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The Cultures

Humanities:
- excellence measured by scholarly monographs
- SM materiality is marketable
- Classicist mentality: SM creates maximum impact by identifying and strengthening author image

»Hard» and SocScis:
- excellence measured by journal publishing
- Journal articles’ materiality is not a selling point
- Postmodernist mentality: JA in OA creates maximum impact by being freely available
De-Culturing Humanities Research:
The EC OA pilot project 2008-13

• Funding OA projects: 2007/08 50 Mio € for digital repositories, 25 Mio € for research on digital archiving, 10 Mio € for enabling interoperability and multilingual use of digital archives

• 2008 pilot projet: contractual obligation of EC grant beneficiaries to publish OA

• Includes only peer-reviewed journal publications, no monographs.
Viewpoints: Theory of Science

• Karl Popper: Scientific methods and results are per se of public character
  – The Crusoe paradigm

• Robert K. Merton: The four institutional imperatives of scientific ethos:
  – Universalism
  – Communism
  – Disinterestedness
  – Organized scepticism
Viewpoints: Theory of Science on SM

»Whoever these days publishes a scholarly monograph in print and in print only, *actively keeps his or her scientific methods and results a secret from the public."

Gerhard Fröhlich at the Open Access conference in Konstanz, Oct 2009
A Footnote: Humanities` impacting culture

“We’d like to publish it, do nothing to promote it, and watch it disappear from the shelves in less than a month.”
Viewpoints: The economical angle

- **Publishers**: profit by hard copies in direct proportion to library acquisition rates; **no technical and financial procedures for repository publishing**
- **Libraries**: implementation and management of repositories, digitalization and distribution of e-copies increases costs **without dedicated budgets**
- **Funding agencies**: Journal publishing – Money to the publisher; SM publishing: Money to the publisher via application of the author; **repository publishing**: ?
- **Authors**: no secure revenue management
- **Users**: knowledge for free
Viewpoints: The copyright problem


• Countries‘ actions to specify norms in existing copyright law and creating new ones in adaptation to the framework

Kuhlen/Ludewig 2009
Viewpoints: The copyright problem – Germany

• 1st Korb 2004, 2nd Korb 2007, 3rd Korb tbd
• 1st and 2nd Korb favor interests of derivative right holders, i.e. publishers:
  – § 52b: Libraries are allowed to digitalize works in their holding, but **may allow the reading of e-books only at dedicated terminals inside the premises**
  – § 53a: Libraries **may distribute digital copies to users only under drastically restricted conditions** and not at all when commercial providers offer corresponding services

• European Network for Copyright in support of Education and Science (Berlin 2008)
Viewpoints: The copyright problem – current developments

• Green Paper *Copyright in the Knowledge Economy* launched by European Commission to instigate consultation process for revision of the 2001 directive
  – focus on contract (private) law instead of c'law

• Nov. 2008 statement handed to EC
  – publishers not rightful owners of products
  – OA can only be guaranteed by public mandate, i.e. through change of c`law
Four arguments on SM in OA

- Unlike authors in public entertainment markets (popular literature), authors of SMs are a priori both users and producers of written knowledge – the feedback argument
- SMs are stand-alone qualification exercises – the academic career argument
- SMs deal with a broader range and complexity of scientific problems than any journal article is able to – the scientific achievement argument
- SMs are inscribed into a historical flow of scientific discourse, i.e. as texts they do not have the same status as f.e. literary or philosophical works – the commodity argument
... and their consequences:

- the **feedback argument**: as SMs themselves feed off freely accessible knowledge, they themselves should be fed back into the common pool.
- the **academic career argument**: for institutional reasons, the SM may not be marginalized.
- the **scientific achievement argument**: SMs produce a unique kind of scientific quality.
- the **commodity argument**: the materiality of the hard copy SM is not directly relevant to the distribution of its content.
Conclusions I: Creating the framework

- **Theory of Science-viewpoint**: OA for SM
- **Technical viewpoint**: Implementation of interoperationable repository system
- **Economical viewpoint**: conceptual approach, ideally in cooperation of all stakeholders
  - EC Funding *Open Access Publishing in European Networks* (OAPEN) towards development of a model for financing OA-publishing of SM
- **Copyright law viewpoint**: ERA countries need to take an active part both in shaping their respective copyright law and in the revision process of EC directive 2001
Conclusions II: Humanities’ quality management of OA for SM

• Ultimate goals:
  – Obligatory, internationally standardized peer-review process for publication of OA SM
  – Hybrid publishing with or without a moving wall between print component and digitalized repository component

• Interim strategy: systematical repository publishing of
  – Abstracts
  – Key word clusters
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