

Review of: "International Education and the Crises of Cosmopolitanism and Global Citizenship"

Chaitali Das¹

¹ Frankfurt University of Applied Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper brings to the fore some very central and critical points about Global Citizenship and Cosmopolitanism and the attempts to integrate them in education to create more open-minded citizenry. The history of the development of these concepts as well as the current discussions and developments indicate the power biases and the Eurocentric nature of these concepts, that may be exclusionary, have been considered and argued. I outline some comments/ideas/suggestions that may sharpen the clarity of the paper and perhaps support the further strengthen the arguments presented.

From the title of the Paper: International Education and the Crises of Cosmopolitanism and Global Citizenship, I was expecting to read about how international education is impacted by the crisis of Cosmopolitanism and ideas of global citizenship. However, in the paper International Education or what is meant by it does not really become clear. There is no reference to any literature or research on international education but rather a focus on education and pedagogy in general that should include GC (Global Citizenship) and/or Cosmopolitanism. I think it would be useful to define International Education (IE) first and then outline or make the case that GC and/or cosmopolitanism are key ideas that are couched in IE. In the literature on internationalization of social work education for example, there is a body of literature on how international exchange is part of this internationalization but that this is often one-sided and student/staff mobility generally only flows from the North to the South. Furthermore, there is also a lot of critique that such internationalization leads to further reiterating colonial/neo-colonial power dynamics. Including arguments and critiques such as these for internationalization in education may further help to cement the conclusion that the paper eventually presents.

There is a good outline of the histories of Cosmopolitanism and GC and I believe the main point is that these are Eurocentric concepts or stemming from people who had access to travel and see the world and consider themselves cosmopolitans, but that this is not accessible for everyone and does not reflect the realities of people in other continents such as Asia and Africa. I understand the critique for Cosmopolitanism to be based on the limits of such access while the critique for global citizenship lies in the political structures and governance frames and there is no such political/governance structure for GC as such.

Adapting the structure a little bit that then highlighting these critiques/challenges from the Asian or African perspective might be useful. In the current form, the section on Western perspectives seems repetitive, the section on Asia (China) appears somewhat superficial – there is some mention of Confucianism but no development of this and how it relates to GC or Cosmopolitanism and then there is mention of China's current policy for IE in support of Cosmopolitanism or GC. I

am wondering is there might be an argument to be made here that China's current international education is not aimed at GC or Cosmopolitanism but is perhaps more visibility an assertion of Chinese students and their ideas. The section of Africa reflects the costs of imposed eurocentrism on the African context. However, I also think there might be an opportunity here to also highlight the agencies of African people to challenge these colonial frameworks. Perhaps these resistances can then help to frame what is meant by 'Crisis' in the title, if these resistances and inequalities are a reflection of the crisis.

The power and political issues of colonialism and neo-liberalism are mentioned towards the latter half of the paper but are not drawn out. There is a little critical examination of IE in this context regarding the extent to which IE is also a product of colonialism and neo-liberalism and seeks to benefit privileged persons (who were also the so-called cosmopolitans in the past and travelled the world). After all, Higher Education remains a site of extremely high inequalities. The extent to which IE accessible to students in resource crunched universities all around the world could have been highlighted more clearly to also reinforce this point about power inequalities and who has access to IE, global citizenship, or cosmopolitanism.

I also believe that highlighting specific examples would strengthen the core argument of the paper. The paper has a tendency towards generalization, across different disciplines and in a world of increasing diversities; such generalizations typically obscure one's understandings of the core ideas rather than highlighting it.

The main case is that GC and Cosmopolitanism as aspired to under IE can lead to addressing the challenges of a global world. The challenges of the global world, one could argue, are inequalities. However, given that only privileged students have access to this, and such privileges often exist at the cost of others, the question arises, how and why should these students want to address the challenges if this results in them losing their privileges?

Overall, I congratulate the author on putting forward this important topic for critical discussion, particularly in our contemporary times where on the one hand solidarity and global ideas have importance but at the same time inequalities and crisis are on the rise. I wish the author my very best towards further developing these ideas.