

# Notes

## Introduction

1. Bryce Huebner et al., "Making an Author in Radically Collaborative Research," in Thomas Boyer-Kassem et al., eds., *Scientific Collaboration and Collective Knowledge* (Oxford 2018) 101.

2. Stephen G. Nichols and Abby Smith, *The Evidence in Hand: Report of the Task Force on the Artifact in Library Collections* (Council on Library and Information Resources, November 2001) 30, <https://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub103/>.

## Chapter 1

1. C. Armstrong et al., eds., *Access to Knowledge in Africa: The Role of Copyright* (Claremont SA 2010) 335.

2. Charlotte Hess and Elinor Ostrom, "Introduction: An Overview of the Knowledge Commons," in Hess and Ostrom, eds., *Understanding Knowledge as a Commons* (Cambridge MA 2007) 11–13.

3. In the case of porn, its share of the web varies from 10% to 30%, depending on whom you ask: Michael Castleman, "Dueling Statistics: How Much of the Internet Is Porn?" *Psychology Today* (3 November 2016), <https://www.psychologytoday.com/gb/blog/all-about-sex/201611/dueling-statistics-how-much-the-internet-is-porn>.

4. "Scientific and Technical Journal Articles," World Bank, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IP.JRN.ARTC.SC>.

5. JSTOR article numbers from [https://constellate.org/builder/?provider=jstor&start=1800&end=2021&doc\\_type=article](https://constellate.org/builder/?provider=jstor&start=1800&end=2021&doc_type=article).

6. Benoît Godin, "The Most Cherished Indicator: Gross Domestic Expenditures on R&D (GERD)," Project on the History and Sociology of S&T Statistics: Working Paper No. 22 (Montreal, Canadian Science and Innovation Indicators Consortium, 2003) 5, [http://www.csiic.ca/PDF/Godin\\_22.pdf](http://www.csiic.ca/PDF/Godin_22.pdf); Steven P. Dehmer et al., "Reshuffling the Global R&D Deck, 1980–2050," *PLoS One*, 14, 3 (2019), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6440631/>; World Bank: Data; Research and Development Expenditure (% of GDP), <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/GB.XPD.RSDV.GD.ZS>.

7. Lutz Bornmann and Rüdiger Mutz, "Growth Rates of Modern Science: A Bibliometric Analysis Based on the Number of Publications and Cited References," arXiv (8 May 2014), <https://arxiv.org/abs/1402.4578>.

8. Roberto Bolli, "Reflections on the Irreproducibility of Scientific Papers," *Circulation Research*, 117, 8 (2015), <https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/epub/10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.115.307496>.

9. Philip Mirowski, "The Future(s) of Open Science," *Social Studies of Science*, 48, 2 (2018) 179–180, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0306312718772086>.

10. An attempt to account in Roger E. Bohn and James E. Short, "How Much Information? 2009: Report on American Consumers," Global Information Industry Center, University of California, San Diego (December 2009), [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242562463\\_How\\_Much\\_Information\\_2009\\_Report\\_on\\_American\\_Consumers](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242562463_How_Much_Information_2009_Report_on_American_Consumers).

11. James Stayer, "The Anabaptist Revolt and Political and Religious Power," in Benjamin W. Redekop and Calvin W. Redekop, eds., *Power, Authority, and the Anabaptist Tradition* (Baltimore 2001) 50.

12. Claus-Peter Clasen, "Medieval Heresies in the Reformation," *Church History*, 32, 4 (1963) 393, 404; Leonard W. Levy, *Treason against God: A History of the Offense of Blasphemy* (New York 1981) 245; Gershom Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi: The Mystical Messiah: 1626–1676*, 2nd ed. (Princeton 1975) 628; Elisheva Carlebach, *The Pursuit of Heresy: Rabbi Moses Hagiz and the Sabbatian Controversies* (New York 1990) 9, 184.

13. Ann Margaret Doyle, *Social Equality in Education: France and England, 1789–1939* (Cham 2018) 109; Terry Wrigley, "Curriculum Change in English Schools: Educating Working-Class Children," *Social and Education History*, 3, 3 (2014) 212.

14. Vito Tanzi and Ludger Schuknecht, *Public Spending in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge 2000) 34.

15. R. D. Anderson, *European Universities from the Enlightenment to 1914* (Oxford 2004) 11.

16. Thomas D. Snyder, ed., *120 Years of American Education: A Statistical Portrait* (Washington DC 1993) table 24. Similar statistics for percentages of the whole population in "Percentage of the U.S. Population Who Have Completed Four Years of College or More from 1940 to 2020, by Gender," *Statista*, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/184272/educational-attainment-of-college-diploma-or-higher-by-gender/>.

17. Peter Mandler, *The Crisis of the Meritocracy: Britain's Transition to Mass Education since the Second World War* (Oxford 2020) 2–3.

18. Eric Klinenberg, *Palaces for the People: How Social Infrastructure Can Help Fight Inequality, Polarization, and the Decline of Civic Life* (New York 2018).
19. Michael Kevane and William A. Sundstrom, "The Development of Public Libraries in the United States, 1870–1930: A Quantitative Assessment," Santa Clara University, *Scholar Commons* (2014) 1, <https://scholarcommons.scu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1039&context=econ>; Wayne A. Wiegand, *Part of Our Lives: A People's History of the American Public Library* (New York 2015) 1, 2.
20. Thomas Ralf, ed., *Deutschland in Daten* (Bonn 2015) 162.
21. Svend Dahl, *History of the Book* (New York 1958) 68.
22. "Historic Trends in Book Production," *AI Impacts* (7 February 2020) fig. 3, <https://aiimpacts.org/historic-trends-in-book-production/>; Jeremiah E. Dittmar, "Information Technology and Economic Change: The Impact of the Printing Press," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 126, 3 (2011) 1133.
23. James F. English, *The Economy of Prestige: Prizes, Awards, and the Circulation of Cultural Value* (Cambridge MA 2005) 19.
24. Peter Baldwin, *The Copyright Wars* (Princeton 2014) 119, 323.
25. Peter Suber, "Knowledge as a Public Good," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, 139 (2009), <http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/newsletter/11-02-09.htm>.
26. Paul J. Heald, "The Demand for Out-of-Print Works and Their (Un)Availability in Alternative Markets," *Illinois Public Law and Legal Theory Research Papers Series*, No. 14–31, fig. 1, [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2409118](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2409118).
27. Alliance of Independent Authors, "Facts and Figures about Self Publishing: The Impact and Influence of Indie Authors," *ALLi Blog* (22 June 2020), <https://selfpublishingadvice.org/facts-and-figures-about-self-publishing-the-impact-and-influence-of-indie-authors/>.
28. Hugh Trevor-Roper, *The European Witch-Craze of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and Other Essays* (New York 1967) 101–102.
29. Seren Boyd, "Pushing Back: Tackling the Anti-vax Movement," *BMA* (11 January 2021), <https://www.bma.org.uk/news-and-opinion/pushing-back-tackling-the-anti-vax-movement>.
30. King's College, Policy Institute, "Covid Conspiracies and Confusions: The Impact on Compliance with the UK's Lockdown Rules and the Link with Social Media Use," (18 June 2020), <https://www.kcl.ac.uk/policy-institute/assets/covid-conspiracies-and-confusions.pdf>.
31. William Eamon, "From the Secrets of Nature to Public Knowledge," in David C. Lindberg and Robert S. Westman, eds., *Reappraisals of the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge 1990) 346.
32. Orla Higgins et al., "A Literature Review on Health Information-seeking Behaviour on the Web," European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (October 2011) 8, <https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/literature-review-health-information-seeking-behaviour-web-health-consumer-and>.
33. Examples in Peter Suber, *Open Access* (Cambridge MA 2012) 203. If anything, open access might help the situation of freely available but ill-digested information

by supplying it from the horse's mouth, the professional literature, rather than via a detour through journalists' often unhelpful hands.

34. Sharon Swee-Lin Tan and Nadee Goonawardene, "Internet Health Information Seeking and the Patient-Physician Relationship," *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 19, 1 (2017), <https://www.jmir.org/2017/1/e9/>.

35. Richard Wrangham, *The Goodness Paradox: The Strange Relationship between Virtue and Violence in Human Evolution* (New York 2019) 20 and *passim*.

36. Johan Grolle, "Those Who Obeyed the Rules Were Favored by Evolution," *Spiegel* (22 March 2019), <https://www.spiegel.de/international/interview-with-anthropologist-richard-wrangham-a-1259252.html>.

37. Joseph Henrich, *The Secret of Our Success: How Culture Is Driving Human Evolution, Domesticating Our Species, and Making Us Smarter* (Princeton 2017) ch. 11 and *passim*.

38. Nicholas A. Christakis and James H. Fowler, *Connected: The Surprising Power of Our Social Networks and How They Shape Our Lives* (New York 2009).

39. Joseph Henrich, *The WEIRDest People in the World: How the West Became Psychologically Peculiar and Particularly Prosperous* (New York 2020) 448–452.

40. Joel Mokyr, *The Gifts of Athena: Historical Origins of the Knowledge Economy* (Princeton 2002) 74–75.

41. Robert Barnes, "Cloistered Bookworms in the Chicken-Coop of the Muses: The Ancient Library of Alexandria," in Roy MacLeod, ed., *The Library of Alexandria* (London 2010) 63–65.

42. Ian F. McNeely and Lisa Wolverson, *Reinventing Knowledge: From Alexandria to the Internet* (New York 2009) 21.

43. 3.5 million books × 200 pages × 400 words.

44. Michael McCormick, "Research and Teaching: Making Connections in Widener Library," *Harvard Magazine* (1997), <https://www.harvardmagazine.com/sites/default/files/html/1997/05/scholars.mccormick.html>.

45. G. R. Hardy, "S. Ramanujan, F.R.S.," *Nature*, 105, 2642 (1920) 495.

46. Eric J. Hobsbawm, "From West European to World Science: Seventeenth–Twentieth Centuries," in Peter Hanns Reill and Balázs A. Szélenyi, eds., *Cores, Peripheries, and Globalization: Essays in Honor of Ivan T. Berend* (Budapest 2011) 262.

47. B. Zorina Khan, *The Democratization of Invention: Patents and Copyrights in American Economic Development, 1790–1920* (Cambridge 2005) chs. 8, 9; Meredith L. McGill, *American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting, 1834–1853* (Philadelphia 2003).

48. Jeremy Farrar with Anjana Ahuja, *Spike: The Virus vs the People: The Inside Story* (London 2021) 24–31; Michael A. Johansson et al., "Preprints: An Underutilized Mechanism to Accelerate Outbreak Science," *PLOS Medicine* (3 April 2018), <https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1002549>; Peter Baldwin, *Fighting the First Wave: Why the Coronavirus Was Tackled So Differently across the Globe* (Cambridge 2020) 14–15.

49. Holly Else, “How a Torrent of COVID Science Changed Research Publishing—In Seven Charts,” *Nature* (16 December 2020), <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-03564-y>.

50. Vannevar Bush, “As We May Think,” *Atlantic* (July 1945), <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1945/07/as-we-may-think/303881/>.

51. Andy Clark and David Chalmers, “The Extended Mind,” *Analysis*, 58, 1 (1998); Andy Clark, *Supersizing the Mind: Embodiment, Action, and Cognitive Extension* (Oxford 2008).

52. Roger Clarke, “Information Wants to be Free . . .” <http://www.rogerclarke.com/II/IWtbF.html>.

53. Alain M. Schoenenberger, “Are Higher Education and Academic Research a Public Good or a Public Responsibility? A Review of the Economic Literature,” in Luc Weber and Sjur Bergan, eds., *The Public Responsibility for Higher Education and Research* (Council of Europe, Strasbourg 2005) 66–67, <https://rm.coe.int/the-public-responsibility-for-higher-education-and-research/168075ddd0>.

54. 63% in the US, 66% in Germany, 79% in Japan, figures from 2018: OECD. Stat, Gross Domestic Expenditure on R&D by Sector of Performance and Source of Funds; Sector: Total Intramural; Source of Funds: Business Enterprise Sector Divided by Total Funding; Measure: PPP Dollars—Current prices, US Dollar, Millions. [https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=GERD\\_SOF](https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=GERD_SOF).

55. Department for Business, Innovation, and Skills, *What Is the Relationship Between Public and Private Investment in Science, Research, and Innovation?* (April 2015) 7, [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/438763/bis-15-340-relationship-between-public-and-private-investment-in-R-D.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/438763/bis-15-340-relationship-between-public-and-private-investment-in-R-D.pdf).

56. Wesley M. Cohen et al., “Protecting Their Intellectual Assets: Appropriability Conditions and Why US Manufacturing Firms Patent (Or Not),” National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 7552 (2000).

57. Michael Strevens, “Scientific Sharing, Communism, and the Social Contract,” in Boyer-Kassem et al., eds., *Scientific Collaboration and Collective Knowledge*, 3.

58. Krzysztof Trzciński, “Citizenship in Europe: The Main Stages of Development of the Idea and Institution,” *Studies in European Affairs*, 1 (2021) 13, [http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.ojs-doi-10\\_33067\\_SE\\_1\\_2021\\_1](http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.ojs-doi-10_33067_SE_1_2021_1); Andrew T. Young, “How the City Air Made Us Free: The Self-Governing Medieval City and the Bourgeois Revaluation,” *Journal of Private Enterprise*, 32, 4 (2017).

59. Generally, see Susan C. Lawrence, *Privacy and the Past: Research, Law, Archives, Ethics* (New Brunswick 2016).

60. Laura M. Beskow, “Lessons from HeLa Cells: The Ethics and Policy of Biospecimens,” *Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics*, 17 (2016), [https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-genom-083115-022536?url\\_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr\\_id=ori%3Arid%3Acrossref.org&rfr\\_dat=cr\\_pub%3Dpubmed](https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-genom-083115-022536?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori%3Arid%3Acrossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub%3Dpubmed).

61. Ian Vincent McGonigle, "Patenting Nature or Protecting Culture? Ethnopharmacology and Indigenous Intellectual Property Rights," *Journal of Law and the Biosciences* (6 February 2016) 223, <https://academic.oup.com/jlb/article/3/1/217/1751287>.

62. Howard Wolinsky, "Ancient DNA and Contemporary Politics," *EMBO Reports*, 20, 12 (2019), <https://www.embopress.org/doi/full/10.15252/embr.201949507>; Jessica Bardill, "Native American DNA: Ethical, Legal, and Social Implications of an Evolving Concept," *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 43 (2014).

63. Daniel Jütte, *The Age of Secrecy: Jews, Christians, and the Economy of Secrets, 1400–1800* (New Haven 2015).

64. Paul A. David, "From Keeping 'Nature's Secrets' to the Institutionalization of 'Open Science'," in Rishab Aiyer Ghosh, ed., *Code: Collaborative Ownership and the Digital Economy* (Cambridge MA 2005) 94.

65. Jana Bacevic and Chris Muellerleile, "The Moral Economy of Open Access," *European Journal of Social Theory*, 21, 2 (2018) 175.

66. "How Much Does Your Country Invest in R&D?" UNESCO Institute for Statistics, <http://uis.unesco.org/apps/visualisations/research-and-development-spending/>.

67. Mu-Hsuan Huang and Mei-Jhen Huang, "An Analysis of Global Research Funding from Subject Field and Funding Agencies Perspectives in the G9 Countries," *Scientometrics* (2018) table 5, <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1007/s11192-018-2677-y>.

68. Godfrey Oswald, ed., *Library World Records*, 3rd ed. (Jefferson NC 2017) 17, 19, [https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=G4owDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=world+%22largest+libraries%22&ots=WEFE21BUfB&sig=74hB718P84QKiZseD-GwNBEhyE4&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q=world%20%22largest%20libraries%22&f=false](https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=G4owDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=world+%22largest+libraries%22&ots=WEFE21BUfB&sig=74hB718P84QKiZseD-GwNBEhyE4&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=world%20%22largest%20libraries%22&f=false).

69. Suber, *Open Access*, 30.

70. WIPO, *World Intellectual Property Indicators 2019*, calculated from figures on 205–206.

71. WIPO, *World Intellectual Property Indicators 2019*, 15.

72. Fran M. Collyer, "Global Patterns in the Publishing of Academic Knowledge: Global North, Global South," *Current Sociology*, 66, 1 (2018) 58.

73. Alexander Gerschenkron, *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge MA 1962).

74. Index Mundi, <https://www.indexmundi.com/g/r.aspx?v=4010>; Hannah Ritchie and Max Roser, "Technology Adoption," *Our World in Data* (2019), "Technology Adoption in US Households," <https://ourworldindata.org/technology-adoption#citation>.

75. US authors were invited to the UK by their British publishers in hopes of securing local copyright for their works: Katie McGettigan, "When American Literature Came to Grove Terrace NW5," *Kentishtowner* (13 May 2021), <https://www.kentishtowner.co.uk/2021/05/13/american-literature-came-grove-terrace/>.

76. Adolf Fleischmann, "Die Berner Übereinkunft zum Schutze des Urheberrechts," *UFITA*, 103 (1986) 50.

77. Baldwin, *Copyright Wars*, 277.

78. In 2018, China filed almost three times as many patents as the US. WIPO, *World Intellectual Property Indicators 2019*, 7.

79. Timothy Bazzle, "Pharmacy of the Developing World: Reconciling Intellectual Property Rights in India with the Right to Health: TRIPS, India's Patent System, and Essential Medicines," *Georgetown Journal of International Law*, 42, 3 (2011).

80. Armstrong et al., eds., *Access to Knowledge in Africa*, 318–320, 326.

81. Arguments summarized in Martin Paul Eve, *Open Access and the Humanities* (Cambridge 2014) 62–67, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316161012>; Philip Mirowski, "What Is 'Open Science' Open To?" (February 2014), [https://www.academia.edu/11571042/What\\_is\\_Open\\_Science?auto=download](https://www.academia.edu/11571042/What_is_Open_Science?auto=download); Bacevic and Muellerleile, "Moral Economy of Open Access," 179; David Golumbia, "Marxism and Open Access in the Humanities: Turning Academic Labor against Itself," *Workplace*, 28 (2016) 75.

82. Nathaniel Tkacz, *Wikipedia and the Politics of Openness* (Chicago 2015).

83. Samuel A. Moore, "A Genealogy of Open Access: Negotiations between Openness and Access to Research," *Revue Française des Sciences de l'information et de la communication*, 11 (2017), <https://journals.openedition.org/rfsic/3220>.

84. Nicholas Kulish, "Direct Democracy, 2.0," *New York Times* (6 May 2012); Richard Barbrook and Andy Cameron, "The Californian Ideology," *Mute*, 1, 3 (1995), <https://www.metamute.org/editorial/articles/californian-ideology>.

85. Examples in Leslie Chan et al., eds., *Contextualizing Openness: Situating Open Science* (Ottawa 2019), <https://www.idrc.ca/en/book/contextualizing-openness-situating-open-science>.

86. Thomas Maier, *Masters of Sex: The Life and Times of William Masters and Virginia Johnson, the Couple Who Taught America How to Love* (New York 2009) 175.

## Chapter 2

1. David Blank, "'Our Fellow Shakespeare': A Contemporary Classic in the Early Modern University," *Review of English Studies*, 71, 301 (2020); Devoney Looser, *The Making of Jane Austen* (Baltimore 2017) 4.

2. Martin Hägglund, *This Life: Secular Faith and Spiritual Freedom* (New York 2020).

3. Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Use and Abuse of History*.

4. Washington Irving, "The Mutability of Literature," in his *The Sketch Book* (New York n.d.).

5. Hugo Reinert and Erik S. Reinert, "Creative Destruction in Economics: Nietzsche, Sombart, Schumpeter," in Jürgen G. Backhaus and Wolfgang Dreschler, eds., *Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900)* (New York 2006).



6. "How Many Melodies Are There in the Universe?" Everything2.com, <https://everything2.com/title/How+many+melodies+are+there+in+the+universe%253F>; <https://plus.maths.org/content/how-many-melodies-are-there>.

7. All the Music LLC, <http://allthemusic.info/>.

8. Dean Keith Simonton, "Thematic Fame and Melodic Originality in Classical Music: A Multivariate Computer-content Analysis," *Journal of Personality*, 48, 2 (1980) 216; Dean Keith Simonton, "The Decline and Fall of Musical Art: What Happened to Classical Composers?" *Empirical Studies of the Arts*, 27, 2 (2009) 210–212.

9. Grosso modo the argument of Colin Martindale, *The Clockwork Muse: The Predictability of Artistic Change* (New York 1990).

10. Ed Simon, "Stories in Formaldehyde: The Strange Pleasures of Taxonomizing Plot," *The Millions* (2 October 2020), <https://themillions.com/2020/10/stories-in-formaldehyde-the-strange-pleasures-of-taxonomizing-plot.html>.

11. Pamela Samuelson, "Reconceptualizing Copyright's Merger Doctrine," *Journal of the Copyright Society of the USA*, 63, 3 (2016).

12. Joseph M. Santiago, "The Blurred Lines of Copyright Law: Setting a New Standard for Copyright Infringement in Music," *Brooklyn Law Review*, 83, 1 (2017).

13. Constance Malpas and Brian Lavoie, "Strength in Numbers: The Research Libraries UK (RLUK) Collective Collection," *OCLC Research* (2016) 19, <https://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/2016/oclcresearch-strength-in-numbers-rluk-collective-collection-2016.pdf>.

14. William M. Landes and Richard A. Posner, "Indefinitely Renewable Copyright," *University of Chicago Law Review*, 70 (2003) 474.

15. James Shackell, "'Most of Australia's Literary Heritage Is Out of Print:' The Fight to Rescue a Nation's Lost Books," *Guardian* (23 June 2021), <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2021/jun/24/most-of-australias-literary-heritage-is-out-of-print-the-fight-to-rescue-a-nations-lost-books>.

16. *Gowers Review of Intellectual Property* (December 2006) 52–53, [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/228849/0118404830.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/228849/0118404830.pdf).

17. Only 13% of copyrights registered between 1923 and 1942 in the US were renewed. Rebecca Giblin, "A New Copyright Bargain: Reclaiming Lost Culture and Getting Authors Paid," *Columbia Journal of Law & the Arts*, 41, 3 (2018) 375.

18. Richard Schiff, "Originality," in Schiff and Robert Nelson, eds., *Critical Terms for Art History* (2nd ed.; Chicago 2003) 145–149; Edward Earle, "The Effect of Romanticism on the 19th Century Development of Copyright Law," *Intellectual Property Journal*, 6 (1991) 275–276.

19. Walter Bappert, *Wege zum Urheberrecht: Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Urheberrechtsgedankens* (Frankfurt 1962) 20–22.

20. John Willinsky, *The Intellectual Properties of Learning: A Prehistory from Saint Jerome to John Locke* (Chicago 2018) 34.



21. Nick Groom, "Unoriginal Genius: Plagiarism and the Construction of 'Romantic' Authorship," in Lionel Bently et al., eds., *Copyright and Piracy* (Cambridge 2010) 274–275; Carla Hesse, "The Rise of Intellectual Property, 700 BC–AD 2000: An Idea in the Balance," *Daedalus*, 131, 2 (2002) 26–30.

22. Martha Woodmansee, *The Author, Art, and the Market: Rereading the History of Aesthetics* (New York 1994) 35–40.

23. Alan Bradshaw and Morris B. Holbrook, "Remembering Chet: Theorizing the Mythology of the Self-Destructive Bohemian Artist as Self-Producer and Self-Consumer in the Market for Romanticism," *Marketing Theory*, 7, 2 (2007).

24. Honoré de Balzac, "Pro Aris et Focis: Lettre adressée aux écrivains du XIXe siècle," *Revue de Paris*, ns 11 (1834) 63.

25. Simon Schaffer, "Scientific Discoveries and the End of Natural Philosophy," *Social Studies of Science*, 16 (1986).

26. Thomas Nickles, "Enlightenment versus Romantic Models of Creativity in Science—and Beyond," *Creativity Research Journal*, 7 (1994) 278.

27. Marx, *The German Ideology*, part IA.

28. Michael Nielsen, *Reinventing Discovery: The New Era of Networked Science* (Princeton 2012).

29. Howard Bloom, "Who's Smarter: Chimps, Baboons or Bacteria? The Power of Group IQ," in Mark Tovey, ed., *Collective Intelligence* (Oakton 2008) 251–253; Stefan Wuchty et al., "The Increasing Dominance of Teams in Production of Knowledge," *Science*, 316 (2007) 1036–1039; Richard M. Shiffryn et al., "Scientific Progress despite Irreproducibility: A Seeming Paradox," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, 115, 11 (2018) 2633–2635.

30. Steven Shapin, *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England* (Chicago 1994) ch 8.

31. Simon Fuller and James O'Sullivan, "Structure over Style: Collaborative Authorship and the Revival of Literary Capitalism," *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, 11, 1 (2017).

32. David W. Shapiro et al., "The Contributions of Authors to Multiauthored Biomedical Research Papers," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 271, 6 (1994) 438.

33. William J. Broad, "The Publishing Game: Getting More for Less," *Science*, 211 (1981) 1137; LSE Public Policy Group, "Maximizing the Impacts of Your Research: A Handbook for Social Scientists," Consultation Draft 3 (14 April 2011) 114, <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/files/2018/06/Handbook-PDF-for-the-LSE-impact-blog-April-2011.pdf>.

