Introduction: Open Divide Emerges as Open Access Unfolds

Ulrich Herb, Joachim Schöpfel

Introduction: Open Divide Emerges as Open Access Unfolds

Ulrich Herb and Joachim Schöpfel

Thirty years have passed since *New Horizons in Adult Education*, the first online peer-reviewed journal, was launched by the Syracuse University Kellogg Project. Fifteen years have passed since the first notable declaration on Open Access, the Declaration of the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI). It seems it is time to risk a critical review of Open Access, a time when Open Access is being renegotiated.

Open Access was at its beginning, if we could date it to the year 1987 or 2001, a rather simple undertaking that knew only one imperative – disseminate scientific publications as quickly as possible without paying any licensing fee. Much has changed since. Whilst *New Horizons in Adult Education* was founded on the initiative of scientists, in 2002 research sponsors and libraries had already discovered Open Access for themselves and, at the latest with the purchase of the Open-Access publishing house Biomed Central in 2008, also the commercial publishers. But their material interests were opposed: while librarians and funders considered Open Access as a way to render scientific information less expensive and to make savings on the library budget, publishers learned how to make money with Open Access, even more money than with the subscription model alone.

Even the definition of what Open Access could be has become more and more differentiated. While the BOAI was still just trying to distinguish between Green Open Access and Gold Open Access, there are the 2017 terms such as Hybrid Open Access, Platinum Open Access, Bronze Open Access and numerous grey areas of Open Access, such as when scientists post articles on social networks or publishers provide articles for free online reading without the possibility of printing or downloading them. This confusion corresponds to on-going battles for the definition of supposedly true Open Access. These discussions are interwoven with licensing issues, which are also reflected in (from the perspective of 1987) subtle distinctions in Free, Libre or True Open Access.

However, these differentiations are not navel-gazing. The confusion over concepts should not mask the reality. They have substantial consequences, for example, if the paid Gold Open Access and its appreciation by research funders push the commercialisation of Open Access and put dubious publishing practices such as predatory publishing on the agenda. The also encountered preference for the provision of texts under licences that emulate open source conditions is frightening for Humanities scholars who are already struggling with the free provision of texts and are also sometimes unfamiliar with Open Access because there are comparably few attractive Open Access publication options for books.

There is no such thing as the one and only Open Access, which is more evident today than ever. Open Access is differentiated and at the same time integrated into social and economic patterns, interests and developments. These differentiations, as well as the social and economic agendas attached to them, are sometimes accompanied by authoritarian or administrative measures and lead to conflicts. The lines of confrontation are no longer as clear as they were in 2002 when research funders, scientists and libraries formed a coalition against commercial publishers, and today we find that all these actors form alliances with varying arrangements that are both applauded and criticized.

Something has gone wrong, and the stakes have changed. Thirty years ago, there was a problem with access to information. Today, we have a problem with publishing and moreover, with the control and governance about the whole scientific process and output. Former inequalities remain. New inequalities are emerging. Is open access the beginning of a new and more egalitarian episode of scientific communication? Or is it just another Trojan horse for some private companies to extend their control on the Big Data of science? Open Divide is dedicated to these conflicts and upheavals in Open Access. The book has two parts. The first part deals with general questions of Open Access while the second shifts the focus on Open Access in the Global South.

At the beginning of the first part, Jutta Haider (Lund) confronts us with the question as to whether Open Access, driven by economic interests, will become an instrument for the evaluation of, control within and over science. Based on a critical evaluation of recent European initiatives, she states that Open Access has been turned into an indicator, one amongst others, to motivate researchers and to

assess their performance and that a significant part of open access and open science has become a part of a drive towards further economization and privatization of a vast and diverse field of publicly funded knowledge production. New initiatives, disruption and transition are also the topic of the following paper. Elena Šimukovič (Vienna) critically reflects on the dominant discussion of Gold Open Access and argues for plurality of options that might even take – as the author puts it - deviant directions. Otherwise, she warns, Open Access might simply replace the "pay-to-read" barrier with a "pay-to-say" barrier.

