5

Openness, Politics and Power

Martin Paul Eve

Among many changes to research practices in higher education (HE) with which those in leadership roles are having to contend, open access is one of the most globally transformative but also most contentious phenomena. The term 'open access' refers to the removal of price and permission barriers to scholarly research by open dissemination on the Internet (Suber 2012: 8). Such an idea, whereby the fruits of HE's research are extended to anybody with access to the Internet, free of charge, obviously sits in harmony with many of the goals of mass intellectuality and particularly those with an emphasis on 'sharing' as a stage in a move towards an integrated and productive general intellect (University of Utopia n.d.; see also Stallman 2010; Virno 2003: 38).

As simple as this fundamental concept might be, though, it is also, as I will demonstrate, highly politicized and situated within frameworks that complicate a relationship to mass intellectuality. For one thing, our set of 'open' practices is defined in specific ways with a myriad of contentions around who controls the space of 'open' (Hall 2016a; Weller 2014). For another, as Nigel Vincent and Chris Wickham noted in the foreword to a British Academy volume on the topic, open access 'has a current force, however, which is not only moral but now political, with Conservative politicians in effect lined up with unequivocal egalitarians' (Vincent and Wickham 2013: 6). This has been seconded by Cameron Neylon, a prominent figure in the OA world of the sciences, who recently likewise pointed out on Twitter that to work on open access projects is to find oneself accused one day of being a neoliberal sell-out and the next of being an anti-corporatist Marxist (Neylon 2013). It is also the case, though, that critical thinking in the academy tends to turn its gaze away from its own practices where they seem self-evident. Academic publishing is one of these areas, where intra-disciplinary practices become normalized and absolved from scrutiny by its routinized form.

In this chapter, to address these topics, I will consider the range of political interpretations that have been placed upon 'open access' to academic research. This stretches from those, like Jeffrey Beall, who condemn the phenomenon as a mode of 'collectivizing production and denying the freedom of the press from those who prefer the subscription model of scholarly publishing', to those, such as John Holmwood,

who see a danger in OA of neoliberal appropriation and re-enclosure (Beall 2013; Holmwood 2013a,b). I will also examine the ways in which open access to reading can facilitate a co-productive mode of open access to writing; a mass intellectuality.[1] Indeed, it strikes me that open access may be a fundamental historical prerequisite for a mass intellectuality, in which a society-wide and disciplinarily ambiguous co-production and mutual harnessing of intellectual labour – wheresoever it may be found – can become possible.

Beginning from a description of the forms of open access, I will note that there are intrinsic power motivations at play in the enforcement of OA mandates, often linked to corporate finance, and that, at this particular historical moment, it is possible to effect apolitical interpretations, socialist interpretations and capitalist interpretations of the movement. Like many social changes engendered by the Internet – and while eschewing technological fetishism (Sayre 2005) – I will also argue that it is very difficult to predict the outcomes, even if one group's intentions are clear.

From this diagnosis, I will next move to suggest the ways in which those with a democratic outlook on mass intellectuality can take a role of intellectual leadership – through innovative experimentation – to act to decouple the potentially dangerous side effects of OA from its liberating potential: an upending of traditional hierarchies of research universities based purely on extant accumulated capital. Finally, I will note that OA on its own is not enough, amid radical projects, to rethink the hierarchies and divisions of labour, but that it can be a useful tool along that road, so long as proponents are vigilant for the dangers of recuperation and co-option.

What is open access and why is it relevant?

For a piece of academic research to be deemed 'open access', it must be available digitally for anybody to read at no financial cost beyond those intrinsic to using the Internet. This demands the removal of price barriers.[2] This is similar to most of the material on the world wide web but it is not the way in which scholarly publication has traditionally been offered. Indeed, comparatively few websites charge readers to view their content, yet most academic publications are paid for by university libraries through purchases or subscriptions. Open access means reconfiguring how we publish academic work so that peer-reviewed scholarly research is available freely to the reader on the world wide web (relying on digital technology to allow instant, near-free copying). In the original declarations on OA from around 2002, the term was also defined to mean that people should be permitted to re-use this scholarly material more liberally than is allowed by the fair use/fair dealing provisions of copyright law, so long as the author is given credit (Brown et al 2003). This is the removal of permission barriers that advocates claim brings a host of advantages, such as the creation of a teaching/course pack of lengthy extracts. When these two 'barriers' are removed, this is called open access and it modifies the current model for scholarly communications quite dramatically. It also causes substantial economic reconfigurations because in order to implement some forms of open access we must formulate new economic models to support the labour inherent in publishing.

