

22 Not Self-Indulgence, but Self-Preservation: Open Access and the Ethics of Care

Eileen A. Joy

Caring for myself is not self-indulgence, it is self-preservation and that is an act of political warfare.

—Audre Lorde¹

How might certain forms of academic publishing—especially scholar-led, community-owned, open-access platforms, and presses—enable better forms of institutional life conducive to personal flourishing and the increase of public knowledge (and to lubricating the important connection between the two), especially at a time when the University is swarming with managerial technocrats invested in privatizing and outsourcing higher education, students are saddled with staggering levels of debt, and the casualization of academic labor is at an all-time high?² This question feels particularly acute at a time when the University is more than neck-deep in accelerating the quantification of long-entrenched (and toxic) forms of research and career gatekeeping, and thus the Academy no longer feels like a hospitable place within which to practice what some call “academic freedom.”³ There is perhaps no concept that is less debatable among faculty-researchers than academic freedom, yet I’ve personally seen so little of it in actual practice (even when “secured” by tenure—in the US context, at least), partly because of the myriad ways in which scholars are coerced (subtly and otherwise) to follow certain methodologies of thought and to seek particular, peer-approved modes and outlets for the dissemination of their work, outside of which it is believed only bad or mediocre scholarship could result. And thus, there isn’t much academic freedom in the precise place where it is cherished and argued for as a high ethical good.

I nevertheless consider academic freedom to be the most vital, and elusive, element of academic life. But there is no absolute right to academic

freedom (that would be sheltered, in the US context, under the First Amendment), even when supposedly affirmed by judicial decisions in the US such as *Cary v. Board of Education*, which held that tenured secondary school teachers had the right to determine the subject matter taught in their classrooms, but at the same time “determined their [First Amendment] constitutional rights were waived under the terms of a collective bargaining agreement ... between the Aurora Education Association ... and the school district.”⁴ It is also important to note that the US Supreme Court has never recognized “academic freedom” as an independent constitutional right, and according to W. Stuart Stuller, despite “tributes” to “academic freedom” in many cases, “the courts are remarkably consistent in their unwillingness to give analytical shape to the rhetoric of academic freedom.”⁵ The US Constitution guarantees freedom of speech, but legal guarantees do not ensure that everyone, everywhere, has equal access to the expression of that right. Which is why we need to understand that “academic freedom” is more of a practice of care (for ourselves and others) at which we have to work vigilantly every day and thus one of the most important tasks of the University today should be to make room for ideas to merely emerge—to foster spaces within which researchers might have more freedom than currently exists to experiment and to pursue in their work their desires, unencumbered by professional anxieties over whether or not those desires are legitimated in advance by what particular fields have already deemed as “proper” to themselves. Rather than regulating thought, we should be working harder to create the hospitable conditions for its emergence. This will entail an attention to and care for the importance of individual scholarly desires, which of necessity come before community, and yet rely on community for their articulation (which articulation is the very foundation of communication in general).⁶ Under continual assault and threat by protocols and checkpoints for tenure, for promotion, and for professional affirmation and advancement in general, we have lost sight in the Humanities of the important meaningfulness of singularity and self-expression, in our work and in our relationships, and this is an issue that raises ethical questions regarding how we care for others’ ability to self-express.⁷ And the business-as-usual of academic publishing plays no little part in hampering our capabilities for such.

Here is where I have some hope that the Open Access Movement could be one possible route for positive change and renewal. First and foremost, we need to take back into the University (under Academic Affairs + Libraries)

as many of the means of the production of academic publishing as possible, and we need to do so in ways that reenergize the Demos of the Academy;⁸ we need to reject any and all forms of the privatization of our intellectual work (or at least enable “leaking” by any means necessary⁹); and we also need to make space and shelter for new forms of intellectual and bodily life, and for fostering the well-being of intellection, in ourselves and in others. We need also to pay better attention to the fact that how our work is published is just as important as the content of what we write. As Gary Hall asks, how can we “operate in a manner that is different not just from the neoliberal model of the entrepreneurial academic associated with corporate social networks such as Facebook and LinkedIn, but also from the traditional liberal humanist model that comes replete with clichéd, ready-made (some would even say cowardly) ideas of proprietorial authorship, the book, originality, fixity, and the finished object”?¹⁰ To begin, we need to understand that each of us bears a special responsibility for enabling styles and modes of scholarship and cultural systems that would “give priority to the protection, the maximum use, and the enjoyment of the one resource that is almost equally distributed among all people: personal energy under personal control.”¹¹

