science as "both a cause and an indicator of human progress itself" (Harding, 2002, 90) has blocked, in the West, "the possibility of developing self-critical perspectives on the emerging self or subject of Europe's sciences and politics" (2002: 99). For example, Harding points out that it obstructed a perspective on other knowledge systems (for example, indigenous, pagan, or feminist ones) originating from the lives of the manifold others that imperialist expansion has produced. By rendering humanist knowledge systems as universal they have become normalised. And therefore, as Harding adds, until today, many scholarly institutions and scientists conflate "western scientific traditions with all possible scientific activity, or, to put the issue another way, they restrict 'real science' to WMS [Western Modern Science]" (2002: 91).

[48] It is no coincidence that Anzaldúa – by means of concepts such as "mestizaje" and "nepantla" –complicated the identity politics inherent to the gender- and race-based foci of the queer and ethnic social movements of their time. Identity politics is a politics in which individuals pertaining to a particular race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, social background, or social class – based on the purity and mutual exclusivity of these positionalities and belonging – develop political agendas and struggles. By stressing the hybridity of marginalised identities as well as the multiple, hybrid, at times conflictual positions they inhabit; and by emphasising the ability of "mestizaje" and "nepantla" to connect across different contexts of marginalisation, Anzaldúa affirmatively criticised the rigid boundary-making within identity politics.

A lack of perspective on other epistemologies and the resulting conflation of "western scientific traditions with all possible scientific activity," also manifests itself in the ideas of Merton (1943, 1967) and in those theorists that have focused on the democratic potential of OA publishing, as I discussed in the previous chapter. Within the formulation of the democratising potential of OA publishing, a disregard for humanist-critical discourses, has made it difficult to develop a sense of critical self-awareness with respect to the Eurocentrism that is embedded in the hermeneutical (humanist) basis underlying these democratisation approaches. Simultaneously, and not by coincidence, it has impeded direct engagement with the more critical approaches to OA publishing that have emerged around the same time. It is pertinent to highlight this concurrency because these approaches (conceptualised, here, as a framework distinct from the more popular versions of OA I have discussed so far) work with the same humanist-critical and non-humanist epistemologies as those discussed in this subchapter.

Humanism & Scholarly Practice (Fixing and Stabilising the Text and the Author)

Contrary to their inherent claim to be universal – i.e. technologically agnostic, ahistorical, devoid of social and cultural situatedness, and apolitical – humanist epistemologies of science (and the ways in which they influenced knowledge production) have not developed autonomously from technological innovations and connected practices of knowledge labour, representation, and distribution.

According to the view of Elizabeth Eisenstein (1980), the introduction of the printing press in the fifteenth century helped standardise the ordering and classification of data and information in books and allowed their wider multiplication and distribution, which made the development and broad expansion of a certain type of (humanist) modern science possible and allowed a direct comparison of its outputs and their evaluation based on uniform criteria. This standardisation involved introducing title pages, indexes, running heads, footnotes, and cross-references; as well as printed images, maps, charts, and diagrams (Adema, 2015, 2021). Eisenstein (1980) points out how, compared to the scribal culture preceding print, the printing press brought about features such as standardisation and fixity. These are qualities that benefit and emphasise the basic features of modern science presumed within humanist thought, including replicability, universality, and truth.

Walter Ong (1982) emphasises that fixity and stability, and with that the possibility of distribution and alignment within scholarly production, already emerged in relation to previous technologies. The dominance of humanist epistemologies should be seen as a result of writing, he argues. Ong

discusses the shift between oral and written cultures as a shift from sound to visual space. As he points out, knowledges and meanings, in oral cultures, are contextual, relational, and shaped by "the real-life situations in which the word is used here and now … which … includes also gestures, vocal inflections, facial expression, and the entire human, existential setting in which the real, spoken word always occurs. Word meanings come continuously out of the present" (1982: 46). As he further contends, writing, by locking words into a visually structured field, sets up conditions for the humanist notion of "objectivity," in the sense of personal disengagement or distancing. [49] Post-and de-colonial scholars have remarked that the shift from orality to the written word and the invention of printing technology helped the spread of certain types of books and literacy. Drucker (2014) and Mignolo (1995) discuss in this regard how the common understanding of publications as static objects is the result of a normalisation of the history of inscriptions in Western alphabetic script. A variety of indigenous scripts – glyphs, signs, *wampum*, or *quipu*, for example[50] – scriptures that are not self-evident but have "to be read within the cultural ecology of signs, practices, event spaces, and knowledge techniques" were rendered as particular, "exotic" and thus inferior (Drucker, 2014)

As it reveals from Eisenstein's and Ong's considerations, technologies of transmitting knowledge – among other things as I will elucidate in the following – have led to the development and expansion of a specific concept of scientific thought and its representation through writing that prevails today in the persistent belief that scholarly analysis and representation neutrally reflect the social and natural world and, therefore, are distinct from that which they seek to represent. This, as Barad (2007) points out, is reflected in detached and analytical modes of scientific reasoning in which scientific results are compared with one another and evaluated.

Eisenstein further remarks that, with the spread of the printing press not only the text or the book itself was imbued with a level of fixity but also the (unitary) possessive relation between the author,

[49] Darnton (1999) stresses that the change from orality to literacy was not an abrupt disruption. He points out that until the push for extensive literacy in the nineteenth century, oral modes of transmission – listening to someone else reading or recounting a story – persisted as the main mode of interacting with printed text. As he underlines, "for most people throughout most of history, books had audiences rather than readers" (1999: 93). Striphas (2014) and Howe (2002), in a similar vein, stress the history of reading as a public act, not necessarily involving a written text. As Howe recounts: the "text did not have to be written; oral record, memory, and reperformance [and] word of mouth [sufficed]" (Howe, 2002, 2). Howe describes reading as a public, spoken act of storytelling, translation, and interpretation – giving counsel and explaining obscurity involving both readers and their publics coming to an agreement on the meaning of a text.

[50] *Quipu* were a system of knots tied into textile strings that were used as accounting system by Andean peoples during the Inca empire. Stringed beads of *wampum* shells by some Native American communities were used as a device for recording contracts, for registering historical events, and for storytelling; and they were passed along as gifts (Kelsey, 2014).

their work, and the book "characterising the attitudes of writers to their work" (1980: 120-121).[51] She elucidates that not least early printers themselves have been important in fixing, legally and morally, the contents of a book as well as in supporting its further commodification – for example in order to protect their share in the burgeoning print market against competitors. As she elaborates, in this context, liberal humanist concepts and practices such as authorship and the ownership of a work became relevant in terms of financial and reputational revenue for authors and printers alike. In other words, the book or the text and the author are inextricably interrelated. This interrelatedness in contemporary academic knowledge creation and sharing is embodied in liberal copyright regimes and the way in which bibliometric data and rankings provide the basis upon which the success of an individual scholar is calculated. However, possessive models of authorship contradict ideas in which knowledge cannot be fixed or owned as they appear in certain indigenous cultures, for example. In these settings, knowledge is not individually owned but collectively stewarded by the community who makes it available for the future generations that live and re-enact these knowledges (Simpson, 2011, 2014).

Indeed, as I have shown above, the proliferation of print and literacy (and, as a consequence, textuality) has had a significant impact on knowledge creation and circulation. For example, it eminently contributed to the prominent status of features such as stability and fixity, the unity between author and work, as well as distinct author functions, such as responsibility, authority, and ownership. Adema calls these features "print-based essentialisms" (Adema, 2015, 70). These have, as she points out, become reified and understood as intrinsic qualities connected to the book and scholarship themselves. In this regard, she remarks that "these perceptions are reproduced and fixed through our common daily practices, where they eventually become the basis of our institutions. As a result of this the salient features that have come to define the printed book look highly similar to the scholarly communication system that gets promoted within academia: one that is qualitative, stabile and trustworthy" (2015: 71).

As Moore elaborates, academic texts and monographs are, consequently, "continually and routinely rehearsed according to the standards of the traditional university press or publishing house, which in turn both reflects and shapes the assessment structures within the university itself,

[51] The notion of the humanist author – able to represent and external truth through scientific reasoning and writing – is not only related with a specific idea about knowledge and knowledge practices, but also specific ideas of the human. Risam (2019) discusses how seemingly evident textual aesthetics and properties, such as the fixity and stability of text and the unity of author and work, have historically been inextricably related to a specific idea of human essence or subjectivity; the self as a unified and integral individual, and vice versa. As she argues: "The production of a universalist notion of the 'human' relies on defaulting to the [written] aesthetics of dominant cultures" (2019: 136). In colonial and patriarchal contexts, Risam points out, the textual cultures and aesthetics that diverged from the dominant ones have been deemed outside the boundaries of the idea of the "human" (as inscribed in humanist (academic) textual and linguistic norms), and therefore invalidated.

but particularly those that value the perceived prestige granted by the imprimatur of a university press deemed reputable. The influence of prestige has perhaps the greatest impact on the ways in which humanities researchers decide to publish their work" (2019b: 41). Indeed, similar values are perpetuated through the rationale of a "knowledge-based economy" that, as I discussed previously, governs prominent institutional takes on scholarly publishing in general and OA publishing specifically. In this realm, scholarly publishing is assessed through economic or market-based lenses. Here, publishing promises financial return on investment for funders, universities and libraries, and promises reputation and career progression to researchers.

In contemporary academia, as Moore posits, "projects are undertaken with specific publication formats in mind; journal choice is frequently determined by how well regarded they are by assessment panels; and there is an informal hierarchy of certain kinds of academic publication, from the monograph at the top down to co-authored works and book chapters in edited volumes towards the bottom" (2019b: 41). Moore writes that this has significant ordering effects on scholarly practices of knowledge creation and sharing.

The way in which scholarship tends to be understood and represented in the realm of OA publishing is not an exception here. As I further elaborate in chapter 8, even though digital forms and formats of knowledge creation and circulation have the potential to accommodate more experimental, fluid, and collaborative scholarship, the printed book or text continues to be the dominant reference regarding notions of linearity and fixity; the possessive unity of author, work, and publication; as well as humanist concepts of individual and competitive authorship. These models, based on a positivist interpretation of humanist epistemologies, continue to figure as the standard against which scholarship is performed and evaluated (Collins & Milloy, 2016; Mrva-Montoya, 2015). At the same time, as Adema stresses, the fetishisation of certain ideas of scholarly authorship "is integral to an increasingly hegemonic academic discourse related to originality and authority, to impact and responsibility, and linked to a humanist and romantic notion of the individual author-genius. This specific discourse on authorship is directly connected to a certain essentialist idea of *the human*, which one could argue the humanities—and with it, scholarship as a whole—is based upon" (2021: 71).

The notion of universal access to research *outputs* – often formatted as stable and "closed (source)" pdfs, HTMLs, and ebooks – that many approaches towards (OA) publishing are still focused on, does nothing to question these standards, both with respect to their historical implications and their potential (or inability) to represent knowledge diversity and equity. With this focus on research outputs, many of the digital environments through which (OA) publishing is performed today reproduce these historical humanist bindings and fixtures of scholarly knowledge production that are

by no means self-evident and remain highly contestable. However, these are hard to overcome, not least because the neoliberal academic reputation and monetary economy inherent to certain dominant approaches to OA publishing depends on them (Moore, 2019b).

A More than Leaky Consensus on the Universality of Humanist Paradigms

Adema (2015, 2021) explains that "print based essentialisms" or the "salient features" of books and texts (as scholarly outputs), including notions of fixity, standardisation, and humanist authorship models are the outcome of material processes of practice and dispute, and as concepts and practices they are changing constantly: "The construction of what we perceive as stable knowledge objects serves certain goals, mostly to do with the establishment of authority, preservation …, reputation building …, and commercialization" (2021: 213). In the colonial and imperialist contexts I am discussing in this chapter, these goals have been the establishment of the dominance of colonial and patriarchal knowledge systems connected to the "subjugation of one people by another for the advantage of the dominant one" (Alatas, 2000, 23). Adrian Johns (1998) stresses the cultural and institutional factors contributing to prevalent understandings of the book and related practices. Additionally, he emphasises that it is not printing per se that possesses defining power in this regard, but the way printing is put to use in particular ways in certain circumstances, in certain socio-cultural systems. For example, he states that readers started to trust and use print because printers, booksellers, and authors were producing credit and liability through, among other things, patenting and copyright. Similarly today, we can see how scholars continue to trust metrics and rankings as embodied in WoS and Scopus community (Bornmann et al., 2021; Tennant & Breznau, 2022) because publishers such as Elsevier have positioned their argument regarding the trustworthiness of their databases around notions of scale (or comprehensiveness) and rigid selection. Additionally, tools such as Springer Nature's abstract writing guidelines evoke neutrality, and a transparent and inclusive approach. They suggest that everyone who would like to participate in scholarly knowledge creation can do so by simply following set writing suggestions. At the same time, many scholars have come to distrust epistemologies of science and forms of knowledge creation that lack alleged quality markers (such as the possibility to evaluate knowledge according to quantifiable bibliometric data and the comparison of (possessive) authors on the basis of their scientific output). This, for example, is the case with certain indigenous knowledges that rather than being individually owned are collectively stewarded (Christen, 2012; Simpson, 2011, 2014; Raibmon, 2018) or feminist knowledges that are fluid, relational, and situated.

Johns (1998), discusses fixity and standardisation as institutional and social constructs rather than as an outcome of the material, economic, and technological factors going along with the expansion of writing and print. He considers the tendencies to fixity and standardisation -rather than relating them to print cultures - as an unstable and contingent factor emerging from the diverse labours and representations of the actors and institutions involved in writing, reading, and publishing. According to Johns, rather than a fixed object enlaced with stable properties and values, the scholarly monograph, or text, can be seen as the result of norms determined by disciplinary, cultural, ideological, and institutional assumptions and practices, alongside technological and economic factors. As Adema points out, "for Johns, a book is the material embodiment of a consensus or of a collective consent, and thus he argues that the development of a print culture was … marked by uncertainty and a shaky integration" (2015: 50). Consequently, the book, both in its digital and pre-digital forms, is characterised by much more "material complexity, anomaly and disruption" than it is generally assumed (Thoburn, 2016, 9).

Indeed, as I show in the next chapter, the emergence of early anti-colonial and proto-feminist publishing initiatives in the seventeenth century can illuminate that for people at that time the nature of printing – including its interrelations with features such as standardisation, fixity, and linearity of text, as well as proprietary and individualistic authorship models – was disputable. Instead "experiments" with relational, situated, and performative forms of author- editor- and readership, as well as with versioned and multi-agential publications performed during this time, emphasised the uncertain integration of the book form into a "collective consent," or, arguably, even a failure to reach such a consent.

I have pointed out in this chapter that the humanist epistemologies which, until today, form the hermeneutical basis upon which many approaches towards OA have been constructed, are by no means universal nor self-evident. Rather, these have historically been constructed as dominant – among others through colonial institutions such as libraries, universities, and schools. Knowledge systems divergent from the dominant ones were denied relevance and deemed incapable of being a credible alternative to the humanist ones and lacking entitlement to universality.

However, as I have stressed, the unavoidability and the universality of humanist epistemologies, as well as their positivist interpretation in modern science, has also been criticised by academics throughout the twentieth century, not least within critical feminist theoretical engagement. Yet, the Eurocentric universalisation and normative positioning of humanist theories of science has blocked a more thorough engagement with these and other critiques. This can be considered as one of the main reasons why humanist theories of science have become dominant within contemporary

approaches that theorise and implement global scale knowledge creation and distribution (including via OA publishing).

As I further elaborated, popular paradigms that dominate the way in which research is written up, evaluated, and shared, have developed in relation to colonial and imperialist interests. The means of knowledge production have been used to further these interests. As I have shown, these paradigms are thus by no means inevitable but they are the result of certain historical humanist fixtures and fixities, based on features such as standardisation, replicability, universality, and stability, which have come to dominate contemporary ideas about the book, the text, and authorship.

Looking closer, in what follows, at how (early) anti-colonial, proto-feminist, and feminists-of-colour publishing initiatives from the seventeenth century onwards have disputed seemingly evident humanist features of text (such as standardisation, fixity, and linearity), as well as pertaining ideas about proprietary and individualistic authorship is important for this thesis. It helps to re-contextualise the experiments with more horizontal, collaborative, and open scholarship conducted by critical OA advocates (chapter 8) as an important contribution to a long-lasting struggle for the right to take part in scholarly discourse, on one's own terms, rather than conceiving these experiments as something external, or alien, to possible OA agendas.

Chapter 6: An Antagonist History of Editing, Writing, and Publishing

From the seventeenth century onwards, various early anti-colonial, proto-feminist, as well as queer Latin American and Womanist grassroots initiatives have "experimented" with relational, situated, and performative forms of author-, editor-, and readership, as well as with versioned and multi-agential publications. The experimental engagements of these initiatives, cannot simply be regarded as glitches in an otherwise smooth institutionalisation of humanist norms and standards of knowledge production. Rather, these experimental engagements must be considered as examples of a long-lasting (and ongoing) antagonist engagement with the hegemonic institutions governing knowledge and the dominant (humanist) norms and conventions of knowledge production controlled by these institutions.

In this chapter, I look at the antagonist engagement of these early anti-colonial, proto-feminist, as well as feminists-of-colour grassroots initiatives. I analyse their approaches to self-organisation and -management and how these are intrinsically related with experiments with book formats, authorship, and editing practices that were challenging common humanist paradigms such as the stability, authority, and commodification of the book or text, as well as dominant authorship models and practices. As part of the analysis conducted in this chapter, I ask if and how these initiatives – put into a genealogical relation with one another – can mutually illuminate each other across time and space. Does diffractively reading and relating these initiatives with one another, as I do in this chapter, make it possible to carve out an alternative, antagonist and humanist-critical history of knowledge creation and sharing that stretches from early anti-colonial and proto-feminist initiatives in the seventeenth century, to feminist-of-colour publishing in the second half of the eighteenth century? Can the way in which critical OA advocates through their writing, editing, and publishing experiments challenge humanist fixtures (such as the stability and authority of books, the linearity of text, or the unity between the singular author and her work) (I investigate these experiments in chapter 8), be related with the pre-digital initiatives that I showcase in what follows? And in how far and how can positioning – again in a diffractive and non-oppositional gesture and as part of embedding contemporary OA advocacy in a longer history of theoretical and practical antagonist engagement with humanist epistemologies – the experiments conducted in the context of critical OA advocacy in close relation to the pre-digital initiatives I discuss in this chapter, help to underline why it is crucial to explicitly reposition the processes and practices of knowledge production as important sites of struggle for knowledge equity and diversity? Affirming the processes and practices of

knowledge production as important sites for knowledge equity and diversity is one of the main aims of this study. Additionally, reading the experimentation I discuss in this chapter with experimentation in the context of critical OA advocacy (chapter 8), might provide insights about the nature and scope of the interventionist reading methodology I propose.

Making Space for Experimentation

In the time after the "imperialist conquest" indigenous forms of oral storytelling in colonised countries were increasingly shifted from open-air and community spaces into the realm of the domestic (Simpson, 2011). As Simpson recounts by reference to Nishnaabeg[52] culture: these "private" gatherings were engendering "a space where we [the Nishnaabeg people] can escape the gaze and the cage of the Empire, even if it is just for a few minutes … Storytelling is an important process for visioning, imagining, and critiquing the social space around us, and ultimately challenging the colonial norms fraught in our daily lives" (2011: 34-35). This strategic withdrawal into domestic space to (re)claim practices of knowledge production and sharing, namely storytelling, is the reason, Simpson emphasises, that "we have those things [ancestral teachings and knowledges] today because our Ancestors … acted within the family unit to physically survive, to pass on what they could to their children …. They 'protected' their interpretations by embodying them and by living them" (2011: 216-219).

Whitney Trettien (2015) discusses a similar strategical (re)claiming of practices of knowledge creation in seventeenth century England. She does so by reference to the editing and publishing practice of Mary Ferrar, Anna Collett, and their sisters at the extended family and religious group Little Gidding in Huntingdonshire, now Cambridgeshire, in England. From the 1620s to the 1640s, in a special community room called the Concordance Chamber, these women sliced apart published bibles and engravings and re-assembled their collages into newly bound editions. By doing so, the Ferrar and Collett sisters were intervening into the New Testament, which spreads Christ's life across four gospels. The women pasted the passages concerned with the life of Christ into one continuous narrative to be read aloud as part of the common pious practice of bible reading at appointed hours of the day.[53] The Ferrar and Collett sisters manufactured at least thirteen harmonies that were used in the Little Gidding community or presented as gifts (Gaudio, 2017). These carefully constructed

[52]The Nishnaabeg (or Anishaabeg), meaning "the people," refers to an indigenous nation encompassing the Ojibwe, Odawa, Potawatomi, Mississauga, Saulteaux, and Omàmìwinini (Simpson, 2011).

[53] These collaged editions later came to be known as the *Little Gidding Harmonies.*

editions attracted King Charles' I attention during his visit of an estate in the area which led him to request a similar volume – integrating the Old Testament books of Kings and Chronicles – be made for himself (Gaudio, 2017; Riley, 2007; Trettien, 2015).

Trettien highlights the entwinement of the aesthetics, technique, and practice of slicing, cutting, and pasting performed by the Little Gidding women with textile work in the Elizabethan and early Stuart periods, with embroidering woodcuts, making needlework copies from illustrated herbal and narrative engravings, manufacturing hand-stitched book bindings, and with producing embroidered and annotated print pages. The sisters, in their practice, were marrying, as Trettien writes, "the language of text-making to textile labor" (2015: 15). Pursuing their work as a variant of textile practice within closed community circles, allowed the women of Little Gidding to circumnavigate the stigma that in the sixteenth century, specifically for women, was associated with writing and, consequently, "speaking through" print publications "giving up the validation that publication, as in *making public*, brings" (Trettien 2015, V). Instead, engaging with scissors and rearranging motifs while shifting their engagement from textile to paper and to edit existing texts (instead of writing new ones) and design new editions, allowed the women to bypass the blemish attached to writing and print and "opened a path for women to participate in print culture through a medium that was ideologically chaste, verbally silent, and viewed primarily not by a male public, but within a domestic coterie of friends and family" (2015: 230).

In 1981, Kitchen Table Women of Color Press (KTP) was launched in Chicago by feminist and lesbian of colour academics, writers, and artists situated in different countries – amongst them the activists and scholars Barbara and Beverly Smith, Audre Lorde, Cherrie Moraga, and Gloria Anzaldúa. KTP was driven by a commitment to queer activism and women-of-colour feminism, as well as by their positioning against white, middle-class feminism – especially the privileged position of white feminists in the U.S. American publishing landscape (Moraga & Anzaldúa, 1983). As Smith recounts: "We chose our name because the kitchen is the centre of the home, the place where women in particular work and communicate with each other. We also wanted to convey the fact that we are a kitchen table, grass roots operation, begun and kept alive by women who cannot rely on inheritances or other benefits of class privilege to do the work we need to do" (1989: 11). Sitting around a metaphorical kitchen table and medially connected through the telecommunications network, these women, from 1981 to 1996, edited and published, among others: two mixed-genre anthologies and six *Freedom Organizing Pamphlets*, which included the Combahee River Collective's *The Combahee River Collective Statement: Black Feminist Organizing in the Seventies and Eighties,* an important document in the history of contemporary Black feminism. KTP were also involved in the distribution

of books published by other independent presses (Jones et al., 2014). Discussing the motivations behind founding KTP, Smith remarks:

> An early slogan of the women in print movement was “freedom of the press belongs to those who own the press.” This is even truer for multiply disenfranchised women of color …. On the most basic level, Kitchen Table Press began because of our need for autonomy, our need to determine independently both the content and the conditions of our work and to control the words and images that were produced about us (1989: 11).

Smith describes the early activities of the collective as "consciousness raising and political work on a multitude of issues," along with the building of "friendship networks, community and a rich Black women's culture where none had existed before" (1995: 172). In this context, technology played an important role: “the telecommunications network … can bring together women of various cultural backgrounds ‘on the line,’ allowing them to overcome … the material barriers that had prevented women of color from collective writing, teaching, and learning” (Adair & Nakamura, 2017, 261). At the same time, nineteenth century print technology, such as offset and mimeograph printing, were cheap and enabled the abundant emergence of feminist pamphlets and periodicals at that time: their sheer “ubiquity — most commonly in the form of newsletters or newspapers—made them a dynamic and important site of feminist knowledge production” (Enszer & Bains, 2018, 22).

Even though the indigenous practices of storytelling, the engagements of the Ferrar and Collet sisters and of the women behind KTP, were essentially different – for example, in terms of the media ecologies they were embedded in, as well as the cultural and epistemo-political context from which their critical practices emerged – I think there are still various parallels that can be drawn between them. All these initiatives were in control of or governed the particular infrastructures, technologies, and practices of knowledge creation and sharing they needed to support their work. In the case of the oral storytellers and KTP this control implied a partial withdrawal into domestic spaces; and it involved the (re)claiming of oral ways of transmission, the usage of scissors and glue in textual production, and the printing press. Having control over these realms allowed these initiatives to, at least to a certain extent, determine which knowledge was conveyed and how (under which labour conditions, in which form, and format). By doing so, these initiatives carved out small alternative and antagonistic spaces and gained some independence from the colonial and/or patriarchal enclosures of knowledge creation and sharing prevailing at their times. Yet beyond that, by creating these alternative spaces, these early anti-colonial, proto-feminist and feminists-of-colour initiatives also forged an opportunity to perpetually intervene into the humanist fixtures – standardisation,

replicability, universality, and stability – that have come to dominate academic practices of knowledge production today. They imagined and performed knowledge production differently.

Looking at how these initiatives did so, as I do in what follows, can not only help to question and challenge the necessity of these humanist fixtures in the dominant forms of academic (OA) publishing and dominant forms of textual production today. It also provides answers to questions such as: How can antagonist pre-digital engagements with humanist epistemologies be put in connection with critical OA advocacy today? How far can such an interconnection emphasise the importance of the experiments with the processes and practices of knowledge production suggested within critical OA advocacy? And how can such a connection provide conceptual and practical insights regarding how to facilitate greater knowledge equity and diversity in addition to what already has been proposed by critical OA advocates?

Complicating the Fixity and Authority of Text and the Integrity of the Author

Simpson (2014) describes indigenous forms of storytelling by reference to the Nishnaabeg intellectual and cultural traditions as a central practice of theory and knowledge creation and circulation. She characterises practices of indigenous storytelling as a re-enactment of knowledge that is highly situated and relational, and knowledge and knowing themselves as embedded within intellectual, practical, spiritual, and embodied realms. She stresses that all Nishnaabeg knowledge is communal knowledge. As she remarks:

> Coming to know is a mirroring or a re-enactment process where we understand Nishnaabeg epistemology to be concerned with embodied knowledge animated collectively, and lived out in a way in which our reality, nationhood and existence is continually reborn through both time and space. This requires a union of both emotional knowledge and intellectual knowledge in a profoundly personal and intimate spiritual context. Coming to know is an intimate process, the unfolding of relationship with the spiritual world (2014: 15).

Nishnabeeg epistemologies – as they persist within colonised contexts and resist the adoption of humanist epistemologies – do not only challenge concepts of individual and possessive authorship but also complicate the notions of durability, stability, trust, and textual inscription in the humanist tradition; as well as the idea of the written, “fixed” text as the only valid form through which knowledge can circulate.

As Simpson (2011, 2014) and Anzaldúa (1987) point out, thanks to their active protection, reperformance, and their positioning as part of an ongoing struggle for self-determination beyond cognitive imperialism, indigenous forms of storytelling have persisted until today. They have, as I posit, found their way into twentieth and 21st century literary and academic editing and writing practices – including, but not only, those of indigenous and feminist-of-colour writers – where they continue to interweave in unruly textual topographies, languages, and authorship-modes. These practices can be found in forms of *mestizaje* (Anzaldúa, 1987) or/and/as "writing back" (Smith, 1999) as they have been embodied in indigenous and Womanist experimental, imaginary literary and poetic forms of academic writing. These are, for example, Pauline Alexis Gumbs' (2018, 2020) evocation of ancestral human- and non-human voices through dub poetry – a form of performance poetry of West Indian origins – as part of her theoretical reflections on diaspora, migration, blackness, and intersectionality; or within the creative academic semi-nonfiction writing of Saidyia Hartman (2007, 2020) that attempts to bring the buried voices of the past to the surface.[54]

As Anzaldúa writes regarding her own book *Borderlands/La Frontera* (1987):

> In looking at this book … I see a mosaic pattern (Aztec-like) emerging, a weaving pattern, thin here, thick there. I see a preoccupation with the deep structure, the underlying structure, with the gesso underpainting that is red earth, black earth [the black and red ink painted on Aztec codices, black and red symbolizing writing and wisdom]. … This almost finished product seems an assemblage, a montage … with several leitmotifs and with a central core, now appearing, now disappearing in a crazy dance. The whole thing has had a mind of its own, escaping me and insisting on putting together the pieces of its own puzzle with minimal direction from my will. It is a rebellious, wilful entity … rough, unyielding, with pieces of feather sticking out here and there, fur, twigs, clay (66).

Here, Anzaldúa intervenes into historical humanist logics of representation prevalent in contemporary academia. What is challenged are the book as authoritative entity; its perceived inherent material stability and fixity; ideas of the humanist unified self and an integral individual

[54] In the early twentieth century, practices of "writing back" can, for example, be found in diasporic artistic movements such as the Harlem Renaissance in the 1920s or the *Négritude* movement in Francophone literature in the 1930s. The first – through writings such as Langston Hughes' poetic affirmations of a black cultural identity as continuous stretching across the violence and displacement of slavery – was promoting a sense of pride, hope, and agency in the African American community, while calling for a refusal to submit to the widespread injustices in 1920s USA. The second – performed through the poetic writings of Aimé Césaire, Léopold Senghor, Leon Damas, and others that were dealing with questions of violent assimilation, creolisation, and racialisation – can be understood as a heterogenous political, ontological, epistemological, and aesthetical struggle for black self-affirmation and self-definition.

being in control of the truth; as well as ideas of authoritative, possessive authorship. The book, and the work represented in it, appear as resistant, untameable, and wilful agencies escaping the seemingly flat surface of the printed page and the control of their author (and with that the humanist scholarly apparatus that the work and Anzaldúa herself are embedded in). Both in Anzaldúa's and Simpson's considerations, knowledge production appears as highly embodied, situated acts that involve organic, continuously developing social relations between the different human and non-human agencies involved in these processes.

Trettien (2015, 2021) and Gaudio (2017) situate the collaborative practice of the Ferrar and Collett sisters within a tradition of "commonplacing." This form of "experimental" textual engagement was a widespread method of approaching writing, editing, and reading in seventeenth to nineteenth century England. Commonplacing involved the collection of quotes, text passages and images published in books – by hand but also by actual material interventions such as cutting books apart with scissors as in the case of the women at Little Gidding – into blank books or into newly assembled bound and locally printed editions. Trettien points out that the Collett and Ferrar sisters were "not rewriting, glossing, or correcting Scripture but rather cutting, excising, and rearranging it, with the aim of reordering, not altering, the source text, indeed the source page. As an edited document, it clings materially to its source, literally" (2015: 235).

The interventionist practices of cutting and "unbinding" existing books and reassembling them in newly bound editions containing diverse works, authors, and print dates – despite leaving the source text intact – can be seen as a form of collaborative textual production (Adema, 2017; Trettien, 2015). This is a practice that, as I stress, is blurring the boundaries between writing and editing and in doing so is complicating historical and prevalent ideas on editorial workflows and author and editor functions as clearly separated and consecutive. Furthermore, such a practice of cutting and pasting mobilises combinatorial creativity, in which existing ideas are combined to produce something different and new. Similarly to Anzaldúa, who relates early anti-colonial textual engagements to contemporary forms of writing back and mestizaje, Adema (2017) places the cut-up as performed by the Little Gidding women as part of a longer-lasting critical literary and academic tradition of cutting up, collaging, and remixing existing content into something different, or new. Such a tradition, according to Adema, spans from commonplace techniques as performed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, to Dadaist works such as Tristan Tzsara's poems, and to literary and academic remixes such as Mark Amerika's *remixthebook* (2011). As such, these practices are a critical intervention into humanist paradigms, including the idea of the original genius, or, in the context of academia, of the single liberal humanist author (Trettien, 2015, 2021; Adema, 2015, 2021). The pasted fragments create material depths and layers embodying, among others, the manifold human

and non-human agencies involved in creating the text: the authors of the source texts, the Ferrar and Collett sisters, the scissors applied to the bibles etcetera.

I have argued in this subchapter that early anti-colonial, proto-feminist, and feminists-of-colour initiatives – by experimenting with the multi-agential, horizontal, and fluid nature of knowledge and the forms and formats through which knowledge is created and circulated – undermine and complicate the historical humanist bindings of scholarly knowledge creation and communication (including notions of fixity, standardisation, as well as individual and possessive authorship models). I have emphasised in the examples discussed above that concepts and practices of authorship, the ownership of a work, and copyright are intrinsically related with the idea of the book as fixed and static format. Changing one of the aspects of the way in which one relates to these functions, as Fitzpatrick argues, "implies change across the entirety of the way we work" (2011: 4). As Derrida points out in a similar vein, adjusting the form and format of the book cannot be done "without disturbing everything else" (1983: 3).