Many advocates of open access believe that the greatest mass exposure to research will be achieved by making research free to read. The benefits of this economic reconfiguration include academics whose university libraries cannot meet the price of subscriptions and a set of heterogeneous publics for whom much research material remains unaffordable. As George Veletsianos and Royce Kimmons put it, '[m]any scholars hope and anticipate that open practices will broaden access to education and knowledge, reduce costs, enhance the impact and reach of scholarship and education, and foster the development of more equitable, effective, efficient, and transparent scholarly and educational processes' (Veletsianos and Kimmons 2012: 167). In other words, through a democratization of access, the *hope* is that a type of mass intellectuality – in which any member of society can also contribute to the production of knowledge, from spaces far removed from the traditional academy – might emerge. As shall be seen, this is not a universally held belief, though, and many have objected to open access for both of its elements (price and permission), while others, of course, object to the extension of open access to a co-productive mode featuring different types of expertise. That said the levels of objection are tiered according to the ways in which OA is implemented. Models of OA that place the economic burden directly upon researchers are far less popular with those researchers than those models that seem to co-exist peacefully with the existing subscription ecosystem.

To understand the preceding statements, it is necessary to know that there are a variety of ways in which open access can be achieved. These are usually referred to through the jargonistic matrix of terms: *gold*, *green*, *gratis* and *libre*. Gold OA refers to research that is made available openly *by the publisher*. Gold open-access journals are usually either entirely open access or 'hybrid' (in which subscription publications carry a subset of open-access articles). Gold OA has implications for the business models of publishers. If publishers cannot sell the work (because they are giving it away for free), then they need a different model to remunerate their labour. One way of achieving this in a gold open-access mode is to require that authors or their institutions pay a fee to the publisher, thereby inverting the current subscription model. This is known as an 'article processing charge' (APC) or a 'book processing charge' (BPC). Many publishers are adopting this model for gold open access. The logic is that publishing here becomes a service for which academics and/or their institutions pay. Gold OA is not the same as 'author pays', though. Indeed, this was not integral to the term as it was coined by Stevan Harnad. At the time of writing in late-2015, the majority of gold OA journals in the Directory of Open Access Journals do not charge a fee (Directory of Open Access Journals n.d.), although as David Crotty points out, there are complications with this calculation; it actually depends on how you define 'majority' and whether this pertains to articles or journals (Crotty 2015).

The other term that is used to describe a way of achieving OA is *green*. Green open access refers to the delivery of OA by an *institutional* or *subject repository*. An institutional repository is a database-driven website, usually housed within a university library, that holds copies of affiliated authors' works along with the associated metadata. Whenever an academic has published work (even in a subscription journal), he or she is encouraged to add it to the repository in accordance with publisher policies. This work is then made publicly available, green open access.

Many publishers allow authors to do this and there are several tools to allow authors to check publisher policies, such as SHERPA/RoMEO (Jisc n.d.).

However, green open access can be a poor and downgraded substitute when compared to gold. Unlike gold open access, the version uploaded to a repository is not always the 'version of record'. Furthermore, there is frequently (but not by necessity) an embargo period that delays the public availability of a green OA version. This is claimed to protect publisher revenues. In disciplines with strict normative citation standards to the version of record, green open access can also be problematic; it will not function as a substitute if the pagination/content differs in the green OA version. Lengthy embargoes can also devalue green open access in some fields of contemporary study where the most current research is needed quickly.

Green and gold are the routes to remove price barriers to research. On its own, this is called 'gratis' OA. The material is free to read but has standard copyright provisions. If permission barriers are also removed, this is termed 'libre' OA, an aspect usually achieved through a form of open licensing. Traditionally, academic authors sign their copyright over to publishers, who then hold the exclusive dissemination rights to the research material for the duration of the copyright term. However, all the early declarations on open access also specify the lowering of permission barriers as a crucial part of OA (Anon 2003; Chan et al. 2002; Suber et al. 2003). Open licenses are legal texts founded upon copyright that an author can use explicitly to allow others to redistribute and, in some cases, modify the work legally. The demand for attribution remains in the vast majority of cases. The most frequently used and best known libre licenses are the Creative Commons Attribution licenses.

For reasons of space, I will now move on from the basic terminology. Those who would like more on this should consult one of the many excellent guides on the subject, but most importantly, Peter Suber's *Open Access* or my own *Open Access and the Humanities* (both freely available online). What should, I hope, be clear is that in its most positive forms open access potentially takes a step towards a socialized model of research through the removal of payment to access work (even if it does not lower the barriers to collective production of that work). As I will show throughout the rest of this chapter, though, that promise is somewhat utopian (in a pejorative sense) and often compromised in various ways. I remain convinced that OA is a move in the right direction; it is just not the final end destination.