Open access (OA) still has many hurdles to cross, in terms of its sustainability and evasion of commercial capture, but we are thankfully beginning to move beyond debates over the so-called integrity, prestige, and authority of OA publications.¹² In the UK and much of Europe, OA is not only fast becoming the norm,¹³ but is even government-mandated: if you don’t publish, or deposit your publications, in OA venues—venues, moreover, that have adopted all of the “best practices” of editorial review, metadata management, and the like—then your work might not “count” in the evaluation of your research, such as in the UK’s REF, or Research Excellence Framework, which is the national system for assessing the quality of research in UK universities.¹⁴ Unfortunately, nothing like this broad governmental support exists in the US context.¹⁵ Nevertheless, researchers have responded globally to the Knowledge Economy (heavily leveraged by commercial-conglomerate interests) by agitating for governmental and institutional policies that would support OA, designing knowledge-sharing platforms (such as *arXiv*), building new publishing platforms (such as the Open Library of Humanities), and even establishing digital “pirate” and “shadow” libraries (such as *aaaarg.fail* and *Sci-Hub*) that have proved sustaining to the increasing ranks of deinstitutionalized scholars, even as they

have also been under siege by corporate litigators seeking to protect copyrights.¹⁶ Within the US context, although many institutions now have OA policies of one sort or another (such as mandates for self-archiving preprints of published journal articles),¹⁷ the University of California system has led the way in promoting what they have called “transformative” pathways to open access. In 2013, the system-wide UC Academic Senate adopted an OA policy mandate, which was strengthened by a further directive from UC’s Office of the President in 2015, which requires the deposit of published work (where allowed by publishers) in open university repositories.¹⁸ More recently, in 2018, UC’s Council of University Librarians (CoUL) released a Pathways to Open Access “toolkit” that describes and analyzes “the many approaches and strategies for advancing the large-scale transition to OA, and identifies possible next action steps for UC system-wide investment and experimentation.”¹⁹ In October of the same year, UC Libraries hosted a working forum in Berkeley, “Choosing Pathways to Open Access,” which was “designed to enable North American library and consortium leaders and key academic stakeholders to engage in action-focused deliberations about redirecting subscription and other funds toward sustainable open access (OA) publishing.”²⁰ In addition, UC Libraries also severed ties with Elsevier in 2019 by deciding not to renew its bulk subscription to Elsevier journals because, under Elsevier’s proposed contract renewal, “the publisher would capture significant new revenue on top of the university’s current multimillion-dollar subscription while significantly diminishing UC’s rights to Elsevier content,” and also because UC Libraries wanted default OA publication for all UC-corresponding authored articles in Elsevier journals, with no increase in total payments made by UC to Elsevier.²¹

UC Press has also served as somewhat of a leader in OA publishing by launching a platform for OA monographs in the Humanities and Social Sciences and an OA mega-journal in Science (Luminos and Collabra, respectively), but they are dependent upon author-pay schemes (in the case of Luminos, anywhere from \$5,000 to \$7,500 per book²²), which in the Humanities is simply untenable, and administrators and librarians on individual UC campuses have struggled to aid UC researchers who want to publish with these platforms. While scientists have access to bigger pots of money to support publication charges, humanists simply do not. This is a troubling issue with respect to the ability of humanists to embrace OA venues for their work. In this scenario, the democracy of thought is threatened.