As I want to stress on the basis of Adema's, Anzaldúa's and Simpson's considerations, using techniques such as the cut-up or methods of "writing back" have persisted as forms of a critical way of doing scholarship until today. As I discuss in chapter 8, similar forms of critical experimentation with and around text have found their way into the digital realm, including the practices performed by critical OA advocates. The processes and practices of knowledge production remain important sites of struggle for knowledge equity and diversity in a system that, until today, is enlaced with humanist paradigms and conventions that are contributing to the exclusion of certain communities from scientific discourse. The book or the text must still find their place in the contingent and perpetually contested digital space of knowledge production. So must the connected authorship functions and textual practices. Critical OA scholars, by means of their experimentation, demonstrate what a new (digital) place for the book and text today potentially could look like and how it could be created and sustained under conditions that are more equitable and diverse.

Complicating Readership, the Communality & Performativity of Text

Anzaldúa (1987) recounts how "[b]efore the Conquest, poets gathered to play music, dance, sing and read poetry in open-air places around the *Xochicuahuitl, el Arbol Florido*, Tree-in-Flower" (66). After the conquest these forms of storytelling persisted in the realm of the domestic, by continuing to be embodied and lived. In this regard, as Anzaldúa points out, within these communities, in "the

ethnopoetics and performance of the shaman, my people, the Indians, did not split the artistic from the functional, the sacred from the secular, art from everyday life. The religious, social and aesthetic purposes of art were all intertwined … The ability of story (prose and poetry) to transform the storyteller and the listener into something or someone else is shamanistic. The writer, as shape-changer, is a *nahual*, a shaman" (1987: 66). Anzaldúa herself reperforms in her own writing the function of the shaman: as a shape-changer and translator between worlds of meaning, between the readers (or listeners) of her texts.

Trettien (2015) discusses in a similar vein that the Ferrar and Collett sisters' engagement revolved around a physical nodal point, the Concordance Chamber, which was situated in the community's main house and served the women as their "media collaboratory." She describes the room as a "liminal space between the public and the domestic, between the gift economy and for-profit production" (61), which's walls were ornated with bible verses inscribed by members of the community As Trettien remarks, thus "the space where the Harmonies were made physically embodied the communal labor that imbues their production, as individual voices and choices resolve into a unique configuration of familiar sententiae" (2015, 60). As Trettien suggests, in the practice of the women at Little Gidding, there is a spatio-temporal closeness and overlap between collective reading – absorbing texts as they were written on the wall of the Concordance Chamber, cut apart in the manufacturing process of the Harmonies, or recited aloud or sung during the daily communal practice of reciting psalms – and collaborative editing (as a form of textual production. Consequently, she emphasises that the collaborative approach to the situated editing and assembling of these editions and their reception by the public were not two linear, secluded, and separate events. They rather formed part of *one* "process that unfolds dynamically over time through a series of local engagements between readers, books, and the media ecologies in which they continue to circulate, long past their original creation" (Trettien, 2015, 224). The editing practices of the sisters were *directed* towards contexts of social reading: they did not "edit in order to fix an ideal text – a text that would serve as authoritative for all audiences at all times – but rather … [to] treat the material text and its design as a translational medium through which the canon is recoded and repurposed for communal contexts, where readers experience the text together" (Trettien, 2015, 224). It is important to notice here that the practices of cutting and pasting employed by the sisters can be seen as purposeful editorial techniques, or methods that treated editions as spaces for plurality and performativity with an eye to the processes and practices of community formation (through common worship) that these editions might enable within the local social fabric.

Within the forms of indigenous storytelling and the pious collages assembled by the women at Little Gidding, texts (be they oral or written), the editorial (or rhetorical) choices made, as well as the

decisions on how and where to present these works, act performatively upon the reader (and *vice versa*). The active role of the reader also as the co-creator of text, intervenes into humanist logics of representation, specifically the idea that language or texts are a neutral means of representing an objective, external reality. It obstructs the perspective of dominant humanist critical paradigms of reading, including the idea that the reader is distant from, and situated outside of, the text. Furthermore, reading is a deeply situated and relational act. Every text – no matter its claim for authority and fixity – is a cultural and social text that does not exist as a thing or object but as an event that within each reading is created anew; it can be seen as a (political) praxis, as an intervention in, and (co)creation of, the world in which a text exists (McGann, 2004; Drucker, 2009, 2014; Rivera Garza, 2013). At the same time, editing and reading become a performative and critical intervention both in the production of text and language and into the way individuals and communities – be they writers or readers – reproduce themselves through text and language. Writing, editing, and reading texts can thus, as I argue in what follows, be considered as practices of community-building and -organisation, as well as collective and individual practices of subjectivation.

Complicating Abstraction: Subjectivity and Subjectivation

As I mentioned previously, Simpson (2011), describes indigenous storytelling as "a process of remembering, visioning and creating a just reality [and] a lens through which we can envision our way out of cognitive imperialism" (33). Similarly, Smith (1999) characterises these forms of storytelling as pertaining to an ongoing struggle for self-determination beyond "the underlying code of imperialism and colonialism" (7). Through writing, Anzaldúa is creating "[her] own face, … [her] own heart – a Nahuatl concept. …[Her] soul makes itself through the creative act. It is constantly remaking and giving birth to itself through … [her] body. It is this learning to live with *la Coatlicue* [a Mesoamerican fertility and Earth goddess] that transforms living in the Borderlands from a nightmare into a numinous experience. It is always a path/state to something else" (1987: 73). As she remarks elsewhere:

> When I create stories in my head, that is, allow the voices and scenes to be projected in the inner screen of my mind, I 'trance.' I used to think I was going crazy or that I was having hallucinations. But now I realize it is my job, my calling, to traffic in images. Some of these film-like narratives I write down; most are lost, forgotten …. Because writing invokes images from my unconscious, and because some of the images are residues of trauma which I then have to reconstruct, I sometimes get sick when I do write. ... But, in reconstructing the traumas behind the images, I

> make sense of them, and once they have 'meaning' they are changed, transformed. It is then that writing heals me… (1987: 69-70).

Anzaldúa (1987) describes writing as a subjectivation practice, as a way of enabling new modes of being and becoming through writing (or storytelling) that have been suppressed in the way indigenous, queer, female, and life-of-colour has been objectified through humanist modes of representation, language, and textual practice. The specific focus on the relationship between interventionalist uses of language and writing and notions of embodiment through this language – "[w]ords made flesh, muscle and bone animated by hope and desire" (Wynter, 1995, 35) – does not only hint towards the recuperation of a feminist, queer, or decolonial individual and collective subject, as I want to emphasise. Rather, it is the category of the human itself that has been under duress in colonial contexts in which textual cultures and aesthetics that diverged from the dominant (humanist) ones have been deemed outside the boundaries of the idea of the "human" (Risam, 2019). In this sense, escaping, through writing, the control over language becomes an existential task, is an affirmation and validation of of-colour experience and "corpo-reality." I want to stress here that also Anzaldúa frequently uses metaphors of awakening and rebirth to describe her writing. Similarly, as McKittrick (2015) remarks, for Sylvia Wynter writing entails the "possibility of undoing and unsettling … Western conceptions of what it means to be human" (2). As McKittrick continues, referring to Wynter's writing, her "experiences as an anticolonial figure emerge not as inciting the political vision put forth in her writings but rather as implicit to a creative-intellectual project of reimagining what it means to be human" (2015: 2). Being human for Wynter, then, rather than a noun – signalling a state/claim/assertion – is a verb. Being human, through textual work, is a practice that realises living within the remnants of intersectional oppression.

The cut-up as performed by the women of Little Gidding also can be seen as a practice of subjectivation and identity formation (Adema, 2017). By cutting and slicing texts apart, the Collett and Ferrar sisters were intervening into the textual ethos of a particular economic, political, and cultural moment. Through collaging the fragments together and re-enacting them within communal forms of reading, they enabled new modes of being and becoming women through editing and reading that were suppressed in their times as women were excluded from forms of widely circulated textual production in the seventeenth century.

As I want to argue based on the above, textual material manipulations and linguistic interventions have the potential to trouble the humanist logics of subjectivity and representation, specifically the idea that language or texts are a neutral means of representing an objective, external reality, or a tool for expressing a stable, authentic, subjective interior. Interventions such as the cut-up are

gestures that imply a radical reconfiguration of not only individual but also communal subjectivity. As Sarah Kember and Joanna Zylinska argue, cutting, whether metaphorically or not "is fundamental to our emergence in the world, as well as our differentiation from it" (2012: 21). The act of cutting induces individuation, as it entails a temporary stabilisation of the self, while actively forming the world we are part of and the matter surrounding us (Barad, 2007; Haraway, 1988; Law, 2004).

The subjectivities Anzaldúa (1987) and Simpson (2011) describe, and the ones established through the practice of the Ferrar and Collet sisters, transcend the self-contained and detached humanist subject or a clear-cut subordinated colonial or female identity. They are based on more complex, relational, and situated understandings of subjectivity and identity. Anzaldúa, from her perspective as a queer Latin American writer, scholar, and activist, describes the multiple identities and positionings from which she derives meaning:

> I am a wind-swayed bridge, a crossroads inhabited by whirlwinds. Gloria, the facilitator. Gloria, the mediator, straddling the walls between abysses. 'Your allegiance is to La Raza, the Chicano movement,' say the members of my race. 'Your allegiance is to the Third World,' say my Black and Asian friends. 'Your allegiance is to your gender, to women,' say the feminists. Then there's my allegiance to the Gay movement, to the socialist revolution, to the New Age, to magic and the occult. And there's my affinity to literature, to the world of the artist. What am I? … They would chop me up into little fragments and tag each piece with a label (1983: 228).

In the late 1960s and 1970s, Latin American feminist and Womanist scholars fought for recognition within the academy. In this context, Patricia Hill Collins (1997) coins the term "outsider within" that I mentioned previously. bell hooks (1990) describes the faculties that an outsider within status can generate. In describing her small-town, Kentucky childhood she notes, "living as we did - on the edge - we developed a particular way of seeing reality. We looked both from the outside and in from the inside out … we understood both" (341). Anzaldúa calls similar multiple positions *borderlands*. These are places of contradiction, anger, hatred, and exploitation, but also places of resistance against racism, gender discrimination, class oppression, sexual repression, and colonial domination. But borderlands also constitute concrete places of ideological, cultural and biological cross-pollination. Therefore, borderlands, as Anzaldúa states, mobilise certain "faculties," *facultades:*

> La facultad is the capacity to see in surface phenomena the meaning of deeper realities, to see the deep structure below the surface. It is an instant 'sensing,' a quick perception arrived at without conscious reasoning. … Those who are pushed out of the tribe for being different are

> likely to become more sensitized … Those who do not feel psychologically or physically safe in the world are more apt to develop this sense. Those who are pounced on the most have it the strongest - the females, the homosexuals of all races, the darkskinned, the outcast, the persecuted, the marginalized, the foreign (1987: 38).

Anzaldúa verbalises the substantive *mestiza* into *mestizaje* to indicate its double property as not only a hybrid, shapeshifting individual and common identity. Rather, *mestizaje* figures as a critical methodology of resistance potentially able to engender new modes of agency, of being and becoming (or modes of being human). Later in her life, Anzaldúa invents the word *nepantla* expanding on her concept of borderland and *mestizaje*. This term is based on a common *Náhuatl*[55] word for "in-between space," *nepantla*. As Anzaldúa explains in her preface to the book *This Bridge we Call Home*: "I use the word nepantla to theorize liminality … and to talk about those who facilitate passages between worlds, whom I've named nepantleras. I associate nepantla with states of mind that question old ideas and beliefs, acquire new perspectives, change worldviews, and shift from one world to another" (2002: 1). Drawing on her own experiences with a variety of social-justice movements and academic organisations, Anzaldúa understands herself a *nepantlera,* a shaman, a threshold person, or world traveller: someone who, through writing and collective publishing practices enters into, interacts with, and facilitates multiple, often conflicting, political/cultural/ideological/ethnic/etcetera worlds and yet refuses to entirely adopt, belong to, or identify with any single belief, group, or location.

What I have described above, are forms of writing (as well as editing and publishing) that celebrate a being-in-common that engenders critical interventions into dominant paradigms, breaking away from their ordering effects for long enough to open spaces for imagining a different future for knowledge production. As Rivera Garza (2013) points out, if writing is "the basis of all practice of community," both writing and community are always unfinished, always yet to be done. Therefore, both practicing community (or being human, maybe) and writing (or establishing community through writing and editing) is about rendering something as "unfinished." Adema remarks in a similar vein: "we need to enable a form of knowledge … that remains open to question but that can at the same time be reconfigured, that can be cut and (temporally) fixed at some points to establish meaning and signify knowing. It is a knowing that, in this case goes beyond an internal subjectivity and includes the external lifeworld" (2021: 183).

Such forms of writing (and publishing) have been embodied in the practices of all the cases I discuss in this chapter. I consider this approach to publishing, editing, and writing as a form of

[55] *Náhuatl* is an Aztec language still spoken in certain Central American regions.

celebrating a being in-common while opening a space for reimagining what counts as knowledge (production) especially important for my thesis. I see a communality between this approach and how it was performed by pre-digital initiatives and how it gets realised in the context of critical OA publishing today (especially also in the three experimental publishing projects that I discuss as case studies in chapter 8). This approach – the aim to establish a space for imagining and performing a different future for knowledge production with a focus on knowledge equity and diversity – also sits at the basis of the interventionist reading methodology that I propose as part of my theoretical framework and is one of the main outcomes of this thesis.

In the next section I explore this approach as part of an in-depth exploration of the editing and publishing practice of KTP. Following the logic of "border," "hybrid," or “mestiza,” editing and publishing for the members of KTP became a method or methodology for organising “[global] resistance, identity, praxis, and coalition under contemporary first world, late-capitalist cultural conditions” (Trujillo, 1998, 361), while taking account of the power differences within and among the various individuals and communities involved. I take KTP as an example here because their practice helps me to concretise some aspects that I consider especially relevant regarding contemporary digital processes and practices of knowledge production in the context of OA publishing and the question of how and how far they can contribute to greater knowledge equity and diversity, as well as for designing the interventionist reading methodology as part of my thesis.

Complicating Representation: Textual Practice as Methodology

The editors of KTP and the contributing authors used their engagement with writing, editing, and publishing to organise their antagonist resistance against the privileged position of white feminism in the U.S. publishing landscape of their time (Moraga & Anzaldúa, 1983). Through their publishing practices, the women involved in KTP organised resistance across different gender, sex, race, cultural, class, or national commitments. KTP, consequently, can be understood as a network of nodes amalgamating around similar (yet distinctive) struggles, forging connections and solidarity between scholars, artists, and activists situated in different contexts of marginalisation. These connections were established through shared publishing undertakings and communal forms of editing and writing, while accounting for the diversities between the various individuals and communities involved, while also trying to accommodate the precarious economic status of the involved women.

The communality or community established and enacted amongst KTP's members was, as Moraga emphasises, neither based on an abstract notion of sisterhood or solidarity nor simply emphasising difference. Rather, it redefined difference in potentially transformative ways, as catalysts for personal and social change. For example, solidarity between Chicana and Black members was achieved through engagement with issues of diversity, difference, and collective and individual transformation interwoven with the daily organisational necessities imposed by the running of an anti-hegemonial press and the intense commitments and forms of organisation necessary to sustain it. Sitting around a metaphorical kitchen table, and medially connected through the telecommunications network, these women perpetually negotiated the nature and terms of their relationships and interactions emerging within their shared publishing undertaking. As KTP member Moraga stated in the foreword of the 2nd edition of KTP's anthology *This Bridge Called my Back* (1993): "We must acknowledge that to change the world, we have to change ourselves – even sometimes our most cherished block-hard convictions." Within common activities of writing, revision, and negotiation the authors and editors involved in making *This Bridge* actively engaged with each other's singularities and differences by foregrounding questions of positionality, connectivity, collective responsibility, and mutual accountability. They were trying to articulate common needs without homogenising distinct struggles.

Keating (2013) provides a concrete insight into these intricate and discordant negotiations. As she recalls, a contributor to the first edition of *This Bridge Called my Back* (1981) threatened to rescind her contribution as a reaction to Anzaldúa's and Moraga's decision to include a reference to Adrienne Rich – a white, middle-class feminist – in the foreword of their publication. Anzaldúa in her answer to the threat validates her contributor's concern yet also eschews her oppositional politics:

> I spent almost a whole day going over your paper—felt a lot of love toward you. We want you in our book …. You object to our use of A. Rich's quote. My vision does not exclude white women. I learned from R. [Rich] She took her work as far as she could coming from a privileged class. We all have our different paths, our different works cut out for us. It is not politically correct to cite a white woman. But for me it is personally correct. We must not let color or class separate us — there are too many divisions in our lives, too much silence among us (Keating, 2013, 48).

Practices such as writing, editing, and publishing were used by KTP as methods or methodologies for the facilitation and curation of more concrete, diverse, and active conversation and collaboration between the different individuals and communities that surrounded the press. I believe that their practices can offer tentative insights in relation to how to better leverage the potential of a contemporary, digital scholarly "knowledge diaspora" too (Risam, 2019).

As Risam discusses, in the digital spaces of today, research, editing, writing, and publishing evolves in the many offshoots between different local, national, and global contexts, epistemes, languages, and cultures. Scholars, thanks to the internet, and thanks to ambitions within OA publishing to make texts digitally available without charging readers, can more easily engage with the materials emerging out of these different contexts and they can do so in collaboration with a diverse range of individuals and communities. By understanding today's digital scholarly communities through ideas of diaspora, Risam situates the locus of diasporic individual and communal identity formation within shape-shifting virtual "communities built around shared knowledge and experience that manifest in scholarly practices" (75). Moreover, in the context of digital humanities, she considers scholarly practices themselves "as constituting a knowledge diaspora: the knowledge itself is scattered, shared among virtual communities, facilitating new relationships and networks around the broader set of investigations possible at the intersections of the digital and the humanistic" (75).

However, even if the internet offers enhanced possibilities for forging connections between distant individuals, the existence of such communities – joining different culturally and epistemically situated individuals with diverse experiences – cannot be presupposed. It requires, as I have shown with the example of KTP, active community building and engagement, involving intricate negotiations between the participants in what Risam calls the "broader set of investigations possible at the intersections of the digital and the humanistic." Furthermore, many digital collaborations today still happen within relatively narrow boundaries: within faculty reading groups, disciplinary conferences, or publishing undertakings in the context of a research project (de Mourat et al. 2020). Consequently, any participation that goes beyond these institutional, disciplinary, and linguistic confines, must be actively engendered and facilitated.

It is this active facilitation of diverse and equitable participation in the processes and practices of knowledge production (beyond disciplinary, epistemic, and linguistic "silos") that sits at the core of the reading methodology I suggest and test in this thesis (see chapters "Conclusion" and "Postscript") with the intention of contributing to the various facilitation methodologies and methods that have been proposed by critical OA advocates (see chapter 8).

As I have shown in this chapter, over the last four centuries marginalised communities – first and foremost women – have created strategic spaces to experiment with different ways of self-organisation, collaboration, creating and sharing knowledges able to engender a socio-political intervention into the dominant humanist and masculinist norms and conventions of knowledge and knowing at their times. These women have re(claimed) the colonially and patriarchally dominated infrastructures and technologies of knowledge production. They have used the processes and practices of knowledge creation to gain individual and communal agency in resisting domination, in

shaping their own social realities, and in envisioning alternative – more inclusive and diverse – futures for knowledge production. In order to do so, oral storytellers, the women of Little Gidding, and KTP have challenged dominant humanist and masculinist epistemologies of knowledge and knowing and related ideas; the text as static and authoritative, possessive individual authorship, or practices of writing, editing, and publishing as purely representational. They have done this by engaging in relational, situated, and performative forms of author- editor- and readerships (for example, by blurring the lines between writing, editing, and reading through collaborative, community-based engagements), as well as with unruly, versioned, open-ended, and multi-agential publications (for example, by cutting and pasting texts together). Showcasing these initiatives and relating them across time and space has underlined that fixity and standardisation are institutional and social constructs rather than the inevitable results of the material, economic, and technological factors that emerged with the expansion of writing and print.

Before I can turn my attention to a discussion on how critical OA advocates – in a similarly antagonist gesture as the initiatives I looked at in this chapter – engage in writing, editing, and publishing experiments challenging prevalent (humanist) norms and conventions of contemporary academic knowledge production, I must clarify the epistemo-political basis upon which these experiments have emerged and evolved. In this vein, in the next chapter, I conceptualise what I call critical OA publishing as a framework distinct from the more popular versions of OA that I have discussed in chapters 1 to 3. I do so by showing the rootedness of the diverse takes on OA publishing that I synthesise as "critical" in antagonist humanist-critical and non-humanist academic traditions such as the ones I introduced in chapter 5.

SECTION III

CRITICAL OA PUBLISHING:

A HUMANIST-CRITICAL GENEALOGY

Chapter 7. A Humanist-critical Theoretical Grounding for OA Publishing

At the end of the last century, with the rise and development of the Internet, publishing endeavours led by public institutions and academics that experimented with the affordances of the new technology to communicate their research while bypassing many of the traditional intermediaries (such as big publishing houses) started to emerge (Babini, 2019; Becerril-García & Aguado-López, 2018; Harnad, 1991; Okerson, 1992). During this time, OA publications such as *Surfaces* or *Postmodern Culture* (*PMC*) were launched by humanities scholars on listservs and the Web (Moore, 2020; Kiesewetter, 2020a, b; Steiner, 2022). These scholars were organising textual production, editing, and distribution independently from commercial presses. At the same time, transnational, non-commercial publishing infrastructures were initiated by the scholarly community. These included the Spanish- and Portuguese-language the consolidated repositories and databases Redalyc (2003) and SciELO (1997) representing non-English-language journals and research articles.

In this chapter, I want to explore and expand on the diverse genealogical interrelations of what I conceptualise as today's critical OA publishing. I use "critical OA publishing" as a term that includes different strands within OA advocacy that are – as the most basic common denominator – set up in antagonistic relation to commercial publishing systems and the many funder-, and policy-driven approaches and liberal democratisation discourses I discussed in chapter 4.

Besides asking questions about the governance and ownership of the institutions, platforms, and means of scholarly knowledge production, what I conceptualise as critical OA publishing also poses questions related to knowledge, writing-up, and representing knowledge. In chapter 8 I discuss how they do so by reference to three case studies emerging in the context of critical OA publishing.

The origin of the antagonistic positioning of critical OA advocacy in relation to established publishing systems is, as I argue in what follows, partially related to their common hermeneutical grounding of their approaches to OA publishing in non-humanist or humanism-critical epistemologies which take inspiration from indigenous, feminist, or post-humanist discourses.

To make this positioning and the rationale to conceptualise critical OA publishing as a distinct framework explicit, in this chapter I showcase several approaches to critical OA publishing emerging in Europe, Canada, Latin America, and Africa, primarily in the humanities and social sciences. I position these contemporary approaches as part of an academic tradition that epistemo-politically is interrelated with the humanist-critical academic discourses emerging in the second half of the twentieth century (discussed in chapter 5), with globalisation-critical and certain feminist theories, for example (as well as with the critiques of liberal humanism and liberal democracy I introduced in chapter 4). I primarily focus on critical OA traditions that emerged from cultural studies discourses, from critical development discourses, and from discussions around epistemic justice.

After a brief overview over what can be considered the first manifestations of critical OA publishing in the 1990s, in the first part of this chapter, I provide an insight into the humanist-critical academic traditions in which I want to position critical OA publishing, starting with the cultural studies discourse. From there, in the second half of the chapter, I further explore how historically – in a non-humanist or humanist-critical epistemological framework – a specific way of conceptualising and theorising OA publishing has emerged. This is one that fundamentally differs from how OA publishing has been envisioned within commercial, and many funder-, and policy-driven approaches, as well as within the liberal democratisation discourses that have emerged around and during the same time as the BOAI, for example. Even though in the public debate on OA publishing the latter have held a more prominent position, alternative ways of conceiving of and practicing OA publishing have persisted – they have just, in certain contexts, become obfuscated.

By controlling and governing their own infrastructures for scholarly publishing Latin American public institutions and researchers in the case of Redalyc and SciELO were claiming space for a fuller international representation of non-English speaking research communities, their outputs, and knowledge practices. They did so within an international academic publishing landscape that, during this time, was increasingly dominated by English-language publications (Beigel, 2013, 2018). I have introduced Redalyc earlier in this thesis. Initiated by Eduardo Aguado López, Arianna Becerril García, and Salvador Chávez Ávila in 2003 in the context of a research project at Autonomous University of the State of Mexico (UAEM) – and supported by this institution until today – the project has aimed to support OA social science and humanities journals from Latin America and enhance their visibility. SciELO, provides full texts online in HTML, PDF, and ePUB formats; a journal index; and the measurements of access, downloads, and citations into each publication. The platform was implemented 1998 in Brazil after the conclusion one-year pilot project with ten selected Brazilian journals led by the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) and the Latin American and Caribbean

Center in Health Sciences Information of the Pan American Health Organization / World Health Organization (BIREME/PAHO/WHO). Since then, SciELO has expanded towards a decentralised form of cooperation with other national collections in Argentina, Mexico, and Peru. Besides sharing a platform, each of these partners have their own governance, management, and operation systems, while relying on funding of national research agencies and related institutions. SciELO Brazil is responsible for the development and maintenance of the platform and is financially supported by the State of São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP). Similar to Redalyc, SciELO "aims to improve the quality and impact of the journals that it indexes and of the research they communicate" (Packer et al., 2014, 41). As Packer et al. (2014) state, SciELO, since its beginning, had two aims "first, the indexing of national quality journals to complement international indexes and the publication of the full texts with free access on the Web in the modality known today as the 'Golden Road' …. and, second, the cooperative convergence of independent publishers, editors and national research agencies around a common objective to increase the visibility and quality of journals" (15).

Latin American academic publishing has historically been seen as a great inspiration for more academic-controlled publishing ventures, standing at the root of a distinct (critical) Latin American OA tradition that until today is in large parts community-led, not-for-profit, and horizontal, while many Latin American academics are advocating for a broad and inclusive participation in international knowledge production (Alperin, Fischman, et al., 2008; Babini, 2019; Becerril-García & Aguado-López, 2018).

Today organisations such as Redalyc and SciELO still exemplify this tradition. However, as Becerril-García and Aguado-López remark, each of the platforms funded in the late 1990s and early 2000s since then has been going their own direction. While SciELO employ Clarivate Analytics to create a journal citation index inside the Web of Science in order "to achieve the inclusion of journals in the mainstream science" (Becerril-García & Aguado-López, 2018). On the contrary, Redalyc – in a concerted effort with the cooperative infrastructure AmeliCA, as I wrote previously – seeks to strengthen supports journals that refrain from using author- and reader-fees, while arguing for responsible metrics and the diversity of knowledges.

In the 1990s the journals *Surfaces* and *Post Modern Cultures* emerged. *Surfaces,* a bilingual (English/French) comparative literature journal, ran from 1991 to 1999. It was, in its first years, published by the Département de Littérature comparée (Université de Montréal), and then by the Presses de l'Université de Montréal. The journal was led by Terry Cochran, Wlad Godzich, Jean-Claude Guédon, and Bill Reading (until his death in 1994). *Postmodern Culture* is a multidisciplinary journal evolving around contemporary literature, theory, and culture. It was founded in 1990 by Eyal

Amiran, Greg Dawes, Elaine Orr, and John Unsworth at North Carolina State University. It is still running today. The editors of *PMC* and *Surfaces* suggested that electronic text – because of the possibility to share and collaborate in online documents – would, in comparison to traditional printed texts, be more amenable to collaborative revision and open to a broad range of different conversations between diverse communities (Amiran et al., 1990a). Digital text would allow the inclusion of different forms of scholarly knowledge, for example more experimental, embodied, relational, and performative ones. The editors of *PMC* expected that "the medium itself would encourage us to think of our writing as constituted both from the writer's position and from the readers'. Such thinking (about writing and reading) can lead to further experimentation within the academy, in culture, and with/in those relationships fostered through *Postmodern Culture*" (Amiran et al., 1990b). This is exemplified in the first issue of *PMC* that contains, among others, bell hooks' essay "Postmodern Blackness"[56] Kathy Acker's "Dead Doll Humility"[57] and Laura Kipnis' piece "Marx: The Video (A Politics of Revolting Bodies)".[58] By supporting this diversity of contributions and more experimental approaches to scholarly knowledge creation, the editors of *PMC* aimed to "dis-establish the practice of admitting only those who speak our language or who position themselves as we do" (Amiran et al., 1990b.).[59] Jean-Claude Guédon, founder of *Surfaces*, hoped with this journal to facilitate and "explore transformations in knowledge and their relationship with power, culture, and emerging communities" (Moore, 2019a, 13).

Moore (2019a) emphasises the parallels between early scholar-run journals such as *Surfaces* and *PMC* and contemporary critical OA discourse in the humanities. He highlights the way in which the editors of these journals have tried to address and interrelate questions on the governance of scholarly infrastructure and the means of knowledge production with questions on different types of knowing and knowledge, as well as on how to better create and represent knowledge. Such an approach is also visible within current critical OA projects such as COPIM. COPIM researchers have developed community-owned OA systems and infrastructures (such as the *Open Book Collective*, a community-governed charity supporting a consortial funding model for small to mid-scale OA projects, and the open metadata system *Thoth*) but they have also conducted experiments with the

[56] A personal reflection of/on a black scholar working in a predominantly white institution and the implication of this positionality regarding hooks' own critical scholarly practice.

[57] An experimental essay seeking to embody the female struggle for the right to write (and speak) in a classist, male-dominated society.

[58] An experimental critique on the absence of female and queer bodies in Marxist thought delivered as a script for a (fictional) video.

[59] Indeed, the first issue of *PMC* featured a large variety of essayistic and experimental writings, and diverse community of female, male, of-colour and white authors, However, as I discussed elsewhere (Kiesewetter, 2020 a, b), within subsequent issues of the journal released throughout the 1990s, while the texts remained radical in content and form, white, male authors prevailed (Kiesewetter, 2020a).

ways in which research gets written up and published (for example, within several experimental pilot projects developed in COPIM's Experimental Publishing work package).

The Cultural Studies Discourse on the Nature of Scholarship

From the 1960s onwards in the UK and, later on, more widely, cultural studies scholars have reflected on the relation between culture and (its) politics while examining the ideological assumptions shaping cultural contexts and discourses. Theoretically and ideologically, cultural studies have been traditionally committed to the discourse on cultural hegemony as well as social, historical, and political movements broadly associated with the Left and its social justice trajectory (Wright, 2003). Its closeness to feminism, (post-)structuralism, Marxism, and post-Marxism – specifically those theories' considerations of the constitutive nature of power relations, the intrinsic antagonism of the social, and the role of the university as a place of knowledge production – has pushed cultural studies scholars to look at and question their own relation to and involvement with hegemonic power. They have done so regarding the university itself, in relation to academic authority and institutional legitimacy, and in relation to their own disciplinarity and every-day practices (Hall, 2008; Zylinska, 2005). This focus has triggered a negotiation of dichotomies and tensions between the academy and the community, academic and non-academic work, theory and practice (Rodman, 2010). At the same time the heightened awareness of academics' own involvement in dominant systems of power has led, at least within some disciplinary instances, to an understanding of cultural studies scholarship as an intrinsic part of an organic engagement with its own society and times (Hall, 2002; Hall, 1996; Weber, 2000).

Another specificity injected in the disciplinary setting of cultural studies has determined the nature and the scope of these considerations. According to Bill Readings' diagnosis in *The University in Ruins* (1996), national culture – once a foundational principle and regulatory unity for the nation state and referent for the modern university and liberal education – has been replaced by an idea of culture expressed in terms of "excellence," where this is a unit of a scale which can be measured with performance indicators. Therefore, as Reading argues, the study of the relation between culture and politics and of cultural identification and participation (both foundational for cultural studies), has been disabled by the disappearance of its object of study and field of engagement. In other words, cultural studies has lost its integrating subject topic. As Zylinska interprets this state of "being without:" "Rather than being studied as an object, culture can only be used; it can be performed, produced and consumed but not studied in the conventional sense, because its researcher is unable

to separate herself from her object of study" (Zylinska, 2005, 1). Thus, being intrinsically interwoven with and determined by the subjectivation effects and "creative impetus" of the partaking researchers, the epistemo-political thinking space cultural studies scholars have operated in (their ethics and politics) cannot be determined in advance but are always bound to their performance within an (academic) everyday practice and workday encounters that challenge the familiar and the ordinary (Zylinska, 2005).

However, despite its inherent state of "being without", cultural studies, like any other discipline, has been subject to its own stabilisation and institutionalisation, for example within a specific normative leftist or democratic politics, with corresponding values and ethics, or as part of a neoliberal framework of academic knowledge production. Against this background, Gary Hall (2002, 2006) stresses that cultural studies, in the early days of its emergence, had a strong self-reflexive, experimental, and speculative aspect.[60] However, this aspect, as Hall points out, often got closed down in the later versions of cultural studies that were dominant in the 1980s and 1990s and which were firmly positioned in a pre-decided liberal left politics and its ethics and morals, rather than remaining open to experimentation and speculation.