34. Hans-Jürgen Quadbeck-Seeger, ed., *World Records in Chemistry* (Weinheim 1999) 135.

35. ATLAS Collaboration Phys. Lett. B 716, 1–29 (2012). See <https://www.nature.com/news/physics-paper-sets-record-with-more-than-5-000-authors-1.17567>.

36. G. Aad et al., “Combined Measurement of the Higgs Boson Mass in *pp* Collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  and 8 TeV with the ATLAS and CMS Experiments,” *Physical Review Letters*, 114, 191803 (2015).

37. Producers Guild of America, “Code of Credits,” [https://www.producersguild.org/page/coc\\_tmp\\_2](https://www.producersguild.org/page/coc_tmp_2).

38. “What Do ‘Best Boy’ and ‘Dolly Grip’ Mean?” *Reel Rundown* (20 April 2016), <https://reelrundown.com/film-industry/What-is-a-Best-Boy-Film-Terminology-and-Movie-Terms>.

39. Stephen Follows, “How Many People Work on a Hollywood Film?” (21 February 2014), <https://stephenfollows.com/how-many-people-work-on-a-hollywood-film/>.

40. Vijaysree Venkatraman, “Conventions of Scientific Authorship,” *Science* (16 April 2010), <https://www.sciencemag.org/careers/2010/04/conventions-scientific-authorship#>.

41. “CRedit—Contributor Roles Taxonomy,” *Casrai*, <https://casrai.org/credit/>; Alex Holcombe, “Farewell Authors, Hello Contributors,” *Nature* (5 July 2019), <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-02084-8>.

42. English, *Economy of Prestige*.

43. John Tebbel, “The Book Business in the US,” in David Daiches and Anthony Thorlby, eds., *The Modern World* (London 1976) iii, 533; Paul W. Kingston et al., “The Columbia Economic Survey of American Authors: A Summary of Findings,” Center for Social Sciences, Columbia University (1981) 14.

44. Christine Larson, “The Profession of Author in the 21st Century,” *Authors Guild* (2019) 4, 17–18, <https://www.authorsguild.org/industry-advocacy/authors-guild-issues-report-exploring-the-factors-leading-to-the-decline-of-the-writing-profession/>.

45. Alexander Busch, “The Vicissitudes of the *Privatdozent*,” *Minerva*, 1, 3 (1963) 319.

46. Robert Wicks, *Schopenhauer* (Malden 2008) 8.

47. Forty per million in 1835, 507 in 2010: Claude Diebolt, *Die langfristige Entwicklung des Schulsystems in Deutschland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (2005), C.3. Anzahl der Lehrer in Deutschland (1835–1940), Deutschland, Professoren an den Universitäten. 1997 [2005]. Gesis, histat: Historische Statistik, <https://histat.thesis.org/histat/de/table/details/F19F3B6F210A682349F308D8618F1D0C#tabelle>. (1835–1940), Deutschland, Professoren an den Universitäten, 1997 [2005]; Statistisches Bundesamt, H201—Hochschulstatistik, Professoren nach Geschlecht, Insgesamt, Excel file provided by Statistisches Bundesamt.

48. “Number of Faculty Members in Humanities and Other Fields,” American Academy of Arts and Sciences, <https://www.amacad.org/humanities-indicators/workforce/number-faculty-members-humanities-and-other-fields>.

49. What is known as “guaranteed author’s money,” some \$25,000 annually until the recipient turns 70, which has replaced a slightly more generous system of “state artist’s salary.” My thanks to Aris Fioretos for this information.

50. John L. Campbell and Ove K. Pedersen, *The National Origins of Policy Ideas: Knowledge Regimes in the United States, France, Germany, and Denmark* (Princeton 2014) 51, 104–105.

51. HSBC Global Research, “Survey of Funders Supports the Benign Open Access Outcome Priced into Shares” (11 February 2013) 5, <https://www.research.hsbc.com/midas/Res/RDV?ao=20&key=RxArfbnG1P&n=360010.PDF%20>.

52. “Research and Development Expenditure (% of GDP),” World Bank, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/GB.XPD.RSDV.GD.ZS?end=2019&start=1996&view=chart>.

53. European Commission, Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, *Future of Scholarly Publishing and Scholarly Communication* (January 2019) 21, <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/464477b3-2559-11e9-8d04-01aa75ed71a1>.

54. Robert Anderson, *British Universities Past and Present* (London 2006) 5, 37.

55. Anderson, *European Universities*, 9.

56. Anderson, *European Universities*, 61–62.

57. Baldwin, *Copyright Wars*, 217–20.

58. Drummond Rennie et al., “When Authorship Fails: A Proposal to Make Contributors Accountable,” *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 278, 7 (1997), <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/article-abstract/417997>.

59. Peter Galison, “The Collective Author,” in Mario Biagioli and Peter Galison, eds., *Scientific Authorship: Credit and Intellectual Property in Science* (New York 2002) 328–329.

60. Bryce Huebner, *Macrocognition: A Theory of Distributed Minds and Collective Intentionality* (Oxford 2014).

### Chapter 3

1. Monika Dommann, *Authors and Apparatus: A Media History of Copyright* (Ithaca 2019) 100–103.

2. Alandis Kyle Brassel, “Confused, Frustrated, and Exhausted: Solving the U.S. Digital First Sale Doctrine Problem through the International Lens,” *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, 48, 1 (2015) 254.

3. Geoffrey A. Fowler, “Want to Borrow that E-book from the Library? Sorry, Amazon Won’t Let You,” *Washington Post* (10 March 2021).

4. Rebecca Klar, “Amazon under Pressure to Lift Ban on E-book Library Sales,” *The Hill* (2 December 2020), <https://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/528280-amazon-under-pressure-to-lift-ban-on-e-book-library-sales>.

5. Andrew Albanese, “Amazon Publishing, DPLA Ink Deal to Lend E-books in Libraries,” *Publishers Weekly* (18 May 2021), <https://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/industry-news/libraries/article/86399-amazon-publishing-dpla-ink-deal-to-lend-digital-content-in-libraries.html>.

6. David R. Hansen and Kyle K. Courtney, "A White Paper on Controlled Digital Lending of Library Books," (2018), <https://controldigitalending.org/whitepaper>.

7. *Capitol Records LLC v. ReDigi Inc.*, 934 F. Supp. 2d 640 (S.D.N.Y. 2013).

8. Its story in Deanna Marcum and Roger C. Schonfeld, *Along Came Google: A History of Library Digitization* (Princeton 2021).

9. James Somers, "Torching the Modern-Day Library of Alexandria," *Atlantic* (20 April 2017).

10. The British Library's "Private Case Collection" forms part of Gale Cengage's "Archives of Sexuality & Gender, Part III" which Gale licenses to other libraries, <https://www.bl.uk/press-releases/2019/february/private-case-collection-launched>.

11. Its history in Roger C. Schonfeld, *JSTOR: A History* (Princeton 2003).

12. <https://about.jstor.org/oa-and-free/>.

13. <https://case.law/>.

14. McKinsey Global Institute, "Digital America: A Tale of the Haves and the Have-Mores" (1 December 2015), <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/technology-media-and-telecommunications/our-insights/digital-america-a-tale-of-the-haves-and-have-mores>.

15. ProQuest had the exclusive right to license its Early English Books Online (EEBO) "Phase 2" texts to new customers, or to users outside the original Phase 2 partnership. This restriction ended on January 1, 2021, thus opening it to readers in general, <https://textcreationpartnership.org/tcp-texts/eebo-tcp-early-english-books-online/>. Thanks to Ross Mounce for this.

16. Mario Biagioli, "Rights or Rewards? Changing Frameworks of Scientific Authorship," in Biagioli and Galison, eds., *Scientific Authorship*, 256–257.

17. William E. Savage and Anthony J. Olejniczak, "More Journal Articles and Fewer Books: Publication Practices in the Social Sciences in the 2010's," *PLoS One* (3 February 2022), <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0263410>.

18. HSBC Global Research, "Going for Gold: Open Access Risks Are Diminishing for Reed Elsevier and Informa" (31 August 2012) 18, <https://www.research.hsbc.com/midas/Res/RDV?p=pdf&key=ZMbgSQ5vv&n=341184.PDF>.

19. An example: Mary Poovey, *A History of the Modern Fact: Problems of Knowledge in the Sciences of Wealth and Society* (Chicago 1998).

20. Marilyn Deegan, *The Academic Book of the Future Project Report: A Report to the AHRC and the British Library* (June 2017) 40–41, <https://academicbookfuture.org/end-of-project-reports-2/>.

21. Anthony F. J. van Raan, "On Growth, Ageing, and Fractal Differentiation of Science," *Scientometrics*, 47, 2 (2000) 350; Bornmann and Mutz, "Growth Rates of Modern Science," 10.

22. David Worlock, "After Content: Scholarly Communications After Articles?" *DavidWorlock.Com* (19 November 2021), <https://www.davidworlock.com/2021/11/after-content-scholarly-communications-after-articles/>.

23. Daniele Fanelli and Vincent Larivière, “Researchers’ Individual Publication Rate Has Not Increased in a Century,” *PLOS One* (9 March 2016) 5, <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0149504>.

24. John P. A. Ioannidis et al., “The Scientists Who Publish a Paper Every Five Days,” *Nature*, 561 (2018) 167–169, <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-06185-8>.

25. Christopher Anderson, “Writer’s Cramp,” *Nature*, 355 (1992) 101, <https://www.nature.com/articles/355101a0.pdf>.

26. Jack Grove, “Restrict Researchers to One Paper a Year, Says UCL Professor,” *Times Higher Education* (28 November 2019).

27. The 2019 version: <http://www.icmje.org/icmje-recommendations.pdf>.

28. Shapiro et al., “Contributions of Authors to Multiauthored Biomedical Research Papers,” 441.

29. Ioannidis et al., “Scientists Who Publish a Paper Every Five Days,” 167–169.

30. Arnold S. Jacobs, “An Analysis of Section 16 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934,” *New York Law School Law Review*, 32 (1987) is 492 pages long.

31. Stephen Bainbridge, “Law Review Word Limits Go Unenforced . . . at Least at Harvard and Yale” (15 October 2013), <https://www.professorbainbridge.com/professorbainbridge.com/2013/10/law-review-word-limits-go-unenforced-at-least-at-harvard-and-yale.html>.

32. Gerhard A. Ritter, “Entstehung und Entwicklung des Sozialstaates in vergleichender Perspektive,” *Historische Zeitschrift*, 243, 1 (1986) is almost half the length of his subsequent book *Der Sozialstaat: Entstehung und Entwicklung im internationalen Vergleich* (Munich 1989). Tomáš Lackner and Richard A. B. Leschen, “A Monograph of the Australopacific Saprininae (Coleoptera, Histeridae),” *ZooKeys*, 689 (2017), <https://zookeys.pensoft.net/article/12021/> is book length.

33. Oxford University Press’s *Very Short Introduction* series is among the best known, strictly limited to 30,000 words, and is at some 750 titles and counting.

34. Cited in Arthur Austin, “Footnote Skulduggery and Other Bad Habits,” *University of Miami Law Review*, 44 (1990) 1009; Joan Ames Magat, “Bottomheavy: Legal Footnotes,” *Journal of Legal Education*, 60, 1 (2010) 70.

35. Lori McPherson, “Law Review Articles Have Too Many Footnotes,” *Journal of Legal Education*, 68, 2 (2019).

36. Anne-Wil K. Harzing and Ron van der Wal, “Google Scholar as a New Source for Citation Analysis,” *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics*, 8 (2008) 64.

37. “Highly Cited Researchers (h > 100) According to Their Google Scholar Citations Public Profiles,” <https://www.webometrics.info/en/hlargerthan100>. That was the case when this was consulted early in 2021. A year later, the first nonscientist was Stiglitz at 34. Amartya Sen followed at 64. The list now includes only living authors, explaining the disappearance of past greats, except that the first humanist is Theodor Adorno at 349, apparently an oversight.

38. Lawprofblawg and Darren Bush, "Law Reviews, Citation Counts, and Twitter (Oh my!): Behind the Curtains of the Law Professor's Search for Meaning," *Loyola University Chicago Law Journal*, 50 (2018) 333.

39. Katherine W. McCain, "Obliteration by Incorporation," in Blaise Cronin and Cassidy R. Sugimoto, eds., *Beyond Bibliometrics: Harnessing Multidimensional Indicators of Scholarly Impact* (Cambridge MA 2014). This footnote commits that crime, since the idea comes originally from Robert Merton. But this also ignores the converse issue, that in some fields, such as history, the act of finding an obscure work that is then cited (what we call research) obliges subsequent scholars to cite the intermediary work as well, giving credit for the finding, too, not just pretending that their erudition extended to the original source.

40. Fred R. Shapiro and Michelle Pearse, "The Most Cited Law Review Articles of All Time," *Michigan Law Review*, 110 (2012) 1485.

41. As pointed out by Hirsch himself, after whom the index is named: J. E. Hirsch, "An Index to Quantify an Individual's Scientific Research Output," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102, 46 (2005) 16571.

42. Differences among fields are explored in A.W. Harzing, and S. Alakangas, "Google Scholar, Scopus, and the Web of Science: A Longitudinal and Cross-Disciplinary Comparison," *Scientometrics*, 106, 2 (2016).

43. Stephen Bosch et al., "Deal or No Deal: Periodicals Price Survey 2019," *Library Journal* (4 April 2019) table 3, <https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=Deal-or-No-Deal-Periodicals-Price-Survey-2019>.

44. Mu-Hsuan Huang and Mei-Jhen Huang, "An Analysis of Global Research Funding from Subject Field and Funding Agencies Perspectives in the G9 Countries," *Scientometrics* (2018) table 4, <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1007/s11192-018-2677-y>.

45. HSBC Global Research, "Reed Elsevier" (30 April 2012) 25, <https://www.research.hsbc.com/midas/Res/RDV?p=pdf&key=0gdqbAbXzv&n=328354.PDF>.

46. Burcu Yucesoy et al., "Success in Books: A Big Data Approach to Bestsellers," *EPJ Data Science*, 7, 7 (2018) 3, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1140/epjds/s13688-018-0135-y#Fig3>.

47. Fei Shu et al., "Is It Such a Big Deal? On the Cost of Journal Use in the Digital Era," *College and Research Libraries*, 79, 6 (2018) 1, <https://crl.acrl.org/index.php/crl/rt/prINTERfriendly/16829/18997>.

48. Neil Beagrie, "Preservation, Trust, and Continuing Access for e-Journals," 6–7, DPC Technology Watch Reports, <https://www.dpconline.org/docs/technology-watch-reports/924-dpctw13-04/file>.

49. John Willinsky, *The Access Principle: The Case for Open Access to Research and Scholarship* (Cambridge MA 2006) ch. 4.

50. John J. Regazzi, *Scholarly Communications: A History from Content as King to Content as Kingmaker* (Lanham 2015) 10.

51. John B. Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age: The Transformation of Academic and Higher Education Publishing in Britain and the United States* (Cambridge 2005) 101.
52. Vincent Larivière et al., "The Oligopoly of Academic Publishers in the Digital Era," *PLOS One* (10 June 2015), <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127502>.
53. Greg Tananbaum, "Of Wolves and Boys: The Scholarly Communication Crisis," *Learned Publishing*, 16 (2003) 286, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1087/095315103322422035>.
54. S. C. Bradford, "Sources of Information on Specific Subjects," *British Journal of Engineering*, 137 (1934), available at [https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1300/J105v01n03\\_06](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1300/J105v01n03_06).
55. <https://openstax.org/>.
56. MIT OpenCourseWare: <https://ocw.mit.edu/courses/online-textbooks/>. See also <https://fredonia.libguides.com/oer/textbooks>.
57. Open Syllabus, OER Metrics, <https://oer.opensyllabus.org/?category=Top%20Titles&>.
58. "Consumer Expenditure on Educational Books in the United States from 1999 to 2020," <https://www.statista.com/statistics/192867/consumer-expenditures-on-educational-books-in-the-us-since-1999/>.
59. "Student Spending on Course Material in the United States from the Academic Years 2007/08 to 2019/20," <https://www.statista.com/statistics/592371/student-spending-course-material-usa/>.
60. Stephen Buranyi, "Is the Staggeringly Profitable Business of Scientific Publishing Bad for Science?" *Guardian* (27 June 2017), <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2017/jun/27/profitable-business-scientific-publishing-bad-for-science>.
61. Richard Edwards and David Shulenberg, "The High Cost of Scholarly Journals (and What to Do about It)," *KU ScholarWorks*, 2, <https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/12546/Highe%20Cost%20of%20Scholarly%20-%20Change.pdf>.
62. Association of Research Libraries, *ALR Statistics, 2003–04*, Graph 4, [http://www.libqual.org/documents/admin/2012/ARL\\_Stats/2004-05arlstats.pdf](http://www.libqual.org/documents/admin/2012/ARL_Stats/2004-05arlstats.pdf). More recent continuing bad news in Rachael Pells, "Top Universities' Journal Subscriptions 'Average £4 Million.'" *Times Higher Education* (12 June 2018), <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/top-universities-journal-subscriptions-average-4-million-pounds>.
63. Fei Shu et al., "Is It Such a Big Deal?" fig. 2; Tananbaum, "Of Wolves and Boys," 285.
64. John W. Houghton, "Crisis and Transition: The Economics of Scholarly Communication," *Learned Publishing*, 14 (2001) 168, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1087/095315101750240412>.
65. Donald A. Barclay, "Academic Print Books Are Dying," *Conversation* (10 November 2015), <https://theconversation.com/academic-print-books-are-dying-whats-the-future-46248>.



66. Chandra Prabha and John E. Ogden, "Recent Trends in Academic Library Materials Expenditures," *Library Trends*, 42, 3 (1994) fig. 2; *Trends in the Finances of UK Higher Education Libraries: 1999–2009*, 14–15, [http://www.rin.ac.uk/system/files/attachments/library\\_trends\\_report\\_screen.pdf](http://www.rin.ac.uk/system/files/attachments/library_trends_report_screen.pdf).

67. <https://www.elsevier.com/books-and-journals/journal-pricing/print-price-list>.

68. Thanks to Ian Baldwin for this caution.

69. Stephen Bosch et al., "Deal or No Deal: Periodicals Price Survey 2019," *Library Journal* (4 April 2019) table 3, <https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=Deal-or-No-Deal-Periodicals-Price-Survey-2019>.

70. Peter Mandler, "Open Access: A Perspective from the Humanities," *Insights*, 27, 2 (2014), <http://doi.org/10.1629/2048-7754.89>.

71. Mary Waltham, "The Future of Scholarly Journals Publishing among Social Science and Humanities Associations," *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 41, 3 (2010) 264–265, accessible version at <https://www.marywaltham.com/JSPfulltextarticleApril2010.pdf>.

72. Joseph Esposito, "Why Elsevier is a Library's Best Friend," *Scholarly Kitchen* (9 January 2018), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2018/01/09/50692/>.

73. Shu et al., "Is It Such a Big Deal?" fig. 3.

74. Rob Johnson et al., *The STM Report: An Overview of Scientific and Scholarly Publishing* (5th ed.; 2018) 6, 76, [https://www.stm-assoc.org/2018\\_10\\_04\\_STM\\_Report\\_2018.pdf](https://www.stm-assoc.org/2018_10_04_STM_Report_2018.pdf).

75. HSBC Global Research, "Going for Gold," 14.

76. Ann M. Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven 2010) 18.

77. <https://scoop3.org/>.

78. <https://www.openlibhums.org/>.

79. Richard Poynder, "Open Access: 'Information Wants to Be Free?'" *Open and Shut?* (2 December 2020) 82, <https://poynder.blogspot.com/2020/12/open-access-information-wants-to-be-free.html>.

80. Peter Gruss, president of the Max Planck Society, quoted in Ralf Schimmer et al., "Disrupting the Subscription Journals' Business Model for the Necessary Large-scale Transformation to Open Access," Max Planck Digital Library Open Access Policy White Paper (28 April 2015) 4, [https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item\\_2148961\\_7/component/file\\_2149096/content](https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_2148961_7/component/file_2149096/content).

81. David Shulenberg, "Substituting Article Processing Charges for Subscriptions: The Cure Is Worse than the Disease," Association of Research Libraries (20 July 2016), <https://www.arl.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/substituting-apcs-for-subscriptions-20july2016.pdf>.

82. Mellon Foundation, *Pay It Forward: Investigating a Sustainable Model of Open Access Article Processing Charges for Large North American Research Institutions* (University of California Libraries, 30 June 2016), 87, 89, <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8326n305>.

83. Abel L. Packer, "The SciELO Open Access: A Gold Way from the South," *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 39, 3 (2009) 123, <https://journals.sfu.ca/cjhe/index.php/cjhe/article/view/479/504>.

84. Valerie Spezi et al., "Open-access Mega-journals: The Future of Scholarly Communication or Academic Dumping Ground?" *Journal of Documentation*, 73, 2 (2017) 273, <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JD-06-2016-0082/full/html>.

85. "Springer Nature Announces Gold Open Access Options for Nature Journals from January 2021," Springer Nature Group (24 November 2020), <https://group.springernature.com/gb/group/media/press-releases/springer-nature-announces-gold-oa-options-for-nature-journals/18614608>.

86. Stephen Bosch et al., "Deal or No Deal: Periodicals Price Survey 2019," *Library Journal* (4 April 2019) table 3, <https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=Deal-or-No-Deal-Periodicals-Price-Survey-2019>.

87. Mark McGurl, *Everything and Less: The Novel in the Age of Amazon* (London 2021) 35.

88. Rebecca Darley et al., *Open Access Journals in Humanities and Social Science: A British Academy Research Report* (British Academy 2014) 7–8, <https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/publications/open-access-journals-humanities-and-social-science/>. This underestimates the half-lives of humanities articles by perhaps 50% since it counts only downloads from publishers' sites, not also JSTOR, source of half of such downloads. Personal communication from Peter Mandler.

89. House of Commons Business, Innovation and Skills Committee, *Open Access: Fifth Report of Session 2013–14* (10 September 2013) i, 14–15, <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201314/cmselect/cmbis/99/99.pdf>.

90. Mellon Foundation, *Pay It Forward*, 7.

91. University of California, Office of Scholarly Communications, "An Introductory Guide to the UC Model Transformative Agreement," <https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/uc-publisher-relationships/resources-for-negotiating-with-publishers/negotiating-with-scholarly-journal-publishers-a-toolkit/an-introductory-guide-to-the-uc-model-transformative-agreement/>.

92. Gemma Hersh, "Working towards a Transition to Open Access," *Elsevier* (26 September 2017), <https://www.elsevier.com/connect/working-towards-a-transition-to-open-access>; Poynder, "Open Access: 'Information Wants to Be Free'?" 34.

93. Anna McKie, "'Location-specific' Blocks on Journal Access Could be OA 'Interim Solution'," *Times Higher Education* (8 November 2019), <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/location-specific-blocks-journal-access-could-be-oa-interim-solution>.

94. Jason Potts et al., "A Journal Is a Club: A New Economic Model for Scholarly Publishing," *Prometheus*, 35, 1 (2017) 78, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08109028.2017.1386949>.

95. Brian Resnick, "The World Just Redefined the Kilogram," *Vox* (16 November 2018), <https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2018/11/14/18072368/kilogram-kibble-redefine-weight-science>; Bureau International des Poids et Mesures, "Resolution 1 of the 17th CGPM (1983)," <https://www.bipm.org/en/CGPM/db/17/1/>.

96. <https://www.crossref.org/services/crossmark/>.

97. Jean-Claude Guédon, "Open Access: Toward the Internet of the Mind," 31, <https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/boai15/Untitleddocument.docx>.

98. <https://f1000research.com/>; Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 18.

99. Jean-Claude Guédon, *Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association* (9 December 2020), <https://oaspa.org/open-post-the-rise-of-immediate-green-oa-undermines-progress/#comment-15016>.

100. Even the first version deposited is largely indistinguishable from the version of record: Martin Klein et al., "Comparing Published Scientific Journal Articles to their Pre-print Versions," *International Journal on Digital Libraries* (18 January 2018), <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00799-018-0234-1>. Similar results in Jessica K. Polka et al., "Preprints in Motion: Tracking Changes between Posting and Journal Publication," *bioRxiv* (20 February 2021), <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.02.20.432090v1>.

101. For example: Jane Winters, "Giving with One Click, Taking with the Other: E-legal Deposit, Web Archives and Researcher Access," in Paul Gooding and Melissa Terras, eds., *Electronic Legal Deposit: Shaping the Library Collections of the Future* (London 2020), the preprint version at <https://sas-space.sas.ac.uk/9439/1/Giving%20with%20one%20click%2C%20taking%20with%20the%20other.pdf>.

102. Consider the three depository versions of an article by Sergei Dubovsky, "The QCD  $\beta$ -Function on the String Worldsheet," *arXiv*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.00254>. The second one corresponds to the published version, at *Physical Review D* (21 December 2018), <https://journals.aps.org/prd/abstract/10.1103/PhysRevD.98.114025#fulltext>. But the third one, from 5 June 2019, has moved on. Thanks to Ross Mounce for this example.

103. Kathleen Shearer, "Correcting the Record: The Critical Role of OA Repositories in Open Access and Open Science," *OASPA News* (11 December 2020), <https://oaspa.org/guest-post-correcting-the-record-the-critical-role-of-oa-repositories-in-open-access-and-open-science/>.