The term “democracy” does not often enter into conversations around the subject of OA publishing, but alongside Derrida’s idea of a “university without condition,” where it is the Humanities’ singular purpose to ensure the “right to say everything, whether it be under the heading of fiction and the experimentation of knowledge, and the right to say it publicly, to publish it,”²³ I believe it is the unique purview of scholarly communications to insist upon the centrality of the “right to say everything” relative to modes of publication. This is why it is also important to understand the vital connection between free speech (and “academic freedom”) and the fact that democracy, in the words of Janneke Adema and Gary Hall, is “not an established reality,” but rather “a permanent struggle for democratization,” and in which struggle, I would add, some OA publishers could have an important role to play in always clearing ground for more (and different sorts of) speech to emerge, which speech opens up more horizons for a Democracy-to-come.²⁴ Any version of OA that does not begin with this emphasis has lost sight of the vital relationship between access to modes of publication and academic freedom. This is also why having for-profit actors (and also university presses that are forced, more and more, to justify their “bottom line”) in this landscape potentially warps what should be the nurturing and capaciously curatorial role of the academic publisher because, regardless of claims to the contrary, editorial and marketing decisions are always closely correlated, whereas it ought to be the role of the public research university—and by extension, of its platforms for disseminating research results—not to regulate and officiate thought, while also subjecting its potential publication to market conditions,²⁵ but rather to create the hospitable open conditions for its creative emergence, in whatever form(s) it might take.

Let me pause, then, to sum up what I see as the ways in which the OA movement (and the cooption of such by various forces) represents desires and values that are not always compatible with and can even be antithetical to each other, while also explaining why I feel OA publishers (especially within the scholar-led, nonprofit sphere) should be taking up this state of affairs as a primary cause of action. First, there is the governmental rationale to make publicly funded research accessible to the public(s) who fund it, which also entails centralized systems of data management sometimes requiring unhealthy alliances between public institutions, nonprofit service agencies, and for-profit corporations. Second, there is the for-profit

business imperative to capitalize upon the governmental rationale in ways that allow commercial publishers to continue charging exorbitant rates for subscription journals while also taking cash up front to make selective content in these journals more accessible (“double-dipping”), and as always, continuing to shore up obscene profit margins.²⁶ And then there is the more anarchic-ethical imperative to make the means of the possibility of publishing work more possible, and to pose no barriers to authors or readers. The imperative here is to diversify the voices that “count” within the University and to disrupt conventional paradigms of thought. Can these various forces work together to enhance the long-term sustainability of a more open Knowledge Commons? The answer, decidedly, is no, primarily because the mission of for-profit companies will never line up with the values of public research institutions. It may be possible for the governmental and the anarchic-ethical forces to work together, but there will be tough hurdles to cross in terms of how the primary stakeholders in OA (researchers, publishers, university administrators, librarians, knowledge managers, and so forth) define what the values and outputs of scholarly communications should be, and how those definitions won’t always be compatible.

Consider the Mellon-funded study undertaken by the University of California–Davis and the California Digital Library to investigate whether it would be possible for large North American research institutions to sustain a model of OA that depended upon article processing charges (APCs).²⁷ In a survey of researchers that accompanied the study, scientists indicated they were invested in OA, and also in publishing outlets with high impact factors and good citation metrics, whereas humanists were primarily concerned with prestige, with publishing their work in journals of a certain, significant reputation. In the same study, it was suggested that it might be possible to “flip” library collections budgets from journals subscriptions to APCs, with the understanding that the burden of these fees would have to be shared by researchers, granting agencies, and libraries, such that publishers would be forced to make APCs more affordable, because researchers would help to apply “multiplayer” “market pressure” to publishers’ OA fee schedules (especially when their institutions make clear that they cannot supply the entire fee from one source only). This would turn researchers into “speculators,” which is frankly obscene.²⁸ And we would still be allowing corporations that have proven to be bad actors with respect to the mission of public research libraries to profit from the dissemination of our research (the report is agnostic with respect to for-profit versus nonprofit

publishers), and I think we need to seriously understand how untenable this situation is, not just financially, but ethically.