Hall's assessment underscores the important position experimentation has had within cultural studies. According to Weber (2000), experimentation is processual, open to ambivalence, uncertainty, and risk and, with that, open to a plurality of possible outcomes. Therefore, as soon as experimentation gets locked down within neat and static framings, it loses its critical impetus. A pre-decided liberal left politics (Hall 2002, 2008) – or a prevalent idea of the neoliberal university based on a positivist interpretation of humanist epistemologies that, as Weber (2000) admonishes, insists on the universal validity of knowledge, as well as on a totalising and unifying (humanist) notion of the human – thus poses risks to the experimental, self-reflexive, and speculative aspect of cultural studies practice. Bennett (2004) describes this inherent "cultural studies antagonism" (between institutionalisation and experimentation as a movement away from institutionalisation) by referring to cultural studies as a "reluctant discipline." As O'Sullivan (2002) notices, in this context, experimentation antagonistically and perpetually creates new lines of flight (out of, or away from, its own disciplinarisation and institutionalisation). As Adema (2015) elaborates, O'Sullivan (2002) thus proposes cultural studies "as a pragmatic experimental program moving away from stability, affirming cultural studies as a critical process, as a doing" (174).

[60] For example within the cultural studies' scholar Raymond William's long lasting engagement in adult education for the Workers Education Association and Stuart Hall's work with the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) that he founded at the University of Birmingham in 1964.

Therefore, Kember (2014a, b), Hall (2008), and Zylinska (2005) have understood their scholarship and scholarly work as a space and instrument to pursue a specific politics through experimental interventions into institutional, socio-political, and cultural arrangements, practices, and issues. A politics of cultural studies (as a practice), in this context, then, is, as Hall (2008) remarks, always one that adheres "to the pragmatic demands of each particular, finite conjunction of the 'here' and 'now,' whatever and wherever it may be" (201) and hinges upon the exposure to and encounter with the "singularity of the other" (Hall, 2008, 202).

Such a politics then, as Hall remarks, requires an acknowledgement of the "possibility that the "'here' and 'now' may change us and our politics" (2008: 202). Only like this, Hall argues, will it be possible to conceive of politics as something "that does not conform to the political vocabularies and frameworks of interpretation that are already transcendentally decided in advance [and consequently are subsumable within (neo-)liberal agendas]" (2008: 202). This theoretical instantiation mirrors Mouffe's philosophy of hegemony and antagonism, as well as Nancy's idea of democracy as a process. As Mouffe stresses, the political is a decision that is always "taken in an undecidable terrain," (2000: 130) because social relations are not fixed or natural. Rather they are a product of continual, precarious, hegemonic, politico-economic articulations, that is, of contingent, pragmatic yet temporary decisions involving power, conflict, and negotiation. This also echoes Stuart Hall's (1996) claim to construct, through doing cultural studies, a politics beyond liberal pluralism which works with and through difference, building forms of solidarity and identification between different subjects without suppressing the heterogeneity of interests and without fixing the boundaries of the political for eternity.

Against this background, ethics is theorised by Zylinska (2005) with reference to Levinas (minus the humanist limitations of his ethics) as something "that makes sense—and that senses its own making" (33). Similarly to Gary Hall's politics, Zylinska's ethics is adopting "an attitude of unconditional openness which does not consume the other in the name of cultural studies politics" (32). For her, ethics is situated outside, or beyond, the traditional (humanist) discourse of moral philosophy. Instead, it is performed through a constant exposure to incalculable alterity, within workday encounters which challenge the usual. Therefore, ethical decisions, as well as the enactment of a specific politics always require a "leap of faith," a movement situated within and into "an undecidable terrain" (see, for example, Mouffe, 2000, 130). It entails an encounter with what seems unknown and unknowable, without passage, and therefore aporetic. This constitutes an ethics, a politics, and a subjectivity that is formulated and negotiated "on the go," that is always in the making and on the way to becoming itself (and the other).

Cultural studies – not least thanks to scholars such as Stuart Hall, Spivak and Wright – in its closeness to psychoanalysis, post-, and decolonial, and, more recently, post-humanist and New Materialist feminist discourses, has paid close attention to the discipline's (and the university's) relation to and openness towards its "others:" the voices, positions, and experiences that have been marginalised or ruled out of dominant disciplinary, cultural, intellectual, and political formation. In this regard, cultural studies scholarship is aimed at a displacement of Western-centric and masculinist discourses by putting into question their humanist and universalist character, as well as their transcendental claims. Additionally, the contestation of humanist Western/Eurocentric models of selfhood, as Stuart Hall (see Chen & Morley, 1996) argues, induced the departure from such a model and led to the recognition of subjects as politically and culturally constructed, relational, intrinsically incomplete, and hybrid. The concern with subjectivity and the experience of identity – among others with regards to gender, sexual difference, race, and cultural difference – has been elaborated upon by, for example, Gilroy (1993), Hall (1997), Spivak (1988, 1990), the South Asian Subaltern Studies Group (SSG), as well as the Women's Studies Group situated at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at Birmingham University.

As Wright remarks, works such as Spivak's notion of the postcolonial migrant academic (1988)[61] and in connection to that the notion of strategic essentialism (1990)[62] have been utilised as "both critique the status quo of cultural studies for its failure to represent and include certain marginalized groups and to begin to indicate what cultural studies might look like if it did include those voices and perspectives" (2003: 812). Wright (2003) describes his own identity as a post-colonial migrant academic (specifically, as an academic from Sierra Leone in a Canadian institution) as fluid, non-essentialist, and performed through multiple, shifting and contradictory identities in relation to cultural studies:

> [T]he political cannot be reduced to the personal. Questions of experience, identity and representation and the autobiographical are central … [but] it is important to point out … that for me these are not given, fixed notions nor sources of authenticity but rather constructed, procedural, multiple, overlapping, contradictory and performative (2003: 809).

[61] This term describes a privileged subaltern inhabitant of the neo-colonial metropolitan space, who has not been – can never be – firmly and exclusively positioned. Rather this figure is bound to be "scratching at the rift between global post-coloniality and metropolitan migrancy'" (Spivak 1988, 375). In this position the migrant postcolonial academic "often [is] bestowed a subject-position as geo-political other by the dominant radical (one is most struck by this when planning or attending international conferences)" (1988: 339).

[62] Spivak suggests "strategic essentialism" as a scholarly politics and method that implies a "drifting" between different knowledge systems – strategically and temporarily playing down differences between members of scholarly communities or groups. This "strategic essentialism" is necessary for Spivak to intervene in power on behalf of the marginalised.

These assessments of identity and subjectivity are common among cultural studies scholars, including the idea that subjectivation can never be fully achieved in the sense of being final and whole, as an individual is always in the process of being made, and the idea that subject-positions themselves are creative processes that act productively by making sense of shapeshifting worlds and ways of inhabiting them. For theorists such as Hall (2008) and Zylinska (2005), a scholar's position and subjectivity, and – consequently – politics, can only be actualised and specified within and through the performance of the own contaminated, fragmented and fluid subject, through its encounter with the "singularity of the other" (Hall, 2008, 202). Consequently, subjectivity, in these conceptualisations, is always relational. It relies on interactions with forces, laws, institutions, power, other humans, and non-humans, and appears as a process rather than an essence.

Sustainable Development, Science, and Epistemic Justice

As well as cultural studies, there are also other humanist-critical academic traditions which I consider as influential and formative for critical OA advocacy. These traditions include scholars who – in the context of the cultural hegemony discourse – have been critical of the hierarchical dynamics within globalised science and development agendas, and their corresponding strategies and policies. These scholars have criticised the belief that exporting (Western) modern knowledge systems can lead to world-wide economic, social, and scientific change (and/as development) (Death & Gabay, 2015). Amartya Sen (1985a, b) suggests instead that development should be considered as the process of enlarging a person's capacity and agency to function (which he describes as the whole spectrum of things a person possibly could be and do). Consequently, as Arjun Appadurai (2000, 2006) stresses, all humans should be granted the right, and have the capability, to imagine their own knowledges and futures. This right then, for these theorists, implicates an agency that is based on the accessibility to knowledge and the possibility to, on local and international levels, choose to actively take part in creating and distributing knowledge, as well as questioning its very nature. For Appadurai, access and the possibility of taking part in knowledge production are not only dependent on technological, legal, or economic factors but are socio-cultural matters of education, nourishment, health, and self-efficacy.

As Appadurai (2006) remarks, the lack of agency to exercise choice in peripheral regions, is, among others, a result of the progressive disconnection of local and global knowledges and research approaches within universalising centre-driven research agendas. Research – which for Appadurai is "a specialised name for a generalised capacity to make disciplined inquiries into those things we need to know, but do not know yet" (167) – within international research agendas and related

policies has been rendered a "high-end, technical activity, available by training and class background to specialists in education, the sciences and related professional fields" (167). This, as he stresses, makes it hard for certain local communities who often lack specialist knowledges, understanding of scientific jargons, and the technological skills needed for organising and sharing information to take part in and profit from this research. As he points out: "while knowledge of the world is increasingly important for everybody … the opportunities for gaining such knowledge are shrinking" (176). Consequently, Appadurai states that in order to increase the agency to exercise choice within "peripheral" communities, research must be redefined, anchored, and practiced as a human right.[63]

Appadurai and Sen's ideas are closely related to the concept of cognitive justice. This term has been coined by the anthropologist and human rights researcher and activist Shiv Visvanathan (1999). Visvanathan argues that cognitive justice should be understood in its relationship with science, particularly regarding the violence justified and imposed by science. Visvanathan identifies four central nodes around which this violence has been exercised: These include the "imperatives of progress" – linear in time and irreversible – embedded in modern science; or the "idea of triage" whereby a society, a subculture or a species is labelled as obsolete because humanist "scientifically reasoned judgment" has deemed it incurable or beyond help, given available knowledge, time, and resources. As Visvanathan argues, instead, science should be based on central principles of cognitive justice promoting a pluriversal, inclusive approach to different knowledges and ways of knowing (Escobar, 2018; Kothari et al., 2019). Such an approach implies that: "All forms of knowledge are valid and should co-exist in a dialogic relationship to each other; Cognitive justice implies the strengthening of the 'voice' of the defeated and marginalised; Traditional knowledges and technologies should not be 'museumized'; Every citizen is a scientist; Each layperson is an expert; Science should help the common man/woman; All competing sciences should be brought together into a positive heuristic for dialogue" (as cited in Van der Velden, 2006, 3). And, as De Sousa Santos claims – tying in epistemic justice with notions such as Appadurai's right to research and Sen's capability approach – "no global social justice without global cognitive justice" (2015: 42).

As De Sousa Santos further emphasises, the struggle towards epistemic justice must be "based on [a politics inspired by] the experiences of large, marginalized minorities and majorities that struggle against unjustly imposed marginality and inferiority, with the purpose of strengthening their resistance" (2015: ix). Only through valorising non-Western (and non-humanist) conceptions of

[63] According to Appadurai (2006), after the founding of the United Nations in the mid- twentieth century the idea of human rights has been formalised as a universal and transcendental value. This contributed to its progressive disconnection from its situated and practical performance and definition.

emancipation, freedom, and liberation, he posits, true emancipatory (and real democratic) politics can emerge. Real engagement for epistemic justice, as Choudry (2020), D'Souza (2009), Escobar (1995, 2018), Grosfoguel (2012), and Windle (2017) also argue, can only emerge through a preoccupation with the creative emancipatory responses formulated within the liberation struggle of situated social and political projects and the epistemologies framing these struggles in the "Global South." For example, in the rally for *buen vivir*[64] in Latin America, within the Zapatistas' *Other Campaign* [65] in Mexico, or in the African idea of *Ubuntu.*[66]

The epistemology shaping these movements' struggles, D'Souza (2009) argues, is one "where the distinction between the knower and the knowledge is … blurred" (35). This idea hints at a fluid and hybrid understanding of subjectivity "that moves forward asking questions and listening [instead of preaching]" (Grosfoguel, 2012, 99) and acknowledges the "inexhaustible diversity of the world and its knowledges" (Santos, 2015). Therefore, it requires the subject – in this case the scholar – "to make a qualitative leap into the unknown because the effect of the actions cannot be known or predicted definitively in advance" (D'Souza, 2009, 35). Only then "vast political landscapes of emancipation and liberation will emerge" (Santos, 2015, ix). These landscapes will, in the eyes of these scholars, be freed from the imperatives of Western humanist (neo-)liberal thought and consequently from its totalising and unifying trajectories.

The concepts discussed above are different from the humanist epistemologies that have, in a positivist manner, been used as a basis to theorise and conceptualise the dominant versions of OA publishing that I analysed previously in this thesis. These concepts emphasise the validity and sovereignty of all knowledge systems, knowledges, and knowledge practices rather than universalising the ones based on humanist epistemologies as the only valid ones. Knowledge and knowing themselves, rather than as pure, neutral, detached, and transcendental, have been conceived of as relational, situated, and partial. The knower, rather than a unitary and coherent humanist subject, appears as contaminated, fragmented and fluid. Rather than conceiving of scientific, or scholarly, practices as systems of representation, these are understood – for example in the context of cultural studies – as practices of intervention.

---

[64] *Buen vivir* emerged in Latin America as critique of economic growth and a focus on "living well" (*buen vivir*). The concept was included in the constitutions of Ecuador in 2008 and Bolivia in 2009 with the ambition to delineate an emancipatory horizon, that is, the idea of a buen vivir/ good living that entails ideas of both sustainable development and socialism (Hidalgo-Capitán & Cubillo-Guevara, 2022).

[65] The *Other Campaign* (*La otra campaña*) was the political program of the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) in Mexico. It had the ambition to create connections among the EZLN and other resistance groups – e.g. trade unions, indigenous groups, feminist and queer activists – throughout Mexico. The newest instantiation of this trajectory is the "Declaration for Life" (2021) that is directed at creating similar connections with Europe.

[66] According to *Ubuntu*, a Zulu word and concept for advancing communal justice *en route*, actions are right insofar as they are a matter of living harmoniously with others or honouring communal relationships (Metz & Gaie, 2010).

As I show next, shifting the theoretical basis upon which to theorise OA publishing, its scope, and its potential – away from humanist towards non-humanist or humanist-critical epistemologies – significantly influences the ways in which OA publishing is understood and practiced.

OA Publishing as a Doing

Today's critical OA theorists allied to the field of cultural studies, have framed OA publishing as a "doing," a practice tending both to question the governance and ownership of the institutions, platforms, and means of scholarly knowledge production, as well as questions related to knowledge, knowing, and representing knowledge. Their OA practice has been conceived as a critical "mode of being in academia through the project of publishing as an ongoing [experimental] intervention" (Marczewska, 2018). This includes – similarly to the early precedents of today's critical OA publishing I discussed at the beginning of this chapter – an intervention into the commercial institutions that govern scholarly knowledge production (for example, by developing horizontal infrastructures such as the Radical Open Access Collective); into the humanist forms and formats of scholarly knowledge production (for example, by, within experimental publishing, reperforming possessive, individual, humanist authorship and writing cultures in a more open and collaborative way); as well as into the manifold relationships (for example, between researchers, researchers and institutions, researchers and books, and between technologies and scholarly practice) that are required in academic knowledge production.

Critical OA scholars who advocate for sustainable development and cognitive justice have understood OA publishing in a similar vein, namely, "as an entry point to… [shifting] the hegemonic system of traditional scientific knowledge" (Okune et al, 2019, 131). In other words, these scholars position themselves in an active, antagonistic relation to the ongoing enclosure of knowledge, knowing, and knowledge production by neoliberal, neo-colonial, or neo-imperialist, systems. They do so, by reference to the concept of cognitive justice. Pursuing and realising anti-hegemonic interventions into dominant (humanist) knowledge systems requires a twofold approach according to Mboa Nkoudou (2020) and Chan et al. (2020). Firstly, it implies the performance of epistemic diversity, difference, and plurality within knowledge production in a way that caters to diverse situated knowledges, epistemologies, research cultures, and needs (for example, within collaborative research projects between academic and non-academic communities). And secondly, it requires a strengthening of such an approach within South-South exchanges and collaboration (for example by founding and sustaining non-English language repositories and publishing platforms), in order to position it globally as a viable alternative to universalising centre-driven approaches.

What becomes evident from this positioning of critical OA advocates in the past and present, is that the focus within OA publishing and the questions posed there always has gone beyond the mere techno-legal and financial mediation of the consumption of research *outputs*. Rather, a more holistic understanding of the scope of OA publishing has been proposed by critical OA advocates that also includes cultural, linguistic, and epistemic questions, such as who is allowed to contribute to knowledge creation and sharing, how, in which language, and on whose terms.

In chapter 8, I take a closer look at how critical OA advocates address cultural, linguistic, and epistemic questions in their experiments with the forms and formats of scholarship. Before I turn to this more practical discussion, however, I want to have a closer look at how the idea of OA publishing as a doing, as an intervention into the hegemonic system of academic knowledge production, affects the way in which OA publishing is further theorised and conceptualised by critical OA advocates.

An Interventionist and Healing Politics for OA Publishing

According to the cultural studies frameworks that some critical OA advocacy is built on, an ethics and politics of OA publishing cannot be determined in advance. Instead, OA ethics and politics are always bound to their actualisation and performance within an (academic writing, editing, and publishing) practice that is experimentally and tentatively engaging, for example, at the "nexus of trouble understood … as the configuration of … writing, publishing, privatisation and marketisation" (Kember, 2014b). This practice perpetually "moves against the enclosure [of critical scholarship and scholarly politics] although it does not, in any final sense, achieve it. It is political only in its antagonism … It is always on the move as a politics of intervention (in a text, a system, a movement [including its own], a status quo) and of invention" (Kember, 2014b, 114). As Adema and Hall (2013) point out by reference to Nancy's idea of democracy as a process, such a conceptualisation of politics leads towards understanding OA "less as a project and model to be implemented, and more as a process of continuous struggle and critical resistance" (33).

To delineate their OA politics scholars coming from an epistemic justice background have worked with concepts such as as *buen vivir* or *Ubuntu*. Hilliyer et al. (2020), when discussing the conceptual references of the OCSDNet, write: "the … tradition of buen vivir …. And the …concept of Ubuntu … both informed the network's conceptual framework" (361). *Ubuntu,* in the context of African OA advocacy, has been suggested as a value system and organisation principle for OA publishing (Raju et al., 2020) and it has been identified as a driving force of OA advocacy itself (Piron et al., 2016). Raju et al. (2020) postulate an approach that combines social justice trajectories and *Ubuntu* principles as a way to "advance sharing for the eradication of information poverty and information unfairness"

(56). Piron et al. (2016) have used the concept of *Ubuntu* to explain how the community formed through the research project SOHA[67] "has given rise to a deep concern for others and an admirable solidarity, typical of the mutual aid necessary to survive in the countries of the South." As they additionally state: "This 'knowing how to be together' [Ubuntu] … where the Other is a priori a brother or sister, has undeniably coloured our concrete utopia, despite its technological mediation by Facebook! …. Several SOHA members … say: 'when we finally meet, we feel like we know each other!' Special friendships have been born between students from Haiti, Niger, Togo, Cameroon or Benin who decide to write together, to set up projects, to encourage each other, to visit each other" (Piron et al., 2016). Similarly, the members of the platform *Grenier des savoirs* advocate for "egalitarian and friendly relations between the people who work on its journals, whether they be members of editorial boards, scientific committees, authors or readers. Magazine teams are encouraged to get to know each other, exchange news and best practice, and work on projects together. Discussion groups help to ensure that these exchanges are fruitful" (Science Afrique, n.p.).

For Adema it is by way of responsible, and careful decisions – or cuts (Barad, 1997) – about "how, where, when, [with whom], and in what form we publish [and conduct] our research" that a politics of OA experiments with and re-invents itself perpetually (Adema, 2015, 44). [68] Careful and ethical interventions into the hegemonies in scholarly knowledge creation and communication, imply — but are not limited to — establishing more open, horizontal, and diverse community-led, not-for profit ecosystems for the governance of the institutions, means and processes of scholarly knowledge production. As I discussed previously in this thesis, this approach is exemplified by networks such as the Radical Open Access Collective and the research project COPIM and it comes to the fore in the interventions into the (humanist) norms and conventions that dominate academic knowledge production critical OA advocates perform. This is especially seen in how they are experimenting with alternative forms of publishing, including more collaborative and open forms of pursuing humanities scholarship, such as collaborative writing and forms of open editing and peer review.

A politics formulated on Ubuntu and *buen vivir* principles, has been exemplified within Mboa Nkoudou's idea of a "healing" politics for OA publishing. This "politics of healing" for Mboa Nkoudou (2020) – along with the aim of "globalising knowledge from Africa," (for example, by participating in

[67] Open Science in Haiti and Francophone Africa (SOHA) is a project that is part of the OCSDNet. The SOHA project focuses on several African universities with the objective to understand barriers to the adoption of open science by post-graduate students; support the creation of local training tools open science; test the feasibility of institutional repositories and science shops; and create an interdisciplinary network of information and discussions on Open science in Haiti and Francophone Africa (OCSDNet, n.d.(b)).

[68] Within the framework in which much critical OA advocacy operates, care is taken "for others, for processes, for the work involved in all aspects of the supply chain, and for the (content of the) publication" (Adema & Moore, 2018, 8). It is not conceived as a normative moral obligation or an empathic gesture but as a "thick, impure, involvement in a world where the question of how to care needs to be posed" (Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017, 6).

networks such as the Radical Open Access Collective of which the scholar-led Cape Town based non-for-profit OA publisher African Minds is a member) – is based on the possibility for African (or, as I want to add, all marginalised) researchers to develop their "own methodologies, and to write from where one is located, unencumbered by Eurocentrism" (Mboa Nkoudou, 2020: 36) and the right to co-create and co-determine the norms, infrastructures, and policies of knowledge production. This aim is exemplified by African Minds who publishes in French, English, and Portuguese, predominantly in the field of social sciences but also accepts proposals from outside of academia. African Minds' "authors are typically African academics and thinkers, as well as international academics who have a close affinity with the continent. … Our emphasis is less on the commercial viability of our publications than on fostering access, openness and debate in the pursuit of growing and deepening the African knowledge base" (African Minds, n.p.).

A "politics of healing" for OA publishing has manifested itself also in so called South-South engagements which are claiming space for a fuller representation of marginalised communities within OA publishing, such as the bibliographic database and digital library of open access journals Redalyc, the pan African publishing platform Continental Platform; and the African Books Collective, an African-run distribution network for African books, writers, and scholarship. The Continental Platform is an infrastructure hosting diamond OA journals, monographs, and textbooks. Its aim is to allow "the African research community to take ownership of creating and sharing its own scholarly content, which contributes to the growth and development of local research for African society" (University of Cape Town, n.d.). The platform was initiated at the University of Cape Town (UCT) under the lead of Reggie Raju, director of research and learning at the University of Cape Town Libraries. The platform is still in development and is currently supported by universities in Cameroon, Namibia, South Africa, and Zimbabwe. The African Books Collective was founded in 1985 as a collective "self-help initiative" of presses aiming to "address the constraints they were experiencing in marketing and distributing their books outside of their domestic markets" (African Book Collective, n.d.). It is a non-profit-organisation owned by its founder publishers. Currently it includes more than 100 partnering presses from over 20 countries across Africa, promoting and selling books from all academic disciplines as well as books for children. Additionally, platforms such as the Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO) and the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) offer resources – such as lists of OA databases and search engines, and digital libraries – as well as support and trainings for humanities scholars.

Regarding the expansion of participation in knowledge creation as well as the co-creation of methodologies, norms, and policies, a healing politics of OA publishing, has been mirrored within the employment of "devices" such as science shops, forms of citizen science, and living laboratories (Piron et al., 2021), as well as within collaborative transdisciplinary research, writing, and publishing

projects such as the ones administered by the OCSDNet (among others by means of the "Open Science Manifesto" that I will discuss more in depth in the next chapter).[69]

The interventionist and healing politics in the context of critical OA publishing have been mirrored in discussions on alternative quality assessment mechanisms and evaluation criteria that are able to respond to a diversity of authors from diverse disciplinary, epistemic, and linguistic backgrounds and to a "diversity of outputs of academic work, such as 'artistic production, social impact, outreach, and contributions to public debate'" (Piron et al., 2021, 283). Such approaches, which contribute to the visibility of researchers in Francophone Africa, have been pursued through the *Grenier des savoirs*. As well as strengthening the position of French content and the self-confidence of French speaking researchers, the journals represented in the *Grenier des savoirs* jointly ask their authors to commit to values of knowledge democracy such as the accessibility of the used language, the broad social relevance of the topics broached, as well as to the inclusion of the voices from among female researchers and Global South scholars (Science Afrique, n.d.). A similar politics is, as I discussed previously, suggested in initiatives such as DORA, the Leiden Manifesto, and AmeliCA.

As I have shown above, the way critical OA advocates understand OA politics – as context-related, differentiated, relational, and fluid – sits uncomfortably with the OA politics that emerged, as I discussed in chapter 4, in the context of liberal democracy discourses on OA publishing, which have seen a wide-spread adaptation by funders, for example. Different to these approaches, the politics suggested by critical OA advocates is based upon, recognises, and caters to the experiences of those that have traditionally been marginalised within academic knowledge creation and distribution, also within more progressive, liberal contexts. Critical OA advocacy, as I discussed above, conceives of OA publishing as a way of taking control of and intervening into the systems, tools, and procedures that scholarly knowledge production is dominated by, and should be seen as a form of open-ended, situational, and bottom-up democratisation. Such a democratisation – or better a struggle for more equal conditions within academic knowledge production – rather than by a shared and pre-determined political goal, is defined by practices including self-organisation, collaboration, inclusivity, diversity, and horizontality. These practices get manifest in concrete strategies for governance as well as in experiments with processes and practices of knowledge production and sharing that are, as

[69] The epistemic justice approach to research pursued within the OCSDNet, involves the co-creation, co-analysing, and co-communication of research with diverse participants – including the design of the research problem, data collection, and analysis methodologies and the publication and circulation of findings (with the objective of exploring different modes of meaning making, production and circulation in scientific production); the co-development of a methodological toolset; a commonly-designed perspective on scientific rigour and quality; the collaborative development of a research and data governance frameworks; as well as the co-design of a research contract that allows non-academic (for example, indigenous and/or rural communities) to define when, where and how their community knowledge is used by external researchers (Albornoz et al., 2017; Okune et al., 2019; Hillyier et al., 2020).

I will discuss in what follows, adhering to the pragmatic demands of particular situated socio-material, cultural, and epistemic contexts.

Complicating Openness

The above-described understanding of politics as put forward by critical OA scholars has been closely entwined with a specific notion of openness. This notion delineates a perpetual and open-ended (often experimental) movement away from OA publishing's various enclosures (for example the commercial enclosures of publishing infrastructures; or the humanist colonial and patriarchal legacies embedded in predominant argumentative and writing conventions) that continue to limit access to knowledge around the world. This movement is relational, situated, context-specific, and performative. Here, openness itself implies a plurality of possible approaches and values that cannot be fixed in advance.

Janneke Adema, in her reflection on openness as scholarly *poethics*, describes such an openness. For her, doing OA is about creating

> forms of openness that do not simply repeat either established forms (such as the closed print-based book, single authorship, linear thought, copyright, exploitative publishing relationships) or succumb to the closures that its own implementation (e.g. through commercial adaptations) and institutionalisation (e.g. as part of top-down policy mandates) … brings with it. It involves an awareness that publishing in an open way directly impacts on what research is, what authorship is, and with that what publishing is. It asks us to take responsibility for how we engage with open access, to take a position towards it … and towards the goals we want it to serve …. Through open publishing we can take in a critical position, and we can explore new formats, practices and institutions, we just have to risk it (2018: 23).

In a similar vein, Denisse Albornoz et al. (2020) write:

> [T]he Combahee River Collective Statement, a Black feminist declaration, not only reflects on their struggles, victories, and losses, crises and openings, but also dares to imagine what survival and liberation may look like. … we call for those working in public scholarship and open movements to engage in the hard work of reflecting on our values and reorganizing social life through political

> engagement, community involvement, education, debate, and dreaming. Instead of seeking to develop agreement and consensus around universal standards and technologies of "openness," time and space is necessary for policy makers, scholar activists, and concerned community members to develop collaborative imaginaries for more just and equitable knowledge infrastructures. Dismantling the old is just half the battle; the other half begins with attempting to imagine futures that are radically different from the present (74).

Openness, according to Adema and Albornoz, means not only the performative and interventionist character of critical OA publishing but also has the implication that the questions raised within the field of OA publishing have on the processes and practice of scholarly knowledge creation and sharing themselves. For example, as Adema and Hall remark, OA publishing in general, and a complicated notion of openness specifically, pose questions "of both a practical and theoretical nature that have the potential to open up a space for reimagining what counts as scholarship and research, and of how it can be responded to and accessed: …. [for example] about what an author, a text, and a work actually is, and where any authority and stability that might be associated with such concepts can now be said to reside" (2013: 25).

The realisation and performance of such an openness in the context of critical OA advocacy (while considering its more holistic understanding of the scope of OA publishing), is, closely related to issues of accessibility and participation in academic discourse – or the ability and agency to imagine and perform OA "futures that are radically different from the present" (Albornoz, 2020, 74) and to "open up a space for reimagining what counts as scholarship and research, and of how it can be responded to" (Adema & Hall, 2013, 25). These issues cannot be simply attended to via a redistribution of the access to research output. As I discuss in chapter 8 by reference to critical experiments with writing, editing, and publishing conducted by critical OA advocates, attending to these issues includes a consideration of the accessibility of the technologies, the processes, and the practices through which knowledge creation and circulation is performed. Here accessibility does not rely solely on questions such as who has the skills or the financial means to access and use the digital technologies through which knowledge production is mediated today. Rather it focuses on who has the ability and agency to use these technologies and to participate in digitally mediated practices of knowledge creation and sharing, a realm which is bound to historic epistemic, cultural, and linguistic barriers (Zaveri, 2020).

Additionally, the consideration of the participation in academic discourse include a thorough preoccupation with prevalent processes and practices of knowledge creation and sharing, including an attentiveness towards their historical dependencies and scholars' own involvement in reproducing them through their research, writing, and publishing. This insight validates the claim that

the processes and practices of knowledge production have to be seen as an inherent part of OA publishing when striving for greater knowledge equity and diversity in this context.

Within critical OA advocacy there have been considerable efforts to address these barriers and to establish a dialogue among different communities, knowledges, and ways of knowing. For example, in the case of the COPIM project, outreach has been undertaken to establish connections with "Global South" researchers and initiatives such as, amongst others, the Brazilian repository and database SciELO Books and the pan-African publishing platform Continental Platform initiated by South African researchers. These connections have consisted of both informal and more formalised encounters, for example within meetings and workshops, and with CLACSO's[70] Dominique Babini and SciELO's Amanda Ramalho as advisory board member to the project. Similar outreach has been conducted via the tri-lingual platform *Science Afrique* (originating from the action-research project SOHA), including by setting up a "voluntary collaboration between partners from the Global South and the North" (Science Afrique, n.d.) that offers free open source research tools and support and training, as well as free support and hosting of, scientific journals, blogs, and research groups.[71]

Critical OA advocates such as Janneke Adema and Gary Hall (2013), organisations such as the OCSDNet and RavenSpace, as well as publishers such as Open Humanities Press also recognise collaborative research, writing, and editing practices and processes as ways to bring different communities, knowledges, and ways of knowing in dialogue with each other. They do so while, additionally, in their publishing projects, challenging the humanist hierarchies of knowledge, language, and humanist textual conventions and paradigms that might impede an equal exchange. They strive to experimentally perform these conventions and paradigms differently.

Instead of insisting on universalist principles based on a positivist understanding of what, ultimately, are local humanist paradigms, critical OA advocates exemplify that difference and plurality among knowledge cultures, ways of knowing, and ways of creating and sharing knowledge, should not be elided to produce a coherent global exchange and equal collaboration. Rather, what is emphasised here, is that the temporal entanglements, relations, and connections forged by critical OA advocates

[70] The Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales (CLACSO) is an international NGO associated to UNESCO. It currently brings together research and postgraduate centres in the field of social sciences and humanities in most countries in Latin America and from other continents. Among its objectives are the strengthening of sustainable processes of academic internationalisation in Latin America and the Caribbean; the expansion of South-South and North-South cooperation and academic dialogue; as well as the development and consolidation of social sciences and critical thinking in the poorest countries of Latin America and the Caribbean.

[71] The collaborations emerging around *scienceafrique.org* include the International Laboratory for Action-Research on Cognitive Justice, Open Science and the Commons (LIRAJ), the Science and Common Good Association (ASBC), the Association for the Promotion of Open Science in Africa and Haiti (APSOHA) and the Interdisciplinary Research Centre on Africa and the Middle East (CIRAM).

within situated exchanges and collaborations crucially contribute to its becoming global (while retaining all its diversity): These transnational, transepistemic, and transdisciplinary collaborations emerge as strategic spaces – dialogically connecting protagonists, their experiences, and struggles beyond local realities – in which issues of openness, accessibility, and participation in established forms of knowledge production can be questioned, negotiated, and reperformed under the premise of establishing more diverse and equitable futures for OA publishing. Such an approach manifests in the three cases that I discuss in depth in the next chapter: the bilingual publication *Ecological Re-writing: Situated Engagements with the Chernobyl Herbarium,* a pilot project in the context of the COPIM research project on which I have collaborated; *As I Remember It,* a living archive of Canadian First Nation teachings; and the "Open Science Manifesto," which is both a text on and a methodology for multi-disciplinary, multi-lingual, and multi-cultural research collaboration.