104. Blair, *Too Much to Know*, 39.

105. Amazon's Quantum Ledger Database is an example of non-blockchain technology with a central authority that simplifies things, rather than having to embody the entire record-keeping and verifying function in the act of recording: <https://aws.amazon.com/qlldb/>.

106. Baldwin, *Fighting the First Wave*, 21.

107. Deborah Cohen and Peter Mandler, "Silent Changes to *The History Manifesto*," *Deborah Cohen* (23 March 2013), <http://www.deborahcohen.com/profile/?q=content/silent-changes-history-manifesto>.

## Chapter 4

1. Budapest Open Access Initiative, 14 February 2002, <https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>.
2. Henry Ansgar Kelly, "Inquisitorial Due Process and the Status of Secret Crimes," in Stanley Chodorow, ed., *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Medieval Canon Law* (Vatican City 1992) 419–420.
3. Marion Renault, "An Elixir From the French Alps, Frozen in Time," *New York Times* (17 December 2020).
4. Jütte, *Age of Secrecy*, 22.
5. Rowan Jacobsen, "Life, New and Improved," *Scientific American*, 325, 1 (2021) 29.
6. Alejandro Barredo Arrieta et al., "Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Concepts, Taxonomies, Opportunities and Challenges toward Responsible AI," *Information Fusion*, 58 (2020).
7. "Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) and Amending Certain Union Legislative Acts," COM/2021/206 final, *EUR-Lex*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1623335154975&uri=CELEX%3A52021PC0206>.
8. Thomas H. Davenport and Keith W. Dreyer, "AI Will Change Radiology, but It Won't Replace Radiologists," *Harvard Business Review* (27 March 2018), <https://hbr.org/2018/03/ai-will-change-radiology-but-it-wont-replace-radiologists>.
9. Yilun Wang and Michal Kosinski, "Deep Neural Networks Are More Accurate than Humans at Detecting Sexual Orientation from Facial Images," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 114, 2 (2018), <https://doi.apa.org/doiLanding?doi=10.1037%2Fpspa0000098>.
10. John Leuner, "A Replication Study: Machine Learning Models Are Capable of Predicting Sexual Orientation From Facial Images," (Masters thesis, University of Pretoria, November 2018), <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1902.10739.pdf>.
11. Eamon, "From the Secrets of Nature to Public Knowledge," 334.
12. Paul A. David, "From Keeping 'Nature's Secrets' to the Institutionalization of 'Open Science,'" in Rishab Aiyer Ghosh, ed., *Code: Collaborative Ownership and the Digital Economy* (Cambridge MA 2005) 90.
13. Richard R. John, *Spreading the News: The American Postal System from Franklin to Morse* (Cambridge MA 1995) 37.
14. Robert Darnton, *The Forbidden Best-Sellers of Pre-Revolutionary France* (New York 1996); Darnton, *The Literary Underground of the Old Regime* (Cambridge MA 1985).
15. Mokyrr, *Gifts of Athena*, 44.
16. Eric S. Raymond, "The Cathedral and the Bazaar," <http://www.catb.org/~esr/writings/cathedral-bazaar/cathedral-bazaar/ar01s04.html>; Richard Campbell, "When

Open Source Came to Microsoft," *CODE Magazine* (2020), <https://www.codemag.com/Article/2009041/When-Open-Source-Came-to-Microsoft>.

17. Peter B. Kaufman, *The New Enlightenment and the Fight to Free Knowledge* (New York 2021) ch. 3.

18. Stig Fredrikson, "How I Helped Alexandr Solzhenitsyn Smuggle His Nobel Lecture from the USSR," *Nobel Prize*, <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/literature/1970/solzhenitsyn/article/>.

19. William A. Bone, "The Centenary of the Friction Match," *Nature* (2 April 1927) 495, <https://www.nature.com/articles/119495a0.pdf>.

20. Rodney Stark, *For the Glory of God: How Monotheism Led to Reformations, Science, Witch-Hunts, and the End of Slavery* (Princeton 2003) 77; A. N. Wilson, *Tolstoy* (London 1988) 237, 425, 493–495.

21. Isabel Hofmeyr (2013) *Gandhi's Printing Press* (Cambridge MA 2013) 2–3, 29, 67; Shyamkrishna Balganes, "Gandhi and Copyright Pragmatism," *California Law Review*, 101 (2013) 1709, otherwise [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2233063#](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2233063#).

22. <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Gandhi-Home-Rule-First-Edition-1909.jpg>. Thanks to Ross Mounce for this.

23. *Congressional Record*, House (7 October 1988) 24336; US Constitution, art. I, §8, cl. 8.

24. Baldwin, *Copyright Wars*, 4.

25. Cecil C. Kuhne III, "The Steadily Shrinking Public Domain: Inefficiencies of Existing Copyright Law in the Modern Technology Age," *Loyola Law Review*, 50 (2004) 560.

26. Albert N. Greco, "Academic Libraries and the Economics of Scholarly Publishing in the Twenty-First Century," *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 47, 1 (2015) 3.

27. Yu Zie et al., "China's Rise as a Major Contributor to Science and Technology," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111, 26 (2014) 9437, <https://www.pnas.org/content/111/26/9437#xref-ref-1-1>. Less exuberant figures in Chuanyi Wang and Qiang Zha, "Measuring Systemic Diversity of Chinese Universities," *Quality & Quantity*, 52 (2018) 1340, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11135-017-0524-5>.

28. Xiaotian Chen, "Scholarly Journals' Publication Frequency and Number of Articles in 2018–2019: A Study of SCI, SSCI, CSCD, and CSSCI Journals," *Publications* (8 September 2019), <https://www.mdpi.com/2304-6775/7/3/58>.

29. Samuel Moore et al., "Excellence R Us: University Research and the Fetishisation of Excellence," *Palgrave Communications* (19 January 2017), <https://www.nature.com/articles/palcomms2016105>.

30. An unpleasant example in Philip G. Altbach and Hans de Wit, "Too Much Academic Research Is Being Published," *University World News* (7 September 2018), <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20180905095203579>.

31. Lisong Liu, "Return Migration and Selective Citizenship: A Study of Returning Chinese Professional Migrants from the United States," *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 15, 1 (2012) 37, <https://doi.org/10.1353/jaas.2012.0007>.

32. Brian Lavoie et al., "Anatomy of Aggregate Collections: An Example of Google Print for Libraries," *D-Lib Magazine*, 11, 9 (2005) fig. 5, <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/september05/lavoie/09lavoie.html>.

33. Brian F. Lavoie and Roger C. Schonfeld, "Books without Boundaries: A Brief Tour of the System-wide Print Book Collection," *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 9, 2 (2006), <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/j/jep/3336451.0009.208?view=text;rgn=main>.

34. Rick Anderson, "How Important Are Library Sales to the University Press? One Case Study," *Scholarly Kitchen* (23 June 2014), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2014/06/23/how-important-are-library-sales-to-the-university-press-one-case-study/>.

35. Joseph J. Esposito and Karen Barch, *Monograph Output of American University Presses, 2009–2013: A Report Prepared for the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation* (10 February 2017) 23, <https://3spxpi1radr22mzge33bla91-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Monograph-Output-of-University-Presses.pdf>.

36. Lisa Rose-Wiles, "Are Print Books Dead? An Investigation of Book Circulation at a Mid-sized Academic Library," Seton Hall University eRepository (2013) 12, [https://scholarship.shu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1057&context=lib\\_pub](https://scholarship.shu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1057&context=lib_pub).

37. Chelsea Follett and Andrea Vacchiano, "A Reminder of How Far Transatlantic Travel Has Come," *HumanProgress* (2 August 2018), <https://www.humanprogress.org/a-reminder-of-how-far-transatlantic-travel-has-come/#:~:text=First%2C%20consider%20the%20cost.,approximately%20%20million%20Spanish%20maravedis>.

38. "What Is The Most Expensive Object Ever Built?" *ZidBits* (6 November 2010), <https://zidbits.com/?p=19>.

39. 77 million days of labor or \$445 million at the current Egyptian minimum daily rate (\$5.73/day) or ca \$1 billion of construction costs by a modern firm per pyramid. Ed Davey, "What Is the Most Expensive Object on Earth?" *BBC* (29 April 2016), <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-36160368>.

40. Michael Gibbons et al., *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies* (London 1994) 11.

41. John Preston, *Fall: The Mystery of Robert Maxwell* (np 2020) 24–26.

42. Gordon Graham, "The Journals Crisis: Origins and Resolution," *Serials*, 4, 2 (1991) 20; Robert W. Cahn, "The Origins of Pergamon Press: Rosbaud and Maxwell," *European Review*, 2, 1 (1994).

43. Preston, *Fall*, 30–31.

44. Hebe Vessuri et al., "Excellence or Quality? Impact of the Current Competition Regime on Science and Scientific Publishing in Latin America and its Implications for Development," *Current Sociology*, 62, 5 (2014) 648.

45. Brian Cox, "The Pergamon Phenomenon, 1951–1991," *Learned Publishing*, 15, 4 (2002) 278.

46. Aileen Fyfe et al., "Untangling Academic Publishing: A History of the Relationship between Commercial Interests, Academic Prestige and the Circulation of Research," (May 2017) 17, <https://zenodo.org/record/546100#.YKJDGKhKia8>.

47. "Expenditure Trends in ARL University Libraries, 1998–2018," <https://www.arl.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/expenditure-trends.pdf>.

48. Mark Rambler, "Do It Yourself? A New Solution to the Journals Crisis," *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 4, 3 (1999), <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/t/text/idx/j/jep/3336451.0004.306/--do-it-yourself-a-new-solution-to-the-journals-crisis?rgn=main;view=fulltext>.

49. Glenn S. McGuigan and Robert D. Russell, "The Business of Academic Publishing: A Strategic Analysis of the Academic Journal Publishing Industry and Its Impact on the Future of Scholarly Publishing," *Electronic Journal of Academic and Special Librarianship*, 9 (2008) 1–11, <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/ejasjournal/105/>.

50. Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 19.

51. Buranyi "Is the Staggeringly Profitable Business of Scientific Publishing Bad for Science?"

52. RELX, "Results for the Year to 31 December 2020" (11 February 2021), <https://www.relx.com/~media/Files/R/RELX-Group/documents/press-releases/2021/results-2020-pressrelease.pdf>.

53. Robert-Jan Smits and Rachael Pells, *Plan S for Shock* (London 2022) 120, <https://www.ubiquitypress.com/site/books/m/10.5334/bcq/>

54. Bo-Christer Björk, "Why Is Access to the Scholarly Journal Literature So Expensive?" *Portal*, 21, 2 (2021), <https://preprint.press.jhu.edu/portal/sites/ajm/files/21.2editorial.pdf>.

55. Jörg Albrecht, "Forscher, hört die Signale," *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (17 June 2012) 54.

56. Clay Shirky, *Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing without Organizations* (New York 2008).

57. Moore, "Genealogy of Open Access."

58. Irving, "Art of Book-Making," 65.

59. Jane Hugo and Linda Newell (1991) "New Horizons in Adult Education: The First Five Years (1987–1991)," *Public-Access Computer Systems Review*, 2, 1 (1991), <https://hdl.handle.net/10657/5149>. Having been bought by Wiley, the journal later disappeared behind a paywall. Tonette S. Rocco, "Turning a Corner: The Future of *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*," *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development* (30 January 2013) 1–2, <https://doi.org/10.1002/nha.20001>.

60. Samuel A. Moore, "Revisiting 'the 1990s Debutante': Scholar-led Publishing and the Pre-history of the Open Access Movement," *Journal of the Society for Information Science and Technology*, 71, 7 (2020).



61. Budapest Open Access Initiative. More detail on the history of such declarations: Jorge Machado, "Open Data and Open Science," in Sarita Albagli et al., *Open Science, Open Issues* (Brasilia 2015) 192–196, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303963675\\_Open\\_Science\\_open\\_issues](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303963675_Open_Science_open_issues).

62. Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing (20 June 2003), <https://web.archive.org/web/20120311105112/http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/bethesda.htm>.

63. Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities (23 October 2003), <https://openaccess.mpg.de/Berlin-Declaration>.

64. Mission Statement at the Berlin 11 Open Access Conference of the Max Planck Society (20 November 2013), [https://openaccess.mpg.de/mission-statement\\_en](https://openaccess.mpg.de/mission-statement_en).

65. John Unsworth and Eyal Amiran, "Postmodern Culture: Publishing in the Electronic Medium," *Public-Access Computer Systems Review*, 2, 1 (1991) 74–75, <http://mural.uv.es/diades/arby3.htm>.

66. Nancy Gusack and Clifford A. Lynch, "The TULIP Project," *Library Hi Tech*, 13, 4 (1995).

67. Richard E. Lucier and Peter Brantley, "The Red Sage Project: An Experimental Digital Journal Library for the Health Sciences," *D-Lib Magazine* (August 1995), <https://www.dlib.org/dlib/august95/lucier/08lucier.html>.

68. Waltham, "Future of Scholarly Journals Publishing among Social Science and Humanities Associations."

69. Rita Gardner, "Open Access and Learned Societies," in Nigel Vincent and Chris Wickham, eds., *Debating Open Access* (London 2013) 18, <https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/publications/debating-open-access/>.

70. Guédon, "Open Access: Toward the Internet of the Mind," 9.

71. Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing.

72. Open Knowledge Foundation, "Open Definition," version 2.1, Compilation, 2.1.5, <https://opendefinition.org/od/2.1/en/>.

73. Guédon, "Open Access: Toward the Internet of the Mind," 10.

74. Carlos A. Sierra, "Elite Journals and the Defeat of Science," (21 March 2017), <http://www.bgc-jena.mpg.de/~csierra/blog/2017/03/21/rejectNature/>.

75. HSBC Global Research, "Going for Gold," 12.

76. HSBC Global Research, "Going for Gold," 9.

77. Roger C. Schonfeld, "The Supercontinent of Scholarly Publishing?" *Scholarly Kitchen* (3 May 2018), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2018/05/03/supercontinent-scholarly-publishing/>; Bo-Christer Björk, "Gold, Green, and Black Open Access," *Learned Publishing* (7 February 2017), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/leap.1096>.

78. "Springer Nature Announces Gold Open Access Options for Nature Journals from January 2021," Springer Nature Group (24 November 2020), <https://group.springernature.com/gb/group/media/press-releases/springer-nature-announces-gold-oa-options-for-nature-journals/18614608>.

79. Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing.
80. Schimmer et al., "Disrupting the Subscription Journals' Business Model," 1.
81. *Accessibility, Sustainability, Excellence: How to Expand Access to Research Publications* (June 2012), <https://www.sconul.ac.uk/sites/default/files/documents/finch-report-final.pdf>.
82. House of Commons Business, Innovation and Skills Committee, *Open Access: Fifth Report of Session 2013–14*, i, 11–12.
83. Stephen Curry, "We Need to Talk about Open Access," *Reciprocal Space* (24 November 2012), <http://occamstypewriter.org/scurry/2012/11/24/we-need-to-talk-about-open-access/>.
84. *Accessibility, Sustainability, Excellence*, 7–8, 17.
85. Fyfe et al., "Untangling Academic Publishing," 16.
86. <https://www.coalition-s.org/>; "Science Without Publication Paywalls, a Preamble to: cOAlition S for the Realisation of Full and Immediate Open Access," [https://www.coalition-s.org/wp-content/uploads/cOAlitionS\\_Preamble.pdf](https://www.coalition-s.org/wp-content/uploads/cOAlitionS_Preamble.pdf).
87. Shina Caroline Lynn Kamerlin et al., "Journal Open Access and Plan S: Solving Problems or Shifting Burdens?" *Development and Change* (29 January 2021), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/dech.12635>.
88. "Reaction of Researchers to Plan S: Too Far, Too Risky," <https://sites.google.com/view/plansopenletter/home>.
89. Eduardo Aguado López and Arianna Becerril García, "Latin America's Longstanding Open Access Ecosystem Could Be Undermined by Proposals from the Global North," *LSE* (6 November 2019), <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/latamcaribbean/2019/11/06/latin-americas-longstanding-open-access-ecosystem-could-be-undermined-by-proposals-from-the-global-north/>.
90. "Plan S Rights Retention Strategy," <https://www.coalition-s.org/rights-retention-strategy/>.
91. Holly Else, "A Guide to Plan S: The Open-access Initiative Shaking up Science Publishing," *Nature* (8 April 2021), <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-00883-6>.
92. Smits and Pells, *Plan S for Shock*, 75, 85.
93. "NIH Public Access Policy Details," <https://publicaccess.nih.gov/policy.htm>.
94. Darley et al., *Open Access Journals in Humanities and Social Science*, 13; Guédon, "Open Access: Toward the Internet of the Mind," 20.
95. <https://www.gatesfoundation.org/about/policies-and-resources/open-access-policy>; <https://www.hhmi.org/news/hhmi-announces-open-access-publishing-policy>.
96. <https://wellcome.org/grant-funding/guidance/open-access-guidance/open-access-policy>.
97. Geoffrey Crossick, "Monographs and Open Access: A Report to HEFCE," (January 2015) 60–61, [https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/21921/1/2014\\_monographs.pdf](https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/21921/1/2014_monographs.pdf).
98. OAPEN-CH, *The Impact of Open Access on Scientific Monographs in Switzerland* (Swiss National Science Foundation; Bern, 2018) 13, [https://www.snf.ch/SiteCollectionDocuments/OAPEN-CH\\_schlussbericht\\_en.pdf](https://www.snf.ch/SiteCollectionDocuments/OAPEN-CH_schlussbericht_en.pdf).

99. "About DASH," <https://dash.harvard.edu/pages/About>.
100. A list of university open access policies: Berkman Klein Center, "Policies of the Kind Recommended in the Guide," [https://cyber.harvard.edu/hoap/Additional\\_resources#Policies\\_of\\_the\\_kind\\_recommended\\_in\\_the\\_guid](https://cyber.harvard.edu/hoap/Additional_resources#Policies_of_the_kind_recommended_in_the_guid).
101. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/?lang=en>; <http://roar.eprints.org/view/geoname/geoname=5F2=5FDE.html>; <http://roar.eprints.org/>.
102. Chris Wickham, "Open Access in the UK and the International Environment: The View from Humanities and Social Science," in Vincent and Wickham, eds., *Debating Open Access*, 46–48.
103. Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age*.
104. <https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/>.
105. UK Research and Innovation, "UKRI Open Access Policy," (6 August 2021) Annex 1, <https://www.ukri.org/publications/ukri-open-access-policy/>.
106. *Accessibility, Sustainability, Excellence*, 34–35; HSBC Global Research, "Going for Gold," 23.
107. European Commission, *Future of Scholarly Publishing and Scholarly Communication*, 21. That meshes reasonably with the €7.6 billion estimate by the Max Planck Society a few years earlier: Schimmer et al., "Disrupting the Subscription Journals' Business Model," 5.
108. Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 24.
109. <https://knowledgeunlatched.org/>.
110. Michael Jubb, *Academic Books and their Future: A Report to the AHRC and the British Library* (June 2017) 192, <https://academicbookfuture.org/end-of-project-reports-2/>.
111. Marcel Knöchelmann, "Knowledge Unlatched, Failed Transparency, and the Commercialisation of Open Access Book Publishing," *LSE* (3 October 2018), <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2018/10/03/knowledge-unlatched-failed-transparency-and-the-commercialisation-of-open-access-book-publishing/>; "The Enclosure of Scholarly Infrastructures, Open Access Books and the Necessity of Community," *ScholarLed* (5 June 2019), <https://blog.scholarled.org/open-research-library/>.
112. "Wiley Acquires Open Access Innovator Knowledge Unlatched," *Knowledge Unlatched* (2 December 2020), <https://knowledgeunlatched.org/2021/12/wiley-acquires-oa-innovator-ku/>.
113. <https://www.openmonographs.org/>.
114. MIT: <https://direct.mit.edu/books/pages/direct-to-open>; Michigan: <https://blog.press.umich.edu/2021/05/u-m-press-fund-to-mission-model-aims-to-expand-open-access-monograph-publishing/>; Central European University: <https://ceup.openingthefuture.net/>.
115. Suzanne Smalley "MIT Press to Release Many Spring Titles Open Access," *Inside Higher Ed* (14 December 2021), <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2021/12/14/mit-press-plans-release-much-spring-slate-open-access#.YbmVJc2f3c.twitter>.

116. <https://unglue.it/>.
117. Izabella Penier et al., *COPIM: Revenue Models for Open Access Monographs 2020*, 17, [https://zenodo.org/record/4455511#.YR4uHI5Ki\\_A](https://zenodo.org/record/4455511#.YR4uHI5Ki_A).
118. <https://www.berghahnjournals.com/page/577>.
119. Bo-Christer Björk, “Have the ‘Mega-journals’ Reached the Limits to Growth?” *PeerJ* (26 May 2015), <https://peerj.com/articles/981/>.
120. <https://plos.org/resources/community-action-publishing/>; Jeffrey Brainard, “New PLOS Pricing Test Could Signal End of Scientists Paying to Publish Free Papers,” *Science* (15 October 2020), <https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2020/10/new-plos-pricing-test-could-signal-end-scientists-paying-publish-free-papers>.
121. <https://doaj.org/>.
122. Jeroen Bosman et al., *The Open Access Diamond Journals Study: Findings* (9 March 2021) 30, <https://zenodo.org/record/4558704>.
123. Aaron Swartz, “Guerilla Open Access Manifesto” (July 2008), <https://archive.org/details/GuerillaOpenAccessManifesto/page/n1/mode/2up>.
124. Sérgio Amadeu da Silveira, “Aaron Swartz and the Battles for Freedom of Knowledge,” *Sur*, 18 (2013) 11–12, <https://sur.conectas.org/en/aaron-swartz-battles-freedom-knowledge/>. A similar case: Samantha Murphy, “Guerilla Activist Releases 18,000 Scientific Papers,” *MIT Technology Review* (22 July 2011), <https://www.technologyreview.com/2011/07/22/192838/guerilla-activist-releases-18000-scientific-papers/>.
125. Austin C. Murnane, “Faith and Martyrdom: The Tragedy of Aaron Swartz,” *Fordham Intellectual Property, Media, and Entertainment Law Journal*, 24 (2014) 1109–1110.
126. Kaufman, *New Enlightenment*, 22–26.
127. “The Cost of Knowledge,” <http://thecostofknowledge.com/>.
128. Nisha Gaiind, “Huge US University Cancels Subscription with Elsevier,” *Nature*, 567 (7 March 2019) 15.
129. “UC Terminates Subscriptions with World’s Largest Scientific Publisher in Push for Open Access to Publicly Funded Research,” University of California Press Room (28 February 2019), <https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/press-room/uc-terminates-subscriptions-worlds-largest-scientific-publisher-push-open-access-publicly>.
130. “Elsevier Transformative Open Access Agreement,” University of California, Office of Scholarly Communication, <https://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/uc-publisher-relationships/elsevier-oa-agreement/>.
131. Lisa Janicke-Hinchliffe, “Transformative Agreements: A Primer,” *Scholarly Kitchen* (23 April 2019), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2019/04/23/transformative-agreements/>.
132. Richard Poynder, “Plan S: What Strategy Now for the Global South?” *Open and Shut* (15 February 2019) 9, <https://poynder.blogspot.com/2019/02/plan-s-what-strategy-now-for-global.html>.

133. "Jisc, UK Institutions and Wiley Agree Ground-breaking Deal," *Jisc News* (2 March 2020), <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/news/jisc-uk-institutions-and-wiley-agree-ground-breaking-deal-02-feb-2020>.

134. Roger C. Schonfeld, "Read and Publish: Is It Good for the Academy?" *Scholarly Kitchen* (4 September 2018), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2018/09/04/read-publish-good-academy/>.

135. Shaun Yon-Seng Khoo, "Article Processing Charge Hyperinflation and Price Insensitivity: An Open Access Sequel to the Serials Crisis," *LIBER Quarterly*, 29, 1 (2019), <https://www.liberquarterly.eu/article/10.18352/lq.10280/>.

136. "Four Concerns About the New UC-Elsevier Deal," *The Taper* (19 March 2021), <http://thetaper.library.virginia.edu/2021/03/19/four-concerns-about-the-new-uc-elsevier-deal.html>.

137. University of California, Office of Scholarly Communications, "Introductory Guide to the UC Model Transformative Agreement."

138. The indifference to the overall price libraries were willing to pay is made clear here: Jeffrey MacKie-Mason, "Supporting OA2020: Changing the Journal Funding Model to Pre-payment Doesn't Increase Publisher Market Power," *madLibbing* (23 October 2016), <https://madlibbing.berkeley.edu/supporting-oa2020-changing-the-journal-funding-model-to-pre-payment-doesnt-increase-publisher-market-power/>.

139. Poynder, "Open Access: 'Information Wants to Be Free'?" 78–79.

140. Latin America receives 20% of Spanish book production, sends only 2% of its. Julieta Lionetti, "Asymmetry in the Spanish Book World: Spain vs. Latin America," *Publishing Perspectives* (8 March 2012), <https://publishingperspectives.com/2012/03/asymmetry-in-the-spanish-book-world-spain-vs-latin-america/>.