If, as humanists, we embrace and put into practice certain values in our research and teaching—such as openness, pluralism, constructive dissensus, freedom of thought, equity, decoloniality, and the like—then shouldn't we be mindful of the ways in which the practices of the dissemination of our research may be at odds with these values? Shouldn't we be paying better attention to the modes of production of our work, especially with an eye toward not just moving away from for-profit publishing platforms, but also helping to promote a more rowdily diverse set of voices seeking to amplify and diversify what “counts” as the University? If we care so much about “prestige,” we might remind ourselves that the word derives from the Latin *praestigium* (“illusion” or “trick”) and only later came to mean “glamor” and, eventually, something that is worthy of “admiration.” With the advent of “impact factors,” tracked and calculated by for-profit companies, and the long-running obsession with “excellence” as a calculable commodity of higher education, the gamification of “prestige” has come full circle.²⁹

One group that is working toward maximizing processes of radical democratization within the OA landscape is the Radical OA Collective, a consortium of scholar-led, nonprofit OA presses and platforms that is motivated by a desire to reconceptualize academic publishing as a techne of “care of the self”—of individuals, and of individual projects, that are the indivisible units of any legitimate democracy (which again, is always a struggle for democratization, and never an established reality). Further, the Collective wants to provide alternatives to the legacy model of commercial publishers and many of its members' projects diverge significantly from the importance that is generally attached in mainstream OA debates to the development of centralized (one-size-fits-all) platforms, publication fees, and sustainable business models. For the Collective, the main issue concerns scholarly communication—not business models.³⁰ One important outcome of the Collective's work has been the formation of ScholarLed, a consortium of five OA presses specializing in books in the Humanities and Social Sciences, which opposes “the monopolisation of OA book publishing by commercial publishers and for-profit intermediaries” and is dedicated to working on opening up “a more diverse, scholar-led, community-owned, and not-for-profit publishing ecosystem” that they believe is “crucial for the cultivation of more creative modes and forms of scholarship and their open dissemination and preservation as public knowledge.” While ScholarLed

recognizes “the entangled mesh of players and providers (for- and not-for-profit) that are essential for scholarly communications to flourish and be accessible to the widest possible readership,” they are also concerned “to build infrastructure for smaller-scale OA book publishers that would prioritise the needs of the creative research community and the values of public research institutions against the for-profit entities who seek to privatise (and also homogenize) knowledge.”³¹

For me personally, and especially through my work with punctum books, the Radical OA Collective, and ScholarLed, there is an urgency to rewire the definition of OA such that, in addition to making works broadly available to readers without barriers to access, OA publishers must also stop chasing markers for “prestige,” “authority,” “quality control,” and the like, in order to devise more radically open pathways for access to publication for authors who otherwise might not find a publisher, either because their work does not fit within a readily recognizable current disciplinary paradigm or because they want to experiment with forms and styles of academic writing, and so on. It’s a question of personal freedom and how the publisher should strive to be an agent of both sustenance (care) and productive transformation. Ultimately, we need to move away from an author-pay system (which harms democracy as well as limits diversity) to more richly hybrid funding models in which all of the vested partners—government, universities (including libraries), granting agencies, and also readers and other end users (which include faculty, students, and the larger public)—play a role as financial supporters.³² This will also entail taking back from commercial publishers the full reins of the means of production of academic publishing and reinventing the academic press as a critical arm of both the research and teaching mission of the University. There is likely no possible stemming of the tide of neoliberal capital’s narrow-minded imaginary and hyper-accelerated technologized infrastructures, but for me this also means that the task for the Humanities now is to think harder about how to repurpose these infrastructures in order to unleash new, more capacious imaginaries and organs of dissemination for those imaginaries. I have no faith whatsoever that we could accomplish this at a large scale. But I (ridiculously) insist on the necessity of trying to live up to values that the University professes to profess. And on smaller scales, here and there, some of us will continue our work to improve the general weather conditions for a more Open Commons.