Genealogically positioning some of the contemporary approaches to OA as part of a non-humanist or humanist-critical theoretical engagement, I have shown how different conceptualisations of OA publishing have emerged. As part of these, OA publishing has been conceived as a "doing," as a *practice* experimentally intervening in the infrastructures, institutions, technologies, and humanist forms and formats that dominate scholarly knowledge creation today, with the aim of performing these differently, in more horizontal, equal, and diverse ways.

Framing OA publishing as an active doing results in a more holistic understanding of its scope. Such a scope goes beyond a focus on the mere techno-legal and financial mediation of research *outputs* and on the consumption of knowledge. Rather, it expands towards the broader ways in which research is made sense of, written-up, and published. It invites a critical re-evaluation of common scholarly practices of knowledge creation and circulation – to include cultural, linguistic, and epistemic issues and questions, such as who is allowed to contribute to knowledge creation and sharing, how, in which language, and on whose terms.

A politics of OA publishing, according to critical OA advocates, is situational, relational, and interventionist. It insists on a bottom-up approach to democratisation in which the experiences of different communities, as well as differences and plurality among knowledge cultures, ways of knowing, and ways of creating and distributing knowledge are recognised and respected. This differs from a liberal theorising of OA publishing's democratic potential, which draws on a positivist interpretation of humanist principles by essentialising and universalising science and knowledge as *a priori* democratic.

Openness, as conceived of by critical OA advocates, is relational, situated, and performative. It is, as I argued, inherently related to an expanded notion of accessibility – or having the ability and agency to imagine and perform OA publishing differently, in potentially more equal and just ways.

In the next chapter, I discuss the more practical implications of this shift in focus of OA publishing. What does such a shift imply for conventional processes and practices of knowledge creation and sharing, as well as for a potentially different understanding of the responsibilities, workflows, and relationships that support these publishing processes and practices?

Chapter 8: Critical OA Publishing: Experiments in Knowledge Production

In the twenty-first century, many critical OA scholars have been involved in setting up and supporting scholar-led, community-led, or university presses and publishing initiatives as part of their engagement with OA publishing. Contemporary examples include initiatives for digital publishing such as RavenSpace and presses such as Open Humanities Press, and Open Book Publishers.[72] These all support collaborative experiments with the forms, formats, processes, and practices of knowledge creation and sharing. These experiments include: First, redistributing the technologies that scholarly knowledge production relies on, for example by using open source software and platforms such as hypothes.is or PubPub. Second, challenging existing liberal humanist copyright regimes and established ways of publishing research, including the notions of individual authorship, originality, and the ownership of research that these copyright regimes are based on (for example, by focusing on extending interactions around books through open peer review, social annotations, or collaborative writing and editing). Third, questioning notions of the book as fixed (for example, through processual or multi-modal publications). And fourth, re-performing the technological, structural, and organisational challenges around the funding, production, circulation, discovery, reuse, and archiving of experimental OA books and texts (Adema, 2015, 2019, 2021; Adema & Moore, 2018; Deville, 2021; COPIM, 2021, 2022).

As I elaborated in the previous chapter by discussing critical OA publishing as a doing, these interventions cannot be considered as purely aesthetic or formal. Rather, these interventions entail a critique of the ideological, socio-political, economical, and institutional publishing apparatus as well as the dominant (humanist) norms and conventions of knowledge production this apparatus has been interrelated with. In this chapter, I aim to investigate how far is this critique can be considered as part of an antagonistic gesture that is similar to the pre-digital practices of early anti-colonial, proto-feminist, and Womanist initiatives I discussed in chapter 6. In order to do so, I introduce three experimental publications emerging in the context of critical OA advocacy. Additionally, I analyse how these books make an important contribution to global knowledge equity and diversity in the context of (OA) publishing today. The three cases I look at are: First, *As I Remember It: Teachings (ʔəms taʔaw) from the Life of a Sliammon Elder* (2018), the first publication of the initiative

[72] Scholar-led presses such as Mattering Press, African Minds, Tuwhera, or Open Humanities Press often are part of scholar- and community-led systems and infrastructures for critical OA publishing such as the Radical Open Access Collective.

RavenSpace, an interactive multi-media book on the basis of a previous hardcover book[73] that shares teachings presented by the ɬaʔamɩn[74] Elder and knowledge keeper Elsie Paul. The book was co-written and co-edited by Elsie Paul, an elder of the Sliammon, or Tla'amin First Nation; Harmony Johnson, who has served in a number of policy and executive roles in British Columbia First Nations organiSations, and the communication specialist Davis McKenzie (the granddaughter and -son of Elsie Paul); and Paige Raibmon who is a history professor at the University of British Columbia (UBC). Second, *Ecological Rewriting: Situated Engagements with the Chernobyl Herbarium,* a book-length response – based on a collaborative re-writing by a group of scholars located at the Universidad Ibéroamericana in Mexico City under the lead of Gabriela Méndez Cota – to the OA book *The Chernobyl Herbarium. Fragments of an Exploded Cousciousness* (Marder & Tondeur, 2016) published by Open Humanities Press (OHP)[75] under a CC BY licence that ensures that the authors of the original work are credited. *Ecological Rewriting* has been developed in collaboration with Open Humanities Press (OHP) and COPIM's Experimental Publishing working group (in which I have been involved as a Research Fellow) as part of its *Combinatorial Books: Gathering Flowers* Pilot Project. The pilot project has been established as a book series sitting under OHP's *Living/Liquid Books* series edited by Janneke Adema, Simon Bowie, Gary Hall, and myself. *Ecological Rewriting*, the first book in this series, has been published in Spring 2023 (Open Humanities Press (n.d.(a)). Third, the "Open Science Manifesto," a pamphlet in which collaborative writing was used as a methodology for consensus-building among different communities. Writing the manifesto, involved twelve researcher-practitioner teams from different countries in the Global South collaborating within OCSDNet. They were supported by a team of four external advisors, the network Coordination Team consisting of the principal investigator Leslie Chan, and four research associates: two associates from Latin America based in Toronto, an associate from Canada based in South Africa, and an associate from the US based in Kenya.

Various open source publishing tools, technologies, software, and platforms that have recently been developed – Manifold, PubPub, Scalar, and hypothes.is, for example – offer humanities scholars

[73] Paul, E., Raibmon, P., & Johnson, H (2014). *Written as I Remember It: Teachings (ʔəms taʔaw) from the Life of a Sliammon Elder.* UBC Press.

[74] The ɬaʔamɩn, or Sliammon, First Nation have been part of the Coast Salish indigenous peoples of the western coast of Canada since ancient times. The publication approximates the Sliammon way of writing, for example ɬaʔamɩn (or Tla'amin) for Sliammon. However, in the context of this thesis, I will go with the English terminology and the correspondent spelling only, except for direct quotes.

[75] Open Humanities Press was founded by Paul Ashton, Gary Hall, Sigi Jöttkandt, and David Ottina in 2006 as an independent volunteer initiative to promote open access scholarship in journals and books and explore new forms of scholarly communication (Open Humanities Press, n.d.(b)). It understands itself, as Gary Hall describes, as a "network of interlacing scholarly communities whose various activities make up the publishing collective" (Adema et al. 2021). As he continues: "While all of these communities are relatively small in size, each operates according to its own scale and schedule, retaining its particular intellectual identity, approach and manner of working".

enhanced opportunities to facilitate more accessible, diverse, and horizontal knowledge exchanges. They have the potential to establish a dialogue between different communities, knowledges, and ways of knowing. Publishing platforms such as PubPub allow for collaborative writing, editing, and reviewing that can happen in parallel at different stages of a project. These are a challenge to individualistic humanist authorship regimes. However, besides opportunities for knowledge equity and diversity, as I discuss in this chapter, there are also several challenges that emerge in the digital spaces and practices this chapter revolves around: employing open source technologies on their own is not enough to support further knowledge equity and diversity. Therefore, in the second and third parts of this chapter, I ask: what are additional requirements in the facilitation of diverse and equal participation in digitally mediated processes and practices of knowledge production in a way that is attentive to possible socio-cultural, behavioural, and linguistic barriers that might endanger such a participation? And what possible socio-cultural and methodological adaptations to established editorial and publishing workflows and new methodologies and methods for community facilitation and engagement might be required in this context?

Seizing Control over the Technologies of Knowledge Production

Besides taking control over the governance of the particular infrastructures that can support their work (for example setting up infrastructures such as AmeliCA, by founding networks such as the Radical Open Access Collective, and establishing community-led presses), for many critical OA advocates it is also important to replace proprietary writing and publishing tools and platforms with interoperable open source digital platforms and tools. In doing so, OA moves from the top-down emphasis on broadening access to research output to making a bottom-up change to the means by which research is produced. This is done in *As I Remember it* and *Ecological Rewriting*, two of the three cases my argument in this chapter is based on. *As I Remember it* is hosted on a custom-built version of the open, modular scholar-led publishing platform Scalar that allows scholars to assemble audio-visual, image-based, and textual content from multiple sources and supports more experimental ways of assembling and writing-up digital contents: collaborative authoring, and reader commentary, for example. In the framework of *Ecological Rewriting*, platforms such as PubPub and Manifold were explored. To publish the book, PubPub was used because it could best accommodate the project's publishing and editing workflow. Collaborative writing evolved through open markdown editors such as HackMD, Cryptpad, and HedgeDoc and the open annotation software hypothes.is was used for a bilingual open peer-review and editing process. For meetings the conferencing platform BigBlueButton (BBB) was used. The folders and documents regarding the planning and organisation

of the *Combinatorial Books* Pilot Case were hosted on the storage and collaboration platform Nextcloud.[76]

These experimental book projects as I elaborate in what follows demonstrate that, in principle, open source platforms and tools can support the more collaborative, inclusive, horizontal and equitable processes of knowledge production that critical OA advocates want to promote. The markdown editors HackMD, Cryptpad, and HedgeDoc allow for collaborative writing and enable the export of resulting text to other working environments (including to publishing platforms such as PubPub) and the web based annotation tool hypothes.is can be used to collaboratively and simultaneously annotate online web content. Open source tools and platforms enable everyone to view their source code, and to modify and redistribute it. This in principle allows one to add features and customise open source tools and platforms (as is done in the case of *As I Remember it)*. The collaborative nature of scholarly research and publishing that critical OA advocates aim to bring forward for them also tends to extend to the technological set-up and development of the projects themselves. In other words, what becomes visible again here is a shift of focus from the mere accessibility to and *consumption* of the research outputs to the governance of the technological means of scholarly knowledge *production*.

Experimenting with open source technologies is both important and becoming more difficult in a context where many larger presses have purchased expensive proprietary editorial and workflow management systems as well as multi-channel publishing software. One of these systems is the scientific publication workflow management tool Aries Systems that was bought by Elsevier in 2018 and is used by publishers forming part of the RELX Group, Taylor & Francis, DeGruyter, and Springer (Aries Systems Corporation, n.d.). Systems such as Aries tend to work via standardised workflows that are only accessible and adaptable by management and editorial staff. This disables experimentation with more horizontal and inclusive collaborative processes such as the ones critical OA advocates are striving to realise. Furthermore, proprietary editing and publishing systems are generally not very flexible or adaptable to diverse working contexts (Adema & Kiesewetter, 2022). For example, they might only allow restricted input and output file formats (such as ods, doc, or md) which makes their export to and implementation in different working environments – including other documents, websites, or publications – difficult (COPIM, 2022). Similarly, seemingly open and collaborative proprietary platforms such as Google Docs are only open, collaborative, and modular to a certain extent. Google Docs allows for an easy integration (without having to write code) with other

[76] The use of open source tools and platforms in Higher Education institutions (including at Coventry University one of the partners in the COPIM project), often requires intricate negotiations with the institution itself. Often these negotiations evolve around issues of data security and privacy: the proprietary closed source software and tools used by many HE institutions are often preferred as they are already embedded within established data security protocols.

proprietary systems such as the project management and messaging service Slack, the task organising software Trello, and Microsoft 365 Excel, which makes it easy for users to assemble sets of interoperable proprietary solutions. Yet, while it is clear that the user's side of Google Docs consists of Web applications enhanced by the popular Javascript programming language, beyond this only people within Google know how the system supporting Google Docs works (Strickland, n.d.). This prevents users from shaping it. As a result, Google Docs as "as a piece of software …. is proprietary, cloud based, not installable/deployable, and hardly modular or interoperable" (COPIM, 2022).

Many open source apps, platforms and tools are set up in an antagonistic position to these corporate solutions. However, a differentiation between open source applications is to be made, as critical OA advocates emphasise (COPIM, 2022; Maxwell et al., 2019; Chang et al., 2007). For example, one must distinguish between "software packages and hosted solutions, and between the commercial, not-for-profit, and other underlying business models (e.g., institutional support) that support these services or platforms" (COPIM, 2022). To make such a distinction is important because the development of open source software comes with a diversity of business models geared at solving the challenge of being sustainable while providing software licensed free of charge. Furthermore, many large corporations have adopted open source tools and platforms and have built proprietary software on top of them. Examples include how IBM contributes to the Linux open source ecosystem, while selling software that is running on Linux's open source core.

Against this background, the COPIM project states that they limit their "selection to those tools that have been made available as self-hostable packages under the premise of open, permissible licensing (e.g., GPL, Apache 2.0). We also highlight the underlying value system and modus operandi chosen by each of the tools so as to make visible the features that may prove conducive for inclusion in a curated selection of such tools, as we seek to do in the COPIM project" (COPIM, 2022). Additionally, the tools used within COPIM are interoperable and modular because "many interesting experiments happen (both in digital scholarship and publishing) when using and combining different tools together in new ways" (COPIM, 2022).

In relation to considerations like these, Worthington (2015) describes his work with the now inactive, community-based Hybrid Publishing Consortium[77] as much as a political issue (an activity antagonistic to the corporate enclosure of both content and infrastructure) as a technical one (collaboratively building and sharing software and infrastructures that could advance such a politics). Worthington, while emphasising the need for experimenting with alternative technologies, hints at potential issues that can emerge from using open source solutions, especially regarding the

[77] A research network that focused on building public open source software infrastructures for transmedia publishing, while connecting and supporting existing platforms and development communities.

governance of open source technologies in relation to preservation and archiving. Unlike proprietary or commercial software (where the maintenance of backups and long-term storage is often done by the hosting provider), self-hosted open source solutions can place the labour related to archiving and preservation on the user. However, as Simon Bowie and I have written elsewhere (2022), "open source software often makes it easier to export data from its databases in a wide variety of formats so using open source may mitigate some of the risks of using proprietary software since the user is usually able to export their data and store it long-term in whatever way they choose."

It additionally needs to be taken into account when working with open source solutions that, as Tara McPherson (2020) points out, collaborators, including authors, reviewers, and copyeditors, may be alienated by the technical requirements connected to the use of open source technologies. In other cases, they might be overwhelmed by the possibilities that experimentation offers. Against this background, COPIM researchers in the *Combinatorial Books* Pilot Project have shared existing user guidelines provided on the platforms in use or have created new ones, they have engaged in one to one tutorials, and they have pre-tested different applications to find out which application fits a specific book and the communities involved best. In order to facilitate the uptake of already existing open source solutions, COPIM researchers have further provided an overview of open source solutions that support horizontal and collaborative OA book publishing and guidance for their implementation and use.[78]

As Sonal Zaveri (2020) discusses – even in cases in which concerns about the accessibility and usability of open source technologies in use in the context of a specific (publishing) project are attended to – "the inherent social structures that fuel …. [digital collaboration] are often not addressed adequately" (87). For example, the power and responsibility of the decision-maker (such as the project or discussion leader or the initiator of a collaboration) is often not acknowledged enough. As Zaveri emphasises, "who creates knowledge, how it is created, with whom it is shared, and for what depends on who is doing the decision-making" (2020: 95). Neglecting the power dynamics between the host and participants, Zaveri argues, can lead, often implicitly, to privileging the knowledge of some people over others. Furthermore, while open source platforms tend to challenge commercial players that act as gatekeepers to access and use, cultural, social, linguistic, and epistemic factors are not addressed in these considerations: Remy Kalir and Anto Garcia (2019) remark that (besides the lack of agency or skills) historically grown socio-cultural norms and biases may also restrict who can actually use and modify open source platforms and tools and take part in the collaborative interactions evolving through them (for example through co-writing, -editing, and -

[78] See the *Books Contain Multitudes* report (2020, 2022) published on the COPIM website or the *Experimental Publishing Compendium* that will be released in 2023, for example.

review). These factors can include insecurities of non-native English speakers in exchanges dominated by native speakers; a perceived inferiority of more embodied, experimental, and experiential knowledges and ways of knowing versus “factual” scientific knowledges and ways of knowing; and behavioural patterns related to gender, class, and race hierarchies perpetuated by participants in online exchanges.

By taking over the governance over the infrastructures and technologies of knowledge production and sharing, critical OA scholars, as I elaborated in this subchapter, to carve out alternative spaces to establish a certain independence from the contemporary commercial and tendentially neo-colonial and neo-imperialist enclosures of scholarly knowledge production. Doing so allows them, similarly to their pre-digital counterparts, to facilitate, for example within experimental book projects, a possibility for scholars to perpetually and antagonistically intervene into the publishing norms and conventions, forms and formats that dominate practices of knowledge production today, for example into prevalent humanist fixtures. However, the technologies used in this context imply concrete risks regarding the practices of self-organisation, collaboration, inclusivity, diversity, and horizontality that critical OA advocates have pushed forward as part of their politics; and they pose specific challenges for the renegotiation and reperformance of openness, accessibility, and participation in established ways of knowledge production and sharing.

How do OA advocates deal with the challenges posed in this context? And how do they do so in support of knowledge equity and diversity? I discuss these questions below. I do so in reference to the three experimental book projects that I briefly introduced at the beginning of this chapter.

Experimenting with Books

Experimentation with books in critical OA projects has evolved around a preoccupation with different aspects of scholarly knowledge production. Most of these projects focus on one specific issue, such as challenging possessive and singular authorship or copyright by focusing on extending interactions around books through open peer review, social annotations, or collaborative writing and editing, for example. One way to look at this is that changing one of the aspects of the way in which knowledge is produced "implies change across the entirety of the way we work" (Fitzpatrick, 2011, 4). For example, as I discussed previously, prevalent possessive authorship and copyright models are intrinsically related to the idea of the book or the text as fixed and static. Therefore, experiments with authorship functions and practices often also entail experimenting with more open publication formats such as versioned and processual publications. Furthermore, engaging in more relational and open forms of publishing might entail rethinking the linear and sequential tasks, the standardised workflows, and common relationalities (for example, between publishers, authors, editors, reviewers, and developers) that constitute academic writing, research, and publishing. In this sense, it can be said that that content and form are entangled and infrastructure is never neutral (Eyman & Ball, 2014; Helms, 2018; COPIM, 2022).

Several book experiments in the context of critical OA publishing start from an experiment with multi-media forms and formats included in books. The print and digital publication *As I Remember It,* which I discuss in depth in what follows, contains textual, photographic, video, and audio content. At the centre of this multi-media book is Elsie Paul and her vision to produce an interactive and non-linear account of Sliammon knowledge and teachings that future generations could draw upon, rather than an archival document and resource.

Other book experiments conducted by critical OA scholars have addressed the interactions with existing books published under an open licence,[79] among others through re-use, remix, rewriting, or versioning, as a means of generating different or new responses to them. Examples include the *Living/Liquid* book series published by OHP that COPIM's *Combinatorial Books: Gathering Flowers* Pilot Project and *Ecological Rewriting: Situated Engagements with the Chernobyl Herbarium* (the second case I discuss in this chapter). The books this series consists of are "living" in the sense that they are "open to ongoing collaborative processes of writing, editing, updating, remixing and

[79] The nature and potential of a subsequent (interventionist) engagement with openly accessible publications is an element that within OA publishing often remains unspecified or limited to aspects such as citation and replication (for example of images or data) (Mounce, 2022). This is the case even though, for example, CC BY licenses explicitly allow repurposing and remixing as long as the author of a source text or image is explicitly mentioned.

commenting by readers" (OHP., n.d.). In reference to *Combinatorial Books*, Adema, Hall, and Méndez Cota (2021) state, "by focusing specifically on the reuse of existing OA books, this pilot moves from interacting with these books through, for example, annotating them, to collaboratively creating new combinatorial books in response to them."

Further experimental book projects done by critical OA advocates have addressed collaborative writing as a methodology for consensus-building among different communities. Such an approach is exemplified by the third case I focus on in this chapter, the "Open Science Manifesto." This pamphlet figured as a catalyst for enabling a conversation among the many stakeholders of OCSDNet situated in different locations and disciplines in- and outside of academia.

Ecological Rewriting

To define the nature and scope of their re-writing, the authors of *Ecological Rewriting: Situated Engagements with the Chernobyl Herbarium*, which engages in a collaborative re-writing of Marder's and Tondeur's *The Chernobyl Herbarium*, used hypothes.is to annotate the PDF of *The Chernobyl Herbarium* available on OHP's website. In a collaborative writing pad (on HedgeDoc) they ordered and categorised their annotations using tags and started to write out their annotations into a larger response. For this response, each author elaborated a singular way to engage with Marder's and Tondeur's book through rewriting and reflecting on questions such as what of the Chernobyl event remains today, in a country like Mexico? These engagements with the *Chernobyl Herbarium's* style of assembling personal memories and meditations allowed the authors to develop a more creative and testimonial register in their own academic writing and thinking habits. As Méndez Cota et al (2023) remark in the book: "rather than being pre-planned as a critical programme, our articulation of a *situated* reuse and rewriting of *The Chernobyl Herbarium* materialized gradually through the collaborative process of becoming experimental writers or 'rewriters'. At the same time, while we may have decided not to apply any pre-given method or strategy of artistic disruption or critical appropriation to a work we had chosen because it invited us to attune affectively with the fundamental fragility of existence, we nevertheless tried to reuse and rewrite it in a way that conveyed our respect and appreciation for the work of the others involved."

This response went through an open and collaborative editing, peer review, and publishing process on PubPub (once again using hypothes.is), where it has been published as a bilingual publication in 2023. For those readers wanting to retrace the publishing process, links between different versions and stages of the project have been included in the "final" publication (Adema & Kiesewetter, 2022b). These are, for example, bi-directional links between the source-text PDF and

the author's responses on PubPub (using hypothes.is and PubPub's annotation function); or links between the responses and the HedgeDoc pad containing the authors' discussions on the nature of re-writing.

The more conceptual or creative register of fragmentation the authors experimented with, as Gabriela Méndez Cota et al. (2023) write, refers to the poetic complexity of the assemblage process highlighting the wider possibilities to think, in academic practice, collectivity or "community" itself. In this context, the authors positioned their rewriting not as appropriation, but – in reference to a concept coined by the Mexican scholar and poet Cristina Rivera Garza (2013, 2020) – as a *disappropriation,* or *unworking* (Adema et al., 2021; Adema & Kiesewetter, 2022). As part of this unworking, the authors strived to expose "the incomplete, processual nature of any text" and its inherently collaborative nature (Adema et al., 2021). Experimenting with more collaborative forms of scholarship and with the technologies that can support such an experiment – as well as fostering spaces in which that experimentation can happen – is important today because many digital works continue to be published as "whole" and finished works. This is, as Adema (2015) emphasises, partially due to the prevailing idea that having a stable text (formatted, for example, as a PDF) allows for easy retrieval and unified reading experiences. Additionally, the prevalent humanist author function (relating on notions such as originality, authority, and impact) tends to overshadow the inherently collaborative and multi-authorial nature of books and scholarship.

Acknowledging the plural and collaborative quality of text extends beyond collaborative authorship. It includes, among others, also a writer's peers and teachers; as well as the publisher, editor, designer, reviewer, and the reader of a book (not counting in, in this list, the non-human (for example, technological) agencies forming part of publishing). In *Ecological Rewriting* this plural aspect was accounted for also in an experiment with open peer-review using, again, hypothes.is (Adema & Kiesewetter, 2022). Each fragment of the book was assigned to an external reviewer identified to the author(s) who could respond to the reviewers comments in hypothes.is in the course of the reviewing process. To mitigate the risk of power imbalances (for example, many of the reviewers occupied higher academic positions than the authors) or bullying, a code of conduct, as well as contextual and technical guidelines outlining the interactions were provided by the editors who also acted as moderators of the horizontal conversation between reviewers and authors. As Skains (2020) points out (in reference to the example of open annotation) experiments like these are important because, among humanities scholars, there is lack of engagement and horizontal interaction around texts in a more active, collaborative, and potentially more inclusive way. This is related, as Skains (2020) argues, to an academic culture in which "fears about being 'scooped', about

blowback, about domineering commenters, and lack of time coalesce to result in extremely poor participation in this emerging form of discourse."

Publishing *Ecological Rewriting* did not only allow the publisher and the editors but also the authors of the book to engage with a more conscious and dedicated consideration of the micro-power structures embedded in prevalent forms of academic knowledge creation. The fragmentary, situated, and personal way of writing the authors engaged in during *Ecological Rewriting*, has been important in the context of a Mexican culture of academic knowledge production, in which, as Méndez Cota et al. (2023) point out, a cultivation of testimonial writing, in certain contexts, can perform critically as resistance to schooling or forced training into abstract voices that compete for individual authority in a given disciplinary hierarchy.

As critical editors or publishers of OA books, the facilitation of spaces in which such a questioning, interrogation, and resistance to dominant academic cultures can happen, is important for knowledge equity and diversity. It allows to address questions about the nature of what is widely considered valid knowledge or about what the "valid" ways of "writing up" this knowledge are, how they came about and to whose cost. It also makes it possible to demonstrate that practices such as writing and editing are important sites of struggle for the right to take part in knowledge creation, on one's own terms and to perform scholarly knowledge production beyond the myth of the academic scholar as a rational genius, and measurable subject.

Enacting more social and open ways of performing humanities scholarship and its relationalities, while experimenting with open source tools that could support this engagement, requires the adaption of more conventional editing and publishing workflows (Adema et al., 2022; Bowie et al., 2022). Therefore, as part of *Combinatorial Books: Gathering Flowers*, as I discuss next, the editors of *Ecological Rewriting* have been experimenting with and developing an editorial and publishing workflow that enables the creation of new books out of existing OA books.

Designing technical, editorial, and publishing workflows for *Ecological Rewriting* enabled the editors to reflect "on how to develop situated practices of community-care, building, and interaction for the various agencies involved in this specific publication" (Adema & Kiesewetter, 2022; Kiesewetter, 2022). This process also helped them think about how these elements – responding to and accommodating a shape-shifting, multi-agential, and open-ended publishing process – sit in relation to more standardised and established online book production, distribution, and preservation systems, including the ones OHP, the publisher of this book, has been employing (Adema et al., 2022; Bowie et al., 2022). As mentioned previously, *Ecological Rewriting* involved working with a multi-lingual group of authors, editors, reviewers, and publishers situated in different disciplinary and

geographical locations (Kiesewetter, 2022). Additional relations with technologists and developers, as well as platform developers and hosts were engendered through the use of the various open source tools and platforms that were experimented with as part of the publication process. This included ongoing conversations (for example, regarding possible adaption and further developments of these tools and platforms) with the providers of these tools and platforms and drawing on the resources available for their users (Adema & Kiesewetter, 2022).

This collaboration required various efforts with (non-linguistic) translation and negotiation. For example, regarding the conceptual framing of the book and its technological set-up and design (to capture the nuances of the relational, contextual, and open-ended nature of Méndez Cota's and her co-writers' work and to make sure the skill-sets of the involved authors and reviewers were responded to); regarding the drawbacks and possible adaptions to be made to the tools and platforms used; regarding the writing, editing, reviewing, and publishing practices and expectations and how these might need to be adapted to these tools and platforms to support the open-endedness and fluidity of *Ecological Rewriting*; [80] and regarding the planning of the work in a way that accommodated the different schedules of authors and editors working in different institutions and, consequently, having to make space for work on the publication within their schedules (Adema & Kiesewetter 2022; Kiesewetter, 2022).

Within the workflows employed, the editors wanted to consciously make space for and facilitate such negotiations. Consequently, the workflows they designed had to be modular, flexible, and recursive. This included overseeing, making transparent, and continuously adapting the publishing end editorial timelines and workflows in direct exchange with the communities involved (Adema & Kiesewetter, 2022). For example, in the workflow that was eventually developed, copy-editing and peer review can happen at various stages of the evolving project to ensure this happens at the points most useful for the authors and for the project itself. Furthermore, the open peer review process developed for this project and the various guidelines provided around it were "focused around ongoing guidance, (over-) communication to, and conversations with the authors and reviewers, ensuring that these various groups remain informed and engaged around the project" (Adema & Kiesewetter, 2022).

In this project, much of the communication of the editors with the authors around workflows, timelines, and peer-review went through the lead author, Gabriela Méndez Cota. This allowed sharing some of the responsibility and workload as editors, but it also put strain on the lead author as a mediator (Adema & Kiesewetter, 2022; Kiesewetter, 2022). Therefore, while a perpetual process of

[80] For example PubPub, the platform on which editing and revisions happened, does not offer colour-coded track changes, such as more familiar co-writing environments such as Google Docs do. PubPub also offers less features than the editors originally hoped for example, initial ideas to have a randomised, shape-shifting chapter structure had to be dismissed during the publishing process.

translating, mediating, and negotiating ideas, concepts, and inputs is especially important for supporting the kind of experimental, more horizontal, and potentially more inclusive collaboration, the labour that comes with this kind of community involvement needs to be acknowledged and addressed too. The researchers on the COPIM project have tried to partly address this by openly sharing, for example, on the COPIM blog (Adema et al., 2022; Bowie et al., 2022) and within the *Experimental Publishing Compendium*, workflows that help distribute and simplify this labour as much as possible. Furthermore, in a series of multimedia blogposts published on the COPIM blog, reflections on the experiences and findings, inhibitions and potentials encountered in the process of developing and implementing *Ecological Rewriting* and accompanying workflows, have been shared.

As I Remember It

As I Remember it is divided into four chapters, each assembling multiple write-ups, images, videos, and audio entries: stories, or teachings, that were told orally by Elsie Paul. These teachings were recorded with the assistance of several friends and family members of Paul, and then were translated and written up by the co-editors/co-authors Paige Raibmon and Harmony Johnson in exchange with Paul. Additional chapters share extensive conceptual and theoretical resources, reflections of the co-editors/co-authors on the writing process, as well as materials documenting the publication's making, for example, the pre-publication review sessions within Sliammon communities. The publication is to be read in a non-linear, meandering fashion, enabling the reader to go back and forth between written, audio, image, and video content, the narrative parts of the publication, and those containing contextual information. The scholar-led platform Scalar, implemented by RavenSpace into their editing and publishing workflows, supports these experimental forms and formats of assembling, writing-up digital, and conveying knowledges.

As I discussed previously, certain indigenous knowledges and ways of knowing are embodied, relational, and performative; in order to persist and evolve they must be lived: in the case of *As I Remember it,* by the reader of the publication. By inviting different paths into what is to be read, listened to, and watched, *As I Remember it* acts performatively upon the reader and vice versa. Rather than aiming to persist on an authoritative, exhaustive, and representative account of the Sliammon culture, truth, and knowledge, it provides an open-ended, patchy resource to be performed, reperformed, and lived by each reader anew. Indigenous knowledge is considered communal knowledge that is collectively stewarded. Consequently, the book opens with an interactive invitation to the reader in form of a pop-up window. It calls the reader to act responsibly

by following the Sliammon guest-host protocol which contextualises the Traditional Knowledge (TK) labels applied to the publication.[81] As the text in the pop-up window states: The responsibility of the reader is to, during their visit to the publication, "abide by ɬaʔamın laws…. As our guest, we welcome you to take a moment to identify your intentions and to confirm your understanding and willingness to abide by ɬaʔamın protocol."

By making use of the capabilities of digital publishing, by including non-linear multi-media content and by including context-specific TK Labels, *As I Remember it* does make an important contribution to knowledge equity and diversity in the context of scholarly knowledge production. In doing this it shows in an exemplary way how digital publishing platforms can be used to remediate living and community-stewarded indigenous knowledges that are embodied, relational, living and often oral and visual. As Cullen and Bell point out, today – especially when it comes to indigenous forms of knowledge, knowing, and conveying these knowledges – "there is a pressing need for this different kind of publishing, both for collaborative authorship and for more flexible, interactive publications" (2018: 198). This is the case because, as these researchers stress, conventional publishing processes are still often based on historical humanist fixtures such as liberal humanist understandings of copyright, single authorship, and the fixed, bound book (after which PDFs and ebooks often are modelled). This condition, as they stress, reinstates "old authorial hierarchies and the limitations of the printed book" (198).

Publishing this book involved engagement across knowledge cultures, knowledges, and ways of knowing and engendered "a kind of collaboration among authors, editors, and technical staff that is quite different from the traditional publishing process" (Wittenberg 2009, 37). As I discuss in what follows, in *As I remember it*, the common narrow definition of these functions as separated tasks succeeding in a sequential manner has been rethought along the lines of more inclusive, diverse, and horizontal collaboration. Working on *As I Remember it*, consequently, has involved a reconsideration of editor and authorship roles and the tasks performed as part of them, as well as the relationship between them.