141. Valerie Miles, "Publishing in Spain and Latin America," 19th International Rights Directors Meeting, Frankfurt Book Fair 2005, [https://www.academia.edu/5276532/Publishing\\_in\\_Spain\\_and\\_Latin\\_America](https://www.academia.edu/5276532/Publishing_in_Spain_and_Latin_America).

142. Agencia Chilena ISBN, *Informe Estadístico 2019*, 48; CERLALC, *El espacio iberoamericano del libro 2018*, table 12, 14, 16, <https://cerlalc.org/publicaciones/el-espacio-iberoamericano-del-libro/>.

143. Fran M. Collyer, "Global Patterns in the Publishing of Academic Knowledge: Global North, Global South," *Current Sociology*, 66, 1 (2018) 66.

144. Sandra Miguel et al., "Open Access and Scopus: A New Approach to Scientific Visibility From the Standpoint of Access," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (11 April 2011) fig. 8, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/asi.21532>.

145. Bosman et al., *Open Access Diamond Journals Study*, figs. 11, 12.

146. Juan Pablo Alperin, "The Public Impact of Latin America's Approach to Open Access," (Dissertation, Stanford 2015), 1.

147. <https://www.scielo.org/>.

148. Abel L. Packer et al., *SciELO: 15 Years of Open Access* (UNESCO, Paris 2014) 15, <http://old.scielo.org/local/File/book.pdf>.

149. Alperin, "Public Impact of Latin America's Approach to Open Access," 12.
150. Its history in Packer, "SciELO Open Access: A Gold Way from the South."
151. Witold Kieńć, "Authors from the Periphery Countries Choose Open Access More Often," *Learned Publishing* (30 January 2017), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/leap.1093>.
152. <https://www.redalyc.org/>; <https://www.clacso.org/>; <http://amelica.org/index.php/en/home/>; <https://www.latindex.org/latindex/inicio>; <http://www.lareferencia.info/es/>.
153. A much disputed post on this, originally by Jeffrey Beal in 2015, is now found here, for some reason supposedly authored by Stef Brezgov: "Is SciELO a Publication Favela?" *ScholarlyOA* (28 May 2019), <https://scholarlyoa.com/is-scielo-a-publication-favela/>.
154. <https://clarivate.libguides.com/webofscienceplatform/scielo>; Phill Jones, "Defending Regional Excellence in Research or Why Beall is Wrong About SciELO," *Scholarly Kitchen* (10 August 2015), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2015/08/10/defending-regional-excellence-in-research-or-why-beall-is-wrong-about-scielo/>.
155. Rogerio Meneghini and Abel L. Packer, "Is There Science beyond English?" *EMBO Reports*, 8, 2 (2007) 115, <https://www.embopress.org/doi/full/10.1038/sj.embor.7400906>.
156. Luis Reyes-Galindo, "On SciELO and RedALyC," Cardiff University Blogs, Sociology of Science and Open Access (5 August 2015), <https://blogs.cardiff.ac.uk/luisreyes/on-scielo-and-redalyc/>.
157. Pierre Mounier, "'Publication Favela' or Biodiversity? Open Access Publishing Viewed from a European Perspective," *Learned Publishing* (6 September 2018), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/leap.1194>.
158. Abel L. Packer, "The Pasts, Presents, and Futures of SciELO," in Martin Paul Eve and Jonathan Gray, eds., *Reassembling Scholarly Communications: Histories, Infrastructures, and Global Politics of Open Access* (Cambridge MA 2020) fig. 21.2, <https://direct.mit.edu/books/book/4933/Reassembling-Scholarly-CommunicationsHistories>.
159. <https://clarivate.libguides.com/webofscienceplatform/scielo>.
160. López and García, "Latin America's Longstanding Open Access Ecosystem Could Be Undermined"; Hebe Vessuri et al., "Excellence or Quality? Impact of the Current Competition Regime on Science and Scientific Publishing in Latin America and Its Implications for Development," *Current Sociology*, 62, 5 (2014) 657–658.
161. Arianna Becerril-García and Eduardo Aguado-López, "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," *HAL* (18 June 2018), <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01816693>.

## Chapter 5

1. Françoise Rousseau-Hans et al., “Les pratiques de publications et d’accès ouvert des chercheurs français en 2019,” *HAL* (25 June 2020) 32, 76, 37, <https://hal-cea.archives-ouvertes.fr/cea-02450324v2/document>.

2. “Higher Education Staff Statistics: UK, 2018/19,” (23 January 2020), HESA, <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/news/23-01-2020/sb256-higher-education-staff-statistics>.

3. In Egypt: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Egyptian\\_Knowledge\\_Bank](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Egyptian_Knowledge_Bank); and Uruguay: <https://foco.timbo.org.uy/home>.

4. Smriti Mallapaty, “India Pushes Bold ‘One Nation, One Subscription’ Journal-access Plan,” *Nature* (3 September 2020), <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-02708-4>.

5. Jean-Claude Guédon, “Mixing and Matching the Green and Gold Roads to Open Access—Take Two,” *Serials Review*, 34, 1 (2008) 46, <http://eprints.rclis.org/11791/>.

6. HSBC Global Research, “Reed Elsevier,” 24.

7. Jill Lepore, “The New Economy of Letters,” *Chronicle of Higher Education* (3 September 2013).

8. Paul Ginsparg, “First Steps towards Electronic Research Communication,” *Computers in Physics*, 8, 4 (1994) 395.

9. Robin Osborne, “Why Open Access Makes No Sense,” in Vincent and Wickham, eds., *Debating Open Access*.

10. Universities are increasingly allowing access to alumni, at least for a while. In the US this is sometimes linked to joining an alumni association and being dunned for contributions.

11. Jennifer Howard, “JSTOR Tests Free, Read-Only Access to Some Articles,” *Chronicle of Higher Education* (13 January 2012), [https://www.chronicle.com/blogs/wiredcampus/jstor-tests-free-read-only-access-to-some-articles?cid=gen\\_sign\\_in](https://www.chronicle.com/blogs/wiredcampus/jstor-tests-free-read-only-access-to-some-articles?cid=gen_sign_in).

12. ElHassan ElSabry, “Unaffiliated Researchers: A Preliminary Study,” *Challenges* (2017), 5, <https://www.mdpi.com/2078-1547/8/2/20>.

13. <https://www.deepdyve.com/>. Other examples of such vendors include Proquest Udini, ReadCube Access, and RightFind.

14. Alperin, “Public Impact of Latin America’s Approach to Open Access,” 49–51.

15. Abraham Miller-Rushing et al., “The History of Public Participation in Ecological Research,” *Frontiers in Ecology*, 10, 6 (2012), [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262093387\\_The\\_history\\_of\\_public\\_participation\\_in\\_ecological\\_research](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262093387_The_history_of_public_participation_in_ecological_research); Rick Bonney et al., “Next Steps for Citizen Science,” *Science*, 343 (2014), [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261186507\\_Next\\_Steps\\_for\\_Citizen\\_Science](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261186507_Next_Steps_for_Citizen_Science); Bruno J. Strasser and Muki Haklay, “Citizen Science: Expertise, Demokratie und öffentliche Partizipation,” Swiss Science Council, 2018, [https://www.swir.ch/images/stories/pdf/de/Policy\\_Analysis\\_SSC\\_1\\_2018\\_Citizen\\_Science\\_WEB.pdf](https://www.swir.ch/images/stories/pdf/de/Policy_Analysis_SSC_1_2018_Citizen_Science_WEB.pdf).



16. British special advisors and civil servants fear trouble if their work computers reveal that they have visited Sci-Hub or Z-Library in search of material they have no other access to.

17. To be fair, only 10% of scholars surveyed in 2010 agreed with the idea that the general public did not benefit from open access to academic research. Suenje Dallmeier-Tiessen et al., "Highlights from the SOAP Project Survey: What Scientists Think about Open Access Publishing," arXiv (28 January 2011) 6, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1101.5260>.

18. Quoted in Jean-Claude Guédon, "The 'Green' and 'Gold' Roads to Open Access: The Case for Mixing and Matching," *Serials Review*, 30, 4 (2004) 327, <http://eprints.rclis.org/5860/>.

19. Alesia Zuccala, "Open Access and Civic Scientific Information Literacy," *Information Research*, 15, 1 (2010) 5, <http://informationr.net/ir/15-1/paper426.html>.

20. Kamerlin et al., "Journal Open Access and Plan S."

21. Suber, *Open Access*, 17.

22. Samuel A. Moore, "Open Access, Plan S and 'Radically Liberatory' Forms of Academic Freedom," *Development and Change* (29 January 2021), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/dech.12640>; "Signatories Publish Statement on Rights Retention Strategy," *STM* (3 February 2021), <https://www.stm-assoc.org/rightsretentionstrategy/>. And a riposte: "COAlition S Response to the STM Statement: The Rights Retention Strategy Restores Long-standing Academic Freedoms," *Plan S* (3 February 2021), <https://www.coalition-s.org/blog/the-rights-retention-strategy-restores-long-standing-academic-freedoms/>.

23. Rick Anderson "Open Access, Academic Freedom, and the Spectrum of Coercive Power," *Scholarly Kitchen* (5 November 2018), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2018/11/05/open-access-academic-freedom-and-the-spectrum-of-coercive-power/>; Lynn Kamerlin et al., "Response to Plan S from Academic Researchers: Unethical, Too Risky!" *For Better Science* (11 September 2018), <https://forbetter-science.com/2018/09/11/response-to-plan-s-from-academic-researchers-unethical-too-risky/>.

24. Rick Anderson, "Open Access and Academic Freedom: Teasing Out Some Important Nuances," *Development and Change* (2021) 8, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/dech.12636#.YBrmwHFD7Tk.twitter>.

25. Paul Fussell, *Class: A Guide through the American Status System* (New York 1983) 166.

26. Patricia E. Campbell, "University Inventions Reconsidered: Debunking the Myth of University Ownership," *William & Mary Business Law Review*, 11 (2019) 79.

27. Vaclav Smil, *Enriching the Earth: Fritz Haber, Carl Bosch, and the Transformation of World Food Production* (Cambridge MA 2001) 74–77 and *passim*.

28. Corynne McSherry, *Who Owns Academic Work? Battling for Control of Intellectual Property* (Cambridge MA 2001) 147.

29. J. H. Reichman, "Computer Programs as Applied Scientific Know-How: Implication of Copyright Protection for Commercialized University Research," *Vanderbilt Law Review*, 42 (1989) 647–648.

30. Harvard University, Office of Technology Development, "Statement of Policy in Regard to Intellectual Property (IP Policy)," <https://otd.harvard.edu/faculty-inventors/resources/policies-and-procedures/statement-of-policy-in-regard-to-intellectual-property/#inventions-and-patents>.

31. In fact, this is usually wiped out by the ban on receiving any earned income for activities performed during their government service, except for book royalties, which do not count as earned income. US Office of Government Ethics, "Book Deals Involving Government Employees," (6 March 2008) pt 2, [https://www.oge.gov/web/oge.nsf/News+Releases/7A40ADA00743E87D852585BA005BECD7/\\$FILE/DO-08-006%20\(1\)\\_.pdf](https://www.oge.gov/web/oge.nsf/News+Releases/7A40ADA00743E87D852585BA005BECD7/$FILE/DO-08-006%20(1)_.pdf).

32. Ashley Packard, "Copyright or Copy Wrong? An Analysis of University Claims to Faculty Work," *Communication Law and Policy*, 7 (2002) 276, 295.

33. Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age*, 215.

34. Tim Wu, "How Professors Help Rip Off Students," *New York Times* (11 December 2019).

35. Richard Read, "A \$280 College Textbook Busts Budgets, but Harvard Author Gregory Mankiw Defends Royalties," *Oregonian* (19 January 2019), [https://www.oregonlive.com/education/2015/02/a\\_280\\_college\\_textbook\\_busts\\_b.html](https://www.oregonlive.com/education/2015/02/a_280_college_textbook_busts_b.html).

36. Medicine being the reverse. Brian Lavoie and Lorcan Dempsey, "Beyond 1923: Characteristics of Potentially In-copyright Print Books in Library Collections," in Lorcan Dempsey et al., eds., *Understanding the Collective Collection: Towards a System-Wide Perspective on Library Print Collections* (OCLC Research; Dublin OH 2013) table 6.

37. <https://books.google.com/ngrams>.

38. Franco Moretti, *Distant Reading* (London 2013).

39. Tim McCormick, "From Monograph to Multigraph: The Distributed Book," *LSE* (17 January 2013), <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2013/01/17/from-monograph-to-multigraph-the-distributed-book/>.

40. Peter Suber, "Gratis and Libre Open Access," *SPARC*, <https://sparcopen.org/our-work/gratis-and-libre-open-access/>.

41. Bryan L. Frye, "Plagiarism Is Not a Crime," *Duquesne Law Review*, 54 (2016) 147–148.

42. During the copyright term, similar removal from the market is possible in nations without moral rights: R. Anthony Reese, "The First Sale Doctrine in the Era of Digital Networks," *Boston College Law Review*, 44 (2003) 595–596, [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=463620](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=463620).

43. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

44. Mandler, "Open Access: A Perspective from the Humanities"; Wellcome Trust, "The Suitability of the CC-BY Licence for Research Publications in the

Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS)," <http://docplayer.net/29379-The-suitability-of-the-cc-by-licence-for-research-publications-in-the.html>.

45. An extreme example in Robert Dingwall, "Why Open Access is Good News for Neo-Nazis," *Social Science Space* (17 October 2012), <https://www.socialsciencespace.com/2012/10/why-open-access-is-good-news-for-neo-nazis/>.

46. For example: James Emmott, "On Academic Integrity and the Right to Copy," *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 18, 4 (2013).

47. C.W. Schadt, "A Rant on Strawberries, Open Access Licenses, and the Reuse of Published Papers," *C.W. Schadt/ORNL-UTK Microbial Ecology Lab* (2 July 2013), <https://schadtlab.wordpress.com/2013/07/02/a-rant-on-strawberries-open-access-licenses-and-the-reuse-of-published-papers/>; Rosie Redfield, "When Is it Ethical to Re-publish Open-access Scholarly Articles?" *RRResearch* (20 July 2013), <http://rresearch.fieldofscience.com/2013/07/apple-academic-predatory.html>.

48. Martin Paul Eve, "OA Books Being Reprinted under CC BY License," *Open Access*, <https://eve.gd/2021/03/02/oa-books-being-reprinted-under-cc-by-license/>.

49. Paul Klimpel, *Free Knowledge Based on Creative Commons Licenses*, 10, [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Free\\_Knowledge\\_thanks\\_to\\_Creative\\_Commons\\_Licenses.pdf](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Free_Knowledge_thanks_to_Creative_Commons_Licenses.pdf).

50. Jane Secker et al., *Understanding the CLA License to UK Higher Education* (Universities UK et al., July 2019) 6, <https://ukcopyrightliteracy.files.wordpress.com/2019/07/cnac-research-project-report-final-with-logos-1.pdf>.

51. Crossick, "Monographs and Open Access," 48.

52. Opinions sampled in Andy Nobes and Sian Harris, "Open Access in Developing Countries—Attitudes and Experiences of Researchers," *Zenodo* (30 September 2019), table 10, [https://zenodo.org/record/3464868#.YMY4o\\_IKia-](https://zenodo.org/record/3464868#.YMY4o_IKia-).

53. Richard Poynder, "Open Access: Could Defeat be Snatched from the Jaws of Victory?" *Open and Shut* (18 November 2019) 68–69, <https://poynder.blogspot.com/2019/11/open-access-could-defeat-be-snatched.html>.

54. Eduardo Aguado-López and Arianna Becerril-García, "North vs South—Are Open Access Models in Conflict?" *University World News* (5 October 2019), <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20191001143012482>.

55. David Nimmer, "The Moral Imperative against Academic Plagiarism," *DePaul Law Review*, 54, 1 (2004) 76.

56. Sherry Turkle, *The Empathy Diaries* (New York 2021) 321.

57. Björk, "Why Is Access to the Scholarly Journal Literature So Expensive?"

58. Peter Suber, "Thinking about Prestige, Quality, and Open Access," *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, 125 (2008), <https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/4322577>.

59. Martin Paul Eve and Ernesto Priego, "Who Is Actually Harmed by Predatory Publishers?" *TripleC*, 15, 2 (2017), <https://www.triple-c.at/index.php/tripleC/article/view/867>.

60. Eelco Ferwerda et al., *A Landscape Study on Open Access and Monographs* (October 2017) 84, <https://zenodo.org/record/815932#.YLdc16hKia8>.

61. John B. Thompson, *Book Wars: The Digital Revolution in Publishing* (Cambridge 2021) 146.

62. John B. Thompson, *Merchants of Culture: The Publishing Business in the Twenty-First Century* (2nd ed.; New York 2012) 91.

63. Karl Miller, "Harry and the Pot of Gold," *Raritan*, 20, 3 (2001) 132, <https://search.proquest.com/docview/203900537/fulltextPDF/44D833B2EFD4498BPQ/1?accountid=14512>.

64. Elliott Green, "What Are the Most-cited Publications in the Social Sciences (According to Google Scholar)?" *LSE* (12 May 2016), <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2016/05/12/what-are-the-most-cited-publications-in-the-social-sciences-according-to-google-scholar/>.

65. Though there is a bookstore in Tokyo that sells only one book at a time. <https://www.indy100.com/offbeat/this-japanese-bookshop-only-sells-one-book-at-a-time-7287071>.

66. Crossick, "Monographs and Open Access," 37.

67. Chen, "Scholarly Journals' Publication Frequency and Number of Articles in 2018–2019," 3.

68. Jop de Vrieze, "Open-access Journal Editors Resign after Alleged Pressure to Publish Mediocre Papers," *Science* (4 September 2018), <https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2018/09/open-access-editors-resign-after-alleged-pressure-publish-mediocre-papers>; Martin Enserink, "Open-access Publisher Sacks 31 Editors amid Fierce Row over Independence," *Science* (20 May 2015), <https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2015/05/open-access-publisher-sacks-31-editors-amid-fierce-row-over-independence>.

69. <https://www.journalguide.com/journals/plos-medicine>.

70. HSBC Global Research, "Going for Gold," 24.

71. Jan Velterop, "On the Dangers of SciHub and Hybrid Journals," *SciELO in Perspective* (22 March 2016), <https://blog.scielo.org/en/2016/03/22/on-the-dangers-of-scihub-and-hybrid-journals/#.YK-iIahKia8>.

72. Lindsay Waters, "Rescue Tenure from the Tyranny of the Monograph," *Chronicle of Higher Education* (20 April 2001), [https://www.chronicle.com/article/rescue-tenure-from-the-tyranny-of-the-monograph/?cid2=gen\\_login\\_refresh&cid=gen\\_sign\\_in](https://www.chronicle.com/article/rescue-tenure-from-the-tyranny-of-the-monograph/?cid2=gen_login_refresh&cid=gen_sign_in); Deegan, *Academic Book of the Future Project Report*, 42.

73. More on specialization: Jones, "Defending Regional Excellence in Research."

74. Themes I have discussed in Peter Baldwin, "Betting on Vetting: Evaluation, not Publication, Should Be Academe's New Priority," *Chronicle of Higher Education* (17 February 2014).

75. Mirowski, "Future(s) of Open Science," 183–184.

76. Neal S. Young et al., "Why Current Publication Practices May Distort Science," *PLOS Medicine*, 5, 10 (2008), <https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article/comment?id=10.1371/annotation/b70a4689-cf09-4db6-a97b-8608b87e629e>. Similar arguments in Hebe Vessuri et al., "Excellence or Quality? Impact of the Current

Competition Regime on Science and Scientific Publishing in Latin America and Its Implications for Development," *Current Sociology*, 62, 5 (2014) 649.

77. Mark Carden, "Time is Money: Why Scholarly Communication Can't Be Free," *Digital Science* (10 February 2015), <https://www.digital-science.com/blog/guest/time-is-money-why-scholarly-communication-cant-be-free/>.

78. HSBC Global Research, "Survey of Funders Supports the Benign Open Access Outcome Priced into Shares," 11.

79. Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 47.

80. HSBC Global Research, "Reed Elsevier," 21.

81. David Crotty, "The 'Burden' of Peer Review," *Scholarly Kitchen* (31 August 2010), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2010/08/31/the-burden-of-peer-review/>; Julia Wallace, "PEER: Final Report," (ECP-2007-DILI-537003, 1 September 2008–31 May 2012) 10, [http://www.peerproject.eu/fileadmin/media/reports/20120618\\_PEER\\_Final\\_public\\_report\\_D9-13.pdf](http://www.peerproject.eu/fileadmin/media/reports/20120618_PEER_Final_public_report_D9-13.pdf).

82. Ferwerda et al., *Landscape Study on Open Access*, 54.

83. To judge from the use of the English word, and a complaint from a mathematician over the use of the Anglicism, in Rousseau-Hans et al., "Les pratiques de publications et d'accès ouvert," 33.

84. Surveyed in Richard Smith, "Classical Peer Review: An Empty Gun," *Breast Cancer Research*, 12 (2010), <https://breast-cancer-research.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/bcr2742>; Richard Smith, "Peer Review: A Flawed Process at the Heart of Science and Journals," *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 99, 4 (2006), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1420798/>.

85. Lutz Bornmann, "Scientific Peer Review: An Analysis of the Peer Review Process from the Perspective of Sociology of Science Theories," *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge*, 6, 2 (2008), [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254693844\\_Scientific\\_Peer\\_Review\\_An\\_Analysis\\_of\\_the\\_Peer\\_Review\\_Process\\_from\\_the\\_Perspective\\_of\\_Sociology\\_of\\_Science\\_Theories](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254693844_Scientific_Peer_Review_An_Analysis_of_the_Peer_Review_Process_from_the_Perspective_of_Sociology_of_Science_Theories).

86. Joel Williamson, "Wounds Not Scars: Lynching, the National Conscience, and the American Historian," and the accompanying reports, *Journal of American History*, 83, 4 (1997). Discussed in Peter Loewenberg, "The Historian's Self-Reflection and American Racism," *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 69, 2 (2021).

87. Examples in David F. Horrobin, "The Philosophical Basis of Peer Review and the Suppression of Innovation," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 263, 10 (1990) 1440, <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/article-abstract/380984>; José Luis Ricón, "Peer Rejection in Science," *Nintil* (2 December 2020), <https://nintil.com/discoveries-ignored>; Juan Miguel Campanario, "Consolation for the Scientist: Sometimes It Is Hard to Publish Papers That Are Later Highly-Cited," *Social Studies of Science*, 23 (1993) 343–346.

88. Juan Miguel Campanario, "Rejecting and Resisting Nobel Class Discoveries: Accounts by Nobel Laureates," *Scientometrics*, 81, 2 (2009).

89. Stuart Macdonald and Jaqueline Kam, "Aardvark et Al: Quality Journals and Gamesmanship in Management Studies," *Journal of Information Science*, 33, 6 (2007) 706.
90. Kathleen Fitzpatrick, *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy* (New York 2011) 24–28.
91. Ofer H. Azar, "Rejections and the Importance of First Response Times," *International Journal of Social Economics*, 31, 3 (2004) 259.
92. "How We Found 15 Million Hours of Lost Time," *Rubriq Blog* (3 June 2013), <https://rubriqblog.wordpress.com/2013/06/03/how-we-found-15-million-hours-of-lost-time/>.
93. Phil Davis, "Cascading Peer-Review: The Future of Open Access?" *Scholarly Kitchen* (12 October 2010), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2010/10/12/cascading-peer-review-future-of-open-access/>; Amy Bourke-Waite, "Innovations in Scholarly Peer Review at Nature Publishing Group and Palgrave Macmillan," *UKSG Insights*, 28, 2 (2015), <https://insights.uksg.org/articles/10.1629/uksg.243/>.
94. Michael Clarke, "Game of Papers: eLife, BMC, PLoS and EMBO Announce New Peer Review Consortium," *Scholarly Kitchen* (15 July 2013), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2013/07/15/game-of-papers-elife-bmc-plos-and-embo-announce-new-peer-review-consortium/>.
95. Bo-Christer Björk and Paul Catani, "Peer Review in Megajournals Compared with Traditional Scholarly Journals: Does It Make a Difference?" *Learned Publishing*, 29, 1 (2016), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/leap.1007>.
96. David J. Solomon, "A Survey of Authors Publishing in Four Megajournals," *PeerJ* (22 April 2014) 6, <https://peerj.com/articles/365/>.
97. Spezi et al., "Open-access Mega-journals," 271.
98. Michèle Lamont, *How Professors Think: Inside the Curious World of Academic Judgement* (Cambridge MA 2009) 8.
99. Rousseau-Hans et al., "Les pratiques de publications et d'accès ouvert," 50.
100. An overview in Yves Gingras, *Bibliometrics and Research Evaluation* (Cambridge MA 2016).
101. Mario Biagioli, "Fraud by Numbers: Metrics and the New Academic Misconduct," *Los Angeles Book Review* (7 September 2020), <https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/fraud-by-numbers-metrics-and-the-new-academic-misconduct/>.
102. Macdonald and Kam, "Aardvark et Al," 707.
103. Allen W. Wilhite and Eric A. Fong, "Coercive Citation in Academic Publishing," *Science*, 335 (3 February 2012), <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/335/6068/542.full>.
104. LSE Public Policy Group, "Maximizing the Impacts of Your Research: A Handbook for Social Scientists," 110.
105. Yves Gingras and Mahdi Khelifaoui, "Why the h-index Is a Bogus Measure of Academic Impact," *Conversation* (8 July 2020), <https://theconversation.com/why-the-h-index-is-a-bogus-measure-of-academic-impact-141684>.