Notes

1. Audre Lorde, "A Burst of Light: Living with Cancer," in *A Burst of Light and Other Essays* (London: Sheba Feminist Publishers, 1988), 130.
2. See, e.g., Maximilian Alvarez, "Contingent No More," *The Baffler*, May 3, 2017, <https://thebaffler.com/the-poverty-of-theory/contingent-no-more/>; L. O. Aranye Fradenburg, *Staying Alive: A Survival Manual for the Liberal Arts*, ed. Eileen A. Joy (Brooklyn, NY: punctum books, 2013), <https://punctumbooks.com/titles/staying-alive/>; Gary Hall, *The Uberfication of the University* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016); Christopher Newfield, *The Great Mistake: How We Wrecked Public Universities and How We Can Fix Them* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016).
3. Bill Readings, *The University in Ruins* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), never ceases to be instructive on this point. On the intensity of the metrification of scholarly communications and the concerns over whether or not "humanist" metrics are possible or desirable for measuring the "impact" of scholarship in the humanities, see Martina Franzen, Eileen Joy, and Christopher Long, *Humane Metrics/Metrics Noir* (Coventry, UK: Post Office Press/meson press, 2018), <https://hcommons.org/deposits/item/hc:19823/>. See also Stacy Konkiel, "Approaches to Creating 'Humane' Research Evaluation Metrics for the Humanities," *Insights: The UKSG Journal* 31 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1629/uksg.445>.
4. See United States Court of Appeals, 598 F.2d 535, *Cary v. Board of Education of Adams* (December 31, 1969), for details of the original case as well as its 1978 appeal.
5. Laurence H. Tribe, *American Constitutional Law*, 2nd ed. (St. Paul, MN: West Academic Publishing, 1988), 1812–1813n32; W. Stuart Stuller, "High School Academic Freedom: The Evolution of a Fish Out of Water," *Nebraska Law Review* 77, no. 2 (1998): 302.
6. My thinking here stems from Jean-Luc Nancy's argument that "behind the theme of the individual, but [also] beyond it, lurks the question of singularity. ... What is their singular necessity in the sharing that divides and that puts into communication bodies, voices and writings in general and in totality?" Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Inoperative Community*, ed. Peter Connor, trans. Peter Connor et al. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991), 6.
7. On the importance of self-expression to human flourishing, see Owen J. Flanagan, *Self-Expressions: Mind, Morals, and the Meaning of Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
8. See Wendy Brown, *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution* (New York: Zone Books, 2015). Brown has defined neoliberalism as "as a governing rationality through which everything is 'economized' and in a very specific way: human beings become market actors and nothing but, every field of activity is seen as a market, and every entity (whether public or private, whether person, business, or

state) is governed as a firm"; quoted in Timothy Shenk, "What Exactly Is Neoliberalism?," *Dissent Magazine* (blog), April 2, 2015, <https://www.dissentmagazine.org/blog/booked-3-what-exactly-is-neoliberalism-wendy-brown-undoing-the-demos>.

9. I give a nod here to the political urgency of leaking information inspired by the work of Alexandria Lockett, whose 2013 PhD dissertation eloquently defends hacktivism as an urgently ethical project, not only in information cultures but also in noncomputing contexts such as contemporary African American literature, where to practice what Lockett calls "leak literacy" means that, despite state-sponsored forms of suppression, some systems are capable, when "leaking," of enabling transformative and progressive change, as well as resistance to a surveillance culture. Alexandria Lockett, "Leaked: A Grammar of Information in Surveillance Cultures" (PhD diss., Pennsylvania State University, 2013).

10. Gary Hall, *Pirate Philosophy: For a Digital Posthumanities* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2016), xiv.

11. Ivan Illich, *Tools for Conviviality* (New York: Harper and Row, 1973); quoted in Mark Seem, "Introduction," in *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983), xxiv.

12. Lamentably, there are still some who voice concern over the quality and authority of OA. As Martin Paul Eve has pointed out, "prestige barriers (hiring, promotion, simple reputation)" have made the majority of academics "reliant upon a narrow set of conventional publishers," and there is, further, "a persisting belief in ... open access meaning a dip in quality control/peer review." Martin Paul Eve, "Four Implementation Questions about Open Access and Monographs," *Martin Paul Eve* (blog), January 3, 2017, <https://eve.gd/2017/01/03/four-implementation-questions-about-open-access-and-monographs/>.

13. It should be noted here that, while my focus in this chapter is primarily upon open-access publishing contexts in the US, UK, and Europe, that other regions, such as Latin America, have long been leaders in this area, such as with the establishment of SciELO (Scientific Electronic Library Online) in Brazil in 1997. In addition to the chapters in this volume devoted to this topic, see Sergio Minniti, Valeria Santoro, and Simone Belli, "Mapping the Development of Open Access in Latin America and Caribbean Countries: An Analysis of Web of Science Core Collection and SciELO Citation Index (2005–2017)," *Scientometrics* 117, no. 3 (2018): 1905–1930, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2950-0>. See also Juan Pablo Alperin, "The Public Impact of Latin America's Approach to Open Access" (PhD diss., Stanford, 2015), <https://purl.stanford.edu/jr256tk1194>.