The ways in which the texts and the narrative of *As I Remember it* is structured, have been based on Elsie Paul's vision. This meant that the author-editors Raibmon, Johnson, and McKenzie had to develop the book through a process of close collaborative writing (transmitted in oral and textual

[81] TK Labels are digital markers for Indigenous cultural heritage that have been developed by the Local Context organisation in collaboration with indigenous communities. TK Labels are an alternative to popular attributing open licenses (for example CC BY) in which the book or the text and the author are inextricably interrelated. In this context, Hall (2016) argues that common CC BY licenses (that require attribution) afford *too much* control and thus imply a humanist take on intellectual property rather than a fundamental critique of it. TK Labels instead define nuanced, complex, and situated stewardship protocols for attribution, access, closure, and use rights of Indigenous cultural heritage, and they can be customised to cater to the requirements of different communities.

forms) together with and not about (or in absence) of Paul (Raibmon, 2014, 2018). This implied for the author-editors partially waiving control over structuring, editing, introducing, interpreting, and publishing. Their aim, consequently, has "not been to produce something that critics might approve in postmodern jargon as a multivocal, culturally pluralist synecdoche for remediated colonial power imbalances. Instead, we sought above all to ensure that both our means and end aligned with Chi-chia's [Elsie Paul's] vision. This approach required us to revisit our plans frequently and to consult with Chi-chia regularly. That said, we played decisive roles in composing this text, and we do not shirk our responsibility as coauthors" (Raibmon, 2014, 13).

Elsie Paul's decision to narrate the stories in English has been the result of a "difficult, even painful, cost-benefit analysis" in the name of accessibility, towards community members, activists, and scholars alike. As Raibmon explains, this decision has been made together with Paul who is convinced that the "reality of the loss of Sliammon as a mother tongue, the history and teachings narrated in English can be carried forward as a kind of proxy: [as Elsie Paul states:] 'But even if our children don't speak the language fluently as my grandparents did, I think as long as they know the history, as long as they know …that we come from a rich history – this is the *true* history of our people" (2014:18). Nonetheless, several stories in the book are narrated in the Sliammon language and in English, in a bilingual format that, in its English version, both retains the Sliammon syntax and style and highlights its differences to English (this approach is, in the book, discussed in a contextualising section).

Paul and her family, early in the process expressed an interest in participating in the representation of the Sliammon tradition in written form. Several audio recordings and draft manuscripts were produced collaboratively with Paul and her family. The co-writers-editors decided to develop the transcripts in close relation to the oral account, keeping the syntax, oral markers, and narrative structure of the storytelling intact. The transcription was done by the poet Marguerite Pigeon who "captured the sound of … [Paul's] voice beautifully" (Raibmon, 2014, 22). Collaboratively, the author-editors then went through the transcripts trying to establish a chapter structure and textual arrangements, intersecting with one another in multiple ways, for example through hyperlinks.

The publication of this book has engendered specific (new) agencies and social relations, for example, with Paul's family members and Pigeon who all inhabited a position in-between traditional author, editor, or translator roles. The process of making *As I Remember it* also entailed a blurring of these roles, especially regarding the function of the editor. Raibmon, similarly to Anzaldúa and the early anti-colonial storytellers (whose work I discussed in chapter 6), performed the function of the shaman: a translator between worlds of meaning. In the foreword to the publication, Raibmon (2018) discussions this function in relation to her own settler-colonial positionality. For example, she

talks about the necessity of active and open-ended listening as an act of reconciliation and, connected to that, the willingness to learn and unlearn. This kind of engagement, for her, depends on the ability to deviate from both a certainty about one's own (settler-colonial) knowledges and ways of knowing, as well as resisting the urge to over-identify with an indigenous narrator: "However moving a particular … account might be, it cannot grant me knowledge of what it was like to be in the narrator's shoes. To assume otherwise invokes a false equivalency that diminishes the particularities of the narrator's experience." To illustrate this precondition as the basis from which transformation can happen, Raibmon (2018) recounts:

> I heard again and again that "teachings" were somehow crucial to this book, even if I did not fully understand how. I came to think of them existing alongside the "history" that the book narrated. I realized my categories of understanding left me short ... To understand teachings *as* history, rather than a category of timeless knowledge *separate from* history, reveals that Elsie holds a worldview that positions past, present, culture, and knowledge in quite different relation to one another than the disciplinary-bound view I learned in school. It reveals alternative metrics of historical significance and ethical judgment. Indigenous individuals who share their testimony – whether as formal evidence to a commission or court, or as personal narrative to a public audience – offer listeners an important gift. They offer an *opportunity* for transformational listening. Whether we, the audiences who bear witness, actually *receive* that gift depends very much on the particular way that we listen.

In conclusion to the above, trans-cultural and trans-epistemic collaboration, involving both communities in- and outside of academia, requires self-reflexivity regarding the scholar's own entanglements with scholarship and scholarly practice. This self-reflexivity might imply partially waiving control over editorial decisions regarding, for example, structuring a publication or selecting content; it might imply deviating from conventional knowledges and ways of knowing, or from what is considered and appraised as an academically valid output. Furthermore, self-reflexivity involves critically reflecting on the new potential closures enacted through (experimental) publishing undertakings (Danyi, 2014; Kember, 2014a, b).

Open Science Manifesto

The process of writing the "Open Science Manifesto,", as Denisse Albornoz et al. elaborate, "became an overarching methodology in our practice – a system of methods that enabled us to constantly pay

attention, monitor, and evaluate the myriad of research practices, working styles, interactions, relationships and power dynamics that are taking place across the network" (2017: 297). In other words, the process of making the "Manifesto" allowed the members and coordinators of the OCSDNet to interact, negotiate and get to know each member's interests and motivations. Furthermore, the "Manifesto" became a tool to gain a deeper understanding of the values, findings, and experiences in open science that are driving the thinking and practices of the network members, while allowing the collaborators to collaboratively revise and adapt the assumptions underlying the network's practice as well as the principles emerging from these assumptions.

Albornoz et al. consider the work on the manifesto as instrumental for their understanding of the nature, the challenges, and the potentials of transnational, trans-epistemic, and transcultural collaborative work as performed within the context of the OCSDNet. They discuss how the method of collaborative writing "allowed us to redistribute the narrative power in terms of defining the story we would tell as a collective, from the central OCSDNet coordination team to the network members who are implementing the projects on the ground and thus have a deeper understanding of the different layers of openness" (2017: 299). However, this way of working required the editors to be highly flexible and adaptive regarding their own functions within the project, as well as regarding the workflows, in order to account for ethnolinguistic and cultural barriers and the resulting dynamics among the participants as I discuss below.

The "Open Science Manifesto" illustrates well how the many communities, cultures, locations, and knowledges involved in certain digital publishing projects can be understood through ideas of diaspora (Risam 2019). As Avtar Brah (1996) writes, diaspora "signals the processes of multi-locationality across geographical, cultural, and psychic boundaries" (186). In the case of the manifesto, this is embodied in the different geographical and institutional locations the collaborators are situated in that often differ from these collaborator's geographical, cultural, linguistic, and epistemic origin. However, even though the participants, in writing the manifesto, have shared certain experiences (such as living and working abroad), a shared individual and communal identity, shared aims and visions cannot be presupposed. Rather, these aims and visions, as I discuss next, must be established in concrete, situated, and collaborative (publishing) projects that, like writing the manifesto, often imply intricate and not always consensual negotiations.

Within the first phase of writing the "Open Science Manifesto", the members of OCSDNet were invited to "collectively question and discuss the knowledge ecosystem in their contexts – asking to whom does knowledge belong?; are benefits of science disproportionately concentrated to some privileged groups over others?; who gets to participate in knowledge production processes?; and in what ways can technology be used to increase the agency of more people over scientific knowledge

production?" (Albornoz et al., 2017, 294). These questions were addressed over a year through a series of collective and horizontal consultative mechanisms conducted remotely and online by the network's coordination team. These mechanisms included, among others, formal project reports and position papers, informal group calls, workshops, and collaborative editing sessions that allowed the co-writers to negotiate their and their communities' views on open science and the implications of an open science approach to knowledge creation and communication.

The written outcomes of these common engagements were then ordered by the coordination team by looking for recurrent keywords, themes, and ideas shared among the collaborators. The coordination team's work of ordering and filtering the collaborator contributions was interwoven with feedback sessions. These allowed the co-writers to adapt and further develop the manifesto, and to collaboratively think about a tone, languages, and possible sharing formats that would be able to reflect the collaborative and inclusive spirit of the model for open science that the manifesto proposed.

The data then was consolidated into seven principles that form the final manifesto, while a document was opened in which the twelve teams discussed each principle from their own situated point of view. These discussions then informed the editing and finalising of the manifesto. The various epistemologies – including postcolonial, feminist, and indigenous ways of knowing – ideas, and knowledges that have informed the collaborative work on and the principles shared within the manifesto have been documented and can be retrieved via a collaborative annotated bibliography and reading list shared on the website of OCSDNet. As Albornoz et al. (2017) remark, this reading list is as much a homage to the authors whose works have informed the manifesto as it is a way of making visible the interrelations between social justice scholarship and open science as envisioned within the manifesto. Finally, the manifesto was translated into several languages and multi-modal formats, such as online infographics, videos, printed pamphlets and posters made and distributed in collaboration with various partners to allow diverse communities to join the conversation among "local and global scientific communities" (Albornoz et al., 2017, 297).

However, as Albornoz et al. point out, the participatory nature of the project did not include everyone to the same degree. For example, it was difficult to overcome language and cultural barriers emerging during the collaboration as well as to address the power disparities among the network members, between those situated in Western institutions and those working within non-academic communities. It was also difficult to motivate some of the participants to engage with the collaborative writing process "unless it was part of a mandatory report or as a result of a one-on-one request from the coordination team" (2017: 299), while others struggled to understand how a formalised document such as the manifesto could advance their specific, situated, and practical

objectives. Furthermore, while researchers in North American institutions tended to dominate the conversation, teams who spoke languages that were not spoken by the other collaborators – for example, Russian – were less active.

In consequence to these observations, tasks, collaborative and participatory exercises, and workflows had to be continuously adapted throughout the writing process to account for ethnolinguistic and cultural barriers and the resulting dynamics among the participants. This involved a lot of unexpected labour, involvement, and facilitation on the side of the coordination team. For example, in reaction to their dominant positions, the coordinators tried to minimise their involvement in writing and content creation. They shifted their engagement towards designing and adapting the methods and tools employed and creating possibilities to facilitate the engagement of less "outspoken" or active participants in the drafting process (for example, via one-on-one interviews, e-mail, and conference calls).

As I have shown in this chapter, experimental book projects, allow scholars to break away from the ordering effects of contemporary knowledge production (these are expressed in the way in which publishing is related with career progression, for example) for long enough to imagine and perform a different future for knowledge production that fosters a more open, horizontal, equitable, and diverse participation in (and through) practices and processes of knowledge creation and sharing. Such a participation cannot be predicated on the use of (open source) technologies alone. Rather, what is needed to make such a participation possible is an awareness and active (re)consideration of the socio-cultural structures, behavioural dynamics, linguistic differences, and the potential resulting biases and barriers at play, even if technological concerns (for example, around the use of open source platforms and tools) have been addressed and resolved (Kalir & Garcia, 2019; Zaveri, 2020).

Firstly, taking into consideration that many academic collaborations and exchanges still evolve in relatively narrow confines – for example, between academics in the same institution or the same disciplines, or those speaking the same language – as an initiator, or host, of a collaboration, it is important to consciously facilitate the inclusion of a diverse range of participants . These can include researchers from different academic hierarchy levels, from various disciplines, from in and outside of academia, different languages and regions.

Secondly, while working with diverse communities, as the initiators of the three publishing projects analysed in this chapter stress, it is important to both acknowledge the power position of the host of the meeting as well as the sovereignty and validity of different knowledges and ways of knowing. It is necessary to allow time and space for a more conscious and dedicated consideration of the micro-power structures embedded in prevalent forms of academic knowledge creation, including the humanist fixtures, conventions, and norms still dominantly defining what constitutes valid

knowledge and a meaningful text. Attention also needs to be paid to the social and behavioural micro-choreographies that might dominate (online) collaboration, including the dominance of English language speakers over those who are less fluent. Such a consideration implies, as Raibmon and Albornoz et al. stress, that scholars engage in a more fundamental, self-critical reconsideration of the dominant research cultures, including an awareness of their own involvement with them.

Thirdly, openness and flexibility towards adapting conventional timelines, editing and publishing workflows are required which may necessitate rethinking conventional author and editor functions and the relationalities between them too. Such an openness and flexibility, as *Ecological Rewriting, As I Remember it*, and the "Open Science Manifesto" show, is a precondition for facilitating more equal and diverse conditions in scholarly knowledge creation in the context of OA publishing. This openness and flexibility is necessary to allow for specific ways of knowing and representing knowledge to persist, as it was in the case of *As I Remember it,* where Raibmon had to step back from her own expectations regarding her author function. But it is also necessary to acknowledge and accommodate the skill sets, schedules, and expectations of different participating communities, as it became visible in the case of *Ecological Rewriting,* where the editors developed a modular, flexible, and recursive workflow and a transparent way to make all supporting materials available online. Finally this is needed in order to respond to inequity issues emerging in the publishing process, where in the case of the "Manifesto", a multi-staged writing-consultation-revision process helped to mitigate potential conflicts.

As is evident from the above considerations, these intricate processes cannot always be institutionalised or systematised, as they are highly situated and involve organic, continuously developing relations. Consequently, these processes must be enacted and re-enacted within situated engagements, in different contexts, between different collaborating communities. As I highlighted throughout this thesis, there is still much work to be done to fully explore and facilitate the range of (potentially more equal and diverse) forms, formats, practices of knowledge creation and circulation made possible by open and digital publishing, especially since within OA publishing these processes and practices have tendentially been neglected in favour of a focus on research outputs (Adema & Kiesewetter, 2022).

The marginalisation of critical OA advocacy contributes to the persistent focus on extending access to research outputs within a large part of OA publishing. While the reasons for this marginalisation include that the voices behind prominent approaches to OA "have shouted louder than others" (Moore, 2017) and that the hermeneutical grounding of critical OA publishing has made it less easily adoptable in commercial and large-scale funder and policy driven contexts, there are also other factors that might have contributed to it. One additional reason for the neglect of

approaches suggested within critical OA advocacy might be that engaging in critical, experimental, more horizontal, open, and inclusive ways of doing scholarship requires a whole welter of adaptions to conventional editing and publishing workflows; a self-critical reconsideration of well-rehearsed authorship and editorship functions; as well as time-consuming conversations and negotiations between the different communities involved in publishing processes and the development of new methodologies to facilitate these negotiations.

However, engagements like the ones analysed above continue to be needed in the academic publishing landscape today where publishing oligopolies are continuously extending their control over academic publishing infrastructures (such as databases); outlets (such as journals and books); and the way in which knowledge is created (for example, through writing guidelines and editing processes); and evaluated (for example through metrics and rankings). Engagements like these are needed also in an OA landscape in which, as I discussed in chapter 4, despite a formal commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion (as well as a focus on research output) tends to pre-empt any further consideration of cultural, linguistic, and epistemic barriers to knowledge production and how these are related with the ways scholars practice their research, write-up, and publish their work.

By proposing – based on my considerations in this chapter, as well as chapters 6 and 7 – an interventionist reading methodology (see chapters “Conclusion” and “Postscript”) I exemplify and enact how the participation in the processes and practices of knowledge production can be achieved by minimising the socio-cultural, behavioural, and linguistic barriers to equal and diverse participation in scholarly knowledge production. With this methodology, I add to the facilitation methodologies and methods that I discussed in this chapter and I enable other critical OA scholars to adopt and adapt these within their own work.

Conclusion

Would a PhD thesis without a conclusion still be a PhD thesis? Presumably not. The conclusion is one of the explicit elements that serves to bind a linear text together (Adema, 2015). Crossley (2021) writes that the conclusion is "typically the final major chapter of a … thesis. … it … wraps up the document … [it] tells the reader what they should take away … what you found, why it's valuable, how it can be applied, and what further research can be done." In many cases, as Crossley continues "readers will jump from the introduction chapter directly to the conclusions chapter to get a quick overview of the study's purpose and key findings." In other words: by binding all arguments together by summarising and curtailing them, the conclusion is tying the beginning of the thesis – the introduction – neatly and closely to its ending, the findings. Thus, a conclusion is that which binds a thesis together, "into a 'work' separate from other contents (such as the appendix etc.)" (Adema 2015, 227).

By writing a conclusion for my thesis, I place the cherry on top of the production of myself as an academic scholar that I have performed by writing this dissertation. By writing this conclusion, I am stating and demonstrating both my willingness and ability to fully comply with the norms of how a graduate student is to author a dissertation. By delivering a concluded thesis, I (hopefully) have earned all the institutional and disciplinary credentials of what the UK-based humanities consider to be a "proper academic."

However, as Crossley's considerations reveal, a conclusion is not an ending as a closure: by offering a perspective on how a thesis' findings can be applied and how new research can be conducted based on them, it also connects a text to possible further iterations, incarnations, and versions (authored by myself as well as by others). Once a thesis has reached its conclusion, it does not have to be finished, fixed, or stable. To this effect, the conclusion this thesis ends with, will not be a closure.

This conclusion summarises and re-iterates the main argument that I have made throughout this thesis, namely that enhancing participation in the processes and practices of knowledge production – and seeing this as a necessary part of what should be the goal of OA publishing – is key to facilitating more equitable and diverse conditions.

This conclusion extends outwards by, towards the end of this chapter, offering a glimpse into the experimental reading methodology which I have developed as part of the critical praxis that I discuss in this chapter. This methodology is further contextualised, critically discussed, and documented in the "Postscript" of this thesis, positioned after this conclusionary chapter (the "official end" of this

thesis). This methodology aims to facilitate an increased participation in the processes and practices of knowledge production by means of a set of methods geared at addressing and overcoming some of the socio-cultural, behavioural, and linguistic hurdles that might impede equal and diverse collaboration online.

As I discussed in chapter 8 of this thesis, several critical OA scholars, scholarly organisations, and scholar-led presses have started to explore and experiment with new forms of digital scholarship. These explorations include more collaborative, open, and horizontal forms of collaborative writing, editing, and publishing challenging dominant humanist paradigms such as singular possessive authorship, the unity of author and work, and the fixity of text. Open Source writing and publishing tools can offer scholars enhanced opportunities for fostering more equal and diverse participation in the processes and practices of knowledge production. However, critical OA advocates have also recognised that, additionally, conventional editing and publishing workflows, temporalities, editor- and authorship-functions and divisions of labour have to be reconsidered and adapted and new facilitation methods have to be invented. By documenting their experiments critical OA activists are enabling others to experiment with similar open and horizontal editing and publishing projects, as is the case in the three experimental book publishing projects I analysed in this thesis.

With the reading methodology I propose in this thesis, I aim to contribute to these critical OA experiments (and to the facilitation methods suggested by OA advocates in this context) and enable others who are interested in facilitating more equal and diverse participation in knowledge production to adopt, adapt, and amplify them further. I have developed this methodology to facilitate a diverse and equitable community engagement around digital text in such a way that it can be transferred to other areas of knowledge creation and sharing. One can imagine that the methodology gets adopted and adapted to facilitate collaboration around open notebook publications, previously published books, and book collections, for example. This might be as part of publisher- and library-driven "curatorial" and community building activities around existing texts and books and could involve non-academic participants (such as citizen researchers). But it could also be applied by scholars working with social groups that have been excluded from knowledge production (such as indigenous communities), or by scholars that are interested in critical transnational, trans-epistemic, and trans-cultural forms of writing and publishing.

Yet, as mentioned previously, this thesis also extends outwards in the most literal sense: it does not end with its conclusion. After the conclusion, another chapter follows. A "Postscript," an experimental piece of writing conceived as part of my critical praxis, an ending after the end, an opening after the closing down. This "Postscript" is not part of the actual thesis – that was bracketed off by the introduction and the conclusion – but it is also not a part of an appendix, or a component

of any of this thesis' future incarnations. It is an element that forms part of my developing critical praxis (the process of (re)producing myself as an academic scholar by writing this dissertation) while also opening out towards a perspective beyond (or another facet of) this identity.

Through the "Postscript", I want to make manifest, account for, and contend with the contradictions and doubts that I struggled with while writing this thesis. These are related to the tensions that emerged between the critical and interventionist ambition of my critical praxis and the institutional frameworks and disciplinary expectations I have had to fulfil by delivering this thesis (as a complete and completed argumentation). Specifically, I want to account for the difficulties (or even the impossibility) of generating more equal and just modes of interaction and representation within academic knowledge production, while at the same time performing a humanist version of singular authorship and linear and secluded argumentation as I have done in this thesis. However, by means of the "Postscript," I begin to break through some of these humanist limitations. In the "Postscript," I will share the collaborative insights and feedback generated during *The Re-Reading Room* which I facilitated to enact and test the proposed methodology.

While this conclusion binds the thesis into a whole, into a "work," the "Postscript" partially un-works this work-ness: it loosens ends, frazzles argumentation; pauses, doubts and speculates; offers tentative thoughts (thought by myself and others, and myself-out-of-myself), precarious openings, and new beginnings.

Main Insights

As I have shown in this thesis, the global sphere of academic knowledge production is marked by power disparities. A few commercial players have come to dominate the way publishing is administered and realised globally. These publishers do not only control major publishing infrastructures (such as databases), pricing models (such as article and book processing charges), and (largely English-language) publishing outlets (such as journals). They have also come to define the way in which research is performed, made sense of, written up, and delivered, in what languages and by whom (for example, by stipulating specific editorial guidelines). This system, as I discussed, has a Eurocentric bias. This amounts to institutionalised *testimonial injustice*, which excludes certain communities from participating in global-scale scholarly knowledge production. These exclusions bear neo-colonial and neo-imperialist characteristics: they disproportionally affect researchers from

the Global South, while also marginalising women and researchers from under-funded institutions and research areas.

The ideas that these large commercial publishers base their approaches to publishing on are by no means self-evident. As I have shown, they are rooted in a positivist understanding of humanist epistemologies of science. These epistemologies have historically figured as important means by which to further the advancement of Western and masculinist ways of knowing.

In this thesis, I also showed how many of the large-scale approaches to OA publishing pushed forwards by research institutions, funders, and policy makers alike, do very little to confront this Eurocentric bias and the neo-imperialist patterns of exclusion. Indeed, they often perpetuate and even aggravate these. They do so, on the one hand, by contributing to a normalisation of OA publishing as a top-down mandated system to generate economic and reputational revenue. This normalisation, I contended, has led to a marginalisation or lack of recognition of alternative, critical, community-based, and not-for-profit approaches to OA publishing. This ignorance should be considered as a form of *hermeneutical injustice*, where the ways in which a few global players are understanding and practicing (OA) publishing has increasingly come to serve as the reference for all OA publishing.

Additionally, OA publishing, in its commercial, as well as in some of its various governmental, policy, and funder-driven approaches, has predominantly focused on financially, technologically, and legally expanding access to research *outputs*. Such a focus, as I argued, reflects a humanist vision of knowledge as transcendental and universalist, of texts considered to represent knowledge free of contextual and subjective influences understood as neutral systems of representation rather than, for example, as practices of intervention. Such a focus on research outputs fails to consider questions such as: who gets to speak in scholarly discourse, in which form and format; and in which language? By not addressing these questions, approaches to OA publishing focusing on research outputs run the risk of ignoring cultural, epistemic, as well as linguistic issues of marginalisation at play *in the processes and practices* that are part of knowledge production, specifically in the (humanist) ways in which research is currently being performed, made sense of, written up, and delivered.

As I further discussed in this thesis, many of the democratisation narratives that have emerged around OA publishing also show Eurocentric characteristics. A prime example is found in those narratives that have envisioned a democratic path for OA publishing based on or in close relation with the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI) (2002). As I have shown, these narratives have little potential to contribute towards greater equity and diversity within knowledge production, as they,

similarly to most commercial and funder-based approaches to OA publishing, perpetuate testimonial and hermeneutical injustices. I have pointed out how democratisation narratives, again, have been conceived upon the basis of humanist epistemologies and how they once more focus predominantly on financially, technologically, and legally expanding access to research *outputs*, while perspectives on the cultural, linguistic, and epistemic inequities that are embedded in the ways in which research is made sense of, written up, and delivered, are mostly blocked.

While certain OA narratives based upon the democratisation of knowledge have proliferated widely, the discourses, practices, and politics pushed forward by critical OA advocates have been less acclaimed. These OA advocates, who, as I have described, have formulated their politics on the basis of non-humanist or humanist-critical epistemologies, take their inspiration from indigenous, feminist, or post-humanist discourses, which, arguably, have made them less present in commercial and large-scale contexts and less easily adoptable within certain humanist-based democratisation narratives. This, I argued, has led to a further marginalisation of critical OA approaches and the ways these have been confronting the inequities in global-scale knowledge production.

Consequently, as I argued in this thesis, what needs to be problematised and critically discussed regarding the question how and in what ways OA publishing can contribute to greater equity and diversity in knowledge production, are the humanist epistemologies that form the basis upon which some of the more prominent approaches to OA publishing have been based and how these have contributed to both hermeneutical and testimonial injustices within the sphere of academic knowledge production.

In the context of this critical discussion of the predominance of humanist epistemologies, I analysed how dominant humanist paradigms came about and how a large part of the (Western) scholarly discourse and its accompanying practices (including forms of OA publishing) came to depend on their positivist interpretation.

As I elaborated, their prominent position is by no means self-evident as humanist epistemologies have been both pushed forward and *contested* as part of political, territorial, and economic power struggles, in imperialist, colonial, and patriarchal contexts. Striving to theorise more inclusively and widely, in a non-oppositional way – while diffractively reading and non-oppositionally theorising various authors, places, times, frames of reference and layers of insight together – I showed, for example, how they have been critiqued from within feminist and critical globalisation discourses.

I have also shown how various proto-feminist and early anti-colonial grassroots initiatives that emerged in the seventeenth century and feminist, queer Latin American and Womanist publishing initiatives from the second half of the twentieth century, have antagonistically positioned themselves

against the patriarchal and colonial suppression that was circulating through the humanist forms of knowledge creation and circulation of their time. I focused on various pre-digital publishing experiments, showing how initiatives such as the women of the Little Gidding community, indigenous people, and Kitchen Table Women of Color Press were working against the fixity and stability of texts and authorship and engaged with more relational, fluid, and situated forms of author-, editor-, and readership, while experimenting with organic and multi-agential publications. I discussed how they used writing, editing, and publishing as a form of community-building and -organising. As part of the analysis I argued that these anti-hegemonic initiatives, positioned in an antagonist relation to humanist epistemologies, when put into relation with one another, can mutually strengthen each other across time and space. Diffractively reading and relating these different projects and discourses to each other, I have carved out an alternative, humanism-critical history of knowledge creation and sharing spanning over five centuries.

Conceptualising and genealogically positioning critical OA publishing – again, in a diffractive, non-oppositional, as well as performative gesture – as part of this longer history of antagonistic theoretical and practical engagement with humanist epistemologies (and clearly distinguishing critical OA advocacy from the liberal humanist tradition from which the BOAI and related democratisation narratives emerged), has been relevant in the context of this thesis. It allowed me to emphasise that critical OA advocates always have framed the scope of OA publishing more widely: beyond the mere techno-legal and financial mediation of research *outputs* towards including cultural, linguistic, and epistemic issues and questions, such as who is allowed to contribute to knowledge production, under which conditions, in what language(s), and in which ways. Such a broader perspective on the scope of OA publishing has resulted:

- in the **framing of OA publishing as an active doing** – as a critical intervention into the hegemonic system of traditional scientific knowledge (tending to question the governance and ownership of the institutions and technologies of scholarly knowledge production, as well as to ask questions related to the creation and representation of knowledge). This framing results in a more holistic understanding of the scope of OA publishing beyond a focus on the mere techno-legal and financial mediation and the consumption of research *outputs*. Rather, it expands towards a critical re-examination and reperformance of how research is made sense of, written-up, and published, inviting an engagement with cultural, linguistic, and epistemic questions, such as who is allowed to contribute to knowledge creation and sharing, how, in which language, and on whose terms.

- in a **politics of OA publishing** that is context-related, differentiated, relational, and fluid. This is a politics that insists on a bottom-up approach to democratisation in which differences and plurality among knowledge cultures, ways of knowing, and ways of creating and sharing knowledge are recognised and respected. This is in opposition to a more positivist theorising of OA publishing's democratic potential based on humanist principles, essentialising and universalising science and knowledge as *a priori* democratic.

- in a **specific notion of openness** that is relational, situated, context-specific, and performative. This notion is, as I argued, inherently related to an expanded notion of accessibility – which includes the ability and agency to take part in experiments for imagining and performing OA publishing in a different, potentially more equal and just way.

Framing OA publishing in this way, as I have argued, sheds a different light on what the main challenges and opportunities to promoting more equal and diverse forms of global knowledge production are and what role OA publishing can play in this. In this thesis, I have illustrated that this shift of perspective demands new and different understandings of the practices and processes, as well as the responsibilities, workflows, and relationalities that are inherent in conventional forms of scholarly knowledge production. As I explained, facilitating more open, horizontal, equitable, and diverse engagements within OA publishing to promote knowledge equity and diversity (for example, by leveraging access to and participation in practices and processes of knowledge production), cannot be predicated on the use of (open source) technologies only. Rather, the following aspects must be taken into account:

- As an initiator, or host, of a collaboration in the context of publishing (or more broadly, scholarly knowledge production), **facilitating the inclusion of a diverse range of participants** is key. This can be done, for example, by directly inviting participants from different academic hierarchy levels, from various disciplines, from in and outside of academia, and different languages and regions.

- For initiators of a collaborative project (for example, a publisher or editor), it is important **to take time to familiarise people with (open source) tools and platforms**, for example, by providing guidelines, 1:1 support, or by trying out different technical solutions.

- While working with diverse communities, it is important to **acknowledge the sovereignty and validity of different (also non-humanist-based) knowledges** and ways of knowing.

- Here, one must be especially attentive to the **power position inhabited by the host** of a meeting or the initiator of a collaboration. Ways to mitigate power disparities include the flexible and transparent management of workflows and timelines and the responsive redistribution of roles and functions.

- What is further needed, is a (**self-)critical reconsideration of the micro-power structures embedded in prevalent forms of academic knowledge creation**. For example, in the humanist conventions and norms that continue to define what constitutes valid knowledge and meaningful texts; in the social and behavioural micro-choreographies that can dominate online exchanges (such as the dominance of English language speakers over those who are less fluent) and how these might disable equal and diverse collaboration. Mitigating these risks might require deviating from conventional knowledges and ways of knowing, or from what is considered and appraised as an academically valid output.

All of this wouldn't be possible without the **adaptation of conventional editing, and publishing workflows, timelines, processes and practices, as well as a rethinking of conventional author and editor functions, and the relationalities** between them, as I have stressed throughout this thesis. Facilitation of more equal and diverse participation in the processes and practices of knowledge production cannot always be institutionalised or systematised, but needs to adapt to specific circumstances.

Drawing on these insights and recommendations on how to facilitate more diverse and equitable participation in knowledge production I, as part of my critical praxis and as one of the main outcomes of this thesis, have developed an interventionist reading methodology focused specifically on minimising the socio-cultural, behavioural, and linguistic barriers to participation in scholarly knowledge production. With this reading methodology I contribute to the various facilitation methodologies and methods as proposed by critical OA advocates, some of which I have described in this thesis. In my proposed reading methodology, I have assembled various methods: these include an editable "code of conduct," a grounding exercise, a "digital campfire," a "wordfall exercise," as well as a set of reading protocols. I have assembled these methods borrowing from the processes and practices of community-building, -engagement, and facilitation that have been used by pre-digital publishing initiatives and in the context of critical OA advocacy. Furthermore, I have employed resources from feminist organisational theory, critical (online) pedagogy, and artistic

experimentation and adapted and further developed these for the specific environment of *The Re-Reading Room*.

a. An **editable "code of conduct"** shared with all the participants prior to the reading group taking place. The code of conduct highlighted some of the social inhibitions and inequity issues that often remain unacknowledged in online spaces to create awareness around them. For example, the tendency of native English-speakers to dominate exchanges with non-native speakers, the tendency to prefer certain (humanist) interpretation modes (e.g., analytical ones) over more anecdotal or personal ones, and the tendency to use complex terminology without explaining or defining it.

b. **Grounding and "digital campfire" exercises** were used to root the participants in their bodies, and their geographical and cultural settings, and to promote a certain sense of spatiality and intimacy. This is important as online meetings often simulate closeness or sameness while simultaneously also inducing feelings of "place-less-ness" and physical detachment.

c. **Reading protocols** (for example, the participants were asked to translate the text they read into their maternal languages, while reading it out aloud; or they read the text out aloud in a choir, trying to align their rhythms). The flow of the text was disrupted and with that the paranoid reflexes through which knowledges are often encountered, and co-produced. In doing this I wanted to de-centre conventional humanist ways of interacting with texts – such as trying to intellectually analyse or grasp it, or solitary ways of deep reading – while opening up the possibility to employ different modes of perception and interrelation.

d. Throughout *The Re-Reading Room*, and as part of the data collection, I gave the participants **the possibility to give feedback and interact with one another** in different ways. For example, within more private conversations (established through breakout rooms); in plenary discussions – both verbally and via the BBB chat function; and within collaborative textual annotations made with hypothes.is. To activate the chat function as a viable channel to contribute to the conversation I employed a **"wordfall exercise"** at the beginning of *The Re-Reading Room*. I asked the participants to share their thoughts based on the prompt "reading can…." And to add their thoughts all simultaneously in the chat function, which created a tumbling waterfall effect animating the chat bar.