Competing interests and powers in the academic publishing space

While I have thus far detailed the background to open access, the variety of political factions involved in the emergent dominance of open-access publishing should give cause for concern. Clearly, when major corporations and economically right-wing governments (which intrinsically depend upon inequality and competition; Davies 2014) also want open access, it is unlikely to be purely for the sake of social equity. Such arguments are particularly applicable to the permissive licensing provisions of open access. For instance, it has been prominently argued, most notably by John

Holmwood, that 'Open Access under CC BY [one of the most liberal of the open licenses] is one of the measures designed to speed up commercialization, by making scientific innovations more immediately accessible, especially to small and medium-sized enterprises' (Holmwood 2013b). Others have argued that there is implicitly a moral violation in the reuse of academic material (Allington et al. 2015: n.4).

This desire for the extraction of research's use-value at sites distant from the university (what is called, in contemporary parlance in the UK: impact) acts as the catalyst for two other distinct mechanisms. First, because the economic protections of copyright in academic publishing are exercised by the publisher, a resistance to open access on corporate financial grounds is triggered. Second, the commodity form of research material within the contemporary university is more thoroughly unmasked, as demonstrated by corporate-financial resistance and through corporate value extraction.

The first of these aspects is the easiest to place. Indeed, one of the oft-touted arguments by left-spectrum OA advocates is that commercial publishers extort their captive library clients.[3] At the parliamentary hearings in the UK in 2013, this was most clear in the evidence of Alicia Wise, representing Reed Elsevier. Elsevier is well known for its vocal opposition to, and legal lobbying against, OA in the States (Grant 2012) and Wise confirmed that Elsevier reported a 37 per cent profit with 'a revenue stream of £2.06 billion and a profit level of £780 million' in 2012 (Wise 2013: Ev3). In the face of such astonishing profit margins, it is hard to fault the argument that at least some resistance from such corporations must come from a desire to protect the conventional economics of subscription publications, which have served them very well. Advocates point out that the corresponding margins of major oil companies are around 6.5 per cent or that Big Pharma usually manages about 16 per cent (Bradley 2011).

Another large-scale operation is Taylor & Francis/Routledge. In terms of turnover, Informa Group, who own Taylor & Francis and Routledge, posted an operating margin of 28.4 per cent in 2012 with a £349.7m adjusted operating profit (Informa 2012: 1). Thirty eight per cent of this was derived from Informa's publishing operations, which were 'dominated by subscription assets with high renewal rates, where customers generally pay us twelve months in advance. This provides strong visibility on revenue and allows the businesses to essentially fund themselves, with minimal external capital required' (Informa 2012: 9). For publishers thriving on subscription economics, regardless of whether this system limits those who can read research work, to use their own words: '[i]t is a uniquely attractive mode' (Informa 2012: 9). It is not unreasonable to deduce that corporate entities may be wary of open access when the subscription model has yielded a year-on-year 10 per cent increase of dividends to shareholders (Informa 2012: 1).

The list goes on. Bloomsbury Academic, the publisher of this volume, although a smaller player, is a humanities and social science publisher that is notable for a series of mergers and acquisitions. In recent years Bloomsbury has bought up entities such as Continuum, an organization that had itself previously acquired Cassell, T&T Clark, Berg Publishers, Methuen Drama, Arden Shakespeare, Bristol Classical Press, Fairchild Books and AVA. This forms a continuation of a worldwide trend of concentrating

corporate power within fewer entities. In its 2012 financial report, Bloomsbury posted an adjusted continuing profit of £12.1 million on a continuing margin of 12.4 per cent. Of Blomsbury's activities, '[t]he Academic & Professional division grew the most year on year with a £2.9 million increase in continuing adjusted operating profit, due to both the acquisition of Continuum [a solely humanities-orientated publisher] and a significant increase in income from content licensing deals' (Bloomsbury Group 2012: 7). Interestingly, the Bloomsbury Academic imprint, when it was originally launched in 1998 under the stewardship of Frances Pinter, was OA by design: '[t]he new publishing model [would consist] of releasing works for free online through a Creative Commons or other open license, and then offering print-on-demand (POD) copies at reasonable prices' (Park 2008). This did not move to mass scale, possibly because of fears for ongoing revenue, but Bloomsbury does continue to publish some books in an open-access form.