14. According to the 2016 Consultation on the Second Research Excellence Framework, "journal articles and conference proceedings accepted for publication from 1 April 2016 need to have been deposited in an institutional or subject repository."

Higher Education Funding Council for England, “Consultation on the Second Research Excellence Framework,” Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2016. In a recent news release from UKRI (UK Research and Innovation), it was stated that “sixty-one per cent of research outputs known to be in scope for the REF 2021 are meeting open access deposit, discovery and access requirements.” Research England, “Over 80% of Research Outputs Meet Requirements of REF 2021 Open Access Policy,” UK Research and Innovation, June 14, 2018, <https://re.ukri.org/news-events-publications/news/oa-report-130618/>.

15. One notable exception is the Obama administration’s 2013 policy memorandum directing federal agencies with more than \$100 million in research and development expenditures “to develop plans to make the results of federally funded [scientific] research freely available to the public—generally within one year of publication.” John P. Holdren, “Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies: Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research,” [whitehouse.gov](https://whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/ostp_public_access_memo_2013.pdf), February 22, 2013, https://whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/ostp_public_access_memo_2013.pdf. This directive did not, unfortunately, extend to agencies such as the National Endowment for the Humanities, which has done very little on behalf of OA initiatives.

16. On the history of OA as an advocacy movement, see Peter Suber, “Timeline,” Open Access Directory, accessed May 31, 2019, <http://oad.simmons.edu/oadwiki/Timeline>. On digital “pirate” libraries and their successes and travails, see Bohannon, “Who’s Downloading Pirated Papers?” and Quirin Schiermeier, “US Court Grants Elsevier Millions in Damages from Sci-Hub,” *Nature News*, June 22, 2017, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2017.22196>.

17. See Stevan Harnad, “ROARMAP,” accessed July 25, 2014, <http://roarmap.eprints.org/>.

18. Office of Scholarly Communication, University of California, “UC Open Access Policies,” *Office of Scholarly Communication* (blog), accessed May 31, 2019, <https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/open-access-at-uc/open-access-policy/>.

19. UC Council of University Librarians, “Pathways to Open Access,” February 27, 2018, <https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/content/uc-libraries-release-pathways-oa-analysis>.

20. “Choosing Pathways to OA,” accessed May 31, 2019, <https://cp2oa18.com/>.

21. Ivy Anderson et al., “Open Statement: Why UC Cut Ties with Elsevier,” UC Berkeley Library News, March 20, 2019, <https://news.lib.berkeley.edu/uc-elsevier-statement>.

22. University of California Press, “Luminos FAQ,” Luminos OA, accessed May 31, 2019, <https://www.luminosoa.org/site/faqs/#author-faqs-open-access>.

23. Jacques Derrida, “The Future of the Profession or the University without Condition (Thanks to the ‘Humanities,’ What Could Take Place Tomorrow),” in *Jacques*

Derrida and the Humanities: A Critical Reader, ed. Tom Cohen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 26.

24. See Janneke Adema and Gary Hall, "The Political Nature of the Book: On Artists' Books and Radical Open Access," *New Formations*, no. 78 (2013): 34, <https://doi.org/10.3898/NewF.78.07.2013>. On democracy-to-come, see Jacques Derrida, *Rogues: Two Essays on Reason*, trans. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2005), chaps. 3, 8.

25. Typical questions asked of peer reviewers by both traditional university presses and also commercial-conglomerate academic publishers include "in what sorts of university courses might this book be adopted?," "what other titles exist now that this book would be in competition with?," "are there any new trends in scholarship in this area that the author has overlooked?," "has this book adequately addressed the state of the field in X, Y, or Z areas?," and so on.

26. See Martin Paul Eve, "On Open-Access Books and 'Double Dipping'," *Martin Paul Eve* (blog), January 31, 2015, <https://eve.gd/2015/01/31/on-open-access-books-and-double-dipping/>, and Mike Taylor, "Academic Publishers Have Become the Enemies of Science," *The Guardian*, January 16, 2012, sec. Science, <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2012/jan/16/academic-publishers-enemies-science>.