In the "Postscript" to this thesis I embark on a provisional analysis, documentation, and interpretation of *The Re-Reading Room*, sharing collaborative insights on the potentials, weaknesses, and possible further development opportunities of this methodology, while avoiding the temptation to close down this experimental piece of writing by yet another conclusive summary. However, I would like to share some insights in a more explicit way here:

1. Aiming **to consciously facilitate the participation of a broad range of participants**, I invited artists, librarians, publishers, scholars in different career stages, and infrastructure providers from different countries. However, during *The Re-Reading Room,* the idea of sending personal invitations to a "hand-picked" set of readers triggered a discussion around the role of "coterie" in academia. Some participants pointed out that for them, the relatively small group as well as the diverse exercises performed at the beginning of the event (for example, the grounding and "digital campfire" exercises) constituted a safe, or brave space[82] and established a sense of community between very diverse people that didn't previously know each other. One participant, consequently, suggested that what was practiced during *The Re-Reading Room*, "was or could become some kind of paradoxically open coterie." However, another participant experienced the exercises employed to create a brave space and a sense of community among the participants as "very ritualistic" and exclusionary. If I am to stress the relationality, context-specificity, and partiality of knowledge creation in my thesis, I do not think that any allegation of "coterie" (including the more negative connotations of the term) can easily be dismissed. However, the implied exclusionary risks can be mitigated to a certain extent by hosts consciously involving communities from outside their own institutional, disciplinary, or linguistic "filter bubble." Whether something is perceived as a ritualistic group, or a brave and open space where diverse knowledges can come together, lies partially in the hands of the facilitator of a collaboration or meeting. Exercises and protocols such as the ones applied during *The Re-Reading Room* were seen to be a right step towards facilitating more inclusive conditions by the participants. However, it must be acknowledged that every attempt at establishing more situated, relational, and performative forms of openness comes with new exclusions, and new potential closures that have to be critically reflected upon.

[82] The notion of "brave space" emerged within education and intercultural collaboration discourses, acknowledging that completely safe spaces do not exist. Rather, everyone should be acknowledged, heard, and should feel brave enough to speak up. While conflicts are valued, a non-judgmental attitude is to be upheld (Arao & Clemens, 2013).

2. I Invited the participants to use the protocols and methods devised in *The Re-Reading Room* **to self-critically engage with dominant humanist research cultures**. For example, with ways of understanding a text, interpreting it, and making meaning from it. I employed a series of reading protocols to direct the reading. Many participants at first, as intended, struggled with deviating from their usual, analytical ways of reading and interpretating and became frustrated; this did engender ways of relating differently with and around texts. For example, by listening to others reading (instead of reading oneself), by reading together aloud as a part of a discordant choir, or by sensing a texts' rhythm. One participant, after collaboratively reading the text, emphasised the importance of developing nuanced practices of listening, of acknowledging others; of learning to experience losing control, and abide to cacophony. The participants considered these practices as important in the context of today's individualistic and competition driven academic culture, especially regarding engagement with different knowledges and knowledge groups. In this sense, I consider the experiment with reading practices as successful because it opened up a "space for reimagining what counts as scholarship and research, and of how it can be responded to and accessed: …. about what an author, a text, and a work actually is, and where any authority and stability that might be associated with such concepts can now be said to reside" (Adema & Hall, 2013 25). Another participant pointed out that the reading protocols performed during the reading group can be used to question the universality and transcendentality of knowledge that, as I discussed in this thesis, is implicated within the output focus of many narratives on OA publishing. Instead, as this participant stressed in refence to Rivera Garza's text, the more embodied and multi-vocal ways of experiencing the text we engaged in, exemplified the fraught relationships of bodies partaking in the creation of meaning through practices of writing and reading. Experiencing together new and different forms of reading, as this participant outlined, can bring to the fore that our "bodies occupy spaces from which others have been expelled—which is 'what makes the apparently innocent "YOU ARE HERE" signs on contemporary maps into political insinuations. Who is not here where I am? Who will be here when I am forced out?" (Rivera Garza, 2020, 53). The insights of these two participants clearly hint at questions that I consider an important part of OA publishing and that I argue scholars should be aware of: who is actually taking part in practices and processes of knowledge creation (in this case, writing) and circulation (in this case, reading), in which language, and based on whose cultural and epistemological terms? And who does not – or cannot – contribute?

3. Regarding **the further application of the reading methodology and its relevance and usefulness for OA publishing,** as one of the participants wrote in an email: “I was thinking about your session … and how much it would make sense as part of an Open Access publisher … to have that kind of thing as a kind of 'service side' to the publishing process. It would really make things like Meson press SO MUCH better and cooler if there was a kind of event / community side, and someone running things like what you did on Friday. I mean a publishing house … that creates value from the community generation around published works”. In this sense, reading, or re-reading, could be considered a form of re-use, as creating engagement around already published open works, as publisher- and library-driven “curatorial” and community building activities around existing texts and books.

Postscript (After the End. Openings)

Regrouping. Grouping. Groping.

I've been writing between paranoia and reparation, between Zurich and Birmingham, in between at home and Can Eat, between pain and no pain, between anxiety and exuberance, between yearning for just(er) representation and the impossibility to represent in more just ways, between dissolving and becoming solid, between keeping up and losing it, between academic writing and whatever I am trying to do here, between words and having no words, between closing down and opening up, between building and ripping apart, between before and after the PhD, between not-really knowing and forgetting, between all-alone and in-un-common, between I and you, between not being anymore and becoming, between times, between housemates, between seasons, between flights, between identities, between meetings, between absences, between languages, between lives.

Out of breath. Losing (out on) myself-self.

Afterwording.
Afterworlding.
After the words.
After the world.
A P.S.

Catching Breath.

Body of Us

You say that "the university taught them through its selective genocide: one body. The unitary body."[83] The "we" of modern academia: A self-unaware "body of us". An a priori "we", feeding of the illusion of "a shared deictic centre of time, space and person," so you[84] assert. A unitary body of many; complacently burgeoning on self-proclaimed excellence and the experience of living "in one body … to live one lifetime at one time" as you[85] say; prospering through the solid void left by those denied this privilege.

An imperial subjectivity, a naturalised entitlement of taking part, of belonging everywhere. A sovereign – "the ultimate expression of sovereignty resides, to a large degree, in the power and the capacity to dictate who may live and who must die" you[86] say – placeless yet claiming all the space.

Absents

Writing the "god trick." You[87] name it. The assertive "we" ("the problem was that we did not know whom we meant when we said 'we'," you[88] ruminate) of a seemingly global sphere of academic knowledge creation and sharing: the ingenuous innocence, the drastic puissance, the destructive agency of detached textual abstraction, of megalomaniac decontextualization, of unthinking universalisation, of thoughtless appropriation.

Absence from a relation, too, is a form of action in relation.

[83] Gumbs, 2018
[84] Windle, 2017, 370
[85] Gumbs, 2018, 7
[86] Mbembe & Meintjes, 2003, 11/12
[87] Haraway, 1988
[88] Rich, 1984, 21

Ego Shooter I (Presents)

Global academia, an ego-shooter game. Competition, too, is a form of action in relation. An abstracted, virtual territory, a phantasy landscape – glitching every now and then, yes (a buzz of absence, a plunge of solid voids … rippling surface). Academic writing as a drunken-on-power-game (I'm playing 'cause you're not), quantitative indicators determining your play-level, bagging rankings like nuggets, review as revenue, fighting the monster called partiality to obtain an extra life (or an academic life at all), or a continue.

Ego Shooter II (Mantra)

Shareyourresearch.GrowYourAudience.Buildyoursuccessandtrackyourimpact.Measureyourimpact.
Shareyourresearch.GrowYourAudience.Buildyoursuccessandtrackyourimpact.Measureyourimpact.
Shareyourresearch.GrowYourAudience.Buildyoursuccessandtrackyourimpact.Measureyourimpact.
Shareyourresearch.GrowYourAudience.Buildyoursuccessandtrackyourimpact.Measureyourimpact.
Shareyourresearch.GrowYourAudience.Buildyoursuccessandtrackyourimpact.Measureyourimpact.
Shareyourresearch.GrowYourAudience.Buildyoursuccessandtrackyourimpact.Measureyourimpact.
Shareyourresearch.GrowYourAudience.Buildyoursuccessandtrackyourimpact.Measureyourimpact.
Shareyourresearch.GrowYourAudience.Buildyoursuccessandtrackyourimpact.Measureyourimpact.

(Academia.edu, ResearchGate)

Becoming Head

The unitary body is a cephalopod body. Brain: distanced, analytical, programmatic. Feet: marching in the order of progressive time, steadily: past, present, future – a rope like a motorway, äs Seil wiene Autobahn, yet… a rope (Choudry, D'Souza, Santos, Windle).

While you be murdered, I have (only) been mutilated. Fitting, pressing, squeezing, I have become head. I have become feet. A cephalopod with phantom-limb syndrome: lost spine hurting, lost guts aching, lost heart pounding, feet stumbling – forwards, I've been told.

Refrain (The Re-Reading Room)

[19:26] interesting, why are we still taking about "open access"?

(Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

Annotations I (The Re-Reading Room)

You are here, too! Are these expanding our exclusive archives?

Could we stretch books to the genealogy of knowledge beyond referencing systems? Could we open to other plural / inter- / trans-relationships between words and beyond?

Like reading out loud, how could other sounds, imagery or even silence be embedded into or interweaved into the text?

What would be the point of exploring this question in relation to critical discourses on open access? I think in bibliodiversity. Diversifying texts and textual practices/experiences, maybe we would reflect on what "products" or "formats" we privilege?

(Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

Glitching

"Deslenguadas. Somos los del español deficiente. We are your linguistic nightmare, your linguistic aberration" you[89] adjure. You make it sound like a curse and a promise.

Diini und miini Situation und dPosition vo wo mer schwätzed isch natürli anderscht, muy differente, totally different. Aber hey, mängisch gahtsmer imfall gliich ähnlich wie dir.

Hablo aleman, ingles, frances, italiano, y castellano e – saves, ninguna es mi lengua maternal. Sempre parlo una lingua che non e la mia, une langue étrangère, eine Fremdsprache, foreign language. Uf Züridüütsch chamer nämmli nöd schaffe, eigentli au nöd richtig ernscht schriibe (ussert me macht Mundart Schaason oder Pop oder Räp wie de Mani oder de Fai sit noischtem oder de Chnächt, oder mer isch en Mundartpoet wie de Franz oder au de Domi, wo sogar adä ZettHadeKaa zZüri imnä Master unterrichtet). Dini Schpraach isch immer mini Frömdschprach.

Gradientes de incomodidad. Everlasting alignment. Odd busting. Widderämale, immerwider.

There might be places of convergence. Convergence too, is a form of (suspended) action in relation.

Reading Protocol I (Exercise) (The Re-Reading Room)

We will read the first paragraph out aloud in our maternal languages or dialects. We're simultaneously translating while we are reading. We will switch our microphones on for this.

We will now read the next two paragraphs out aloud, in a choir, microphones on, trying to tune into a common rhythm.

[89] Anzaldúa, 1987, 58

In/Un/Common Transition

A refusal to say – to write – we, *wir, nous, nosotrxs, noi, miiiir*. As well as: they, them, theirs, ours, hers, she, his, our, he, us, we. A refusal to assume belonging as a *fait accompli*, identity as a reality beyond encounter, transition.

"Do I contradict myself? ... I am large, I contain multitudes … will you speak before I am gone? will you prove already too late?" you[90] ask.

Bernard I (An Unsubstantial Territory)

You[91] let Bernard say "But when we sit together, close … we melt into each other with phrases. We are edged with mist. We make an unsubstantial territory". In between before and already too late (between I and you (we) "the immeasurable vastness of a fingertip" you[92] say), I make an unsubstantial territory with you, we are the unsubstantial territory between you and I.

Relating in between, relating through/in transition, too, is an action in relation.

Annotations II (The Re-Reading Room)

Was our exercise an example of bodies in tense contact, digitally and therefore estranged but also our voices were clashing etcetera?

(Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

[90] Whitman, 1992

[91] Woolf, 2010, 8

[92] Nina Jäger (paraphrasing Jean-Luc Nancy) in an email, 2018.

Catfish (Yearning)

Today. Rainy day. Leaves clinging on bare branches, red wet bricks redder, black wet street blacker echoing your[93] words – the melancholic reverberation of raindrops, already fallen. "If I were to live my life / in catfish forms / in scaffolds of skin and whiskers / at the bottom of a pond / and you were to come by / one evening / when the moon was shining / down into my dark home / and stand there at the edge / of my affection / and think, 'It's beautiful / here by this pond. I wish / somebody loved me,' / I'd love you and be your catfish / friend and drive such lonely /thoughts from your mind / and suddenly you would be / at peace, / and ask yourself, 'I wonder / if there are any catfish /in this pond? It seems like / a perfect place for them.'"

Refrain (The Re-Reading Room)

[19:26] interesting, why are we still taking about "open access"?

(Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

Disillusion

I've been scattering pages with sentences like piss-marks: "As I claim…," "As I would like to posit here". You only play an underpart, you are the doormat on which I step through the door to academic recognition, recognition as someone considerate – afloat with the ethical affordance of pronoun use, citation, with the responsibilities of relational solidarity; open, too, towards the irreducible difference of you[94] (the other) – I expect you (and through my authorial authority I force you) to play your role to my liking.

"What about it, you don't need me / What about it, I can't live without you," you[95] sing, I ask.

Ego-Shooter III

Through reading, writing, I'm securing my just ethico-political relation with you, the "others," through writing. I'm tripping on a stimulant called idealisation, the echo chamber asserting my

[93] Brautigan, 1968
[94] Hall, 2008; Zylinska, 2005
[95] Smith, 1976

innocence, helping me to "strategically forget (as all idealizations must) the persistent injustices and inequities that accompany the lived experience of relationality" your[96] voice is cutting sharp through the glutinous compound of an awakening hangover.

After all, the line between your[97] "unsubstantial territory," your "melting into each other," and land grab is a thin one.

Bernard II (Revisited)

"You aren't invited into our commune," you[98] say: "We aren't yet at that point of hospitality. I won't tell you when the time has come. There isn't time here. There isn't ever time here. There is only *here* here. Land here."

This time might never come. Land *here* is not a metaphor. It is not your[99] "unsubstantial territory" across which we can merge and blur – here *here* – when we sit together, close. It is what stands between I, you and – most importantly (most disappointingly for those who want to repent, repair) – we. It's "land/water/air/subterranean earth," as you say.[100] It is the predation of what cannot be possessed. It is total appropriation; erased relationships, erased life turned into resource. Ghosts drawn off possibility, off futurity fortifying your own future.

[96] Fournier, 2021
[97] Woolf, 2010, 8
[98] Belcourt, 2020, 105
[99] Woolf, 2010, 8
[100] Tuck & Yang, 2012, 5

Walking On (Despite. Nonetheless)

"You cannot speak for me.[101] I cannot speak for us. Two thoughts: there is no liberation that only knows how to say 'I'; there is no collective movement that speaks for each of us all the way through."

I cannot walk in your shoes, you cannot walk in mine. How can I, you still walk together even if I, you, might already have gone?

Is it Love? I (Diffraction) (The Re-Reading Room)

[20:03]: "work is love made solid" [20:03] are those your words?

[20:03] i think its maybe from Alasdair Gray [20:04] i've been saying it for years :)

[20:04] i might join you

[20:04] in that

[20:04] "Work as if you live in the early days of a better nation" is another Alasdair Gray

[20:04] is that why we're here then ;)

[20:06] 🚩

(Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

Re-writing-re-reading Together

Re-writing, you[102] say (and re-reading I add), is, can, might, should, ought to be, perhaps, possibly, not unlikely a form of dis-appropriation. Namely, when it is about exposing the incomplete, processual nature of any text; when it is about making time and taking the time to find ways of relating to others within and around texts in more accountable ways.

[101] Rich, 1984, 223/24

[102] Garza, 2013

Reading can… (A Wordfall) (The Re-Reading Room)

open the mind … bring people together … establish relations … anything … make me travel … decentre … split things open … mess with your brain … bore … and make me fall asleep (every now and then) … stretch our worlds … divert …: bring other peoples' voices into your head … inspire anger … charm … isolate and connect … hurt and heal … be refuge … activate inner worlds to inhabit … connect language to dreaming … provide insights … change your mind/body/life … bring conflict … help us get to know ourselves better … be a skipping and jumping … change me. … frustrating sometimes … interrupted … tiring … open perspectives … mess you up. Even more than your mum and dad … allow us thinking things that we would never think.

In a way, reading is like writing, it is part of the same path of discovery.

(Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

Refrain (The Re-Reading Room)

[19:26] interesting, why are we still taking about "open access"?

(Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

Annotations III (The Re-Reading Room)

“Accumulation” and layering could we think of annotations like a “terroir” land; how deep could we go?

The idea of "layers of collective work" makes me think in the diverse processes that allow the generation, publication and visibility of knowledge, mainly in scientific papers published in non-commercial publishing systems (diamond OA).

(Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

Reckoning

"Bring your attention to center," you[103] say. "Feel your dignity, your right to take up space, your connection with others, and your relationship with the arc of your life."

You[104] say that "creating situated knowledge might …. sometimes mean that thinking from and for particular struggles require from us to work for change from *where we are*, rather than drawing upon others' situations for building a theory, and continue our conversations."

Phantoms

You[105] write, I read "to say 'my body' reduces the temptation to grandiose assertions." To feel, breath, and say "my body" means to acknowledge and self-realise within the experiential reality of my life.

Writing re reading re writing reading, I try to fill the gap between my feet and brain, I try to get less cephalopod-ic, to rematerialize my phantom-limbs.

Struggling to get my guts back, my spine, my heart, I somatise my writing.

Approaching writing as a practice that refuses mutilation and killing (of my own body, your body, knowing-knowledge-bodies).

Breathing (Together)

You[106] say that "breathing together over video-conference technology and through pre-recorded content is still breathing together [as] the energetic impact we have on each other is important for how we feel, move, and make decisions in the moment."

[103] Maree Brown, 2021
[104] Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017, 86/87
[105] Rich, 1984, 216/217
[106] Gumbs, 2020

Bodies. Grounded. (Exercise) (The Re-Reading Room)

Close your eyes / Sit in a comfortable position, your feet firmly on the ground / Feel how your feet touch the floor, how parts of your body touch the chair you're sitting on / Feel your hands on the keyboard of your computer, or resting on the table or in your lap / Sense your height, your width, your weight, your physical presence / Feel your clothes rub against your skin / Feel your heartbeat, the rhythm of your breath. / Breath deep into your centre / Feel the place you are at mentally, energy- and mood-wise. Sense the space in and the space around you / Notice the walls, the ceiling, the sky above it / Feel what's outside the window / Notice smells and sounds / Feel the floor under your feet / Feel the fundaments you're grounded in / Sink deeper into the ground / Feel through the layers and sediments of the built, of time, of history – your history, the one of others, common histories… inseparably entangled / Now, slowly come back, open your eyes. Where are you, right now?

Places

To say "my body", to locate myself in my body, means to say "my place". A place beyond geographical location, yet determined by it, too. This white, female, more-or-less-functioning body was born into a place. A place of stability and security (a place bordering hard to entitlement, smugness, condescendence). A place on the sovereign's side: placeless yet claiming all the space, a naturalised sense of belonging – everywhere. The easiness it means to adhere to (and count on) the placid idea of an a-priori communality, a self-evident "we" and "us"!

This body has enabled more than it prevented. This body knows what arrival, what being at home means. Birmingham UK, at the moment. A grown-up house-share in a grown-up neighbourhood (middleclass-y, yet cool), home against expectation. Feeling at home: the matter-of-course-ness of residing among books, warmth, love, and lived politics; a prospect of lake and mountains, the smell of meadows and rocks after a summer rain; friends as kin, family as refuge; having a dark red and a bright red passport. Home: this place writes with me, sits with me, reassuringly holds my hand while I am writing this.

Pain

To say “my body” also means to say “my pain” – not in a metaphorical sense. To say “my body” transforms phantom pain into real, ongoing pain. Withdrawing into the placid life of an academic cephalopod, more often than not, I am able to brush it aside (and if it still bothers me, there’s self-control (phantom limbs cannot really hurt, after all) and Novalgin®). Yet pain is a strong-minded companion.

And, gisch-was-häsch, it brings me back to my body, roots me in my body, brings my body into writing, roots my writing in my body. Comrade pain, both cursed and sacred.

Spine

Does my broken, metal pierced, screwed, bolted, patched up, not-human-human, not-really-existing-anymore spine make me spineless? The contrary, really. The spine after all is the connection between head and limbs, this missing bit, the backward-engineered not-anymore-cephalopod.

Saying “my body,” “my spine,” “my pain,” makes it impossible to keep pace with the universal “unitary body,” this placeless (spineless) painless grandiose “we.”

Crooked Heart

The physical centre of the body, it is said, sits a couple fingerbreadths below the belly button, a haphazard median, a nowhere, an everywhere, and every-now-and-then, a whatever.

My centre: a crooked heart tattoo at the underside of my wrist. This vulnerable bit, veins pulsing under parchment skin strangely untouched by age, by sun, violent grips. I am wearing my crooked heart on (and sometimes under) my sleeve. A proxy-centre, a backup-centre, a centre that I’m not even sure having. But never mind, it still fulfils its function, as good as anything else.

Wär nid spahrt im Liebi gäh, chunt nid zchurz im Liebi näh, you said, Grossmuetti. But you thought me that love is ever so often an unrequited longing, a giving without being able to take, a non-reciprocal bargain. Hence, a crooked heart.

Wisdom

This, my centre, is your wisdom, Grossmuetti, the crooked heart a reminder. A constant reminder that I am not that autonomous, sovereign, independent being. This is, you[107] say, "radical vulnerability that comes when we do not think of." My centre is my vulnerability. Wearing my centre as a heart upon my sleeve – forever entangling my strength and my vulnerability – centring myself in the inherent dissolution of myself, a self that cannot hope for their love to be reciprocated.

Songs (The Re-Reading Room)

https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PLjRg-o1kSrHJ5uxgFgECcueiIvW089iwp

Inventory, Incomplete (Languaging)

Areadinggroupmadeofyoumeothersbooksbetweenlinesformsmailsprotocolsdigitscomputersopensourcetoolsfloorwallshungerspacesvoiceshousesnoisestextsdistractionisolationslownessmisundertandingslisteninginterpunctuationfrustrationcreationroofskeyboardsjoywallpapersancestorstunesbytranslationhighlightsloveglitchessilenceswhitespacebreathslanguagesparalysspeedssoundsconfusiondeskschairstablesexercisesconversationscountriesdeferralsmisunderstandingmeaningreaderlightshellos

In the Centre / Centred

Being centred like this, you[108] tell me, I can "move outward from the base and center of my feelings, but with a corrective sense that my feelings are not the center of feminism." In fact, I've never assumed that my feelings are the centre of anything. But still, that's where they tend to end up: In the centre.

Privilege

I've been afforded with the voice and the means to make knowledge claims – through this PhD, too. It is a privilege that no one ever has threatened to take away from me (and most probably won't). The right of the white born, right born, not too late (and not too early) born. There is no way to repudiate this gift that is not condescending, ignorant, egocentric.

[107] Nagar, 2019, 201

[108] Rich, 1984, 231

Refrain (The Re-Reading Room)

[19:26] interesting, why are we still taking about "open access"?

(Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

Pages & Stages

As someone being afforded with the body, the place to speak from with auctorial authority, you[109] tell me, it's my responsibility to ask: "Whom do I bring with myself onto the page or stage? Whose are the voices we rely on for weaving our stories, but whose tones and accents remain unheard and unacknowledged in our scripts? Who are the people who remain forgotten in our citational practices and for whom the conventional citations of the academy remain meaningless? Can we hope to achieve justice by radically reworking the ways in which these unheard tones, stolen voices, and erased knowledges are rendered through academic practices?"

Whose past, whose present, whose futurity can I secure through writing alone (but my own)?

Walking Together

Who wants to walk with me?

I have my own shoes. I don't want to walk or stand in yours. You[110] say that "we are dealing here with writing practices that bring those shoes and those others into the materiality of a text that is, in this sense, always a text forged relationally, that is to say, in community. And by community here I refer not only to the physical framework constituted by the author, the reader and the text, but also …. to that experience of mutual belonging; with language and of collective work with others, which is constitutive of the text."

[109] Nagar, 2019, 7

[110] Garza, 2013, 21

Annotations I (The Re-Reading Room)

Am I here. You are here? oh no, this is not an innocent question.

(Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

Rephrasing

Who ~~wants to~~ is afforded to walk with me?

Accessing

> You[111] say, too, that I shouldn't just "think for the perpetuated absent [the ones that are kept apart from the places I am authorised to work in, to make knowledge claims]" but that creating and sharing knowledge together entails "to multiply the ways of 'access'".

Invitation (The Re-Reading Room)

Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, Stefano.

At the moment, I am the host of this meeting. I will give each of you hosting capacities.

Echoes (The Re-Reading Room)

[19:30] I would be interested in knowing if open access accommodates approaches to knowledge production and dissemination that are "open" and participatory and if someone has already made this connection ... between how knowledge is produced and communicated.

(Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

[111] Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017, 86

Facilitation (The Politics of Reading)

You[112] say: “Through facilitation, we make the time to engage one another in growing our understanding and practices around assumed and imagined political views, learning styles, gender roles, the value of time, and other definitions. When we center the voices/visions of people othered by racialized capitalism, we are engaging the development of a deeper political understanding, and we are also shaping a culture at its heart, reckoning with historical injustices in our very bodies.”

Relating

A Digital Campfire (Exercise) (The Re-Reading Room)

Now, I would like us to sit in a circle. Please go to the BigBlueButton participants list, it will show all of us in alphabetical order. The first two please turn their computers towards South, the third and the forth towards South-West, the fifth and the sixth towards West, two towards North-West, two towards North, two towards North-East, two towards East, and two towards South-East. Thank you.

Reading Protocol II (Exercise) (The Re-Reading Room)

Once everybody is done, we’re going to read the rest aloud again. Each person reads a sentence and then someone else skips in spontaneously. The ones who do not want to read don’t have to, of course.

Now we read silently until after the Rosa Alcalá quote. Please tilt your computer sideways, while you are reading – as if it were a book.

Reading With I (Cyborgs) (The Re-Reading Room)

[17:08] Sorry I'm on a computer on which the camera doesn't work… I hope my internet will be ok too ;)
[17:09] sorry, what do I have to do with the screen?
[18:31] Wait, what do we do in the breakout room?
[18:31] where can we see the breakout rooms?
[18:33] what do we do now?
[18:45] we were a bit lost with my breakout room partner (whom now in confusion I don't see the name anymore) and now we left the breakout tab and I tried to go back but I'm alone there :-/

[112] Maree Brown, 2021

[18:47] i'm in the main room but strangely you're still in breakout room 5

[19:05] you're frozen....

[19:06] ah no you're just very still

[19:07]: BBB was reading with us :)

[19:08] The non-human machinic readerly voice

[19:09] i didn't mean to be here twice

[19:10] beautiful split :)

[19:11] also the awful resolution of the pirated screen graps was very present for me, blurring

[19:11] oh yes my annotations are all over the place

[19:29] this is the link for the hypothes.is booklet if you're not using chrome

javascript:(function(){window.hypothesisConfig=function(){return{showHighlights:true,appType:'bookmarklet'};};vardocument,s=d.createElement('script');s.setAttribute('src','https://hypothes.is/embed.js');d.body.appendChild(s)})();

[19:29] urgs, this is unusuable forget about it

[19:34] exciting

[19:36] Sorry, I'm still having Hypothes.is issues.

[19:37] are you in the wrong PDF?

[19:38] are you refreshing the browser window?

[19:38] I had to shut the tabs with other pdf in it

[19:41] there's a bit of a "problem" (not that big a problem) with the way that the PDF is scanned, or OCR'd, as you can't highlight certain words on that first page

[20:01] my audio broke... hold up back in a sec

[20:01] I lost the audio

(Anna-Luise, BigBlueButton, several browsers, Eva, Gabriela, hypothes.is, Jamie, Janneke, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Marie-France, Nina, open source OCR converter, Patrick, pirated text (based on screen shots, Rebekka)

Reading With II (Intra-Action) (The Re-Reading Room)

[18:04]: I liked the last bit, where you could listen to each individual voice.

[18:04] I got lost in the first steps.

[18:04] reading, speaking and listening in synchrony is quite a challenge

[18:04] the choir felt perhaps a bit like a forced communality

[18:04] But I also liked the first steps with reading in multiple tongues.

[18:05] sorry I didn't read with you. it was tremendously exhausting to listen even. I didn't understand much of the words, because I had to turn the volume down to be able to listen.
[18:05] Not for the reading comprehension, of course. Just for the experience.
[18:05] very pleasurable the collective reading choir, somehow to me similar to asmr techniques :) agree it would be different in presence
[18:06] i got lost in between and was curious if i was able to join again
[18:09] needed to let go my desire to read and understand the text...
[18:10] while I wasn't reading aloud (because I didn't know where in the text the reading was happening), I started annotating on Hypothesis
[18:11] Also not having the ability to read anyone's body through proximity in addition to visually--I felt very isolated in my body while seeking connection through hearing only
[18:11] i was a bit sad of not being able to grasp a bit more of the text
[18:12] The last part was more easy for me to understand (understand the text) but still changing voice every sentence is a bit challenging for my understanding and brain

Hold on hold on hold on hold on holdonholdonholdonholdonholdon on hold hold on on hold

[19:01] we had a short conversation about what reading means and what it can mean after this experiment, in relation to Open Access. Annavittoria described her experience as a shift between expectations of meaning and expectations of an aesthetic, immersive experience of sound, while people were reading aloud in different maternal tongues and, afterwards, in different paces. Gabriela noticed how this is often experienced as frustration or disorientation by highly-literate participants who understand reading as something essentially related to meaning. Can reading do anything which is not meaning-related? What would be the point of exploring this question in relation to critical discourses on open access?

(Annavittoria, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Jessi, Loraine, Maddalena, Nora, Rebekka, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

Reading With III

Whose meaning?
Who is keeping the gate?

Discomfort

“A facilitator’s role is not to make everyone comfortable,” you[113] say. Not even the facilitator herself, I add. And you[114] explain: “Our job is to help people through their discomfort while using all of the knowledge and feelings in the room to make meaning and take actions informed by the learning. Facilitated environments working in this way open up a space where people get to live into new roles/ new shapes.”

Open Access I (The Re-Reading Room)

[19:05] So it's not about generating meaning through reading such texts
[19:06] but it's also not about reading...?
[19:09] Like, how is reading aloud in this technical setup connected with knowledge creation/exchange via publishing? I think the experience of losing control, of cacophony, and all of that, is very important as an exercise of listening, acknowledging others, letting thoughts flow in a non-instrumental way, and so on.

(Annavittoria, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Jessi, Loraine, Maddalena, Nora, Rebekka, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

Diaspora

You[115] situate “the locus of diasporic individual and communal identity formation within shape-shifting virtual “communities built around shared knowledge and experience that manifest in scholarly practices” considering scholarly practices themselves “as constituting a knowledge diaspora: the knowledge itself is scattered, shared among virtual communities, facilitating new relationships and networks around the broader set of investigations possible at the intersections of the digital and the humanistic”.

Diaspora re-visited (🚩) A reading group Lost in translation? (acknowledging it)

[113] Maree Brown, 2021
[114] Maree Brown, 2021
[115] Risam, 2019, 75

Refrain (The Re-Reading Room)

[19:26] interesting, why are we still taking about "open access"?

(Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

Open Access II (The Re-Reading Room)

[19:10] It's like the emphasis is on the "room" -- the space and the shape it takes (which shifts based on the approach to or exercise of "reading")
[19:11] I think the exercise in itself could be thought as a disappropiative experiment.
[19:12] But is acknowledging others here increased by the shift away from the text's meaning or decreased?
[19:23] Since challenging property and practice is what disappropriation means here
[19:25] At the beginning Garza says that disappropriative poetics views language as not a resource but a "fraught relationship involving bodies..." --> is that what we practiced together in the exercises? Does that offer a different way to approach open access vs. viewing "access" as an accumulation of resources just kind loosely presented?
[19:28] "situated open access"?
[19:30] Situated is another word we might want to interrogate. I have so many!
[19:32] Hebe Vessuri
[19:33] yupp, "situated" is one of the vehicles to be reflected on
[19:33] https://ocsdnet.org/tag/situated-openness/
[19:34] Along with “care”. “Community”...
[19:34] all of them!
[19:34] it's better not to try to mean too much, or anything
[19:34] Eh?

(Annavittoria, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Jessi, Loraine, Maddalena, Nora, Rebekka, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

Now. (Almost) All is Question Marks

??!???????????
??
???????????????????????????????????~~????~~?????????????????????????????.??????????????????
???????????????????????????:??
???????????????????????????????????????,???
??;?????