Samuel Moore (London) shows the different meanings of, expectations of and interests in Open Access related to the diverse semantics of the concept of openness. There are many diverse approaches espousing the open philosophy, and perhaps this means that 'the open' has a more complicated relationship with the political than meets the eye. He argues that openness does have a real basis outside of neoliberalism and that it is an approach or process that requires careful articulation in an un-decidable terrain. Joachim Schöpfel (Lille) points out that while Open Access started as a grassroots initiative, it was subject to fundamental change. Nowadays it is driven by commercial, institutional and political interests and this development may produce dysfunctional patterns, new barriers and digital divides. The following paper by Ulrich Herb (Saarbrücken) states that these new barriers (unintentionally and at the same time intentionally) also serve to produce exclusivity and prestige for scientific institutions.

Soenke Zehle (Saarbrücken) gives a constructive and optimistic finale to the first part of Open Divide that deals with critical issues of Open Access. His text describes economic, social and political strategies for an economy of shared ownership and collective self-organization. He opens the perspective on "cooperative futures" and observes that the interest in new forms of cooperation is driven largely by similar concerns, searching for ways of collaboration that allow a much higher degree of individual and collective self-determination to pursue shared concerns and to progress towards a "cosmopolitics of the common".

The second part of our book focuses on the implications of Open Access for the digital divide between the Global North and South. This part opens with an overview on the situation of Open Access in the Global South by Hélène Prost (Nancy) and Joachim Schöpfel (Lille). Based on figures from directories and databases, they try to answer the question whether repositories and Open Access journals change the situation of unequal scientific production. Florence Piron (Montreal) continues this discussion, reporting from Haiti and Francophone Africa where Open Access can become a tool of neo-colonialism if it only provides better access to the science from the North without becoming an instrument of emancipation. She is convinced that African university libraries, if better funded and their staff better trained in digital open access technologies, could play a major role in locating, archiving and preserving local scientific documents as well as in the management of these archives, and she reminds that African and Haitian students may have other referents or ideals than the Harvard model; thus, Open Access could be a way to discover the scientific and cognitive heritage of their country in order to gain confidence in their ability to create knowledge relevant to their community. Iryna Kuchma (Vilnius) also sheds light on the impact of Open Access in the Global South but with particular attention to collaborative Open Access initiatives. Based on years of practical experience with the Electronic Information for Libraries (EIFL) foundation, her paper is a powerful argument in favor of global networking. Elizabeth Mlambo (Harare) identifies the challenges that the Global South has faced in relation to Open Access, benefits that have arisen for the Global South and the different approaches to Open Access by the Global North and how it has also benefited from the Global South. She is persuaded that open access is now firmly part of the global knowledge creation and dissemination landscape and that African researches can now generate a much more needed visibility and reach wider audiences. But she warns that with the Global North dominating the scene, there is a danger of drowning out scholarship from the Global South if the playing field remains uneven. Beatriz de los Arcos and Martin Weller from the Open University (Milton Keynes) broaden the perspective of Open Access to Open Educational Resources (OER) and discuss the extent to which a digital divide between the Global South and North can be identified also in terms of the production and sharing of OER content. Their conviction is that sharing behaviour needs to be fostered, facilitated and celebrated by North and South alike, for the discussion to become an honest reflection on how much we are taking and how much we are giving back, instead of an imbalanced and negatively-laden assumption of roles in open education. Reggie Raju (Cape Town) takes the perspective of the Global

South semantically. He differentiates between the social Open Access components of the Global North, in the form of social justice on the one hand and Ubuntu on the other hand, a Zulu word for advancing communal justice in order to promote an egalitarian society. In his words, Ubuntu, social justice and open access are all part of the same continuum, that is, a continuum towards an egalitarian society – a society that is not compromised by the lack of access to information to meet its development needs.