27. University of California Libraries, "Pay It Forward: Investigating a Sustainable Model of Open Access Article Processing Charges for Large North American Research Institutions," IATUL—International Association of University Libraries, June 30, 2016, <https://www.iatul.org/about/news/pay-it-forward-investigating-sustainable-model-open-access-article-processing-charges>.

28. On the idea that researchers can help "flip" library budgets to OA by becoming "more thoughtful consumers when publishing their research," see University of California Libraries, "Pay It Forward," 98–99. To be clear, the authors of this report do not recommend this strategy as desirable; they simply indicate that if libraries were to engage in "flipping" at a large scale, such "multiplayer" pressure would likely have to come into play.

29. See Samuel Moore et al., "Excellence R Us: University Research and the Fetishisation of Excellence," *Palgrave Communications* 3 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2016.105>.

30. For more on the Radical OA Collective, see Radical Open Access Collective, "About the Collective," Radical Open Access Collective, accessed May 31, 2019, <https://radicaloa.disruptivemedia.org.uk/about/>. The OA press that I co-direct with Vincent W. J. van Gerven Oei, punctum books, is a founding member of the Collective.

31. See ScholarLed, "Open Infrastructure Development," ScholarLed, accessed May 31, 2019, <https://scholarled.org/#infrastructure>, and Lucy Barnes, "ScholarLed Collaboration: A Powerful Engine to Grow Open Access Publishing," *LSE Impact Blog*, October

26, 2018, <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2018/10/26/scholarled-collaboration-a-powerful-engine-to-grow-open-access-publishing/>.

32. Punctum has experimented with multiple business models in the OA books landscape, and has ultimately settled on a hybrid approach that combines: (a) consortial library funding (<https://punctumbooks.com/supporting-library-membership-program/>); (b) sales of print books; (c) revolving individual reader support (<https://punctumbooks.com/membership-account/membership-levels/>); and (d) an institutional partnership: as of January 2020, UC Santa Barbara (UCSB) Library and Punctum are in a three-year pilot partnership to test a no-fees OA book publishing model that privileges cooperative knowledge- and expertise-sharing between communities of professional-public academic practice (<https://www.library.ucsb.edu/punctum-books-ucsb-library-partnership>).

This is a section of [doi:10.7551/mitpress/11885.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11885.001.0001)

Reassembling Scholarly Communications

Histories, Infrastructures, and Global Politics of Open Access

Edited by: Martin Paul Eve, Jonathan Gray

Citation:

*Reassembling Scholarly Communications: Histories, Infrastructures,
and Global Politics of Open Access*

Edited by: Martin Paul Eve, Jonathan Gray

DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/11885.001.0001

ISBN (electronic): 9780262363723

Publisher: The MIT Press

Published: 2020

The open access edition of this book was made possible by generous funding and support from Arcadia – a charitable fund of Lisbet Rausing and Peter Baldwin, and Birkbeck, University of London



The MIT Press

© 2020 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

This work is subject to a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Subject to such license, all rights are reserved.



The open access edition of this book was made possible by generous funding and support from Arcadia (a charitable fund of Lisbet Rausing and Peter Baldwin), the Open Society Foundations, the Open Knowledge Foundation, Birkbeck, University of London, and the Leverhulme Trust.



LEVERHULME TRUST _____

This book was set in Stone Serif and Stone Sans by Westchester Publishing Services.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Eve, Martin Paul, 1986- editor. | Gray, Jonathan, 1983- editor.

Title: Reassembling scholarly communications : histories, infrastructures, and global politics of open access / edited by Martin Paul Eve and Jonathan Gray.

Description: Cambridge, Massachusetts : The MIT Press, [2020] | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2020000429 | ISBN 9780262536240 (paperback)

Subjects: LCSH: Open access publishing. | Communication in learning and scholarship. | Open access publishing--Social aspects. | Communication in learning and scholarship--Social aspects.

Classification: LCC Z286.O63 R43 2020 | DDC 001.2--dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020000429>