Is it Love? II (Diffraction) (The Re-Reading Room)

[20:25] I hated the first ten minutes, not going to lie :)
But it turned into something
really intriguing - and was great to have time to
talk,
to meet and explore this to hear you all.
[20:25] I really enjoyed it
[20:26] OMG
this is the time when work is becoming
solid love is it?!
[20:28] i wondered about this invitation to the “Rebekka circle,”
but actually there are “many Rebekkas”
(i don't know her new research colleagues, her new friends from the UK, i'm sure many don't know me...)
There is something of a “post-corona” comfort I'm developing
with these kinds of “flat” (in the sense of non-hierarchical)
invitations
[20:29] I love this - coteries get a bad press (rightly, often!),

but this feels like
it was or could become some kind
of paradoxically open coterie.

(Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

The World After / Worlding After

Drifting away, fading out.

Fringe and Frazzle Theorising.
Trapping reverberations.
Holding on echoes.

Opening out
(one very last time).

Loose Ends (New Openings)

You, know, by the way — I was thinking about your session on Friday and how much it would make sense as part of an Open Access publisher … to have that kind of thing as a kind of 'service side' to the publishing process. It would really make things like Meson press SO MUCH better and cooler if there was a kind of event / community side, and someone running things like what you did on Friday. I mean a publishing house that we start, that creates value from the community generation around published works.

Diese Idee, einen Chor zu bilden, im Chor zu sprechen, diese Mehr- und Vielstimmigkeit, trotz aller Widerstände, äußerer und vielleicht auch innerer Art, ist sehr stark und man kann daraus ganz viel mitnehmen. Dann die Wörter, die obenauf schwimmen, oder ganze Sätze und Strukturen, die unterspült werden oder untergehen.

For me personally, our specific re-reading room established a new type of exclusion and closure of the text, nonetheless I can imagine that it had the opposite effect for other participants. While reading silently on my own allows me to focus and contemplate …, the situation of presence and being social with the help of a medium that didn't allow for any hesitation put me under a lot of pressure and actually paralysed me … Another aspect that drew me away from actually participating in the practices is my strong aversion against any kind of collective ritual. It felt very ritualistic ... I think it's wrong to focus too much on the digital, since this is where accessibility is not for many people. Also, texts should morph into different iterations more easily. "Authors" should allow others to produce them, and support should be provided for those who are motivated to produce other iterations. CC licensing is insufficient to support those practices. I would like to see a system evolve

that supports all kinds of contributors without the urge to credit any contribution, since this actually is an appropriation of the social that everyone carries in their minds, which is an idea grounded in "Western" ideology, in modernity. If we let go of this, transcultural interactions have a better chance to take place.

Ich wollte dir nur sagen, dass du es wirklich wunderbar geschafft hast, einen safe space unter so vielen Leuten zu kreieren, und dieses Treffen verlangt nach mehr!

I think a book that it would be interesting to read aloud (throughout several sessions) is Ivan Illich's *In the Vineyard of the Text.*

It was really curious, how some sort of switch flicked in my brain when we were doing the reading aloud together, and I let go of all my discomfort and started hearing. I was thinking a lot about new, online, digital coteries and how that group of people fitted themselves together through the course of the reading. How many of them knew each other already?

Wichtiger: ich hoffe du hast die ganze Liebe genossen die da floss.

(Anna-Luise, Annavittoria, Dubravka, Eva, Gabriela, Gary, Ivonne, Jamie, Janneke, Jessi, Joana, Julien, Loraine, Maddalena, Marie-France, Nina, Nora, Patrick, Sheila, Silke, Stefano)

Bibliography

Adair, C. & Nakamura, L. (2017). The digital afterlives of *This bridge called my back*: Woman of color feminism, digital labor, and networked pedagogy. *American Literature*, *89*(2), 255–278. DOI: 10.1215/00029831-3861505

Adema, J. (2015). *Knowledge production beyond the book? Performing the scholarly monograph in contemporary digital culture*. [Doctoral dissertation]. Coventry University, Coventry. pureportal.coventry.ac.uk/en/studentTheses/knowledge-production-beyond-the-book-performing-the-scholarly-mon

Adema, J. (2017). Cut-Up. In E. Navas, O. Gallagher, & x. burrough (Eds.), *Keywords in Remix Studies* (pp. 104-114). Routledge. DOI: 10.17613/M64V68

Adema, J. (2018). The poethics of openness. In J. Adema, K. Marczewska, F. McDonlad, & V. Trettien (Eds.), *The poethics of scholarship* (pp. 16-23). Post Office Press & Rope Press.

Adema, J. (2021). *Living Books: Experiments in the Posthumanities*. MIT Press. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/11297.001.0001

Adema, J., Bowie, S., Hall, G., & Kiesewetter, R. (2022, December 1). A workflow for Combinatorial Books. *COPIM*. copim.pubpub.org/pub/workflow-for-combinatorial-books/release/1

Adema, J., & Hall, G. (2013). The political nature of the book: on artists' books and radical open access. *New Formations 78*(1), 138-156. DOI: 10.3898/NewF.78.07.2013

Adema, J., Hall, G., & Cota, G. M. (2021, April 30). Combinatorial Books—Gathering Flowers—Part III. *COPIM*. DOI: 10.21428/785a6451.6804756b

Adema, J. & Kiesewetter, R. (2022). Experimental Book Publishing: Reinventing Editorial Workflows and Engaging Communities. *Commonplace. Series 2.2. Community-led Editorial Management.* commonplace.knowledgefutures.org/pub/8cj33owo/release/1?readingCollection=6d0221f4

Adema, J., & Moore, S. A. (2018). Collectivity and collaboration: Imagining new forms of communality to create resilience in scholar-led publishing. *Insights*, *31*(3), 1–11. DOI: 10.1629/uksg.399

Adema, J., & Moore, S. A. (2021). Scaling Small; Or How to Envision New Relationalities for Knowledge Production. *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture*, *16*(1). DOI: 10.16997/wpcc.918

African Book Collective (n.d.). About us. africanbookscollective.com/about-us

Ahmed, S. (1998). *Differences That Matter: Feminist Theory and Postmodernism*. Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511489389

Ahmed, S. (2002). This other and other others. *Economy and Society*, *31*(4), 558–572. DOI: 10.1080/0308514002200020689

Ahmed, S. (2010). *The Promise of Happiness*. Duke University Press. DOI: 10.2307/j.ctv125jkj2

Aigner, F. & Čičigoj, K. (2014). Sobre la diferència que marca la diferència i com hi ha coses que arriben a ser rellevants i altres que no. L'agència i la subjectivitat política en el nou materialisme feminista de Karen Barad. *Artnodes*, *14*(14). DOI: 10.7238/a.v0i14.2406

Alatas, S. F. (2003). Academic Dependency and the Global Division of Labour in the Social Sciences. *Current Sociology*, *51*(6), 599–613. DOI: 10.1177/00113921030516003

Alatas, S.H. (1977). *The Myth of the Lazy Native.* Frank Cass & Co. DOI: 10.1017/S0022463400012030

Alatas, S.H. (2000). Intellectual Imperialism: Definition, Traits, and Problems. *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, *28*, 23–45. DOI: 10.1163/030382400X00154

Albornoz, D., Huang, M., Martin, I. M., Mateus, M., Touré, A. Y., & Chan, L. (2018, June). Framing Power: Tracing Key Discourses in Open Science Policies. [Paper presentation]. ELPUB 2018 22nd International Conference on Electronic Publishing, Toronto, Canada. DOI: 10.4000/proceedings.elpub.2018.23

Albornoz, D., Okune, A., & Chan, L. (2020). Can Open Scholarly Practices Redress Epistemic Injustice? In M. Eve & J. Gray (Eds.), *Reassembling Scholarly Communications: Histories, Infrastructures, and Global Politics of Open Access*. MIT Press. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/11885.003.0016I

Albornoz, D., Posada, A., Okune, A., Hillyer, R., & Chan, L. (2017). Co-Constructing an Open and Collaborative Manifesto to Reclaim the Open Science Narrative. In L. Chan & F. Loizides (Eds.), *Expanding Perspectives on Open Science: Communities, Cultures and Diversity in Concepts and Practices* (pp. 293-304). IOS Press.

Alcoff, L. M. (1991). The Problem of Speaking for Others. *Cultural Critique*, *20*, 5–32. DOI: 10.2307/1354221

Alcoff, L. M. (1995). Is the Feminist Critique of Reason Rational?. *Philosophical Topics*, *23*(2), 1–26. DOI: 10.5840/philtopics19952323

Alexander, M.J., & Mohanty, C.T. (1997). *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*. Psychology Press.

Alexander, M.J., & Mohanty, C.T. (2010). Cartographies of knowledge and power. Transnational feminism as radical praxis. In A. Lock Swarr, R. Nagar (Eds.), *Critical Transnational Feminist Praxis* (pp. 23-45). State University of New York Press.

Alperin, J., Fischman, G., & Willinsky, J. (2008). Open access and scholarly publishing in Latin America: Ten flavours and a few reflections. *Liinc em Revista*, *1*. DOI: 10.18617/liinc.v4i2.269

AmeliCA (n.d.). Principles and Values. amelica.org/index.php/en/principles-and-values/

APS (American Philosophical Society) (n.d.). In Franklin's Footsteps: 275 Years at the American Philosophical Society (Online Exhibition). amphilsoc.org/museum/exhibitions/franklins-footsteps-275-years-american-philosophical-society-online-exhibition

Amiran, E., Orr, E., & Unsworth, J. (1990a). Preface. *Postmodern Culture, 1*(1). pomoculture.org/2013/09/26/preface/

Amiran, E., Orr, E., & Unsworth, J. (1990b). Postface: Positions on postmodernism. *Postmodern Culture, 1*(1). pomoculture.org/2013/09/26/postface-positions-on-postmodernism/

Anzaldúa, G. (1983). La prieta. In Ch. Moraga & G. Anzaldúa (Eds.), *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color* (2nd ed.) (pp. 189-209). Kitchen Table.

Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands / La Frontera*. Aunt Lute Books.

Anzaldúa, G., & Keating, A. (Eds.) (2002). *This bridge we call home: Radical visions for transformation*. Routledge.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity At Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization.* University of Minnesota Press.

Appadurai, A. (2000). Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination. *Public Culture*, *12*(1), 1–19. DOI: 10.1215/08992363-12-1-1

Appadurai, A. (2006). The Right to Research. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *4*, 167–177. DOI: 10.1080/14767720600750696

Arao, B., & Clemens, K. (2013). From Safe Spaces to Brave Spaces: a new way to frame dialogue around diversity and social justice. In L. Landreman (Ed.), *The Art of Effective Facilitation: Reflections from Social Justice Educators* (pp. 135-150). Stylus Publishing.

Arbuckle, A., & Maxwell, J. (2019). Modelling Open Social Scholarship Within the INKE Community. *KULA: Knowledge Creation, Dissemination, and Preservation Studies*, *3*(1), 1–8. DOI: 10.5334/kula.15

Aries Systems Corporation (n.d.). Publish Faster. Publish Smarter. ariessys.com/

Aspesi, C., Allen, N., Crow, R., Daugherty, S., Joseph, H., McArthur, J., Shockey, N., (2019). SPARC* Landscape Analysis: The Changing Academic Publishing Industry – Implications for Academic Institutions. DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska. digitalcommons.unl.edu/scholcom/99/

Aspesi, C., & Brand, A. (2020). In pursuit of open science, open access is not enough. *Science*, *368*(6491), 574–577. DOI: 10.1126/science.aba3763

Babini, D. (2019, September 2). Plan S and Open Access in Latin America: Interview with Dominique Babini. *AmeliCA.* amelica.org/index.php/en/2019/09/02/plan-s-and-open-access-in-latin-america-interview-with-dominique-babini/

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning.* Duke University Press. DOI: 10.1515/9780822388128

Barnes, L. (2018, September 24). Ten Years of OBP: An Interview with Alessandra Tosi and Rupert Gatti (Part One). *Open Book Publishers Blog*. DOI: 10.11647/OBP.0173.0082

Barnes, L., & Gatti, R. (2019). Bibliodiversity in Practice: Developing Community-Owned, Open Infrastructures to Unleash Open Access Publishing. In *ELPUB 2019 23d International Conference on Electronic Publishing.* OpenEdition Press. DOI: 10.4000/proceedings.elpub.2019.21

Bargheer, M., & Verdicchio, D. (2020, November 25). Auswirkungen von Policies und Infrastrukturen auf die Wissenschaftskommunikation. [Paper presentation]. Open Access: mehr Partizipation oder neue Ungleichheiten? Bern, Switzerland.

Becerril-García, A. (2019, February 10). AmeliCA vs Plan S: Same target, two different strategies to achieve Open Access. *AmeliCA.* amelica.org/index.php/en/2019/02/10/amelica-vs-plan-s-same-target-two-different-strategies-to-achieve-open-access/

Becerril-García, A. (2020, May 20). The commercial model of academic publishing underscoring Plan S weakens the existing open access ecosystem in Latin America. *LSE.* blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2020/05/20/the-commercial-model-of-academic-publishing-underscoring-plan-s-weakens-the-existing-open-access-ecosystem-in-latin-america/

Becerril-García, A., & Aguado-López, E. (2019). Redalyc-AmeliCA A non-profit publishing model to preserve the scholarly and open nature of scientific communication. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; Latin American Council of Social Sciences; Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America and the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal; Autonomous University of the State of Mexico; National University of La Plata; University of Antioquia. amelica.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/proyecto-en-extenso-AmeliCA-eng.pdf

Becerril-García, A., & Aguado-López, E. (2018). The End of a Centralized Open Access Project and the Beginning of a Community-Based Sustainable Infrastructure for Latin America: Redalyc.org after Fifteen Years. The Open Access ecosystem in Latin America. [Paper presentation]. ELPUB 2018 22nd International Conference on Electronic Publishing, Toronto, Canada. DOI: 10.4000/proceedings.elpub.2018.27

Becerril-García, A., Bjørnshauge, L., Bosman, J., Frantsvåg, J. E., Kramer, B., Langlais, P.-C., Mounier, P., Proudman, V., Redhead, C., & Torny, D. (2021). The OA Diamond Journals Study. Part 2: Recommendations. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4562790

Beigel, F. (2013). *The politics of academic autonomy in Latin America*. Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781315554426

Beigel, F. (2018). Las relaciones de poder en la ciencia mundial Un anti-ranking para conocer la ciencia producida en la periferia. *NUEVA SOCIEDAD 274*, 13–28. nuso.org/articulo/las-relaciones-de-poder-en-la-ciencia-mundial/

Beigel, M. F., Gallardo, J. O., & Bekerman, F. A. (2018). Institutional Expansion and Scientific Development in the Periphery: The Structural Heterogeneity of Argentina's Academic Field. *Minerva 56*, 305–331. DOI: 10.1007/s11024-017-9340-2

Belcourt, B.-R. (2020). *A History of My Brief Body*. Two Dollar Radio.

Bennett, A. (2004). *The Author.* Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9780203003312

Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities (2003). openaccess.mpg.de/67605/berlin_declaration_engl.pdf

Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing (2003). legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/bethesda.htm

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

Blaikie, N. (2000). *Designing Social Research.* Polity Press.

BMBF (Bundesminsiterium für Bildung und Forschung) (n.d.). Digitalisierung in Bildung und Forschung. bmbf.de/bmbf/de/forschung/digitale-wirtschaft-und-gesellschaft/open-access/open-access_node.html

BOAI (Budapest Open Access Initiative) (2002). budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read

BOAI (2022). The Budapest Open Access Initiative: 20th Anniversary Recommendations. budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/boai20/

Boehm, G. (2009). Kunstwissenschaft. In Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung (Ed.). *Diskussionspapiere der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung. Publikationsverhalten in unterschiedlichen wissenschaftlichen Disziplinen. Beiträge zur Beurteilung von Forschungsleistungen* (pp. 62-63). Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung. qs.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/d_qualitaetssicherung/Dateidownloads/Publikationsverhalten_in_unterschiedlichen_wissenschaftlichen_Disziplinen.pdf

Bondi, M. (2005): Metadiscursive practices in academic discourse: Variations across Genres and Disciplines. In J. Bamford and M. Bondi (Eds.), *Dialogue within Discourse Communities* (pp. 3-30). Niemeyer.

Bonsiepe, G. (2000). Design as Tool for Cognitive Metabolism. [Paper presentation]. International symposium on the dimensions of industrial design research, Milan, Italy. guibonsiepe.com/pdffiles/descogn.pdf

Borgman, C.L. (2007). *Scholarship in the Digital Age: Information, Infrastructure, and the Internet.* MIT Press. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/7434.001.0001

Bornmann, L., Haunschild, R., & Mutz, R. (2021). Growth rates of modern science: A latent piecewise growth curve approach to model publication numbers from established and new literature databases. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *8*(1). DOI: 10.1057/s41599-021-00903-w

Bosman, J., & Cramer, B. (2018). Open access levels: a quantitative exploration using Web of Science and OA DOI data. [Preprint]. *PeerJ*. DOI: 10.7287/peerj.preprints.3520v1

Bouziane, A., & Metkal, F. E. (2020). Differences in Research Abstracts written in Arabic, French, and English. *English Studies at NBU*, *6*(2), 233–248. DOI: 10.33919/esnbu.20.2.4

Bowie, S. (2022, July 7). What is computational publishing? *COPIM.* copim.pubpub.org/pub/computational-publishing/release/1?readingCollection=ace58019

Bowie, S., Hall, G., & Kiesewetter R. (2022, December 1). Implementing a Workflow for Combinatorial Books. *COPIM.* copim.pubpub.org/pub/combinatorial-books-documentation-workflows-post4/release/1?readingCollection=ace58019

Brah, A. (1996). *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*. Psychology Press.

Braidotti, R. (2018). Four Theses on Posthuman Feminism. In R. Grusin (Ed.), *Anthropocene Feminism* (pp.21-48). University of Minnesota Press.

Braidotti, R. (2011). *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory.* Columbia University Press.

Brazilian Manifesto to Support Open Access to Scientific Information (Manifesto Brasileiro de Apoio ao Acesso Livre à Informação Cientifica) (2005)**.** livroaberto.ibict.br/Manifesto.pdf

Brautigan, R. (1968). *In Watermelon Sugar*. Four Seasons Foundation.

Bruijns, S., & Lamanna, C. (2018, Januar 29). The case for a regional approach to publication impact. *Ecancermedicalscience.* DOI: 10.3332/ecancer.2018.ed78

Buranyi, S. (2017). Is the Staggeringly Profitable Business of Scientific Publishing Bad for Science? *The Guardian,* 27 June 2017. theguardian.com/science/2017/jun/27/profitable-business-scientific-publishing-bad-for-science

Burgelmann, J.C. (2019). Introduction to the European Open Science Policy. [Paper presentation]. Taylor & Francis Amsterdam Scholarly Summit, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Canagarajah, A.S. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. University of Pittsburgh Press. DOI: 10.2307/j.ctt5hjn6c

Césaire, A. (2000). *Discourse on Colonialism*. Monthly Review Press. (Original work published 1955).

Cetto, A.M., Schneegans, S., & Moore, H. (2000). *World Conference on Science: Science for the Twenty-first Century*. unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000120706

Chan, L., Hall, B., Piron, F., Tandon, R., & Williams, W. L. (2020). *Open Science Beyond Open Access: For and with communities, A step towards the decolonization of knowledge* (Version 1). DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3946773

Chan, L. & Loizides, F. (Eds.) (2020). *Expanding Perspectives on Open Science: Communities, Cultures and Diversity in Concepts and Practices*. IOS Press.

Chang, V., Mills, H., & Newhouse, S. (2007). *From Open Source to long-term sustainability: Review of Business Models and Case studies*. [Workshop item]. All Hands Meeting 2007, OMII-UK Workshop, Nottingham, United Kingdom.eprints.soton.ac.uk/263925/

Chen, K.-H., Morley, D. (1996). *Stuart Hall Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies.* Routledge.

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: The 22nd International Conference on Electronic Publishing – Revised Selected Papers*. OpenEdition Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4320065

Choudry, A. (2020). Reflections on academia, activism, and the politics of knowledge and learning. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, *24*(1), 28–45. DOI: 10.1080/13642987.2019.1630382

Christen, K. (2012). Does information really want to be free? Indigenous knowledge systems and the question of openness. *International Journal of Communication*, 6, 2870–2893. ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/1618

Collins, E., & Milloy, C. (2016). *OAPEN-UK final report: a five-year study into open access monograph publishing in the humanities and social sciences*. AHRC, Jisc. oapen-uk.jiscebooks.org/finalreport/

Conklin, E.G. (1947). The American Philosophical Society and International Relations. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 91*(1), 1–9.

COPIM (n.d.). About. copim.ac.uk/about-us/

COPIM (Adema, J., Bowie, S., Mars, M., & Steiner, T.) (2022, April 26). Books Contain Multitudes: Exploring Experimental Publishing (2022 update). *COPIM*. DOI: 10.21428/785a6451.1792b84f

COPIM (Adema, J., Moore, S., & Steiner, T.) (2021, October 15). Promoting and Nurturing Interactions with Open Access Books: Strategies for Publishers and Authors. *COPIM.* DOI: 10.21428/785a6451.2d6f4263

Costa, M. P. da, & Leite, F. C. L. (2016). Open access in the world and Latin America: A review since the Budapest Open Access Initiative. *Transinformação*, *28*(1), 33–46. DOI: 10.1590/2318-08892016002800003

Craig, C. J, Turcotte, J. F., & Coombe R. J. (2011). What's feminist about open access? A relational approach to copyright in the academy. *feminists@law*, *1*(1), 1–25. DOI: 10.22024/UniKent/03/fal.7

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. U*niversity of Chicago Legal Forum*, *8*. chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8

Crossley, G. (2021, September). Dissertation Conclusion 101 (Including Examples). *Grad Coach*. gradcoach.com/dissertation-conclusion-chapter/

Cullen, D., & Bell, A. (2018). The Social Text and Networked Knowledge: New Modes of Scholarly Book Publishing in Indigenous Studies. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing 49*(2), 193–212. DOI: 10.3138/jsp.49.2.193

Czisar, A. (2018). *The Scientific Journal: Authorship and the Politics of Knowledge in the Nineteenth Century*. University of Chicago Press.

Darnton, R. (1999). The New Age of the Book. *The New York review of books, 46*(5). nybooks.com/articles/1999/03/18/the-new-age-of-the-book/

Davis, S. (1995). Surviving the Serials Crisis: Are E-journals an Answer? *Serials Review*, *21*(4), 95–96. DOI: 10.1080/00987913.1995.10764286

Death, C., & Gabay, C. (2015). Doing Biopolitics Differently? Radical Potential in the Post-2015 MDG and SDG Debates. *Globalizations*, *12*(4), 597–612. DOI: 10.1080/14747731.2015.1033172

Debat, H., & Babini, D. (2019). Plan S: Take Latin America's long experience on board. *Nature*, *573*(7775), 495. DOI: 10.1038/d41586-019-02857-1

De Mourat, R., Ricci, D., & Latour, B.. (2020). How Does a Format Make a Public? In M. P. Eve & J. Gray (Eds.), *Reassembling Scholarly Communications: Histories, Infrastructures, and Global Politics of Open Access* (pp. 104-112). MIT Press. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/11885.003.0016

Derrida, J. (1983). *Dissemination.* University of Chicago Press.

Deville, J. (2021, May 4). Open access publishing and the promise of collaboration. *COPIM*. DOI: 10.21428/785a6451.5ba5502c

Dirlik, A. (1997). The Global in the Local. In A. Dirlik, *The Postcolonial Aura* (pp. 84-104). Routledge.

Dirlik, A. (2002). Rethinking Colonialism: Globalization, Postcolonialism, And The Nation. *Interventions*, *4*(3), 428–448. DOI: 10.1080/1369801022000013833

DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals) (n.d.). Guide to applying. doaj.org/apply/guide/

Dolphijn, R. & Van der Tuin, I. (2012). *New Materialism: Interviews & Cartographies*. Open Humanities Press.

DORA (n.d.). San Francisco Declaration of Research Assessment. sfdora.org/read/

Douglas, K. (1990). The Serials Crisis. *The Serials Librarian, 18*(1-2), 111–121. DOI: 10.1300/J123 v 18n01_08

Drucker, J. (2009). Entity to event: From literal, mechanistic materiality to probabilistic materiality. *Parallax*, *15*(4), 7–17. DOI: 10.1080/13534640903208834

Drucker, J. (2014). Distributed and conditional documents: Conceptualizing bibliographical alterities. *MATLIT: Revista Do Programa de Doutoramento Em Materialidades Da Literatura*, *2*(1), 11–29. DOI: 10.14195/2182-8830_2-1_1

D'Souza, R. (2009). The Prison Houses of Knowledge: Activist scholarship and revolution in the era of "globalization". *McGill Journal of Education*, *44*(1), 19–38. DOI: 10.7202/037770ar

Dussel, E. (2002). World-System and Trans-Modernity. *Nepantla: Views from South*, *3*(2), 221–244. ifil.org/dussel/textos/c/2002-332.pdf

Edmonds, J. (2018). How Scholars Read Now: When the Signal Is the Noise. *DHQ: Digital Humanities Quarterly, 12*(2), 1–10. digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/12/2/000388/000388.html

Eisenstein, E. L. (1980). *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change. Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Europe.* Cambridge University Press.

Elsevier (n.d.(a)). Scopus Expertly curated abstract & citation database. elsevier.com/solutions/scopus

Elsevier (n.d.(b)). Guide for Authors. elsevier.com/journals/learning-and-instruction/0959-4752/guide-for-authors

Enszer, J.R., & Beins, A. (2018). Inter- and transnational feminist theory and practice in *Triple jeopardy* and *Conditions*. *Women's Studies*, *47*(1), 21–43. DOI: 10.1080/00497878.2017.1406353

Escobar, A. (2018). *Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds*. Duke University Press.

Escobar, A. (1995). Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World. Princeton University Press.

Escobar, A. (2004). Beyond the Third World: Imperial Globality, Global Coloniality, and Anti-Globalisation Social Movements. *Third World Quarterly 25*(1): 217–230.

Eve, M. P. (2015). Co-Operating for Gold Open Access without APCs. *Insights the UKSG Journal 28*(1), 73–77.

Eve, M. P., Inglis, K., Prosser, D., Speicher, L., & Stone, G. (2017). Cost Estimates of an Open Access Mandate for Monographs in the UK's Third Research Excellence Framework. *Insights the UKSG Journal* 30 (3): 89–102. DOI: 10.1629/uksg.392

Eve, M. P., & Gray, J. (Eds.). (2020). *Reassembling Scholarly Communications: Histories, Infrastructures, and Global Politics of Open Access*. MIT Press. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/11885.001.0001

Eyman, D., & Ball, C. E. (2014). Composing for Digital Publication: Rhetoric, Design, Code. *Composition Studies*, *42*(1), 114–117.

Eysenbach, G. (2006). The Open Access Advantage. *J Med Internet Res. 8*(2). DOI: 10.2196/jmir.8.2.e8

Fanon, F. (2007). *The Wretched of the Earth*. Grove Atlantic. (Original work published in 1961).

Farley, A., Langham-Putrow, A., Shook, E., Sterman, L. B., & Wacha, M. (2021). Transformative agreements: Six myths, busted. *College & Research Libraries News, 82*(7). DOI: 10.5860/crln.82.7.298

Fitzpatrick, K. (2011). *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy*. NYU Press.

Fitzpatrick, K. (2019). *Generous Thinking: A Radical Approach to Saving the University*. Johns Hopkins University Press. DOI: 10.1353/book.99579

Foucault M (1991). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In: Rabinow P (ed.) The Foucault Reader. Pantheon.

Fournier, L. (2021). *Autotheory as Feminist Practice in Art, Writing, and Criticism*. MIT Press.

Fraser, N. (2019). *The Old Is Dying and the New Cannot Be Born: From Progressive Neoliberalism to Trump and Beyond.* Verso.

Fredericks, B. (2011). “Universities are not the safe places we would like to think they are, but they are getting safer”: Indigenous women academics in higher education. *Journal of Australian Indigenous Issues, 14*(1), 41–53. eprints.qut.edu.au/38492/

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* Penguin.

Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing.* Oxford University Press.

Fyfe, A. (2020). The Royal Society and the Noncommercial Circulation of Knowledge. In M. P. Eve & J. Gray (Eds.), *Reassembling Scholarly Communications: Histories, Infrastructures, and Global Politics of Open Access*. MIT Press. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/11885.003.0016

Fyfe, A., Coate, K., Curry, S., Lawson, S., Moxham, N., & Røstvik, C. M. (2017). Untangling Academic Publishing: A history of the relationship between commercial interests, academic prestige and the circulation of research. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.546100

Gallagher, M. & Blaney, M. (2021, June 16th). M&M Podcast 24. The one where we talk with Lorna Campbell. [Podcast]. media.ed.ac.uk/media/M%26M+Podcast+24A+The+one+where+we+talk+with+Lorna+Campbell/1_trtn5ipx/134395031

Garreau, F.H. (1988). Another Type of Third World Dependency: The Social Sciences. *International Sociology 3*(2), 171–178.

Gaudio, M. (2016). *The Bible and the Printed Image in Early Modern England: Little Gidding and the pursuit of scriptural harmony* (1st edition). Routledge.

Gilley, J. (2017). Ghost in the machine: Kitchen table press and the *Third wave anthology* that vanished. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, *38*(3), 141–163. DOI: 10.5250/fronjwomestud.38.3.0141

Gilroy, P. (1993). *Small Acts: Thoughts on the Politics of Black Cultures*. Serpent’s Tail.

Giménez Toledo, E., Kulczycki, E., Pölönen, J. & Sivertsen, G. (2019, Dezember 5). Bibliodiversity – What it is and why it is essential to creating situated knowledge. *LSE Impact of Social Sciences*.

blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2019/12/05/bibliodiversity-what-it-is-and-why-it-is-essential-to-creating-situated-knowledge/

Gramsci, A. (1975[1929]). *Quaderni del Carcere: Edizione Critica dell'Istituto Gramsci*. Einaudi.

Gray, E., Trotter, H., & Willmers, M. (2012). A view from the South, scholarly communication in Africa: Aligning strategy and technology for increased visibility of Southern African research. [Paper presentation]. IAMCR 2012, Durban, South Africa.

Grewal, I., & Kaplan, C. (1994). *Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices*. University of Minnesota Press.

Grosfoguel, R. (2012). Decolonizing Western Universalisms: Decolonial Pluriversalism from Aimé Césaire to the Zapatistas. *Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World, 1*(3), 88–104. DOI: 10.5070/T413012884

Guédon, J.-C. (2008). *Open Access and the divide between "mainstream" and "peripheral" science*. e-Lis. eprints.rclis.org/10778/

Guédon, J.-C. (2017, February 23). Open access: Toward the internet of the mind. budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/boai15/open-access-toward-the-internet-of-the-mind/

Guilluroy, J. (2008). How Scholars Read. *ADE Bulletin 146*, 8–17. DOI: 10.1632/ade.146.8

Gumbs, A. P. (2018). *M archive: After the end of the world*. Duke University Press

Gumbs, A. P. (2020). *Dub: Finding Ceremony*. Duke University Press.

Habib, M.A.R. (n.d.). The Myth of Liberal Humanism. *Rutgers.* habib.camden.rutgers.edu/publications/essays/the-myth-of-liberal-humanism/

Hall, G. (2002). *Culture in Bits: The Monstrous Future of Theory.* Bloomsbury.

Hall, G. (2008). *Digitize this book!* University of Minnesota Press.

Hall, G. (2019, February 18). Media gifts – The Left can't meme? *Media Gifts.* garyhall.squarespace.com/journal/2019/2/18/the-left-cant-meme.html

Hall, S. (2010[1980]). Encoding—Decoding. In C. Greer (ed.). *Crime and Media*. Routledge. 44-55

Hall, S. (Ed.) (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. Sage in association with the Open University.

Hanauer, D. I., & Englander, K. (2011). Quantifying the Burden of Writing Research Articles in a Second Language: Data From Mexican Scientists. *Written Communication*, *28*(4), 403–416. DOI: 10.1177/0741088311420056

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14 (3), 575–599. DOI: 10.2307/3178066

Haraway, D. (1997). ModestWitness@SecondMillennium.FemaleMan©_MeetsOncoMouse™: Feminism and Technoscience. *Journal of the History of Biology 30*(3), 494–497. DOI: 10.1023/a:1004349615837

Hardin, R. (2003). *Liberalism, Constitutionalism, and Democracy*. Oxford University Press.

Harding, S. (1991). *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?: Thinking from Women's Lives*. Cornell University Press.

Harding, S. (2002). Must the Advance of Science Advance Global Inequality? *International Studies Review*, *4*(2). 87–105. DOI: 10.1111/1521-9488.00256

Harnad, S. (1990). Scholarly Skywriting and the Prepublication Continuum of Scientific Inquiry. *Psychological Science 1*, 342–343. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.1990.tb00234.x

Harnad, S. (1995). A Subversive Proposal. In A. Okerson, & J. O'Donnell, J. (Eds.) *Scholarly Journals at the Crossroads: A Subversive Proposal for Electronic Publishing.* Association of Research Libraries. eprints.soton.ac.uk/253351/

Hartman, S. (1997). *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-making in Nineteenth-century America*. Oxford University Press.

Hartman, S. (2008). *Lose Your Mother: A Journey Along the Atlantic Slave Route*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Hartsock, N. (1990). Postmodernism and political change: issues for feminist theory. *Cultural Critique 14*(14), 15–33. DOI: 10.2307/1354291

Hartsock, N. (1996). Community/Sexuality/Gender: Rethinking Power. In N.J. Hirschmann & C. Di Stefano (Eds.), *Revisioning the Political: Feminist Reconstructions of Traditional Concepts in Western Political Theory* (pp. 27-49). Westview Press.