106. Richard Van Noorden and Dalmeet Singh Chawla, "Hundreds of Extreme Self-citing Scientists Revealed in New Database," *Nature* (19 August 2019), <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-02479-7>.

107. Stéphane Baldi, "Normative versus Social Constructivist Processes in the Allocation of Citations," *American Sociological Review*, 63, 6 (1998) 841.

108. LSE Public Policy Group, "Maximizing the Impacts of Your Research," 25.

109. Michael J. Moravcsik and Poovanalingam Murugesan, "Some Results on the Quality and Function of Citations," *Social Studies of Science*, 5, 1 (1975) 91.

110. A defense of drawing conclusions about articles from the journals where they are published: Ludo Waltman and Vincent A. Traag, "Use of the Journal Impact Factor for Assessing Individual Articles Need Not Be Statistically Wrong," *F1000 Research* (14 May 2020), <https://f1000research.com/articles/9-366>.

111. Diana Hicks et al., "Bibliometrics: The Leiden Manifesto for Research Metrics," *Nature* (22 April 2015), <https://www.nature.com/news/bibliometrics-the-leiden-manifesto-for-research-metrics-1.17351>.

112. LSE Public Policy Group, "Maximizing the Impacts of Your Research," 25.

113. Jennifer Lin, "Altmetrics Gaming: Beast Within or Without?" in Mario Biagioli and Alexandra Lippman, eds., *Gaming the Metrics: Misconduct and Manipulation in Academic Research* (Cambridge MA 2020).

114. Johan Bollen et al., "A Principal Component Analysis of 39 Scientific Impact Measures," *PLOS One* (29 June 2009), <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0006022#>.

115. Ross Mounce, "Open Access and Altmetrics: Distinct but Complementary," *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (15 April 2013), <https://asistdl.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/bult.2013.1720390406>; Kent Anderson, "All the News That Fits: What's Really Driving Altmetric's Top 100 Articles List?" *Scholarly Kitchen* (13 December 2017), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2017/12/13/news-fits-whats-really-driving-altmetrics-top-100-articles-list/>.

116. Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing.

117. <https://sfdora.org/read/>. A similar emphasis on marrying qualitative to quantitative evaluation in Hicks et al., "Bibliometrics: The Leiden Manifesto for Research Metrics."

118. Chris Woolston, "Impact Factor Abandoned by Dutch University in Hiring and Promotion Decisions," *Nature* (25 June 2021), <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-01759-5>.

119. Haakon Gjerløw, "Peer Review, DORA, and Science," *PRIIO Blogs* (25 September 2020), <https://blogs.prio.org/2020/09/peer-review-dora-and-science/>.

120. Shulenberg, "Substituting Article Processing Charges for Subscriptions."

121. HSBC Global Research, "Survey of Funders Supports the Benign Open Access Outcome Priced into Shares," 6.

122. HSBC Global Research, "Going for Gold," 25.



123. Richard Poynder, "PLoS ONE, Open Access, and the Future of Scholarly Publishing," *Open and Shut?* (7 March 2011) 27, [https://richardpoynder.co.uk/PLoS\\_ONE.pdf](https://richardpoynder.co.uk/PLoS_ONE.pdf).

124. David Mazieres and Eddie Kohler, "Get Me Off Your Fucking Mailing List," <http://www.scs.stanford.edu/~dm/home/papers/remove.pdf>; Joseph Stromberg, "'Get Me Off Your Fucking Mailing List' Is an Actual Science Paper Accepted by a Journal," *Vox* (21 November 2014), <https://www.vox.com/2014/11/21/7259207/scientific-paper-scam>.

125. Robert Phiddian, "Are Parody and Deconstruction Secretly the Same Thing?" *New Literary History*, 28, 4 (1997) 683.

126. Brian Lloyd, "Ern Malley and His Rivals," *Australian Literary Studies*, 20, 1 (2001).

127. Alan D. Sokal, "Transgressing the Boundaries: Towards a Transformative Hermeneutics of Quantum Gravity," *Social Text*, 46/47 (1996).

128. "SCIGen: An Automatic CS Paper Generator," <https://pdos.csail.mit.edu/archive/scigen/>.

129. Cyril Labbé, "Ike Antkare: One of the Great Stars in the Scientific Firmament," *Les rapports de recherche du Laboratoire d'Informatique de Grenoble, HAL* (17 August 2016), <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01354123>.

130. John Bohannon, "US Charges Journal Publisher with Misleading Authors," *Science* (7 October 2016), <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/354/6308/23.summary>; Jeffrey Brainard, "U.S. Judge Rules Deceptive Publisher Should Pay \$50 Million in Damages," *Science* (3 April 2019), <https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2019/04/us-judge-rules-deceptive-publisher-should-pay-501-million-damages>.

131. Jeffrey Beall, "Criteria for Determining Predatory Open-Access Publishers" (1 January 2015), <https://web.archive.org/web/20161130184313/https://scholarlyoa.files.wordpress.com/2015/01/criteria-2015.pdf>.

132. "Beall's List of Predatory Publishers 2017," <https://web.archive.org/web/20170103170903/https://scholarlyoa.com/>. Threatened with defamation suits by publishers he had included, Beall closed his list in 2017.

133. Cenyu Shen and Bo-Christer Björk, "'Predatory' Open Access: A Longitudinal Study of Article Volumes and Market Characteristics," *BMC Medicine* (1 October 2015), <https://bmcmedicine.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12916-015-0469-2>; Chen, "Scholarly Journals' Publication Frequency and Number of Articles in 2018–2019."

134. WIPO, *The Global Publishing Industry in 2018* (Geneva 2018) 26.

135. Mohammad Salehi et al., "Publishing in Predatory Open Access Journals: Authors' Perspectives," *Learned Publishing*, 33 (2020).

136. WIPO, *Global Publishing Industry in 2018*, 26.

137. Rick Anderson, "Why Should We Worry about Predatory Journals? Here's One Reason," *Cabells* (3 March 2020), <https://blog.cabells.com/2020/03/03/guest-post-why-should-we-worry-about-predatory-journals-heres-one-reason/>.

138. Kieńć, “Authors from the Periphery Countries Choose Open Access More Often.”

139. Simon Wakeling et al., “Open-Access Mega-Journals: A Bibliometric Profile,” *PLOS One* (18 November 2016) table 4, <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0165359>.

140. Kieńć, “Authors from the Periphery Countries Choose Open Access More Often.”

141. Juliet Nabyonga-Orem et al., “Article Processing Charges Are Stalling the Progress of African Researchers,” *BJM Global Health*, 5, 9 (2020), <https://gh.bmj.com/content/5/9/e003650#xref-ref-2-1>.

142. Nobes and Harris, “Open Access in Developing Countries,” table 8.

143. Dallmeier-Tiessen et al., “Highlights from the SOAP Project Survey,” 9. Non-payers were much higher in the HSS, lowest in the life sciences.

144. International Labour Organization, ILOSTAT, Statistics on Wages, Data, Mean nominal monthly earnings of employees by sex and economic activity, <https://ilostat.ilo.org/topics/wages/#>.

145. Nabyonga-Orem et al., “Article Processing Charges Are Stalling the Progress of African Researchers.”

146. David J. Solomon and Bo-Christer Björk, “Publication Fees in Open Access Publishing: Sources of Funding and Factors Influencing Choice of Journal,” *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (24 October 2011) table 5, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/asi.21660>. A more recent survey found that 60% of Global South authors paid the APC themselves: Nobes and Harris, “Open Access in Developing Countries.”

147. Predatory journals’ average publishing charges were \$178 in one study, \$100 in another, compared to anything from \$1,000 to \$9,000 for gold open-access journals. Shen and Björk, “‘Predatory’ Open Access”; Larissa Shamsheer et al., “Potential Predatory and Legitimate Biomedical Journals: Can You Tell the Difference?” *BMC Medicine* (16 March 2017), <https://bmcmmedicine.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12916-017-0785-9>.

148. D. Mills and K. Inouye, “Problematizing ‘Predatory Publishing’: A Systematic Review of Factors Shaping Publishing Motives, Decisions, and Experiences,” *Learned Publishing* (23 August 2020), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/leap.1325>; Songqing Lin, “Why Serious Academic Fraud Occurs in China,” *Learned Publishing*, 26, 1 (2013), [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274869749\\_Why\\_serious\\_academic\\_fraud\\_occurs\\_in\\_China](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274869749_Why_serious_academic_fraud_occurs_in_China); Ayokunie Olu-muyiwa Omobowale et al., “Peripheral Scholarship and the Context of Foreign Paid Publishing in Nigeria,” *Current Sociology*, 62, 5 (2014) 667.

149. Chen, “Scholarly Journals’ Publication Frequency and Number of Articles in 2018–2019.”

150. Songqing Lin and Lijuan Zhan, “Trash Journals in China,” *Learned Publishing*, 27, 2 (2014) 151, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1087/20140208>.

151. Reggie Raju et al., “Predatory Publishing from the Global South Perspective,” in Punctum Books, ed., *Predatory Publishing* (Coventry 2018), [https://www.google.com/url?client=internal-element-cse&cx=partner-pub-9759840060944682:1306350668&q=https://hcommons.org/deposits/download/hc:19828/CONTENT/predatory-publishing.pdf/&sa=U&ved=2ahUKewihjqPfo8v2AhWcgnIEHUb\\_BYMQFnoECAQQAQ&usg=AOvVaw1XGbr82czGAQJJWarZ8XYG](https://www.google.com/url?client=internal-element-cse&cx=partner-pub-9759840060944682:1306350668&q=https://hcommons.org/deposits/download/hc:19828/CONTENT/predatory-publishing.pdf/&sa=U&ved=2ahUKewihjqPfo8v2AhWcgnIEHUb_BYMQFnoECAQQAQ&usg=AOvVaw1XGbr82czGAQJJWarZ8XYG).
152. Shen and Björk, “‘Predatory’ Open Access.”
153. Alliance of Independent Authors, “Facts and Figures about Self Publishing.”

## Chapter 6

1. “Data Centres and Data Transmission Networks,” IEA Tracking Report (June 2020), <https://www.iea.org/reports/data-centres-and-data-transmission-networks>.
2. Frederick G. Kilgour, *Evolution of the Book* (Oxford 1998) 26.
3. Caleb Everett, *Numbers and the Making of Us: Counting and the Course of Human Cultures* (Cambridge MA 2017) 243. Unless we accept the Berekhat Ram figure from 230,000 years ago as symbolic: Genevieve von Petzinger, *The First Signs: Unlocking the Mysteries of the World’s Oldest Symbols* (New York 2016) 35.
4. Jeff Rothenberg, *Avoiding Technological Quicksand: Finding a Viable Technical Foundation for Digital Preservation*, Council on Library and Information Resources (Washington DC 1999) 2, <https://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/rothenberg/>.
5. Arch Mission Foundation, <https://www.archmission.org/>.
6. Ernie Smith, “Why the PDF Is Secretly the World’s Most Important File Format,” *Vice* (3 May 2018), <https://www.vice.com/en/article/pam43n/why-the-pdf-is-secretly-the-worlds-most-important-file-format>.
7. “Number of Independent Bookstores in the United States from 2009 to 2020,” <https://www.statista.com/statistics/282808/number-of-independent-bookstores-in-the-us/>. The growth to 4,100 in 2020 is probably a fluke of some sort.
8. “Book Store Sales in the United States from 1992 to 2020,” <https://www.statista.com/statistics/197710/annual-book-store-sales-in-the-us-since-1992/>.
9. Laurel Wickersham Salisbury, “It’s Not That Easy: Artist Resale Royalty Rights and the ART Act,” *Center for Art Law* (1 July 2019), [https://itsartlaw.org/2019/07/01/its-not-that-easy-artist-resale-royalty-rights-and-the-art-act/#\\_ftn3](https://itsartlaw.org/2019/07/01/its-not-that-easy-artist-resale-royalty-rights-and-the-art-act/#_ftn3).
10. “A Giant Leap . . . Backwards,” *Readers First* (6 July 2018), <http://www.readersfirst.org/news/2018/7/6/a-giant-leap-backwards>.
11. Digital Economy Act 2017, <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2017/30/section/31/enacted>.
12. Campaign to Investigate the Academic Book Market, <https://academicbookinvestigation.org/>.
13. Rob Green, “Know Your Rights: The Key to eBook Access,” *CILIP* (29 June 2021), <https://www.cilip.org.uk/news/571553/Know-your-rights-the-key-to-eBook-access.htm>; “Campaign to Investigate the Academic Ebook Market.”

14. "IFLA Statement on Controlled Digital Lending" (May 2021), International Federation of Library Associations, <https://www.ifla.org/publications/node/93954>.

15. Andrew Albanese, "Maryland Library E-book Bill Becomes Law," *Publishers Weekly* (1 June 2021), <https://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/industry-news/libraries/article/86528-maryland-library-e-book-bill-becomes-law.html>; Andrew Albanese, "New York Legislature Passes Library E-book Bill," *Publishers Weekly* (11 June 2021), <https://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/industry-news/libraries/article/86637-new-york-legislature-passes-library-e-book-bill.html>. The NY bill was vetoed by the governor in December 2021. Andrew Albanese, "Hochul Vetoes New York's Library E-book Bill," *Publishers Weekly* (30 December 2021), <https://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/digital/copyright/article/88205-hochul-vetoes-new-york-s-library-e-book-bill.html>.

16. "AAP Sues Maryland over E-Lending Law," *Authors Alliance* (10 December 2021), <https://www.authorsalliance.org/2021/12/10/update-aap-sues-maryland-over-e-lending-law/>.

17. Peter M. Routhier, "U.S. Congress Investigates Publisher Restrictions on Library E-Books," *Internet Archive Blogs* (24 September 2021), <http://blog.archive.org/2021/09/24/u-s-congress-investigates-publisher-restrictions-on-library-e-books/>; "Wyden, Eshoo Press Big Five Publishers on Costly, Overly Restrictive E-Book Contracts with Libraries," US Senate, Committee on Finance (23 September 2021), <https://www.finance.senate.gov/chairmans-news/wyden-eshoo-press-big-five-publishers-on-costly-overly-restrictive-e-book-contracts-with-libraries>.

18. C174/15 Vereniging Opebare Bibliotheken vs Stichting Leenrecht, <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?num=C-174/15> or <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX:62015CJ0174>.

19. Rebecca Giblin et al., "Available, but Not Accessible? Investigating Publishers' E-lending Licensing Practices," *InformationResearch*, 24, 3 (2019), <http://informationr.net/ir/24-3/paper837.html>.

20. Daniel A. Gross, "The Surprisingly Big Business of Library E-Books," *New Yorker* (2 September 2021), <https://www.newyorker.com/news/annals-of-communications/an-app-called-libby-and-the-surprisingly-big-business-of-library-e-books>.

21. Andrew Albanese, "Penguin Random House Changes Library E-book Lending Terms," *Publishers Weekly* (4 September 2018), <https://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/industry-news/libraries/article/77904-penguin-random-house-changes-its-library-e-book-terms.html>.

22. Secker et al., *Understanding the CLA License to UK Higher Education*, fig. 8.

23. *Report of the Commission on the Future of the UC Berkeley Library* (October 2013) 6, [https://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/final\\_cfucbl\\_report\\_10.16.13\\_0.pdf](https://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/final_cfucbl_report_10.16.13_0.pdf).

24. Thanks to Tony Ageh for discussions on this point.

25. Constance Malpas, "Subsidence and Uplift: The Library Landscape," in Dempsey et al., eds., *Understanding the Collective Collection*, figs. 2, 3.
26. Michael Levine-Clark et al., "Uniqueness and Collection Overlap in Academic Libraries," *Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference* (2009), <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1037&context=charleston>.
27. Constance Malpas and Brian Lavoie, "Right-scaling Stewardship: A Multi-scale Perspective on Cooperative Print Management," *OCLC Research* (March 2014), fig. 3, <https://www.oclc.org/content/dam/research/publications/library/2014/oclcresearch-cooperative-print-management-2014.pdf>.
28. Malpas and Lavoie, "Strength in Numbers," 28.
29. Lavoie et al., "Anatomy of Aggregate Collections," fig. 2. This may have been high since it counted book manifestations, not just titles as such, ie each individual edition of books with many such.
30. Lorcan Dempsey, "Libraries and the Long Tail," *D-Lib Magazine*, 12, 4 (2006), <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/april06/dempsey/04dempsey.html>.
31. Dempsey, "Libraries and the Long Tail."
32. Brian Lavoie et al., "Reflections on Collective Collections," *College and Research Libraries*, 81, 6 (2020) fig. 2, 4, <https://crl.acrl.org/index.php/crl/article/viewFile/24618/32425>.
33. Brian Lavoie et al., "Print Management at 'Mega-scale': A Regional Perspective on Print Book Collections in North America," in Dempsey et al., eds., *Understanding the Collective Collection*, 173.
34. Lavoie et al., "Reflections on Collective Collections," 993.
35. Malpas and Lavoie, "Right-scaling Stewardship," tables 2, 3.
36. Malpas and Lavoie, "Strength in Numbers," 16.
37. Lavoie and Schonfeld, "Books without Boundaries."
38. Lavoie et al., "Print Management at 'Mega-scale,'" 183.
39. Lavoie et al., "Print Management at 'Mega-scale,'" 163.
40. Richard Wellen, "Open Access, Megajournals, and MOOCs: On the Political Economy of Academic Unbundling," *SAGE Open* (2013) 4, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2158244013507271>.
41. "An Interview with Frances Pinter," *Knowledge Unlatched*, <http://www.knowledgeunlatched.org/2013/01/an-interview-with-frances-pinter/>.
42. Malpas and Lavoie, "Right-scaling Stewardship," 8.
43. Schonfeld, "Supercontinent of Scholarly Publishing?"
44. Roger C. Schonfeld, "In Latest Sign of Its Resurgence, Clarivate Acquires Kopernio," *Scholarly Kitchen* (10 April 2018), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2018/04/10/clarivate-acquires-kopernio/>.
45. Nicholson Baker, *Double Fold: Libraries and the Assault on Paper* (New York 2001).
46. Nichols and Smith, *Evidence in Hand*, 12–14.
47. Bosman et al., *Open Access Diamond Journals Study*, 8.

48. Fitzpatrick, *Planned Obsolescence*, 148–150.
49. “LOCKSS, CLOCKSS, and Portico: Potential Digital Archive Solutions for Rutgers,” Rutgers Staff Resources (30 January 2007), [https://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/rul/staff/collection\\_dev/reports/lockss-clockss-portico.shtml](https://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/rul/staff/collection_dev/reports/lockss-clockss-portico.shtml).
50. Beagrie, “Preservation, Trust, and Continuing Access for e-Journals,” 8.
51. “LOCKSS GLN Keepers Reports” (18 January 2021), <https://reports.lockss.org/keepers/>; <https://clockss.org/about/>; “Titles and Collections,” <https://www.portico.org/coverage/titles/>.
52. Winters, “Giving with One Click, Taking with the Other.”
53. Paul Gooding and Melissa Terras, “‘An Ark to Save Learning from Deluge’?: Reconceptualising Legal Deposit after the Digital Turn,” in Gooding and Terras, eds., *Electronic Legal Deposit*.
54. Will Manley, “The Manley Arts: One-Tenth of One Percent,” *Booklist* (1 November 1999).
55. Alan Sica, “Sociogenesis Versus Psychogenesis: The Unique Sociology of Norbert Elias,” *Mid-American Review of Sociology*, 9, 1 (1984) 50.
56. Steven Marcus, *The Other Victorians: A Study of Sexuality and Pornography in Mid-Nineteenth-Century England* (New York 1964) xv.
57. Robert Darnton, *Literary Underground of the Old Regime*, vi.
58. Dahlia Remler, “Are 90% of Academic Papers Really Never Cited?” *DahliaRemler* (9 April 2014), <https://dahliaremler.com/2014/04/09/are-90-of-academic-papers-really-never-cited-searching-citations-about-academic-citations-reveals-the-good-the-bad-and-the-ugly/>.
59. Rose-Wiles, “Are Print Books Dead?” 5.
60. Michael Lesk, “How Much Information Is There in the World?” <https://lesk.com/mlesk/ksg97/ksg.html>.
61. Thompson, *Book Wars*, 417–418.
62. Cliff Guren et al., *COVID-19 and Book Publishing: Impacts and Insights for 2021* (5 January 2021), <https://thefutureofpublishing.com/2021/01/covid-19-and-book-publishing-impacts-and-insights-for-2021/>.
63. Rüdiger Wischenbart, *Global 50: The World Ranking of the Publishing Industry 2020*, 20–22, [https://www.wischenbart.com/upload/Global50-Publishing-Ranking-2020\\_ScreenOpt.pdf](https://www.wischenbart.com/upload/Global50-Publishing-Ranking-2020_ScreenOpt.pdf); Rebecca Marston, “People ‘Rediscovering Books’ as Lock-down Sales Jump,” *BBC* (27 October 2020), <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-54703164>; Mark Sweney, “Harry Potter Publisher Says Covid Is Weaving Magic over Book Sales,” *Guardian* (27 October 2020), <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2020/oct/27/harry-potter-publisher-covid-bloomsbury-book-sales-lockdown>.
64. John Sherer, “Making OA Monographs More Discoverable, Usable, and Sustainable,” *Longleaf Services* (12 August 2020), <https://longleafservices.org/blog/the-sustainable-history-monograph-pilot/>.
65. “Book Sales Volume in France from 2010 to 2018,” *Statista*, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/420733/book-sales-france/>; “Marketed Production of Books

in France from 2010 to 2019,” *Statista*, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/420120/commercialized-production-of-books-france/>.

66. Associazione Italiana Editori, *Report on Publishing in Italy: Highlights 2018*, 4, [https://www.aie.it/Portals/\\_default/Skede/Allegati/Skeda105-4263-2018.10.22/Highlights\\_2018\\_DEF\\_digitale.pdf?IDUNI=pavjmaj34x0vmvd1w4v42lqy8441](https://www.aie.it/Portals/_default/Skede/Allegati/Skeda105-4263-2018.10.22/Highlights_2018_DEF_digitale.pdf?IDUNI=pavjmaj34x0vmvd1w4v42lqy8441).

67. CERLALC, *El espacio iberoamericano del libro 2018*, 27, 33.

68. Esposito and Barch, *Monograph Output of American University Presses; “Trends in Academic Books Published in the Humanities and Other Fields,”* American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Humanities Indicators, IV-37a, <https://www.amacad.org/humanities-indicators/funding-and-research/trends-academic-books-published-humanities-and-other>.

69. Crossick, “Monographs and Open Access,” 21.

70. Calculated from the figures in Wischenbart, *Global 50*, 25–27, 10–11.

71. “Number of New Titles and Editions Published in the United States from 2002 to 2013, by Type,” *Statista*, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/248345/number-of-titles-published-in-the-us-by-type/>.

72. “Print Isn’t Dead, Says Bowker’s Annual Book Production Report,” *Bowker* (18 May 2011), <http://www.bowker.com/news/2011/290243111.html>. This report is no longer available on the web.

73. Bowker, *Self-Publishing in the United States, 2013–2018*, <https://media2.proquest.com/documents/bowker-selfpublishing-report2019.pdf>.

74. Thompson, *Book Wars*, 259.

75. “Number of Self-published Books in the United States from 2008 to 2018, by Format,” *Statista*, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/249036/number-of-self-published-books-in-the-us-by-format/>. Similar figures here: Bowker, “Self-Publishing in the United States, 2013–2018: Print and Ebooks,” (2019) 5, 6, <https://actualitte.com/PDF/autopublication%20etats%20unis%20chiffres%20bowker.pdf>.

76. “Largest Self-publishing Companies in the United States in 2018, by Numbers of Titles Published,” *Statista*, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/249043/largest-self-publishing-companies-in-the-us-by-number-of-titles-published/>.

77. Alliance of Independent Authors, “Facts and Figures about Self Publishing.”

78. Andrew Albanese, “BiblioBazaar: How a Company Produces 272,930 Books A Year,” *Publishers Weekly* (15 April 2010), <https://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/industry-news/publisher-news/article/42850-bibliobazaar-how-a-company-produces-272-930-books-a-year.html>.

79. “Print Isn’t Dead, Says Bowker’s Annual Book Production Report.” This report is no longer available, but the figures are partly reproduced in Michael Kelley, “Bowker Declares Print Isn’t Dead,” *Library Journal* (18 May 2011), <https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=bowker-declares-print-isnt-dead>.

80. Rebecca J. Rosen, “The Missing 20th Century: How Copyright Protection Makes Books Vanish,” *Atlantic* (30 March 2012), <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/03/the-missing-20th-century-how-copyright-protection-makes-books-vanish/255282/>.



