

# Lorem de porem

Geert Kapteijns

July 1, 2017

## Open access deal with Elsevier

Why is the deal bad?

- the contracts were secret to begin with, which is a most ridiculous state of affairs
- why did the UvA not support the open-information request?
- Max 3600 articles.
- fees are raised

who is making this deal?

- Deals are with all Dutch universities? But who is *making* them? In the press and reports, it seems as if all universities get the same deal, brokered by VSNU and UKB (Universiteitsbibliotheken en Koninklijke Bibliotheek)

German universities: Elsevier restored access in face of boycott, while terms are being

negotiated. In other words, they were bluffing, and are now trying to quiet down the researchers by giving them access, while working out a deal with the German consortium.

Elsevier's worst fear, of course, is that scientists wake up.

Self-congratulating tone of the Netherlands in VSNU-report is out of place. They signed a deal that is a token step, consolidating power with Elsevier. Why is the discussion framed in this way? What are the filters which are applied by corporate interest? Why do we not read 'this is ridiculous and these companies have got to go' in the official documents?

The solution is simple: scientists should stop publishing in journals run by media conglomerates, stop using these conglomerates' databases to judge each other. This is hard. It requires scientists to confront themselves with their own culture of "publish or perish", and how they judge each other's work and body of work.

Sander Dekker should not be taken seriously. His 2013 letter is scandalous.

SciHub is crucial? Though illegal, it provides for an alternative way to read publications, therefore giving academics more room to boycott.

## Critique of Sander Dekker's letter

Dekker completely buys into the idea that the profit margins of the publishers are legitimate. According to Dekker, the transition period to Open Access publishing should be swift, so that universities will not incur *doubtful costs*, namely those of subscription fees and publishing fees.

De overheid moet richting geven, zodat partijen weten waar ze aan toe zijn en onderling afspraken kunnen maken. Een te lange transitieperiode brengt onnodige kosten met zich mee, omdat de wetenschap dan betaalt voor zowel abonnementen als voor publicaties in tijdschriften. Een duidelijke keuze voor Open Access van publicaties kan het transitieproces de nodige snelheid geven en de transitieperiode verkorten en daarmee onnodige extra kosten voorkomen.

[...]

De wetenschap in brede zin, dus universiteiten, NWO, KNAW, VSNU, Vereniging Hogescholen en NFU en de koepels, heeft belang bij Open Access om resultaten

te verspreiden maar ook bij het behouden van toegang tot wetenschappelijke publicaties uit andere landen. De uitgevers hebben belang bij een goede business case. Dat kan ook een nieuwe business case zijn die gebaseerd is op in Open Access publiceren.

## Green vs Gold?

Why does Dekker see Gold as the best alternative? The beauty of Green open access is, that it's essentially one step from saying: we're going to run the show ourselves.