Hayles, N. K. (2010). How We Read: Close, Hyper, Machine. *ADE Bulletin*, 62–79. DOI: 10.1632/ade.150.62

Helms, J. (2018). *Making Rhizcomics. 23.1*. kairos.technorhetoric.net/23.1/inventio/helms/

Hepler, S., Cannon, S., Hartnett, C., & Peitso-Holbrook, T. (2019). Undoing and Doing-With: Practices of Diffractive Reading and Writing in Higher Education. In C.A. Taylor & A. Bayley (Eds.), *Posthumanism and Higher Education: Reimagining Pedagogy, Practice and Research* (pp. 141-151). Palgrave Macmillan.

Hess C. & Ostrom E. (Eds.) (2011). *Understanding knowledge as a commons: From theory to practice*. MIT Press.

Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L., et al. (2015). Bibliometrics: The Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. *Nature* 520, 429–43. DOI: 10.1038/520429a

Hill Collins, P. (1986). Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought. *Social Problems*, *33*(6), 14–32. DOI: 10.2307/800672

Hillyer, R., Albornoz, D., Posada, A., Okune, A., & Chan, L. (2019). Toward an Inclusive, Open, and Collaborative Science: Lessons from OCSDNet. In L. Chan & P. Mounier (Eds.), *Connecting the Knowledge Commons—From Projects to Sustainable Infrastructure: The 22nd International*

Conference on Electronic Publishing – Revised Selected Papers. OpenEdition Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4320065

Hinchliffe, L. J. (2019, April 23). Read-and-publish? Publish-and-read? A primer on transformative agreements *The Scholarly Kitchen.* scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2019/04/23/transformative-agreements/

hooks, b. (1990). Post modern blackness. *Postmodern Culture*, *1*(1). pomoculture.org/2013/09/26/postmodern-blackness/

Horava, T. (2015). Reading in a Digital Age: Issues and Opportunities—Part One. *Against the Grain 27*(1). DOI: 10.7771/2380-176X.6989

Howe, N. (2002). The Cultural Construction of Reading in Anglo-Saxon England. In R.M. Liuzza (Ed.), *Old English Literature: Critical Essays* (pp. 1-22). Yale University Press.

Hurrell, A., & Sengupta, S. (2012). Emerging powers, North-South relations and global climate politics. *International Affairs*, *88*(3), 463–484. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2346.2012.01084.x

Huttner-Koros, A., & Perera, S. (2016). Communicating science in English: A preliminary exploration into the professional self-perceptions of Australian scientists from language backgrounds other than English. *Journal of Science Communication*, *15*(6), DOI: 10.22323/2.15060203

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing.* Longman.

Illich, I. (1996). *In the Vineyard of the Text: A Commentary to Hugh's Didascalicon*. University of Chicago Press.

Jeffries, J., & Kember, S. (2019). *Whose book is it anyway? A view from elsewhere on publishing, copyright and creativity*. Open Book Publishers. DOI: doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0159

Johns, A. (1998). *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making.* University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 33*(7), 14–26. DOI: 10.3102/0013189X033007014

Jones, A., Eubanks, V., & Smith, B. (Eds.). (2014). *Ain't gonna let nobody turn me around: Forty years of movement building with Barbara Smith*. SUNY Press.

Joy, E. A. F., & Adema, J. (2022, September 2). Open Book Collective: A Model for Open Community-led Governance. *COPIM* blog. DOI: 10.21428/785a6451.d1a7e0dd

Kalir, R., & Garcia, A. (2019). *Annotation.* [Pre-published manuscript]. *MIT Press Open*. mitpressonpubpub.mitpress.mit.edu/annotation

Katz, C. (1996). Towards Minor Theory. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *14*(4), 487–499. DOI: 10.1068/d140487

Keating, A. (2013). *Transformation Now!: Toward a Post-Oppositional Politics of Change*. University of Illinois Press.

Kelty, C.M. (2008). *Two Bits: The Cultural Significance of Free Software.* Duke University Press.

Kelty, C.M. (2018). Recursive Publics and Open Access. In Memory of the World (Eds.), *Guerilla Open Access* (pp. 6-15). Post Office Press, Rope Press, Memory of the World.

Kelsey, M. P. (2014). *Reading the Wampum: Essays on Hodinöhsö:ni' Visual Code and Epistemological Recovery.* Syracuse University Press.

Kember, S. (2014a). Opening out from open access: Writing and publishing in response to neoliberalism. *Ada New Media 4*.

Kember, S. (2014b). Why Write? Feminism, Publishing and the Politics of Communication. *New Formations: A Journal of Culture, Theory, Politics*, *83*, 99–116.

Kember, S. & Zylinska, J. (2012). *Life after new media: Mediation as a vital process*. MIT Press. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/8796.001.0001

Kothari, A., Salleh, A., Escobar, A., Demaria, F., & Acosta, A. (Eds.). (2019). *Pluriverse: A Post-Development Dictionary*. Tulika Books.

Knöchelmann, M. (2020). *The Democratisation Myth: Open Access and the Solidification of Epistemic Injustices* [Preprint]. *SocArXiv.* DOI: 10.31235/osf.io/hw7at

Knöchelmann, M. (2021). The Democratisation Myth: Open Access and the Solidification of Epistemic Injustices. *Science & Technology Studies, 34*(2), 65–89. DOI: 10.23987/sts.94964

Kiesewetter, R. (2020a). A New Genealogy for Critical OA Publishing, Towards a Politics of Intersectional Transnationality. *Journal of International Women's Studies 21*(4). vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/vol21/iss7/6/

Kiesewetter, R. (2020b). Undoing Scholarship. *Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies 23*(2), 113–129. DOI: 10.5117/TVGN2020.2.001.KIES

Kiesewetter, R. (2022). A Community of Communities. *COPIM.* copim.pubpub.org/pub/combinatorial-books-documentation-reuse-rewriting-post3/release/2?readingCollection=ace58019

Krlev, G., & Spicer, A. (2022). Reining in Reviewer Two: How to Uphold Epistemic Respect in Academia. *Journal of Management Studies*, *60*(6). DOI: 10.1111/joms.12905

Law, J. (2004). *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9780203481141

Lawson, S. (2019). *Open access policy in the UK: From neoliberalism to the commons*. [Doctoral dissertation]. Birkbeck, University of London, London. DOI: 10.17613/ktz2-w249

Losurdo, D., & Elliott, G. (2014). *Liberalism: A Counter-History*. Verso Books.

Luescher, T. M., & Schalkwyk, F. V. (2018). African university presses and the institutional logic of the knowledge commons. *Learned Publishing*, *31*(S1), 288–298. DOI: 10.1002/leap.1187

Lugones, M. (2003). Tactical Strategies of the Streetwalker/Estrategias Tacticas de la Callejera. In M. Lugones. *Pilgrimages/Peregrinajes: Theorizing Coalition Against Multiple Oppressions* (pp. 53-63). Rowman and Littlefield.

Lujano Vilchis, I. (2022). Gender disparities in Editorial Boards of scholarly journals: the case of Latin American STEM journals. [Conference presentation]. 4S and ESOCITE conference, Cholula, Mexico.

Macaulay, T. B. (1965[1835]). Minute on Education. In H. Sharp (Ed.), *Bureau of Education. Selections from Educational Records, Part I (1781-1839)* (pp. 107-117). National Archives of India. columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00generallinks/macaulay/txt_minute_education_1835.html

MacKey-Mason, J. (2016, April 23). Economic thoughts about "gold" open access. *madLibbing*. madlibbing.berkeley.edu/economic-thoughts-about-gold-open-access/

Maree Brown, A. (2021). *Holding Change: The Way of Emergent Strategy Facilitation and Mediation*. AK Press.

Mauranen, A. (2007). Hybrid voices: English as the lingua franca of academics. In K. Fløttum, T. Dahl, & T. Kinn (Eds.), *Language and discipline: Perspectives on academic discourse* (pp. 244–259). Cambridge Scholars Press.

Mauranen, A., Hynninen, N. and Ranta, E. (2010). English as an academic lingua franca: The ELFA project. *English for Specific Purposes 29* (3), 183–190. DOI: 10.1016/j.esp.2009.10.001

Mayor, S. (2004). Open access could reduce cost of scientific publishing. *BMJ*, *328*(7448), 1094. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.328.7448.1094-d

Mandler, P. (2014). Open access: A perspective from the humanities. *Insights*, 27(2). DOI: 10.1629/2048-7754.89

Marczewska, K. (2018). The Horizon of The Publishable in/as Open Access: From Poethics to Praxis. In J. Adema, K. Marczewska, F. McDonald, & W. Trettien (Eds.), *The Poethics of Scholarship* (pp. 6-13). Post Office Press.

Maxwell, J. W., Hanson, E., Desai, L., Tiampo, C., O'Donnell, K., Ketheeswaran, A., Sun, M., Walter, E., & Michelle, E. (2019). *Mind the Gap: A Landscape Analysis of Open Source Publishing Tools and Platforms*. PubPub. DOI: 10.21428/6bc8b38c.2e2f6c3f

Mbembe, J.-A., & Meintjes, L. (2003). Necropolitics. *Public Culture*, *15*(1), 11–40. DOI: 10.1215/08992363-15-1-11

Mboa Nkoudou, T. H. (2020). *Epistemic Alienation in African Scholarly Communications: Open Access as a Pharmakon*. In M. P. Eve & J. Gray (Eds.), *Reassembling Scholarly Communications: Histories, Infrastructures, and Global Politics of Open Access*. MIT Press. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/11885.003.0006

McGann, J. (2004). *Radiant Textuality: Literature after the World Wide Web.* Palgrave Macmillan.

McKie, A. (2019). 'Location-specific' blocks on journal access could be OA 'interim solution'. *Times Higher Education,* 8 November 2019. timeshighereducation.com/news/location-specific-blocks-journal-access-could-be-oa-interim-solution

McKittrick, K. (Hrsg.). (2015). *Sylvia Wynter: On being human as praxis*. Duke University Press.

McClintock, A., Mufti, A., & Shohat, E. (1997). *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*. University of Minnesota Press.

Méndez Cota, G. (2018). On being heard: The content and the form of geopolitics. In Culture Machine (Eds.), *The geopolitics of open* (pp. 16-25). Post Office Press, Rope Press & Culture Machine.

Méndez Cota, G. (2020). Gabriela Méndez Cota responds to Gary Hall's Anti-Bourgeois Theory. *Media Theory*. mediatheoryjournal.org/gabriela-mendez-cota-responds-to-gary-halls-anti-bourgeois-theory/

Méndez Cota, G. (Ed.) (2023). *Ecological Rewriting: Situated Engagements with The Chernobyl Herbarium*. Open Humanities Press. DOI: 10.21428/9ca7392d.07cdfb82

Méndez Cota, G., Cuevas Parra, C., Monteon, Y., Hernández, S., Loyola, S., Rodríguez González, F., Garciamoreno Becerril, D., Bernal, E., Arteaga Villamil, X. & Rosales, N. (2023). Reuse, rewrite, disappropriate. In G.Méndez Cota. *Ecological Rewriting: Situated Engagements with The Chernobyl Herbarium*. Open Humanities Press. DOI: 10.21428/9ca7392d.07cdfb82

Merton, R.K. (1938). Social Structure and Anomie. *American Sociological Review*, *3*(5), 672–682. DOI: 10.2307/2084686

Merton, R. K. (1942). Science and Technology in a Democratic Order. *Journal of Legal and Political Sociology 1,* 115–126. panarchy.org/merton/science.html

Merton, R. K. (1973). *The Sociology of Science*. *Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. University of Chicago Press.

Mignolo, W. (1995). *The darker side of the Renaissance: Literacy, territoriality, and colonization.* University of Michigan Press.

Mohanty, C.T. (2003). *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Duke University Press.

Mohanty, C. T. (1984). Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses. *boundary 2, 12*(3), 333–358. DOI: 10.2307/302821

Moreiras, A. (2001). *The Exhaustion of Difference: The Politics of Latin American Cultural Studies.* Duke University Press.

Mouffe, C. (1999). Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic Pluralism? *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, *66*(3), 745–758.

Mouffe, C. (2000). *The Democratic Paradox*. Verso.

Moletsane, R. (2015). Whose Knowledge is It? Towards Reordering Knowledge Production and Dissemination in the Global South. *Educational Research for Social Change (ERSC) 4*(2), 35–47. ersc.nmmu.ac.za/articles/Vol_4_No_2_Moletsane_pp_35-48_October_2015.pdf

Moore, S.A. (2017). A genealogy of open access: Negotiations between openness and access to research. *Revue Française Des Sciences de l'information et de La Communication*, *1,* 1–15. DOI: 10.4000/rfsic.3220

Moore, S.A. (2019a). Revisiting 'the 1990s debutante': scholarled publishing and the pre-history of the open access movement. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 1–11. DOI: 10.17613/41h8-j423

Moore, S.A. (2019b). *Common Struggles: Policy-based vs. Scholar-led approaches to open access in the humanities*. [Doctoral dissertation]. King's College, London. DOI: 10.17613/st5m-cx33.

Moore, S.A. (2019c, Oktober 24). Open *By* Whom? On the Meaning of 'Scholar-Led'. *ScholarLed*. blog.scholarled.org/on-the-meaning-of-scholar-led/

Moore, S., & Adema, J. (2020). COPIM Experimental Publishing Workshop - Part 2: Promoting Experimental Publishing. *COPIM*. DOI: 10.21428/785a6451.a21d57b6

Moraga, C., & Anzaldúa, G. (Eds.) (1983). *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color* (2nd ed.). Kitchen Table.

Mrva-Montoya, A. (2015). Beyond the monograph: Publishing research for multimedia and multiplatform delivery. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, *46*(4), 321–342. DOI: 10.3138/jsp.46.4.02

Nagar, R. (2019). *Hungry Translations: Relearning the World through Radical Vulnerability*. University of Illinois Press.

Nancy, J.-L. (2006). On the Meanings of Democracy. *Theoria*, *53*(111), 1–5. DOI: 10.3167/004058106780446458

Nickerson, C. (2005). English as a lingua franca in international business contexts. *English for Specific Purposes* 24: 367–80.

Noûs, C. M. (2021). Message from the Grassroots: Scholarly Communication, Crisis, and Contradictions. *Canadian Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *7*, 1–27. DOI: 10.33137/cjalrcbu.v7.36448

Okerson, A. (1992). Publishing through the network: The 1990s debutante. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing, 23*(3), 170–177. DOI: 10.3138/JSP-023-03-170

Okune, A., Hillyer, B., Albornoz, D., Sambuli, N., & Chan, L. (2016). Tackling Inequities in Global Scientific Power Structures. *The African Technopolitan 4*(1). DOI: 10.3233/978-1-61499-769-6-18

Okune, A., Hillyer, R., Chan, L., Albornoz, D., & Posada, A. (2019). Whose Infrastructure? Towards Inclusive and Collaborative Knowledge Infrastructures in Open Science. In P L. Chan & P. Mounier (Eds.), *Connecting the Knowledge Commons—From Projects to Sustainable Infrastructure: The 22nd International Conference on Electronic Publishing – Revised Selected Papers*. OpenEdition Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4320065

Ong, W.J. (1982). *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. Routledge.

OCSDNet (n.d. (a)). About OCS. ocsdnet.org/about-ocsdnet/about-ocs/

OCSDNet (n.d. (b)). Open Science in Haiti and Francophone Africa (SOHA). ocsdnet.org/open-science-in-haiti-and-francophone-africa-soha/

Open Humanities Press (n.d.(a)). Living/Liquid Books. openhumanitiespress.org/books/series/liquid-books/

Open Humanities Press (n.d.(b)). About. openhumanitiespress.org/about/community/

O'Sullivan, S. (2002). Cultural Studies as Rhizome - Rhizomes in Cultural Studies. *Cultural Studies, Interdisciplinarity, and Translation 20*, 81–93. DOI: 10.1163/9789004334014_007

Paasi, A. (2015). Academic Capitalism and the Geopolitics of Knowledge. In J. A. Agnew, A.J. Secor, V. Mamadouh, & J. Sharp (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell companion to political geography* (pp. 509-523). John Wiley & Sons.

Packer, A. L., Cop, N. Luccisano, A., Ramalho A., & Spinak E. (Eds.) (2014). *SciELO – 15 Years of Open Access: An analytic study of Open Access and scholarly communication*. UNESCO. DOI: 10.7476/9789230012373

Pérez-Llantada, C. (2012). *Scientific Discourse and the Rhetoric of Globalization: The Impact of Culture and Language*. Continuum.

Perkel, J.M. (2015). Annotating the scholarly web. *Nature*, *528*(7580), 153–154. DOI: 10.1038/528153A

Pia, A. E., Batterbury, S., Joniak-Lüthi, A., LaFlamme, M., Wielander, G., Zerilli, F. M., Nolas, M., Schubert, J., Loubere, N., Franceschini, I., Walsh, C., Mora, A., & Varvantakis, C. (2020). Labour of Love: An Open Access Manifesto for Freedom, Integrity, and Creativity in the Humanities and Interpretive Social Sciences. *Commonplace*. DOI: 10.21428/6ffd8432.a7503356

Piron, F. (2018). Creating science shops in francophone Africa: challenges, possibilities and achievements in 8 countries. [Paper presentation]. Africa Knows!, Leiden, Netherlands.

Piron, F., Nkoudou, T.H.M., Pierre, A., Madiba, M.S.D., Alladatin, J., Achaffert, H.R., Fall, A., Michel, R.I., & Diouf, S.H. (2016). Vers des universités africaines et haïtiennes au service du développement local durable: Contribution de la science ouverte juste. In F. Piron (Ed.), *Justice cognitive, libre accès et savoirs locaux*. Éditions science et bien commun. scienceetbiencommun.pressbooks.pub/justicecognitive1/chapter/vers-des-universites-africaines/

Piron, F., Diouf, A.B**.,** Dibounje Madiba, M.F., Mboa Nkoudou**,** T.H., Aubierge Ouangré**,** Z., Tessy**,** D.R., Achaffert**,** H. R., Pierre, A., & Liré, Z**.** (2017). Le libre accès vu d'Afrique francophone subsaharienne. *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication, 11*. journals.openedition.org/rfsic/3292

Piron, F., Olyhoek, T., Lujano Vilchis, I., Smith, I., & Liré, Z. (2021). Trying to Say 'No' to Rankings and Metrics Case Studies from Francophone West Africa, South Africa, Latin America and the Netherlands. In B.L. Hall & R. Tandon (Eds.), *Socially Responsible Higher Education* (pp. 276-287). Brill. DOI: 10.1163/9789004459076_023

Pohlhaus, Gaile (2017). Varieties of Epistemic Injustice. In I. J. Kidd, G. Pohlhaus & J. Médina Médina (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice* (pp. 13-24). Routledge.

Puig de la Bellacasa, M. (2017). *Matters of care. Speculative ethics in more than human worlds.* University of Minnesota Press.

Raibmon, P. (2014). Introduction: Listening to ʔəms taʔɑw. In E. Paul, H. Johnson, P. Raibmon (Eds.), *Written as I remember it: Teachings (ʔəms taʔaw) from the life of a Sliammon elder* (pp. 3-62). UBC Press.

Raibmon, P. (2018). As I Remember It: Transformational Listening. In E. Paul, H. Johnson, P. Raibmon (Eds.), *As I Remember It: Teachings (ʔəms Taʔaw) from the Life of a Sliammon Elder*. scalar.usc.edu/ravenspace/as-i-remember-it/transformational-listeningRaju, R., Claassen, J., Madini, N., & Suliama, T. (2020). Social Justice and Inclusivity: Drivers for the Dissemination of African Scholarship. In M. Eve & J. Gray (Eds.), *Reassembling Scholarly Communications: Histories, Infrastructures, and Global Politics of Open Access*. MIT Press. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/11885.003.0006

Raju, R., & Badrudeen, A. (2022). Social justice driving open access publishing: An African perspective. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, *25*(1). DOI: 10.3998/jep.1910

RavenSpace (n.d.). About us. ravenspacepublishing.org/about-us/

Readings, B. (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Harvard University Press.

Rebei, M. (2004). A Different Kind of Circularity: From Writing and Reading to Rereading and Rewriting. *Revue LISA/LISA e-Journal. Littératures, Histoire Des Idées, Images, Sociétés Du Monde Anglophone – Literature, History of Ideas, Images and Societies of the English-Speaking World*, *Vol. II-n°5*, Article Vol. II-n°5. DOI : 10.4000/lisa.2895

Rich, A. (1984). Notes toward a Politics of Location. In A. Rich, *Blood, Bread, and Poetry: Selected Prose 1979-1985* (pp. 210-231). Norton.

Riley, Kate E. (2007). *The Good Old Way Revisited: The Ferrar Family of Little Gidding, c. 1625–1637.* [Doctoral dissertation]. The University of Western Australia.

Rio Riande, del, G., Lujano Viljis, I., & Olyhoek, T. (2022). How balanced is multilingualism in scholarly journals? [Paper presentation]. 4S and ESOCITE, Cholula, Mexico.

Risam, R. (2019). *New Digital Worlds: Postcolonial Digital Humanities in Theory, Praxis, and Pedagogy*. Northwestern University Press. DOI: 10.2307/j.ctv7tq4hg

Rivera Garza, C. (2013). *Los muertos indóciles. Necroescrituras y desapropiación*. Tusquets Editores.

Rivera Garza, C. (2020). *The Restless Dead. Necrowriting and Disappropriation*. Vanderbilt University Press.

Rodman, G. (2010). Cultural Studies Is Ordinary. In M. Seidel, R. Horak, & L. Grosberg (Eds.), *About Raymond Williams* (pp. 153-164). Routledge.

Rooryck, J. (2019, December 3). The Plan S open access initiative creates more opportunities than threats for Latin America. *LSE Latin America and Caribbean Blog*. blogs.lse.ac.uk/latamcaribbean/2019/12/03/the-plan-s-open-access-initiative-creates-more-opportunities-than-threats-for-latin-america/

Rouse, J. (2015). *Articulating the World: Conceptual Understanding and the Scientific Image*. University of Chicago Press.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism.* Vintage Books.

Sandoval, Ch. (1998) Mestizaje as method: Feminists-of-color challenge the canon. In C. Trujillo (Ed.), *Living Chicana Theory* (pp. 352-370). Third Women Press.

Sandoval, Ch. (2000). *Methodology of the Oppressed*. University of Minnesota Press.

Santo Domingo Declaration for Open Access *(D*eclaração de Santo Domingo) (2002). Santo Domingo. santoandre.sp.gov.br/pesquisa/ebooks/342872.pdf

Santos, B. de S. (2015). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide*. Routledge.

Schimmer, R., Geschuhn, K. K., & Vogler, A. (2015). *Disrupting the subscription journals' business model for the necessary large-scale transformation to open access*. MPG. PuRe. DOI: 10.17617/1.3

Schöneberg, J. (2018, August 14). Decolonising Teaching Pedagogies—Convivial Reflections. *Convivial Thinking*. convivialthinking.org/index.php/2018/08/14/decolonising-teaching-pedagogies-convivial-reflections/

Schuh, C. (2009). Publikationsverhalten im Überblick – eine Zusammenfassung der einzelnen Diskussionsbeiträge. In Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung (Ed.). *Diskussionspapiere der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung. Publikationsverhalten in unterschiedlichen wissenschaftlichen Disziplinen. Beiträge zur Beurteilung von Forschungsleistungen* (pp. 6-13). Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung. qs.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/d_qualitaetssicherung/Dateidownloads/Publikationsverhalten_in_unterschiedlichen_wissenschaftlichen_Disziplinen.pdf

Science Afrique (n.d.). Le Grenier des Savoirs. revues.scienceafrique.org/

Sedgwick, E.K. (1997). Paranoid Reading and Reparative Reading; or, You're So Paranoid, You Probably Think This Introduction is About You. In E.K. Sedgwick (Ed.), *Novel Gazing. Queer Readings in Fiction* (pp. 1-37). Duke University Press. DOI: 10.1215/9780822382478-001

Sen, A. (1985a). Rights and Capabilities. In T. Honderich (Ed.), *Morality and Objectivity: A Tribute to J.L. Mackie* (pp. 130-148). Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Sen, A. (1985b). Well-being, Agency and Freedom: The Dewey Lectures 1984, *Journal of Philosophy*, *82*(4), 169–221. DOI: 10.2307/2026184

Severin, A., Egger, M., Eve, M. P., & Hürlimann, D. (2018). Discipline-specific open access publishing practices and barriers to change: An evidence-based review. *F1000Research*, *7*(1925). DOI: 10.12688/f1000research.17328.2

Simpson, L.B. (2011). *Dancing on our turtle's back: Stories of Nishnaabeg re-creation, resurgence, and a new emergence*. ARP Books.

Simpson, L. B. (2014). Land as pedagogy: Nishnaabeg intelligence and rebellious transformation. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society 3*(3), 1–25. jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/22170

Skains, R. (2020). Discourse or Gimmick? Digital Marginalia in Online Scholarship. *Convergence*, *26*(4), 942–955. DOI: 10.1177/1354856519831988

Smith, B. (1989). A press of our own. Kitchen table: Women of color press. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies, 10*(3), 11–13. DOI: 10.2307/3346433

Smith, B. (1995). Doing it from Scratch: The Challenge of Black Lesbian Organizing. In B. Smith (Ed.), *The Truth that Never Hurts: Writings on Race, Gender and Freedom* (pp. 167-177). Rutgers University Press.

Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies. Research and indigenous people*. Zed Books.

Smith, P. (1976). Pissing in a River. [Recorded by Record Plant Studios]. On *Radio Ethiopia* [LP]. Artista Records.

Springer Nature (n.d.). Titles, Abstracts, & Keywords. springernature.com/de/authors/campaigns/writing-a-manuscript/titles-abstracts-keywords

Spivak, G.C. (1988). Can the Subaltern Speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (pp. 271-313). University of Illinois Press.

Spivak, G. C. (1990). Practical politics of the open end. In S. Harasym & G. C. Spivak (Eds.), *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues* (pp. 95-112). Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9780203760048

Spivak, G.C. (1999). *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Harvard University Press. DOI: 10.2307/j.ctvjsf541

Stahlschmidt, S., & Stephen, D. (2022). From indexation policies through citation networks to normalized citation impacts: Web of Science, Scopus, and Dimensions as varying resonance chambers. *Scientometrics*, *127*(5), 2413–2431. DOI: 10.1007/s11192-022-04309-6

Star, S.L., &, Griesemer, J.R (1989). Institutional Ecology, "Translations" and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907-39. *Social Studies of Science* 19(3), 387–420. DOI: 10.1177/030631289019003001.

Steiner, T. (2022, August 17). Pluralities: Scholar-led Publishing und Open Access. *Open Media Studies*. mediastudies.hypotheses.org/3263

Stoler, A. L. (1995). *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Duke University Press.

Strickland, J. (n.d.). How Google Docs Work. *howstuffworks.* computer.howstuffworks.com/internet/basics/google-docs5.htm

Striphas, T. (2008). *The Late Age of Print: Everyday Book Culture from Consumerism to Control*. Columbia University Press.

Suber, P. (2009). Knowledge as a public good. *SPARC Open Access Newsletter, 65.* dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/4725013/suber_taxpayer.htm?sequence=1

Swissuniversities (n.d.). Open Access - Digital. Weltweit. Zugänglich. swissuniversities.ch/themen/digitalisierung/open-access

Tennant, J. (2018). Open Science is Just Good Science. [Paper contribution]. DARIAH Annual Event 2018, Paris, France. campus.dariah.eu/resource/posts/open-science-is-just-good-science

Tennant, J., & Breznau, N. (2022). Legacy of Jon Tennant, "Open science is just good science". [Preprint]. *SocArXiv.* DOI: 10.31235/osf.io/hfns2

Thoburn, N. (2016). *Anti-Book*. University of Minnesota Press. DOI: 10.5749/j.ctt1j7x9vm

Tietze, S., & Dick, P. (2009). Hegemonic practices and knowledge production in the management academy: An English language perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *25*, 119–123. DOI: 10.1016/j.scaman.2008.11.010

Tkacz, N. (2015). *Wikipedia and the politics of openness*. University of Chicago Press.

Trettien, W. A. (2015). *Cut/Copy/Paste: Composing Devotion at Little Gidding*. [Doctoral dissertation]. Duke University, Durham.

Trettien, W.A. (2021). *Cut/Copy/Paste*. University of Minnesota Press. manifold.umn.edu/projects/cut-copy-paste

Trujillo, C. M. (Ed.). (1998). *Living Chicana theory.* Third Woman Press.

Truman, S.E. (2019). *Feminist New Materialisms*. SAGE Publications Ltd. DOI: 10.4135/9781526421036808740

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education Society 1*(1), 1–40. jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/18630

UK Government (n.d.). Abstract. gov.uk/research-for-development-outputs/open-access-challenges-and-opportunities-for-low-and-middle-income-countries-and-the-potential-impact-of-uk-policy

UKRI (UK Research and Innovation) (n.d.). UKRI Open Access Policy. ukri.org/publications/ukri-open-access-policy/

University of Cape Town (n.d.). Continental Platform. lib.uct.ac.za/openaccess/services/continental-platform

Van der Velden, M. (2006). A Case for Cognitive Justice. **[**Unpublished manuscript].

Van der Tuin, I. (2011) "A Different Starting Point, a Different Metaphysics": Reading Bergson and Barad Diffractively. *Hypatia 26*(1), 22–42. DOI: 10.1111/j.1527-2001.2010.01114.x

Vessuri, H. (1986). The universities, scientific research and the national interest in Latin America. *Minerva*, *24*(1), 1–38. DOI: 10.1007/BF01102552

Vessuri, H. (2003). Hacia budapest + 5. *Interciencia*, *28*(9), 497. redalyc.org/pdf/339/33908401.pdf

Visvanathan, S. (1997). *A Carnival for Science: Essays on science, technology and development*. Oxford University Press.

Visvanathan, S. (2009). The search for cognitive justice. [Seminar lecture]. india-seminar.com/2009/597/597_shiv_visvanathan.htm

Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. Academic Press.

Weber, S. (2000). The Future of the Humanities: Experimenting. *Culture Machine 2*(0). culturemachine.net/the-university-culture-machine/the-future-of-the-humanities/

Whitehead, C. (2007). The Concept of British Education Policy in the Colonies 1850–1960. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *39*(2), 161–173. DOI: 10.1080/00220620701342296

Whitman, W. (1992). *Leaves of Grass*. Vintage Books/Library of America.

Williams, Gareth (2002). The Other Side of the Popular Neoliberalism and Subalternity in Latin America. Duke University Press.

Willinsky, J. (2003). The Nine Flavours of Open Access Scholarly Publishing. *Journal of Postgraduate* jpgmonline.com/text.asp?2003/49/3/263/1146

Willinsky, J. (2006). *The Access Principle: The Case for Open Access to Research and Scholarship.* MIT Press.

Willinsky, J. (2020). When the Law Advances Access to Learning: Locke and the Origins of Modern Copyright. In M. P. Eve & J. Gray (Eds.), *Reassembling Scholarly Communications: Histories, Infrastructures, and Global Politics of Open Access*. MIT Press. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/11885.003.0006

Windle, J. (2017). Hidden features in global knowledge production: (Re)positioning theory and practice in academic writing. *Revista Brasileira de Linguistica Aplicada*, *17*(2), 355–378. DOI: 10.1590/1984-6398201710966

Wise, A., & Estelle, L. (2019). *Society Publishers Accelerating Open Access and Plan S - Final Project Report*. DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska. digitalcommons.unl.edu/scholcom/124

Wittenberg, K. (2009). The Gutenberg-e project: Opportunities and challenges in publishing born-digital monographs. *Learned Publishing*, *22*(1), 36–41. DOI: 10.1087/095315108X378767

Woolf, V. (2010). *The Waves*. Benediction Classics.

Worthington, S. (2015). *Book to the Future: A Manifesto for Book Liberation*. Mute.

Wright, H.K. (2003) Cultural Studies as Praxis: (making) an Autobiographical Case. *Cultural Studies, 17* (6), 805–822. DOI: 10.1080/0950238032000150039

Wynter, S. (1995). Breaking the Epistemological Contract on Black America*. Forum NHI2*(1). 4–57. DOI: 10.2307/1170642

Yarkoni, T. (2016, December 12). Why I still won't review for or publish with Elsevier–and think you shouldn't either. *Tal Yarkoni*. talyarkoni.org/blog/2016/12/12/why-i-still-wont-review-for-or-publish-with-elsevier-and-think-you-shouldnt-either/

Zaveri, S. (2020). Gender and Equity in Openness: Forgotten Spaces. M. P. Eve & J. Gray (Eds.), *Reassembling Scholarly Communications: Histories, Infrastructures, and Global Politics of Open Access*. MIT Press. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/11885.003.0016

Zuber-Skerritt, O. (2001). Action learning and action research: Paradigm, praxis and programs. In S. Sankara, S., B. Dick, & R. Passfield (Eds.), *Effective Change Management through Action Research and Action Learning: Concepts, Perspectives, Processes and Applications* (pp. 1-20). Southern Cross University Press.

Zylinska, J. (2005). *The Ethics of Cultural Studies*. A&C Black.