81. WIPO, *Global Publishing Industry in 2018*, table 6.
82. Agencia Chilena ISBN, *Informe Estadístico 2019*, 22.
83. CERLALC, *El espacio iberoamericano del libro 2018*, 63.
84. Hector Tobar, "Self-published E-books Rife with Illicit Erotica, Survey Finds," *Los Angeles Times* (21 October 2013); McGurl, *Everything and Less*, 53, 153.
85. "Smashwords Survey 2017," 28, <https://blog.smashwords.com/2017/06/smashwords-survey-2017.html>. Similar data at "Which Self-Published Genres Sell The Most Books? Self-Publishing Relief Has The Answer!" (19 August 2015), <https://selfpublishingrelief.com/self-published-genres-sell-most/>.
86. Edward R. Robertson, "Self-Publishing's Share of the Kindle Market by Genre," <http://edwardwrobertson.com/self-publishing/self-publishings-share-of-the-kindle-market-by-genre/>.
87. Adam Rowe, "How Indie Genre Fiction Ebooks Are Thriving Online," *Forbes* (13 January 2018), <https://www.forbes.com/sites/adamrowe1/2018/01/13/how-indie-genre-fiction-ebooks-are-thriving-online/?sh=77e35b3311fa>.
88. WIPO, *Global Publishing Industry in 2018*, table 5; "Breakdown of Book Publisher Sales Volume in France from 2010 to 2018, by Segment," *Statista*, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/420905/book-publishers-sales-volume-by-genre-france/>; Associazione Italiana Editori, *Report on Publishing in Italy: Highlights 2018*, 4; CERLALC, *El espacio iberoamericano del libro 2018*, table 31.
89. Lavoie and Dempsey, "Beyond 1923," 64.
90. Charlie Tyson, "A Publisher of One's Own," *Inside Higher Ed* (17 July 2014), <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/07/17/self-publishing-option-academics-periphery>.

## Chapter 7

1. Background in Joe Karaganis, ed., *Shadow Libraries: Access to Knowledge in Global Higher Education* (Cambridge MA 2018), <https://direct.mit.edu/books/book/3600/Shadow-LibrariesAccess-to-Knowledge-in-Global>.
2. "NYU's Arabic Collections Online Usage Jumps 700% in March," <http://www.nyu.edu/about/news-publications/news/2020/april/nyu-s-arabic-collections-online-usage-jumps-700--in-march.html>.
3. With 20% in the public domain and 10% in copyright and commercially available. Thompson, *Merchants of Culture*, 362.
4. US Copyright Office, *Orphan Works and Mass Digitization* (June 2015) 36–38, <https://www.copyright.gov/orphan/reports/orphan-works2015.pdf>.
5. David Hansen, "Digitizing Orphan Works: Legal Strategies to Reduce Risks for Open Access to Copyrighted Orphan Works," *Harvard Library* (August 2016) ii, <https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/27840430>.
6. James Boyle, "A Copyright Black Hole Swallows Our Culture," *Financial Times* (7 September 2009).

7. Elisabeth Niggemann et al., *The New Renaissance: Report of the "Comité des Sages" on Bringing Europe's Cultural Heritage Online* (European Commission; Brussels 2011) 15, <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/79a38a23-e7d9-4452-b9b0-1f84502e68c5>. Though, admittedly, the committee also insisted on an opportunity for cultural institutions to digitize works whose rights-holders did not exploit them (p. 26).

8. US Copyright Office, *Report on Orphan Works* (January 2006) 8–9, <https://www.copyright.gov/orphan/orphan-report-full.pdf>; US Copyright Office, *Orphan Works and Mass Digitization*, 7; Gowers *Review of Intellectual Property*, 71–72.

9. "Directive 2012/28/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 on Certain Permitted Uses of Orphan Works," *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 299/5 (27 October 2012), <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32012L0028&from=EN>.

10. <https://www.orphanworkslicensing.service.gov.uk/view-register>.

11. Michelle M. Wu, "Building a Collaborative Digital Collection: A Necessary Evolution in Libraries," *Law Library Journal*, 103 (2011).

12. And equivalent rules abroad. Alexander B. Pope, "A Second Look at First Sale: An International Look at U.S. Copyright Exhaustion," *Journal of Intellectual Property Law* 19, 1 (2011) 216–223.

13. Michelle M. Wu, "Collaborative Academic Library Digital Collections Post-Cambridge University Press, HathiTrust and Google Decisions on Fair Use," *Journal of Copyright in Education and Librarianship*, 1, 1 (2016) 2, 17, <https://www.jcel-pub.org/article/view/5921/5345>.

14. Hansen and Courtney, "White Paper on Controlled Digital Lending of Library Books."

15. Timothy B. Lee, "University Libraries Offer Online 'Lending' of Scanned In-copyright Books," *Ars Technica* (7 April 2020), <https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2020/04/university-libraries-offer-online-lending-of-scanned-in-copyright-books/>.

16. <https://blog.archive.org/national-emergency-library/>.

17. Sherer, "Making OA Monographs More Discoverable;" "Hachette v. Internet Archive: Internet Archive's Memorandum for Summary Judgment," (7 July 2022) 27, <https://www.eff.org/document/hachette-v-internet-archive-internet-archives-memorandum-summary-judgment>.

18. *Hachette Book Group Inc v. Internet Archive* 1:20-cv-04160, US District Court, S.D. New York, <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/17211300/hachette-book-group-inc-v-internet-archive/>; Stephen Beamsterboer, "Fahrenheit 2020: Torching the Internet's Library of Alexandria at the Height of a Global Pandemic," *Journal of Law, Technology, & Policy*, 2 (2021), [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=4037768](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4037768).

19. Boston Library Consortium, "Consortial CDL: Implementing Controlled Digital Lending as a Mechanism for Interlibrary Loan," (September 2021), <https://blc.org/CDLforILL>.

20. C174/15 Vereniging Opebare Bibliotheken vs Stichting Leenrecht, <http://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?num=C-174/15> or <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX:62015CJ0174>; Rob Green, "Know Your Rights: The Key to eBook Access," *CILIP* (29 June 2021), <https://www.cilip.org.uk/news/571553/Know-your-rights-the-key-to-eBook-access.htm>.

21. Digital Economy Act 2017.

22. Jacob Flynn et al., "What Happens When Books Enter the Public Domain? Testing Copyright's Under Use Hypothesis across Australia, New Zealand, the United States and Canada," *UNSW Law Journal*, 42, 4 (2019) 1229; <https://www.unswlawjournal.unsw.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/3-Flynn-Giblin-and-Petitjean.pdf>.

23. Leonid Taycher, "Books of the World, Stand Up and Be Counted! All 129,864,880 of You," *Inside Google Books* (5 August 2010), <http://booksearch.blogspot.com/2010/08/books-of-world-stand-up-and-be-counted.html?m=1>. This may be an overcount caused by duplicates in Google's metadata: Jon Stokes, "Google's Count of 130 Million Books Is Probably Bunk," *Ars Technica* (9 August 2020), <https://arstechnica.com/science/2010/08/googles-count-of-130-million-books-is-probably-bunk/>. On the other hand, what is the likelihood that Google consulted much beyond the English-language literature?

24. Malpas and Lavoie, "Strength in Numbers," fig. 2.

25. The underlying report estimated the number of books, not including journals and newspapers, arriving at a range between 59 and 95 million, for a mean of 77 million. Niggemann et al., *New Renaissance*, 38, 116.

26. <https://www.worldcat.org/>.

27. Lavoie et al., "Reflections on Collective Collections," fig. 4. 128 million in 2013: Lavoie et al., "Print Management at 'Mega-scale,'" 173.

28. Lavoie and Schonfeld, "Books without Boundaries."

29. Lavoie and Schonfeld, "Books without Boundaries."

30. "New Book Titles Published this Year," *Worldometer*, <https://www.worldometers.info/books/>.

31. E-mail from WorldCat, 17 February 2021.

32. Lavoie and Schonfeld, "Books without Boundaries."

33. Lavoie and Dempsey, "Beyond 1923," 62; Greg Cam and Sean Redmond (8 May 2019), <https://twitter.com/GregCram/status/1126153216280989698>. Of 170,000 volumes in the HathiTrust published in these years, 51% were in the public domain. Melissa Levine, "Finding the Public Domain: The Copyright Review Management System," *Ithaka S&R* (26 October 2016), <https://sr.ithaka.org/publications/finding-the-public-domain/>.

34. Thompson, *Book Wars*, 129.

35. Arif E. Jinha, "Article 50 Million: An Estimate of the Number of Scholarly Articles in Existence," *Learned Publishing*, 23, 3 (2010), [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229062236\\_Article\\_50\\_million\\_An\\_estimate\\_of\\_the\\_number\\_of\\_scholarly\\_articles\\_in\\_existence](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229062236_Article_50_million_An_estimate_of_the_number_of_scholarly_articles_in_existence).

36. The figures vary. Among the highest is 4 to 4.5 million articles annually across the globe, but this includes every book review and conference proceeding as well. Bosman et al., *Open Access Diamond Journals Study*, 30.

37. That correlates reasonably with other estimates from 2018 of 70 million articles. Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 25.

38. Radames J. B. Cordero et al., "Life Science's Average Publishable Unit (APU) Has Increased over the Past Two Decades," *PLOS ONE* (16 June 2016), <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0156983>.

39. Niggemann et al., *New Renaissance*, 38, 116, 145.

40. Kalev Leetaru, "Mass Book Digitization: The Deeper Story of Google Books and the Open Content Alliance," *First Monday*, 13, 10 (2008), <https://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/2101>. Microsoft announced it would digitize books from the British Library at what appeared to be \$25/volume. Jonathan Band, "The Google Library Project: Both Sides of the Story," *Plagiarism: Cross-disciplinary Studies in Plagiarism, Fabrication, and Falsification* (2006) 13, <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/p/pod/dod-idx/google-library-project-both-sides-of-the-story.pdf?c=plag;idno=5240451.0001.002;format=pdf>.

41. Claudia Dale Goldin, "The Economics of Emancipation," *Journal of Economic History*, 33, 1 (1973) 73–74; Peter McPhee, *The French Revolution, 1789–1799* (Oxford 2002) 191.

42. *Punch* (24 April 1847) 178, quoted in Melissa J. Homestead, *American Women Authors and Literary Property, 1822–1869* (Cambridge 2005) 49.

43. Baldwin, *Copyright Wars*, 116.

44. David Matthews, "Is It Time to Nationalise Academic Publishers?" *Times Higher Education* (2 March 2018), <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/blog/it-time-nationalise-academic-publishers>; Jean-Claude Burgelman, "Scholarly Publishing Needs Regulation," *Research Professional News* (28 January 2021), <https://researchprofessionalnews.com/rr-news-europe-views-of-europe-2021-1-scholarly-publishing-needs-regulation/>.

45. Barclay, "Academic Print Books Are Dying."

46. Benedicte Page, "'Group Action Needed to Safeguard the Academic Book', Warns Report," *Bookseller* (12 June 2017), <https://www.thebookseller.com/news/group-action-needed-safeguard-academic-book-warns-report-567951>.

47. Rupert Gatti and Marc Mierowsky, "Funding Open Access Monographs," *College & Research Libraries News*, 77, 9 (2016) 458, <https://crln.acrl.org/index.php/crlnews/article/view/9557/10901>.

48. Ferwerda et al., *Landscape Study on Open Access*, 38, 71.

49. Dan Stempel, "Cost of Open Access Book Publishing Goes Under the Microscope," *Simba Information* (10 December 2020), <https://www.simbainformation.com/Content/Blog/2020/12/10/Cost-of-Open-Access-Book-Publishing-Goes-Under-the-Microscope>. Some publishing charges for journal articles are listed in <https://www.openaccess.cam.ac.uk/publishing-open-access/how-much-do-publishers-charge-open-access>.

50. Martin Paul Eve et al., “Cost Estimates of an Open Access Mandate for Monographs in the UK’s Third Research Excellence Framework,” *UKSG Insights* (8 November 2017), <https://insights.uksg.org/articles/10.1629/uksg.392/>.

51. Eelco Ferwerda et al., *A Project Exploring Open Access Monograph Publishing in the Netherlands* (OAPEN-NL 2013) 4, <https://oapen.fra1.digitaloceanspaces.com/0cdef1a177b6470ea5257240682b38e3.pdf>.

52. OAPEN-CH, *Impact of Open Access on Scientific Monographs in Switzerland*, 8.

53. Nancy L. Maron et al., “The Costs of Publishing Monographs,” *Ithaka S+R* (5 February 2016), <https://sr.ithaka.org/publications/the-costs-of-publishing-monographs/>. A more recent study also has figures in excess of charges levied by most open-access publishers: Nancy Maron and Kim Schmelzinger, *The Cost to Publish TOME Monographs* (Association of University Presses 2022), <https://hcommons.org/deposits/item/hc:47235/>.

54. Noah Moxham and Aileen Fyfe, “The Royal Society and the Prehistory of Peer Review, 1665–1965,” *Historical Journal*, 61, 4 (2018) 872, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/historical-journal/article/royal-society-and-the-prehistory-of-peer-review-16651965/93B903FD4D6561AA7224C62EE57B0C18/share/02a909c3ee615bca306491e0feba0b28f6309245>.

55. Charles Watkinson, “University Presses and the Impact of COVID-19,” *Learned Publishing* (18 January 2021), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/leap.1352>.

56. Richard Fisher, “Guest Post—What Are Academic Book Publishers For? Part 2,” *Scholarly Kitchen* (2 September 2020), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2020/09/02/guest-post-what-are-academic-book-publishers-for-part-2/?informz=1>.

57. Michael Jubb, *Academic Books and Their Future: A Report to the AHRC and the British Library* (June 2017) 13, 107, <https://academicbookfuture.org/end-of-project-reports-2/>.

58. Richard Fisher, “Guest Post—What Are Academic Book Publishers For? Part 1,” *Scholarly Kitchen* (1 September 2020), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2020/09/01/guest-post-what-are-academic-book-publishers-for-part-1/>.

59. Sherer, “Making OA Monographs More Discoverable.”

60. There were 339,000 new titles published in the US in 2015: International Publishers Association, *Annual Report 2015–16*, table 2, <https://www.internationalpublishers.org/images/aa-content/ipa-reports/ipa-annual-report-2015-2016/ipa-annual-report-2015-2016.pdf>.

61. Though admittedly 35% in Italy. But since only 3% of Italian books are from the educational sector, something is screwy with the numbers. Similar issues occur with the US numbers of educational volumes sold (only 4.4%). WIPO, *Global Publishing Industry in 2018*, tables 1, 2, 3.

62. Agencia Chilena ISBN, *Informe Estadístico 2019*, 51; CERLALC, *El espacio iberoamericano del libro 2018*, 53.

63. Porter Anderson, “US Market Statistics: The AAP StatShot Annual Report for 2019,” *Publishing Perspectives* (31 July 2020), <https://publishingperspectives.com>.

com/2020/07/united-states-market-statistics-aap-statshot-annual-report-for-2019/. That is confirmed here: WIPO, *The Global Publishing Industry in 2016*, table A1.

64. Ferwerda et al., *Landscape Study on Open Access*, 82–83.

65. <https://aupresses.org/>. E-mail from the AUP, 17 February 2021.

66. Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age*, 52.

67. Authored and edited books and editions. Eve et al., “Cost Estimates of an Open Access Mandate for Monographs.”

68. Eve et al., “Cost Estimates of an Open Access Mandate for Monographs.”

69. Heather Piwowar et al., “The State of OA: A Large-Scale Analysis of the Prevalence and Impact of Open Access Articles,” *PeerJ* (2018), <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4375>. This source puts the total of open-access articles, both gold and diamond, at about a fifth of all articles, but that includes all forms of publications, not just articles: Bosman et al., *Open Access Diamond Journals Study*, 30.

70. European Commission, *Future of Scholarly Publishing and Scholarly Communication*, 30.

71. Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 139.

72. Alberto Martín-Martín et al., “Evidence of Open Access of Scientific Publications in Google Scholar: A Large-scale Analysis,” *Journal of Informetrics*, 12 (2018) fig. 6, 4.

73. Numbers from: Institute of Museum and Library Services; Research: Data Collection; Supplementary Tables; Public Library Revenue and Expenses; Table 26. Total collection expenditures of public libraries and percentage distribution of expenditures, by type of expenditure and state: Fiscal year 2012; Total collection expenditures; Total (in thousands), 73, [http://www.ims.gov/assets/1/AssetManager/FY2012%20PLS\\_Tables\\_21\\_thru\\_31A.pdf](http://www.ims.gov/assets/1/AssetManager/FY2012%20PLS_Tables_21_thru_31A.pdf); Tai Phan et al., *Academic Libraries: 2012: First Look* (National Center for Education Statistics, January 2014) table 9, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2014/2014038.pdf>; Amy Bitterman et al., US Department of Education, *Characteristics of Public Elementary and Secondary School Library Media Centers in the United States: Results From the 2011–12 Schools and Staffing Survey: First Look*, Table 1, Number of public schools that reported having library media centers, by selected school characteristics: 2011–12; Total number of schools; Number of schools with a library media center, 6, <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2013/2013315.pdf>; Dave Bogart, ed., *Library and Book Trade Almanac* (60th ed; Medford NJ 2015) 381.

74. Information kindly provided by Outsell, Inc., a California-based research and advisory firm for data, information, and analytics.

75. Phan et al., *Academic Libraries: 2012*, tables 8, 9. The numbers in Albert N. Greco, “Academic Libraries and the Economics of Scholarly Publishing in the Twenty-First Century,” *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 47, 1 (2015) table 7 are a small fraction of this and include only 785 libraries. The figures do not have much internal consistency—they add up to no more than 50% for various types of library acquisitions.

76. Information kindly provided by Outsell, Inc., a California-based research and advisory firm for data, information, and analytics.

77. £12.4 million in 2013. Eve et al., “Cost Estimates of an Open Access Mandate for Monographs.”

78. Phan et al., *Academic Libraries: 2012*, table 9.

79. Schimmer et al., “Disrupting the Subscription Journals’ Business Model,” 5.

80. Lavoie et al., “Reflections on Collective Collections,” fig. 2, 4.

81. Paul N. Courant and Matthew “Buzzy” Nielsen, “On the Cost of Keeping a Book,” in Council on Library and Information Resources, *The Idea of Order: Transforming Research Collections for 21st Century Scholarship* (Washington DC 2010) 91, <http://www.clir.org/pubs/abstract/pub147abst.html>.

82. Phan et al., *Academic Libraries: 2012*, table 8.

83. Phan et al., *Academic Libraries: 2012*, table 9.

84. Cambridge University Press, for example, allows the submitted manuscript of a book to be posted and the published version of one chapter six months after publication: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/open-access-policies/open-access-books/green-open-access-policy-for-books>.

85. Ferwerda et al., *Landscape Study on Open Access*, 28.

86. Holland: Article 25fa of the Copyright Act (Taverne Amendment), but only for university-affiliated researchers and for work done at least partly with Dutch government funding: <https://www.openaccess.nl/en/in-the-netherlands/you-share-we-take-care>. Belgium: <https://openaccess.be/belgian-open-access-legislation/>. France: <https://www.openaire.eu/france-final-text-of-the-law-for-oa-has-been-adopted>.

87. HSBC Global Research, “Going for Gold,” 8.

88. “Plan S Rights Retention Strategy,” *Plan S*, <https://www.coalition-s.org/rights-retention-strategy/>; “cOAlition S Response to the STM Statement: The Rights Retention Strategy Restores Long-standing Academic Freedoms,” *Plan S* (3 February 2021), <https://www.coalition-s.org/blog/the-rights-retention-strategy-restores-long-standing-academic-freedoms/>; Lisa Janicke-Hinchliffe, “Explaining the Rights Retention Strategy,” *Scholarly Kitchen* (17 February 2021), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2021/02/17/rights-retention-strategy/>.

89. Robert Kiley and Johan Rooryck, “Guest Post—The Rise of Immediate Green OA Undermines Progress: A Response From cOAlition S,” *Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association* (11 December 2020), <https://oaspa.org/guest-post-the-rise-of-immediate-green-oa-undermines-progress-a-response-from-coalition-s/>.

90. Liz Ferguson et al., “Open Post: The Rise of Immediate Green OA Undermines Progress,” *Open Access Scholarly Publishing Association* (4 December 2020), <https://oaspa.org/open-post-the-rise-of-immediate-green-oa-undermines-progress/>; “Signatories Publish Statement on Rights Retention Strategy,” *STM* (3 February 2021), <https://www.stm-assoc.org/rightsretentionstrategy/>.

91. A story told in Baldwin, *Copyright Wars*.

92. Reed Elsevier, Pearson, Wolters Kluwer, Springer. Wischenbart, *Global 50*, 18. If we count Pearson as an educational rather than scientific publisher, that brings Wiley, a US corporation, into the top five.



93. WIPO, *Global Publishing Industry in 2016*, table A1.
94. Mary Nell Bryant, "English Language Publication and the British Traditional Market Agreement," *Library Quarterly*, 49, 4 (1979); Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age*, 74–75.
95. Poynder, "Open Access: Could Defeat be Snatched from the Jaws of Victory?" 62–63.
96. Mallapaty, "India Pushes Bold 'One Nation, One Subscription' Journal-access Plan"; Amitabh Sinha, "Govt Proposes to Buy Bulk Subscriptions of All Scientific Journals, Provide Free Access to All," *Indian Express* (1 January 2021), <https://indianexpress.com/article/india/pune/one-nation-one-subscription-govt-draft-policy-7128799/lite/>.
97. Poynder, "Plan S: What Strategy Now for the Global South?" 14.
98. They are tracked at the ESAC Transformative Agreement Registry, <https://esac-initiative.org/about/transformative-agreements/agreement-registry/>.
99. Though Cambridge University Press has now signed read-and-publish agreements with over 100 US university libraries. Lindsay McKenzie, "Big Read-and-Publish Push Arrives," *Inside Higher Ed* (1 April 2021), <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2021/04/01/cambridge-university-press-strikes-deals-open-access>.
100. Lisa Janicke-Hinchliffe, "The Biggest Deal," *Scholarly Kitchen* (16 March 2021), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2021/03/16/the-biggest-big-deal/>; Danielle Cooper and Oya Y. Rieger, *What's the Big Deal? How Researchers Are Navigating Changes to Journal Access*, Ithaka S&R Research Report (22 June 2021) 7, <https://sr.ithaka.org/publications/whats-the-big-deal/>. Unbundling arrangements are tracked at <https://sparcopen.org/our-work/big-deal-cancellation-tracking/>.
101. Roger C. Schonfeld, "To Bundle or Not to Bundle? That Is the Question," *Scholarly Kitchen* (13 April 2020), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2020/04/13/bundle-question/>.
102. <https://unsub.org/>.
103. <https://home.cern/science/computing/storage>; Michelle Starr, "Less Than 1% of Large Hadron Collider Data Ever Gets Looked At," *Science Alert* (6 January 2019), <https://www.sciencealert.com/over-99-percent-of-large-hadron-collider-particle-collision-data-is-lost>.
104. Melissa Liton, "How Much Data Comes From the IOT?" *Sumo Logic* (7 February 2018), <https://www.sumologic.com/blog/iot-data-volume/>.
105. Poynder, "Open Access: Could Defeat Be Snatched from the Jaws of Victory?" 9.
106. Alejandro Posada and George Chen, "Inequality in Knowledge Production: The Integration of Academic Infrastructure by Big Publishers," *HAL* (15 June 2018), <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01816707v1>.
107. <https://eosc-portal.eu/>.
108. OECD, "Open Science," <https://www.oecd.org/sti/inno/open-science.htm>.
109. Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 9.

## Chapter 8

1. Lavoie et al., "Print Management at 'Mega-scale,'" fig. 9.
2. Malpas and Lavoie, "Strength in Numbers," 17.
3. Various e-mails from the British Library, February and March 2021.
4. This suggests an unexpectedly high level of English-language publication from other nations since only about a third of the titles are published in the UK, another 14% in the US or Canada. Malpas and Lavoie, "Strength in Numbers," 12–13.
5. E-mail from the Bibliothèque Nationale, 26 February 2021. More on this in Baldwin, *Copyright Wars*, 362.
6. 12% of Widener's 14 million volumes. The French figures are from an e-mail from the Bibliothèque Nationale, 26 February 2021.
7. Using WorldCat's figure of 120 million separate imprints globally. Lavoie, et al., "Print Management at "Mega-scale," 173.. Of course, adjusting for journal publication, the institution would have to be even larger.
8. Library of Congress, "Fiscal 2020 Budget Justification," 7, <https://www.loc.gov/static/portals/about/reports-and-budgets/documents/budgets/fy2020.pdf>.
9. Figures for how many readers the Library of Congress's twenty reading rooms seat have been impossible to find, but the Bibliothèque Nationale in France seats some 1,800 and the British Library perhaps 1,200. E-mail, Library of Congress, 22 February 2021.
10. <https://www.internationales-buero.de/en/unesco.php>.
11. John Feather, *Publishing, Piracy, and Politics: An Historical Study of Copyright in Britain* (London 1994) 97–121.
12. 528,000 in 2018 compared to 423,000. "Scientific and Technical Journal Articles," World Bank, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IP.JRN.ARTC.SC>.
13. Lorraine Estelle et al., "How to Enable Smaller Independent Publishers to Participate in OA Agreements," *Information Power* (8 June 2021) 27, [https://wellcome.figshare.com/articles/online\\_resource/How\\_to\\_enable\\_smaller\\_independent\\_publishers\\_to\\_participate\\_in\\_OA\\_agreements/14731308/1](https://wellcome.figshare.com/articles/online_resource/How_to_enable_smaller_independent_publishers_to_participate_in_OA_agreements/14731308/1).
14. *Accessibility, Sustainability, Excellence*, 63; "Written Evidence Submitted by the Russell Group," Commons Select Committees, Business, Innovation and Skills (7 February 2013) 3.2–3.4, <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmselect/cmbis/writev/openaccess/m76.htm>.
15. Hersh, "Working towards a Transition to Open Access"; Poynder, "Open Access: 'Information Wants to Be Free?'" 34; McKie, "'Location-specific' Blocks on Journal Access."
16. <https://plos.org/resources/for-institutions/faqs/>.
17. López and García, "Latin America's Longstanding Open Access Ecosystem Could Be Undermined."