Our book concludes with an interview with Leslie Chan (Toronto), one of the first signatories of the Budapest Open Initiative Declaration, which gives a resume on Open Access development and explains Chan's initial interest in Open Access in the early 90's. This arose not because of the lack of access to scientific information from high-priced subscription journals, but because of the lack of knowledge about high-quality literature from the Global South. The effort to remedy this deficiency led to the launching of Bioline International, a recognised market leader in the provision of Open Access to peer reviewed bioscience journals published in developing countries. The interview also reports on similar initiatives such as Medknow or SciELO, criteria for their success or failure and the extent to which citation impact and Altmetrics discriminate against scholarly publications from the Global South.

All contributions are attempting to present a *panopticon* of Open Access, which on the one hand sheds light on the inherent and potentially critical nature of Open Access and on the other hand examines the effects of Open Access on the exchange of scientific information and privileges between the Global North and South. Obviously this book deals with conflicts in and around Open Access - conflicts, which also accompanied the work on Open Divide and which led to the fact that not all of the articles initially planned became part of the volume. This applies for example, to an article on "predatory publishing" (Jeffrey Beall) and its impact on Open Access, as a form of "parody"[1] of the commercial journal publishing itself. There is also a lack of other urgent topics: for example, a critical analysis of the economic and financial aspects of Open Access, a contribution to the function of a public good such as Open Access for the large media companies, or an even deeper analysis of the relationship between Open Access and evaluation, even though the last topic is addressed by Jutta Haider and Leslie Chan. It seems that already in December 2017 there will be enough material for a continuation of Open Divide.

The World Wide Web with its new technologies and tools and its culture of sharing and common goods enables the academic and research institutions to do science in a different way than before. Open science has become the new paradigm of public research. Last year, the Member States of the European Union endorsed the so-called *Amsterdam Call for Action on Open Science*, which established two major goals, i.e. full open access for all publicly-funded scientific publications should be achieved by 2020, and open data should be the standard for all publicly funded research.[2] The European Council published at the end of May 2016 a statement where the Member States agree "that the results of publicly funded research should be made available in an as open as possible manner and (…) that unnecessary legal, organizational and financial barriers to access results of publicly funded research should be removed as much as possible"; moreover they welcome "open access to scientific publications as the option by default for publishing the results of publicly funded research".[3]

In September 2017, the G7 Open Science Working group, representing seven top-ranked advanced economies with the highest national wealth (United States, Japan, Germany, UK, France, Italy and Canada), expressed concerns about the speed and coherence of the transition towards open science[4]. Open and unrestricted access for a large audience to academic works is one major part of this transition. Fourteen years ago, the Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities, a milestone of the open access movement, defined open access as a "comprehensive source of human knowledge and cultural heritage that has been approved by the scientific community" and required the "active commitment of each and every individual producer of scientific knowledge and holder of cultural heritage (including) original scientific research results, raw data and metadata, source materials, digital representations of pictorial and graphical materials and scholarly multimedia material".[5]

In 2017, open access has become a significant vector of scientific communication, via an ever-increasing number of books, journals, repositories and content providers, including publishers and social media. The Bielefeld Academic Search Engine (BASE) indexes more than 116 million resources from nearly 6,000 content providers, with about 60% items freely available. Other figures

confirm the dramatic growth of OA.[6] Open access is part of our reality and is here to stay, definitively. There is no way back behind the pay walls. But as a part of our reality, open access also shares and reflects existing inequalities and divides. All the authors believe in the positive qualities and promises of open access. However, they also express worries and reservations about dysfunctional developments and risks of even more inequalities between rich institutions, organizations and countries which can afford the costs of access scientific information AND the transition to open access via offsetting agreements and expensive article processing charges, and all the others that cannot.
It is time for a critical assessment of open access, of its dialectics, contradictions and ambivalences. Our book is just a beginning. It is dedicated to all those who need scientific information and who share the conviction that research results are common public goods that should be disseminated and available without any restriction. Perhaps we should just stop talking about open access and start to address the underlying, real issue of control and governance of public research.