18. Poynder, "Open Access: Could Defeat be Snatched from the Jaws of Victory?" 67.
19. "SAGE Open Lowers APCs for HSS Researchers" (23 January 2013), [https://www.researchinformation.info/news/sage-open-lowers-apcs-hss-researchers?news\\_id=1089](https://www.researchinformation.info/news/sage-open-lowers-apcs-hss-researchers?news_id=1089); Solomon, "A Survey of Authors Publishing in Four Megajournals," 8.
20. Suber, *Open Access*, 37; Suber, "Thinking about Prestige, Quality, and Open Access."
21. E. C. Mossner, *The Life of David Hume* (Oxford 1980) 612.
22. Ann Komaromi, "The Material Existence of Soviet Samizdat," *Slavic Review*, 63, 3 (2004) 603.
23. Azar Nafisi, *Reading Lolita in Tehran* (New York 2008) 39.
24. Donald Davidson and Gilbert Harman, eds., *Semantics of Natural Language* (Dordrecht 1972). \$251 in hardback, \$89 in paper.
25. Kaufman, *New Enlightenment*, 76–77.
26. HSBC Global Research, "Going for Gold," 8.
27. Orau and Rubriq, part of Research Square, are examples: <https://www.orau.org/research-reviews-evaluations/index.html>; <https://www.researchsquare.com/publishers/editorial-services>.
28. Amy Bourke-Waite, "Innovations in Scholarly Peer Review at Nature Publishing Group and Palgrave Macmillan," *UKSG Insights*, 28, 2 (2015), <https://insights.uksg.org/articles/10.1629/uksg.243/>.
29. Michael Clarke, "An Interview With Keith Collier, Co-Founder of Rubriq," *Scholarly Kitchen* (5 February 2013), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2013/02/05/an-interview-with-keith-collier-co-founder-of-rubriq/>.
30. Jason Priem and Bradley M. Hemminger, "Decoupling the Scholarly Journal," *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience* (5 April 2012), <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fncom.2012.00019/full#B19>.
31. My thanks to William Pike, practitioner of these arts, for information and thoughts on this.
32. Matthew McCreary, "7 Common Questions about Self-Publishing on Amazon," *Entrepreneur Europe* (31 October 2019), <https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/341595>.
33. David Kadavy, "24 Things I Learned Self Publishing 3 Books in Only 6 Months," *The Writing Cooperative* (5 June 2018), <https://writingcooperative.com/24-things-i-learned-publishing-3-books-in-only-6-months-1b8f743e9e86>.
34. Laura Pepper Wu, "Going Permafree on Amazon: My Reflections after 100,000 Downloads," *30 Day Books* (19 November 2013), <https://www.30daybooks.com/going-perma-free-my-reflections-after-100000-downloads-of-my-ebook/>.
35. Juris Dilevko and Keren Dali, "The Self-publishing Phenomenon and Libraries," *Library & Information Science Research*, 28 (2006) 210–211.
36. Thompson, *Book Wars*, 226–228.

37. Figures from queries sent the following publications: *London Times*, 830; *New York Review of Books*, 400; *Economist*, 200; *Times Literary Supplement*, 1,500; *London Review of Books*, 300; *New York Times Book Review*, 500. That makes a total of 3,730. Discounting by 20% for duplicate reviews, we get about 3,000 individual titles reviewed in the most prominent Anglophone outlets.

38. Joel Friedlander, "The Trouble with Word Processors," *The Book Designer* (19 January 2010), <https://www.thebookdesigner.com/2010/01/the-trouble-with-word-processors/>.

39. Stevan Harnad, "Scholarly Skywriting and the Prepublication Continuum of Scientific Inquiry," *Psychological Science*, 1, 6 (1990) 342.

40. Stevan Harnad, "Scholarly Journals at the Crossroads: A Subversive Proposal for Electronic Publishing," (27 June 1994), <https://web.archive.org/web/20020414062202/https://www.arl.org/scomm/subversive/sub01.html>.

41. Ginsparg, "First Steps towards Electronic Research Communication," 395.

42. Robert Cameron, "A Universal Citation Database as a Catalyst for Reform in Scholarly Communication," *First Monday*, 2, 4 (1997), <https://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/522/443>.

43. Budapest Open Access Initiative.

44. Baldwin, *Copyright Wars*, 366–367.

45. Ferwerda et al., *Landscape Study on Open Access*, 64.

46. <https://dissexpress.proquest.com/search.html>. ProQuest was bought by Clarivate, the indexers who calculate impact factors through their Web of Science, in December 2021 for \$5 billion: <https://clarivate.com/clarivate-proquest-acquisition/>.

47. <https://ethos.bl.uk>.

48. "American Historical Association Statement on Policies Regarding the Embargoing of Completed History PhD Dissertations," *Perspectives on History* (22 July 2013), <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/summer-2013/american-historical-association-statement-on-policies-regarding-the-embargoing-of-completed-history-phd-dissertations>; Scott Jaschik, "Embargoes for Dissertations?" *Inside Higher Ed* (24 July 2013), <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/07/24/historians-association-faces-criticism-proposal-embargo-dissertations>.

49. Joachim Schöpfel et al., "A French-German Survey of Electronic Theses and Dissertations: Access and Restrictions," *D-Lib Magazine*, 21, 3/4 (2015), <https://www.dlib.org/dlib/march15/schopfel/03schopfel.html#n6>.

50. "Business Model," <https://arxiv.org/about/reports-financials>; Poynder, "PloS ONE, Open Access, and the Future of Scholarly Publishing," 11.

51. My thanks to Lukas Richter for this point.

52. 53,000 registered in 2009. Beagrie, "Preservation, Trust, and Continuing Access for e-Journals," 6. A detailed account of the number of journals in Guédon, "Mixing and Matching the Green and Gold Roads to Open Access—Take Two," 43–44, and Michael Mabe, "The Growth and Number of Journals," *Serials*, 16, 2 (2003) 193, <https://serials.uksg.org/articles/abstract/10.1629/16191/>.

53. Priem and Hemminger, "Decoupling the Scholarly Journal."
54. Dorothy Bishop, "How to Bury Your Academic Writing," *BishopBlog* (26 August 2012), <http://deevybee.blogspot.com/2012/08/how-to-bury-your-academic-writing.html>.
55. Peter Binfield, "Open Access MegaJournals—Have They Changed Everything?" *Open Access Week* (23 October 2013), <https://creativecommons.org.nz/2013/10/open-access-megajournals-have-they-changed-everything/>.
56. <https://www.scielo.org/>.
57. Björk, "Have the 'Mega-journals' Reached the Limits to Growth?"
58. Binfield, "Open Access MegaJournals—Have They Changed Everything?"
59. Björk, "Have the 'Mega-journals' Reached the Limits to Growth?"
60. Wakeling et al., "Open-Access Mega-Journals."
61. "Criteria for Publication," *PLOS One*, <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/criteria-for-publication>.
62. Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 7.
63. Young et al., "Why Current Publication Practices May Distort Science."
64. Binfield, "Open Access MegaJournals—Have They Changed Everything?"
65. Guédon, "'Green' and 'Gold' Roads to Open Access."

## Chapter 9

1. Peter Baldwin, *Contagion and the State in Europe, 1830–1930* (Cambridge 2004) 461–462.
2. Phil Pochoda, "The Big One: The Epistemic System Break in Scholarly Monograph Publishing," *New Media & Society*, 15, 3 (2012) 362.
3. Tony Ross-Hellauer et al., "Survey on Open Peer Review: Attitudes and Experience amongst Editors, Authors and Reviewers," *PLOS One*, 12, 12 (2017).
4. David Pontille and Didier Torny, "Peer Review: Readers in the Making of Scholarly Knowledge," in Eve and Gray, eds., *Reassembling Scholarly Communications*, 116.
5. <https://mcpres.media-commons.org/plannedobsolescence/author/fitzpatrick/>.
6. Timothy Gowers, "The End of an Error? Considering the Alternatives to Formal Peer Review," *Times Literary Supplement* (24 October 2017).
7. Alla Katsnelson, "Microbe Gets Toxic Response," *Nature*, 462, 741 (2010), <https://www.nature.com/news/2010/101207/full/468741a.html>; Quirin Schiermeier, "Arsenic-loving Bacterium Needs Phosphorus After All," *Nature* (9 July 2012), <https://www.nature.com/news/arsenic-loving-bacterium-needs-phosphorus-after-all-1.10971>.
8. Ginsparg, "First Steps towards Electronic Research Communication," 390; Alessandro Delfanti and Nico Pitrelli, "Open Science: Revolution or Continuity?" in Albagli et al., *Open Science, Open Issues*, 63.

9. Richard Van Noorden, "Open Access: The True Cost of Science Publishing," *Nature*, 495, 7442 (2013), <https://www.nature.com/news/open-access-the-true-cost-of-science-publishing-1.12676>.

10. <https://scipost.org>.

11. Matthew Hutson, "Boycott Highlights AI's Publishing Rebellion," *Science*, 360, 6390 (2018) 699.

12. <http://www.ssrn.com/>.

13. <http://repec.org/>.

14. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/>.

15. Michael A. Johansson et al., "Preprints: An Underutilized Mechanism to Accelerate Outbreak Science," *PLOS Medicine*, 15, 4 (2018) 3, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002549>.

16. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_academic\\_journals\\_by\\_preprint\\_policy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_academic_journals_by_preprint_policy).

17. Christos Petrou, "Scientific Output in the Year of COVID, An Update," *Scholarly Kitchen* (23 February 2021), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2021/02/23/guest-post-scientific-output-in-the-year-of-covid-an-update/>.

18. [BioRxiv.org](https://www.biorxiv.org/) is one of the sites.

19. Kai Kupferschmidt, "'A Completely New Culture of Doing Research:' Coronavirus Outbreak Changes how Scientists Communicate," *Science* (26 February 2020), <https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2020/02/completely-new-culture-doing-research-coronavirus-outbreak-changes-how-scientists>.

20. Kupferschmidt, "Completely New Culture."

21. Li-Meng Yan et al., "Unusual Features of the SARS-CoV-2 Genome Suggesting Sophisticated Laboratory Modification Rather Than Natural Evolution and Delineation of Its Probable Synthetic Route," *Zenodo* (14 September 2020), <https://zenodo.org/record/4028830>. This was followed the next month with claims that it was a bioweapon. Li-Meng Yan et al., "SARS-CoV-2 Is an Unrestricted Bioweapon: A Truth Revealed through Uncovering a Large-Scale, Organized Scientific Fraud," *Zenodo* (8 October 2020), <https://zenodo.org/record/4073131>.

22. Takahiko Koyama et al., "Reviews of 'Unusual Features of the SARS-CoV-2 Genome Suggesting Sophisticated Laboratory Modification Rather Than Natural Evolution and Delineation of Its Probable Synthetic Route,'" *Rapid Reviews: COVID-19* (24 September 2020), <https://rapidreviewscovid19.mitpress.mit.edu/pub/78we86rp/release/2>.

23. Rob Kuznia et al., "Weird Science: How a 'Shoddy' Bannon-backed Paper on Coronavirus Origins Made its Way to an Audience of Millions," *CNN* (21 October 2020), <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/10/21/politics/coronavirus-lab-theory-yan-bannon-invs/index.html>; Craig Timberg, "Scientists Said Claims about China Creating the Coronavirus Were Misleading. They Went Viral Anyway," *Washington Post* (12 February 2021).

24. Ross-Hellauer et al., "Survey on Open Peer Review"; Mark Ware, "Peer Review: Benefits, Perceptions, and Alternatives," *PRC Summary Papers*, 4 (2008) 20,

[https://ils.unc.edu/courses/2015\\_fall/inls700\\_001/Readings/Ware2008-PRCPeerReview.pdf](https://ils.unc.edu/courses/2015_fall/inls700_001/Readings/Ware2008-PRCPeerReview.pdf).

25. "Number of New Car Models Offered in the U.S. Market from 2000 to 2020," *Statista*, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/200092/total-number-of-car-models-on-the-us-market-since-1990/>.

26. Phil LeBeau, "Americans Buying Fewer New Cars in Lifetime," *CNBC* (22 October 2012), <https://www.cnn.com/id/49504504>.

27. "Guess How Many Items the Average Grocery Shopper Buys in a Year," *Grocery and Retail News* (23 January 2014), <https://couponsinthenews.com/2014/01/23/guess-how-many-items-the-average-grocery-shopper-buys-in-a-year/>.

28. "How Many Books Does Amazon Have for Sale?" *Quora* (4 July 2014), <https://www.quora.com/How-many-books-does-Amazon-have-for-sale>.

29. Kerri Jarema, "This Is How Many Books the Average American Reads in a Year," *Bustle* (19 April 2018), <https://www.bustle.com/p/how-many-books-did-the-average-american-read-in-the-last-year-this-new-study-may-surprise-you-8837851>.

30. Michael J. Kurtz and Edwin A. Henneken, "Finding and Recommending Scholarly Articles," in Cronin and Sugimoto, eds., *Beyond Bibliometrics*, 245.

31. Michael Bhaskar, *The Content Machine: Towards a Theory of Publishing from the Printing Press to the Digital Network* (London 2013) 103.

32. Sherer, "Making OA Monographs More Discoverable."

33. Carol Tenopir et al., "Electronic Journals and Changes in Scholarly Article Seeking and Reading Patterns," *Aslib Proceedings*, 61, 1 (2009) 27, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/39728529\\_Electronic\\_Journals\\_and\\_Changes\\_in\\_Scholarly\\_Article\\_Seeking\\_and\\_Reading\\_Patterns](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/39728529_Electronic_Journals_and_Changes_in_Scholarly_Article_Seeking_and_Reading_Patterns).

34. Charles Duhigg, "How Companies Learn Your Secrets," *New York Times Magazine* (16 February 2012), <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/19/magazine/shopping-habits.html>.

35. Linyuan Lü et al., "Recommender Systems," arXiv (6 February 2012) 69, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1202.1112>.

36. Shirky, *Here Comes Everybody*, ch. 4; Charles Leadbeater, *We-Think: Mass Innovation, Not Mass Production* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; London 2009) xxvii.

37. Ziyad Marar, "Creating Scholarly Knowledge in the Digital Age," in Vincent and Wickham, eds., *Debating Open Access*, 84.

38. Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 59.

39. James A. Evans, "Electronic Publication and the Narrowing of Science and Scholarship," *Science*, 321, 5887 (2008).

40. Rousseau-Hans et al., "Les pratiques de publications et d'accès ouvert," 54.

41. Michael Bhaskar, *Curation: The Power of Selection in a World of Excess* (London 2016).

42. Marion B. Smith, "South Carolina and *The Gentleman's Magazine*," *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, 95, 2 (1994); Thomas Lilly, "The National Archive: Harper's New Monthly Magazine and the Civic Responsibilities of a Commercial Literary Periodical, 1850–1853," *American Periodicals*, 15, 2 (2005).



43. Regazzi, *Scholarly Communications*, 80.
44. <https://f1000.com/>. In January 2020, F1000 was bought by Taylor & Francis, a commercial publisher. It has now been folded into some sort of open-access platform run by Routledge: <https://think.f1000.com/routledgeopenresearch/>.
45. <https://www.ams.org/mr-database>.
46. JMIRx journals present themselves as diamond open access, asking no publication fees from authors, but in fact they do extract an article processing charge of \$1,000 through various subscription arrangements from member universities and other institutions. “What is JMIRx?” <https://support.jmir.org/hc/en-us/articles/360034752692>.
47. Tim Gowers, “Discrete Analysis—An arXiv Overlay Journal,” *Gower’s Weblog*, <https://gowers.wordpress.com/2015/09/10/discrete-analysis-an-arxiv-overlay-journal/>.
48. \$51 for a review of Jessica Goldberg, *Trade and Institutions in the Medieval Mediterranean* in the *English Historical Review*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24474127>, compared to \$40.99 for the book on Amazon, pointed out in Katie Phillips, “The Role of Book Reviews in the Academic Book Ecosystem,” *Arcadia* (August 2020), [https://zenodo.org/record/5533887#.YVc\\_dZrMK\\_A](https://zenodo.org/record/5533887#.YVc_dZrMK_A).
49. Ian Graber-Stiehl, “Science’s Pirate Queen,” *Verge* (8 February 2018), <https://www.theverge.com/2018/2/8/16985666/alexandra-elbakyan-sci-hub-open-access-science-papers-lawsuit>; Bastian Greshake, “Looking into Pandora’s Box: The Content of Sci-Hub and its Usage,” *F1000 Research* (21 April 2017), <https://f1000research.com/articles/6-541/v1>.
50. Daniel S. Himmelstein et al., “Sci-Hub Provides Access to Nearly All Scholarly Literature,” *eLife* (2018), <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.32822>.
51. Cooper and Rieger, *What’s the Big Deal?* 19.
52. John Bohannon, “Who’s Downloading Pirated Papers? Everyone,” *Science* (28 April 2016), <https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2016/04/whos-downloading-pirated-papers-everyone>.
53. [https://twitter.com/aj\\_boston/status/1492564765880770560](https://twitter.com/aj_boston/status/1492564765880770560).
54. The distinction arose in the early thirteenth century. Denis Duncan, *Index, A History of the* (London 2021) 51.
55. Steven Inchcoombe and Heinz Weinheimer, “A Few Words on Sound Science, Megajournals, and an Announcement about SpringerPlus,” *SpringerOpen Blog* (13 June 2016), <http://blogs.springeropen.com/springeropen/2016/06/13/a-few-words-on-sound-science-megajournals-and-an-announcement-about-springerplus/>.
56. Blair, *Too Much to Know*, 144.
57. Kevin Kelly, “Scan This Book!” *New York Times Magazine* (14 May 2006). Similar ideas in John Perry Barlow, “A Declaration of the Independence of Cyberspace” (8 February 1996), <https://projects.eff.org/~barlow/Declaration-Final.html>.
58. Back then, in 2012: Lauren Goode, “Citia Lets You Skip the Boring Stuff in E-books (And Get to the Important Parts),” *All Things D* (30 May 2012), <https://>

allthingsd.com/20120530/citia-lets-you-skip-the-boring-stuff-in-e-books-and-get-to-the-important-parts. Today: <https://www.citia.co/>.

59. Duncan, *Index, A History of the*, 72.

60. Third-wave economics, relying on masses of instant data, is an example. "Enter Third-Wave Economics," *Economist* (23 October 2021).

61. Some preliminary thoughts on this in Baldwin, "Betting on Vetting."

62. Bradley P. Dean and Gary Scharnhorst, "The Contemporary Reception of Walden," *Studies in the American Renaissance* (1990) 294, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30227595>.

63. Curtis N. Johnson, "Charles Darwin, Richard Owen, and Natural Selection: A Question of Priority," *Journal of the History of Biology*, 52, 1 (2019), <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29725900/>.

64. Rousseau-Hans et al., "Les pratiques de publications et d'accès ouvert," 53.

65. *Revision of Copyright Laws: Hearings before the Committee on Patents, House of Representatives (February–April 1936)* (Washington DC 1936) 718–719.

66. James H. Lubowitz et al., "Two of a Kind: Multiple Discovery AKA Simultaneous Invention Is the Rule," *Arthroscopy*, 34, 8 (2018), <https://www.arthroscopyjournal.org/action/showPdf?pii=S0749-8063%2818%2930498-5>.

67. Wikipedia has a long list of examples through the ages: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_multiple\\_discoveries](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_multiple_discoveries).

68. Frank Close, "How the Boson Got Higgs's Name," *Nature*, 465 (2010).

69. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/4%E2%80%B233%E2%80%B3#Precursors>.

70. *Revision of Copyright Laws: Hearings before the Committee on Patents, House of Representatives (February–April 1936)* 198.

71. PLOS, Criteria for Publication, <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/criteria-for-publication>.

72. Björk, "Have the 'Mega-journals' Reached the Limits to Growth?"; Spezi et al., "Open-access Mega-journals," 270.

73. HSBC Global Research, "Reed Elsevier," 26; Poynder, "PLOS ONE, Open Access, and the Future of Scholarly Publishing," 6.

74. Michael B. Eisen et al., "Peer Review: Implementing a 'Publish, Then Review' Model of Publishing," *eLife* (1 December 2020), <https://elifesciences.org/articles/64910>.

75. William Denton, "Fictional Footnotes and Indexes," *Miskatonic University Press* (6 January 2021), <https://www.miskatonic.org/footnotes.html>; Shari Benstock, "At the Margin of Discourse: Footnotes in the Fictional Text," *PMLA*, 98, 2 (1983).

76. Fitzpatrick, *Planned Obsolescence*, 35–37.

77. <http://en.paper.edu.cn/>; Changping Hu et al., "Exploring a New Model for Preprint Server: A Case Study of CSPO," *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 36, 3 (2010) 258.

78. Adam Eyre-Walker and Nina Stoletzki, "The Assessment of Science: The Relative Merits of Post-Publication Review, the Impact Factor, and the Number of

Citations," *PLOS Biology*, 11, 10 (2013), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3792863/>.

79. Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 53.

80. A mere 5% ten years ago. David Crotty, "Peer Review May Be Old and Imperfect, but It Still Works," *Scholarly Kitchen* (23 December 2010), <https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2010/12/23/davids-pick-for-2010-peer-review-may-be-old-and-imperfect-but-it-still-works/>.

81. Tyler Cowen, "Covid Improved How the World Does Science," *Bloomberg Opinion* (1 January 2021), <https://www.bloombergquint.com/business/covid-improved-how-the-world-does-science>.

## Chapter 10

1. William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge MA 1989) ch 4.

2. Hugh Bowden, *Classical Athens and the Delphic Oracle* (Cambridge 2005) 41.

3. McGurl, *Everything and Less*, 136.

4. Alperin, "Public Impact of Latin America's Approach to Open Access," 13.

5. Young et al., "Why Current Publication Practices May Distort Science."

6. 200 pages/book × 400 words/page is 176 billion in books. 5 pages × 1,000 words is 15 billion in articles. Let us say 200 billion words in round numbers.

7. 7.8 billion humans, of whom 74% are over 15 and 86% of them in turn literate, i.e., some 5 billion potential readers.

8. "Best-selling Print Books in the United States in 2020, by Unit Sales," <https://www.statista.com/statistics/324911/best-selling-trade-paperback-books-usa/>.

9. "U.S. Book Industry—Statistics & Facts" (10 November 2020), <https://www.statista.com/topics/1177/book-market/>.

10. Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 39.

11. Donald W. King et al., "Measuring Total Reading of Journal Articles," *D-Lib Magazine*, 12, 10 (2006), <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/october06/king/10king.html>.

12. Lars Wenaas, "Attracting New Users or Business as Usual? A Case Study of Converting Academic Subscription-based Journals to Open Access," *Quantitative Science Studies*, 2, 2 (2021), <https://direct.mit.edu/qss/article/2/2/474/97554/Attracting-new-users-or-business-as-usual-A-case>.

13. Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 131–32.

14. Nicola De Bellis, *Bibliometrics and Citation Analysis: From the Science Citation Index to Cybermetrics* (Lanham 2009) 294–300; Mark J. McCabe and Christopher M. Snyder, "Identifying the Effect of Open Access on Citations Using a Panel of Science Journals," *Economic Inquiry*, 52, 4 (2014), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/ecin.12064>; Bo-Christer Björk and David Solomon, "Open Access versus Subscription Journals: A Comparison of Scientific Impact," *BMC Medicine* (2012), <https://bmcmedicine.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1741-7015-10-73>; Mirjam Curno and Stephanie Oeben, "Scientific Excellence at Scale: Open Access

Journals Have a Clear Citation Advantage over Subscription Journals,” *Frontiers Science News* (11 July 2018), <https://blog.frontiersin.org/2018/07/11/scientific-excellence-at-scale-open-access-journals-have-a-clear-citation-advantage-over-subscription-journals/>.

15. Abhishek Nagaraj and Imke Reimers, “Digitization and the Demand for Physical Works: Evidence from the Google Books Project,” *SSRN* (4 March 2019), [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=3339524](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3339524).

16. OAPEN-CH, *Impact of Open Access on Scientific Monographs in Switzerland*, 44–45.

17. Ferwerda et al., *Project Exploring Open Access Monograph Publishing in the Netherlands*, 4.

18. Christina Emery et al., “The OA Effect: How Does Open Access Affect the Usage of Scholarly Books,” *Springer Nature* (7 November 2017), <https://resource-cms.springernature.com/springer-cms/rest/v1/content/15176744/data/v3>.

19. Vincent Larivière and Yves Gingras, “The Decline in the Concentration of Citations, 1900–2007,” <https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/0809/0809.5250.pdf>.

20. Barnes, “Cloistered Bookworms in the Chicken-Coop of the Muses,” 70.

21. Quoted in Blair, *Too Much to Know*, 55.

22. Umberto Eco, “Afterword,” in Geoffrey Nunberg, ed., *The Future of the Book* (Berkeley 1996) 301.

23. Michael Lesk, “How Much Information Is There in the World?” <https://lesk.com/mlesk/ksg97/ksg.html>.

24. Chip Walter, “Kryder’s Law: The Doubling of Processor Speed Every 18 Months Is a Snail’s Pace Compared with Rising Hard-disk Capacity, and Mark Kryder Plans to Squeeze in Even More Bits,” *Scientific American* (1 August 2005), <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/kryders-law/>. Some cautions on the slowing of this process occur in David S. H. Rosenthal et al., “The Economics of Long-Term Digital Storage” (2012), [https://web.stanford.edu/group/lockss/resources/2012-09\\_The\\_Economics\\_of\\_Long-Term\\_Digital\\_Storage.pdf](https://web.stanford.edu/group/lockss/resources/2012-09_The_Economics_of_Long-Term_Digital_Storage.pdf).

25. René Descartes, “Recherche de la vérité par la lumière naturelle,” Charles Adam and Paul Tannery, eds., *Oeuvres de Descartes* (Paris 1996) 10: 495–532, quoted in Blair, *Too Much to Know*, 5.

26. Dommann, *Authors and Apparatus*, 100–103.

27. Evan R. Risko et al., “On Retrieving Information from External Knowledge Stores: Feeling-of-findability, Feeling-of-knowing, and Internet Search,” *Computers in Human Behavior*, 65 (2016).

28. Daniel M. Wegner and Adrian F. Ward, “The Internet Has Become the External Hard Drive for Our Memories,” *Scientific American* (1 December 2013), <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-internet-has-become-the-external-hard-drive-for-our-memories/>; Betsy Sparrow et al., “Google Effects on Memory: Cognitive Consequences of Having Information at Our Fingertips,” *Science*, 333 (2011).

29. Plato, *Phaedrus* (trans. Robin Waterfield; Oxford 2002) 69; 274e–275b.

30. Elizabeth J. Marsh and Suparna Rajaram, "The Digital Expansion of the Mind: Implications of Internet Usage for Memory and Cognition," *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, 8 (2019) 6.
31. Huebner, *Macrocognition*, ch. 7.
32. Kenneth L. Carriveau, Jr., "A Brief History of E-Prints and the Opportunities They Open for Science Librarians," *Science & Technology Libraries*, 20, 2/3 (2001) 77.
33. Poynder, "PLOS ONE, Open Access, and the Future of Scholarly Publishing," 14.
34. Stevan Harnad, "British Academy Report on Peer Review and Metrics," *Open Access Archivangelism* (4 September 2007), <http://openaccess.eprints.org/index.php?archives/285-guid.html>.
35. E-mail from Springer Nature Group, 3 February 2021.
36. Wellcome Trust, *Costs and Business Models in Scientific Research Publishing* (April 2004) 3, [https://wellcome.org/sites/default/files/wtd003184\\_0.pdf](https://wellcome.org/sites/default/files/wtd003184_0.pdf); Stevan Harnad, "No-Fault Peer Review Charges: The Price of Selectivity Need Not Be Access Denied or Delayed," *D-Lib Magazine*, 16, 7/8 (2010), <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july10/harnad/07harnad.html>.
37. Thompson, *Book Wars*, 217.
38. Timothy Laquintano, *Mass Authorship and the Rise of Self-Publishing* (Iowa City 2016) 2.
39. Ann C. Weller, *Editorial Peer Review: Its Strengths and Weaknesses* (Medford NJ 2001) 64–65.
40. Campanario, "Consolation for the Scientist," 343.
41. Jaime A. Teixeira da Silva et al., "Establishing Sensible and Practical Guidelines for Desk Rejections," *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 24 (2018) 1352–1353.
42. Jan P. Vandembroucke, "Can the Quality of Peer Review Be Measured?" *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 47, 7 (1994) 822.
43. Kent R. Anderson, "BioRxiv: Trends and Analysis of Five Years of Preprints," *Learned Publishing*, 33 (2020).
44. Vincent Larivière et al., "ArXiv E-Prints and the Journal of Record: An Analysis of Roles and Relationships," *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 65, 6 (2014) 1161.
45. Ruijun Chen et al., "Publication and Reporting of Clinical Trial Results: Cross Sectional Analysis across Academic Medical Centers," *British Medical Journal*, 352 (2016); Christine Schmucker et al., "Extent of Non-Publication in Cohorts of Studies Approved by Research Ethics Committees or Included in Trial Registries," *PLOS One* (23 December 2014).
46. Regazzi, *Scholarly Communications*, 8.
47. Lin, "Why Serious Academic Fraud Occurs in China."
48. Jane Qiu, "Publish or Perish in China," *Nature*, 463 (2010), <https://www.nature.com/news/2010/100112/full/463142a.html>.
49. Lin and Zhan, "Trash Journals in China," 147.

50. Mara Hvistendahl, "China's Publication Bazaar," *Science*, 342, 6162 (2013), <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/342/6162/1035.full>.

51. Wei Quan et al., "Publish or Impoverish: An Investigation of the Monetary Reward System of Science in China (1999–2016)," *Aslib Journal of Information Management* (18 September 2017), <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/AJIM-01-2017-0014/full/html>.

52. One scholar has published 275 articles, of which 150 have not yet been cited and may never be. Nonetheless he has an h-index of 37; that is, 37 articles that have been cited at least 37 times. So this is a better measure of his worth than the bulk of his article numbers. Lin and Zhan, "Trash Journals in China," 152.

53. Macdonald and Kam, "Aardvark et Al," 706.

54. Linda Butler, "Explaining Australia's Increased Share of ISI Publications: The Effects of a Funding Formula Based on Publication Counts," *Research Policy*, 32, 1 (2003), <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0048733302000070?via%3Dihub>.

55. Dragan Djuric, "Penetrating the Omerta of Predatory Publishing: The Romanian Connection," *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 21 (2015).

56. Vaclav Stetka, "Battling Predators in Prague: A Case Study of the Rise and Effects of the Predatory Publishing Model," Punctum Books, ed., *Predatory Publishing*, 6–7.

57. Fran M. Collyer, "Global Patterns in the Publishing of Academic Knowledge: Global North, Global South," *Current Sociology*, 66, 1 (2018) 67.

58. Marco Seeber et al., "Self-citations as Strategic Response to the Use of Metrics for Career Decisions," *Research Policy*, 48, 2 (2019).

59. Mark W. J. Ferguson, "Do Judge: Treat Metrics Only as Surrogates," *Nature* (26 October 2016), <https://www.nature.com/news/fewer-numbers-better-science-1.20858>.

60. An example from the fifteenth century: Diane Owen Hughes, "Sumptuary Law and Social Relations in Renaissance Italy," in John Bossy, ed., *Disputes and Settlements* (Cambridge 1983) 94.

61. Poynder, "PLoS ONE, Open Access, and the Future of Scholarly Publishing," 27.

62. David Nicholas et al., "Peer Review: Still King in the Digital Age," *Learned Publishing*, 28, 1 (2015) 15, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1087/20150104>. Even those who make a living from publishing it: Timo Hannay, "Stop the Deluge of Science Research," *Guardian* (5 August 2014), <https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/blog/2014/aug/05/why-we-should-publish-less-scientific-research>.

63. Eve, *Open Access and the Humanities*, 112; Bacevic and Muellerleile, "Moral Economy of Open Access," 179.

64. Altbach and de Wit, "Too Much Academic Research Is Being Published."

65. Giulia M. Dotti Sani and Judith Treas, "Educational Gradients in Parents' Child-Care Time across Countries, 1965–2012," *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 78, 4 (2016), <https://archive.org/details/sani602561/mode/2up>.

66. John Robert Warren, "How Much Do You Have to Publish to Get a Job in a Top Sociology Department? Or to Get Tenure? Trends over a Generation," *Sociological Science* (27 February 2019), <https://sociologicalscience.com/articles-v6-7-172/>.

67. William J. Broad, "The Publishing Game: Getting More for Less," *Science*, 211 (1981) 1137.

68. "The Cost of Salami Slicing," *Nature Materials*, 4, 1 (2005), <https://www.nature.com/articles/nmat1305>.

69. Baldi, "Normative versus Social Constructivist Processes in the Allocation of Citations," 841.

70. Lutz Bornmann and Hans-Dieter Daniel, "Multiple Publication of a Single Research Study: Does it Pay?" *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 58, 8 (2007).

71. Uta Frith, "Fast Lane to Slow Science," *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 24, 1 (2020), [https://www.cell.com/trends/cognitive-sciences/fulltext/S1364-6613\(19\)30242-6?\\_returnURL=https%3A%2F%2Flinkinghub.elsevier.com%2Fretrieve%2Fpii%2FS1364661319302426%3Fshowall%3Dtrue](https://www.cell.com/trends/cognitive-sciences/fulltext/S1364-6613(19)30242-6?_returnURL=https%3A%2F%2Flinkinghub.elsevier.com%2Fretrieve%2Fpii%2FS1364661319302426%3Fshowall%3Dtrue).

72. J. L. Austin, "Three Ways of Spilling Ink," *Philosophical Review*, 75, 4 (1966), for example.

73. Poynder, "PLoS ONE, Open Access, and the Future of Scholarly Publishing," 28–29.

74. Quoted in Blair, *Too Much to Know*, 18.

75. *Accessibility, Sustainability, Excellence*, 21; Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 25. This tallies broadly with a figure of one million publishing annually. Regazzi, *Scholarly Communications*, 5.

76. Katy Börner, *Atlas of Science: Visualizing What We Know* (Cambridge MA 2010) 4.

77. *UNESCO Science Report: Towards 2030* (Paris 2015) table 1.4, <https://en.unesco.org/unescoscience-report>.

78. Zie et al., "China's Rise as a Major Contributor to Science and Technology," 9437, 9440.

79. Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 38.

80. Fanelli and Larivière, "Researchers' Individual Publication Rate."

81. Alison Flood, "UK Publishes More Books per Capita Than Any Other Country, Report Shows," *Guardian* (22 October 2014), <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2014/oct/22/uk-publishes-more-books-per-capita-million-report>.

82. Mary Nell Bryant, "English Language Publication and the British Traditional Market Agreement," *Library Quarterly*, 49, 4 (1979).

83. International Publishers Association, *Annual Report 2015–2016*, table 2, [https://www.internationalpublishers.org/images/reports/Annual\\_Report\\_2016/IPA\\_Annual\\_Report\\_2015-2016\\_interactive.pdf](https://www.internationalpublishers.org/images/reports/Annual_Report_2016/IPA_Annual_Report_2015-2016_interactive.pdf).



84. Nicholas et al., "Peer Review: Still King in the Digital Age," 15.
85. Hazel Rose Markus and Barry Schwartz, "Does Choice Mean Freedom and Well-Being?" *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37 (2010); David S. Ackerman et al., "Having Many Choice Options Seems Like a Great Idea, but . . ." *Journal of Marketing Education*, 36, 3 (2014); Frank Schilbach et al., "The Psychological Lives of the Poor," *American Economic Review*, 106, 5 (2016).
86. Ginsparg, "First Steps towards Electronic Research Communication," 394.
87. Gjerløw, "Peer Review, DORA, and Science."
88. Baldwin, *Copyright Wars*, 338.
89. Susan D. Blum, *My Word! Plagiarism and College Culture* (Ithaca 2010).
90. Serbian conditions are similar: Zorana Suvakovic, "Serbia's Degree Mills," *Aljazeera* (25 July 2014), <https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2014/7/25/serbias-degree-mills>. Even Putin apparently plagiarized his way to an advanced degree. Julie Corwin, "Russia: U.S. Academics Charge Putin With Plagiarizing Thesis," *Radio Free Europe* (27 March 2006), <https://www.rferl.org/a/1067113.html>.
91. <https://www.vroniplag.de/>.
92. 68% of the House and 77% of the Senate have post-BA degrees. Congressional Research Service, "Membership of the 116th Congress: A Profile" (17 December 2020), 5, <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/misc/R45583.pdf>. About the same number have PhDs in the UK and US: 25 Representatives and Senators, 21 MPs in 2012: "How Many Sitting UK MPs Who Hold a PhD Degree?" *Student Room*, <https://www.thestudentroom.co.uk/showthread.php?t=2204934>.
93. Over 40% of MPs have studied politics, English, philosophy, or history. "MPs and Their Degrees: Here's Where and What Our UK Politicians Studied," *Studee* (13 December 2019), <https://studee.com/media/mps-and-their-degrees-media/>. Only 17% in a recent parliament had STEM degrees. "MPs with Both an Educational and Occupational Background in STEM Are the Most Likely to Demonstrate Engagement with STEM Issues in Parliament," *LSE British Politics and Policy* (9 August 2021), <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/stem-mps-pmbs/>. Only 10% have postgraduate qualifications: Rebecca Montacute and Tim Carr, "Parliamentary Privilege: The MPs in 2017," Sutton Trust, *Research Brief*, 18 (2017), [https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Parliamentary-privilege-2017\\_FINAL-1.pdf](https://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Parliamentary-privilege-2017_FINAL-1.pdf).

## Conclusion

1. Stephen Pinfield et al., *Open Access in Theory and Practice: The Theory-Practice Relationship and Openness* (Milton Park 2021) 176.
2. Yochai Benkler, *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom* (New Haven 2007).
3. Jennifer Sinor, "One Size Doesn't Fit All in Open Access," *Chronicle of Higher Education* (24 March 2014), [https://www.chronicle.com/article/one-size-doesnt-fit-all-in-open-access/?cid=gen\\_sign\\_in](https://www.chronicle.com/article/one-size-doesnt-fit-all-in-open-access/?cid=gen_sign_in).

4. HSBC Global Research, "Reed Elsevier," 25.
5. 17 USC Sect 101. McSherry, *Who Owns Academic Work?* ch. 3.
6. Harvard University, Office of Technology Development, "Statement of Policy in Regard to Intellectual Property (IP Policy)," <https://otd.harvard.edu/faculty-inventors/resources/policies-and-procedures/statement-of-policy-in-regard-to-intellectual-property/#inventions-and-patents>.
7. Todd F. Simon, "Faculty Writings: Are They 'Works Made for Hire' under the 1976 Copyright Act?" *Journal of College and University Law*, 9, 4 (1982–83) 496.
8. Reichman, "Computer Programs as Applied Scientific Know-How," 676.
9. The Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act and Bayh-Dole Act. Rebecca S. Eisenberg, "Public Research and Private Development: Patents and Technology Transfer in Government-Sponsored Research," *Virginia Law Review*, 82, 8 (1996) 1665.
10. Reichman, "Computer Programs as Applied Scientific Know-How," 645–646; Steven C. Ward, *Neoliberalism and the Global Restructuring of Knowledge and Education* (New York 2012) 92; Malhar N. Kumar, "Ethical Conflicts in Commercialization of University Research in the Post-Bayh-Dole Era," *Ethics & Behavior*, 20, 5 (2010) 325.
11. In 2009, four-year colleges in the US had a staff of 3.7 million. With enrollments of almost 13 million in 2009 and an average tuition of \$21,657, that suggests an annual income from this source alone of \$280 billion. Added to that were approximately \$60 billion in federal and private R&D funding in 2011. In 2013, the motion picture and recording industries employed 388,000 people. The industries' gross intake was \$61.2 billion in 2010. Figures from: Institute of Education Sciences Digest of Education Statistics, 2011 Tables and Figures, [http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d11/tables/dt11\\_196.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d11/tables/dt11_196.asp); Congressional Research Service memo from Sue Kirchhoff (9 December 2011) at <http://www.techdirt.com/articles/20111212/02244817037/congressional-research-service-shows-hollywood-is-thriving.shtml>; US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Industries at a Glance*; Motion Picture and Sound Recording Industries: NAICS 512; Workforce Statistics: Employment, Unemployment, and Layoffs; Employment, all employees (seasonally adjusted), <http://www.bls.gov/iag/tgs/iag512.htm#workforce>.
12. US Office of Government Ethics, "Book Deals Involving Government Employees" (6 March 2008) 3, [https://www.oge.gov/web/oge.nsf/News+Releases/7A40ADA00743E87D852585BA005BECD7/\\$FILE/DO-08-006%20\(1\)\\_.pdf](https://www.oge.gov/web/oge.nsf/News+Releases/7A40ADA00743E87D852585BA005BECD7/$FILE/DO-08-006%20(1)_.pdf).
13. Samuel E. Trosow, "Copyright Protection for Federally Funded Research: Necessary Incentive or Double Subsidy?" (7 September 2003) 80, [http://publish.uwo.ca/~strosow/Sabo\\_Bill\\_Paper.pdf](http://publish.uwo.ca/~strosow/Sabo_Bill_Paper.pdf).
14. Pamela A. Kilby, "The Discouragement of Learning: Scholarship Made for Hire," *Journal of College and University Law*, 21, 3 (1994) 474.
15. Bacevic and Muellerleile, "Moral Economy of Open Access," 180.
16. House of Commons Business, Innovation and Skills Committee, *Open Access: Fifth Report of Session 2013–14*, i, 13.
17. Guédon, "Open Access: Toward the Internet of the Mind," 15.

18. Which is why we have books extolling the virtues of amateurship: Andy Merrifield, *The Amateur: The Pleasures of Doing What You Love* (London 2017).

19. <https://doaj.org/>.

20. Alfred J. Lotka, "The Frequency Distribution of Scientific Productivity," *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences*, 12, 16 (1926).

21. On other similar measures: De Bellis, *Bibliometrics and Citation Analysis*, ch. 4. There are between 7 and 8 million researchers, of whom about 20% are repeat authors. Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 25. Similar figures here: Mabe, "Growth and Number of Journals," 193.

22. Ian Rowlands, "Emerald Authorship Data, Lotka's Law and Research Productivity," *AsLib Proceedings*, 57, 1 (2005), [https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/00012530510579039/full/html?casa\\_token=fasNnMYjzszAAAA:kzTO40e6njqjF\\_NIecKnF58lqwkWCRBXXuj4p-he-ZMCWC5GGWYjC-Gzwt7dc6RXx04W41iDVk7SSDfzK\\_o\\_aMge5tW3hFyaRgonF7kY-xuMJ1l-yYo](https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/00012530510579039/full/html?casa_token=fasNnMYjzszAAAAA:kzTO40e6njqjF_NIecKnF58lqwkWCRBXXuj4p-he-ZMCWC5GGWYjC-Gzwt7dc6RXx04W41iDVk7SSDfzK_o_aMge5tW3hFyaRgonF7kY-xuMJ1l-yYo). And see Isaiah T. Arkin, "Science, Music, Literature and the One-hit Wonder Connection," *Research Trends* (March 2011), <https://www.researchtrends.com/issue22-march-2011/science-music-literature-and-the-one-hit-wonder-connection/>.

23. H. Kretschmer and R. Rousseau, "Author Inflation Leads to a Breakdown of Lotka's Law," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 52 8 (2001) 610–614.

24. Solomon and Björk, "Publication Fees in Open Access Publishing," 101.

25. Mellon Foundation, *Pay it Forward*, 29.

26. UK Research and Innovation, "UKRI Open Access Policy" (6 August 2021) Annex 1, <https://www.ukri.org/publications/ukri-open-access-policy/>.

27. "Wellcome Trust Extends Open Access Policy to Include Scholarly Monographs and Book Chapters" (29 May 2013), <https://wellcome.org/press-release/wellcome-trust-extends-open-access-policy-include-scholarly-monographs-and-book>.

28. Moore, "Revisiting 'the 1990s Debutante.'"

29. <https://www.doabooks.org/>; Ferwerda et al., *Landscape Study on Open Access*, 21.

30. Colin Steele, "Open Access in Australia: An Odyssey of Sorts?" *UKSG Insights* 26, 3 (2013) 282–289, <http://doi.org/10.1629/2048-7754.91>.

31. Roxanne Missingham, "University Presses Decline to Decline: New Models Down Under," *CAUL Publishing* (30 November 2015), <https://caullibrarypublishing.wordpress.com/2015/11/30/university-presses-decline-to-decline-new-models-down-under/>.

32. Janneke Adema and Graham Stone, *Changing Publishing Ecologies: A Landscape Study of New University Presses and Academic-Lead Publishing* (Jisc nd) 8, <https://repository.jisc.ac.uk/6666/1/Changing-publishing-ecologies-report.pdf>.

33. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/open-research/open-access/oa-book-pilot-flip-it-open>.

34. <https://www.leverpress.org/about>.

35. <https://www.intechopen.com/>.
36. More on European open access publishing: Mounier, "‘Publication Favela’ or Bibliodiversity?"
37. Some of these are collected together as Scholarled: <https://scholarled.org/#overview>. Similar is Radical Open Access: <http://radicaloa.disruptivemedia.org.uk/>.
38. Agata Morka and Rupert Gatti, *Academic Libraries and Open Access Books in Europe* (OPERAS, January 2021) 27, 48, <https://copim.pubpub.org/academic-libraries-and-open-access-books-in-europe-a-landscape-study>.
39. Adema and Stone, *Changing Publishing Ecologies*, 56.
40. The Library Publishing Coalition, <https://librarypublishing.org/>.
41. Adema and Stone, *Changing Publishing Ecologies*, 9–10. Or one in six, depending on whom you ask: Anthony Cond, "The University Press and the Academic Book of the Future," in Rebecca E. Lyons and Samantha J. Rayner, eds., *The Academic Book of the Future* (Basingstoke 2016) 47, <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1057%2F9781137595775>.
42. Lorcan Dempsey, "Library Collections in the Life of the User: Two Directions," *LIBER Quarterly*, 26, 4 (2016), <https://www.liberquarterly.eu/articles/10.18352/lq.10170/>.
43. Bosman et al., *Open Access Diamond Journals Study*, 8, 40, 100, 110.
44. Potts et al., "A Journal Is a Club," 78.
45. London Economics, *Economic Analysis of Business Models for Open Access Monographs: Annex 4 to the Report of the HEFC Monographs and Open Access Project* (January 2015) 16, <https://re.ukri.org/documents/hefce-documents/mono-annex-4-economic-analysis-pdf/>.
46. Phillips, "Role of Book Reviews in the Academic Book Ecosystem."
47. Kieñć, "Authors from the Periphery Countries Choose Open Access More Often"; Johnson et al., *STM Report*, 80.
48. Alessandra Tosi, "Professor Lionel Gossman: In Memoriam," <https://blogs.openbookpublishers.com/professor-lionel-gossman-in-memoriam/>. My own attempt to set a good example was less successful. Only after coming to an agreement with Princeton University Press to release a recent book in an open-access edition two years after publication did I notice that the press has no such program. After the agreed-upon interval, they sent me a PDF, satisfied that they had kept their end of the bargain. It is now available at <https://archive.org/details/BaldwinCopyrightCCBYNCND> or <https://directory.doabooks.org/handle/20.500.12854/44072>.
49. <https://www.openbookpublishers.com/section/101/1>.
50. <https://press.anu.edu.au/publications/series/peacebuilding-compared/macrocriminology-and-freedom>.
51. <https://press.anu.edu.au/publications/regulatory-theory>.
52. <https://www.uclpress.co.uk/pages/statistics>.

53. “A Not So Direct #OpenEd17 Reflection: Openwrapping,” Scott Robison (18 October 2017), <http://scottrobison.net/blog/2017/10/18/a-not-so-direct-opened17-reflection-openwrapping/>.

54. Lindsay McKenzie, “Big Read-and-Publish Push Arrives,” *Inside Higher Ed* (1 April 2021), <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2021/04/01/cambridge-university-press-strikes-deals-open-access>. CUP’s handsome profits, bested only by OUP, help finance the university. Though doubtless a worthy cause, that does not make its output cheaper or more available.



This is a section of [doi:10.7551/mitpress/14887.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/14887.001.0001)

# Athena Unbound

## Why and How Scholarly Knowledge Should Be Free for All

By: Peter Baldwin

### Citation:

*Athena Unbound: Why and How Scholarly Knowledge Should Be Free for All*

By: Peter Baldwin

DOI: [10.7551/mitpress/14887.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/14887.001.0001)

ISBN (electronic): 9780262373968

Publisher: The MIT Press

Published: 2023

The open access edition of this book was made possible by generous funding and support from the author



The MIT Press



© 2023 Peter Baldwin

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

Subject to such license, all rights are reserved.



The MIT Press would like to thank the anonymous peer reviewers who provided comments on drafts of this book. The generous work of academic experts is essential for establishing the authority and quality of our publications. We acknowledge with gratitude the contributions of these otherwise uncredited readers.

This book was set in ITC Stone Serif Std and ITC Stone Sans Std by New Best-set Typesetters Ltd.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Baldwin, Peter, 1956– author.

Title: Athena unbound : why and how scholarly knowledge should be free for all / Peter Baldwin.

Description: Cambridge, Massachusetts : The MIT Press, [2023] |

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2022027103 (print) | LCCN 2022027104 (ebook) |

ISBN 9780262048002 (hardcover) | ISBN 9780262373951 (epub) |

ISBN 9780262373968 (pdf)

Subjects: LCSH: Open access publishing. | Scholarly electronic publishing.

Classification: LCC Z286.O63 B35 2023 (print) | LCC Z286.O63 (ebook) |

DDC 070.5/7973—dc23/eng/20220628

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2022027103>

LC ebook record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2022027104>

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1