It is worth saying, in the face of this critique, that 'publishers' is not a homogeneous term. Some publishers are commercial and do very well out of the system for their shareholders. Others are mission driven but run a surplus. Still others, like many precarious university presses, are very close to bankruptcy (although not Cambridge UP or Oxford UP, which post very healthy profits back to their parent institutions). In other words, academic publishing is itself an industry that is designed to extract surplus value from the labour of academics and the research university. When this industry operates through a paywall model, however, other sectors that would like unencumbered access to research material for their own purposes of value extraction will join forces with egalitarians (who hope for equal access to HE research material and a co-option of a shift towards mass intellectuality) to change the system. In this way, even when industries are in broadly different fields (such as pharmaceuticals) and they want open access to research, they can find themselves *in competition* with academic publishers who operate on a sales/subscription model. This is one reason why strange political alignments have developed in the emergence of open access.

If it is clear why corporate bodies might wish to recuperate a narrative of liberation, why are enthusiastic socially orientated academics less willing to see how their co-option by such entities unfurls? I would suggest that the core reason for this is that it can *superficially appear* that the research work of the academy is different in its terms of production to other manufactured commodities. After all, in the ideal situation, academics are paid a salary in order to give their work away; a rare situation of patronage in contemporary economics. This can lead the more optimistic opponents of marketized HE to deduce that open access might present a point of resistance to the commodification of knowledge. In fact, such an argument would run, what could better resist this process than work that is, in two senses, priceless? Sadly, such a conclusion is flawed. Open-access research is not radically anti-corporate, despite what detractors such as Jeffrey Beall might claim (Beall 2013). Indeed, OA articles have both exchange and use value, even if they are disseminated freely. On top of this, it is also clear that the production of research/scholarship is not simply an esoteric activity undertaken for its own, pure sake. In fact, research is, instead, one of the instruments that transforms academic labour is into productive labour, especially when aligned with the historical provision of land grants (nineteenth century), research patenting (early twentieth

century), mid-century war funding and late-twentieth-century venture capital (Winn 2013b). As with open-source software, what emerges around open access to scholarly research is the university as a service industry, providing training in methods of reading, understanding and (re-)producing such material. When considering the role, function and exceptionality of scholarship, then, it is important not to simply fetishize a return to a form without value. Instead, as Winn puts it, one must remember that 'the trajectory of higher education and its conceived role and purpose in public life over the last century can only be fully understood through a critique of capitalism as the historical mode of production which (re-)produces the university' (Winn 2013b).

From this thinking, however, gold OA highlights the strangeness of ascribing a monetary value for the purchase of a research article or book: the primary audience for its purchase is the same as its genesis (academics write, universities buy). That said, eliminating this demand-side price and instead thinking of an OA article or book as 'free' (and labour-free) can lead to the fallacy that a gold open-access work could resist the commodity form. If something is given away for free, such logic would run, is it a commodity? This originates from a simple oversight of the fact that cost does not equal value.

Open-access articles and books still have an exchange value because universities will pay for the transformation of labour time into published articles, which also hold a use-value since they are of use to people other than the creator, regardless of whether the object is purchased for a monetary sum. As Joss Winn frames this, comparing Marx's examples in *Capital* of linen coats to open-access journal articles,

> there is a common qualitative substance shared by both the linen and the OA article, one common to both the labour of an academic and the labour of a weaver: human abstract labour. Thus, the labour of the academic who writes the OA article cannot be conceived in isolation from all other products of labour being exchanged in the social world of capitalism. (Winn 2015c: 6)

This dissemination presents the opportunity for the extraction of surplus value from the labour of academics, which explains, at least in part, why centre-right governments are so keen on OA (Holmwood 2013a). That said, even those who do not share that agenda can find themselves desiring open access, purely because it may engender a broader, mass spectrum of access to research. Sceptics might counter, though, that this egalitarian spectrum is only one in which academics are more freely exploited and that supply-side payment models for gold will lead only to a less-equal community where researchers without funds cannot publish.

Within a framework of mass intellectuality – understood as a transformation in the social relations of knowledge production so that knowledge produced for the 'valorization of value' (the M-C-M form that Marx describes in *Capital* whereby accumulation only ever spirals upwards) becomes, instead, knowledge produced for humanity, harnessing an unalienated and co-productive 'general intellect' that obliterates the traditional notion that '[t]hinkers must live estranged from their community' (Virno 2003: 38) – we should consider the logical flow for knowledge production and where open access can be situated. Open access, as it is theorized,

seems to become a first step for the co-production of knowledge for humanity. It is a mode, potentially, where the fruits of existing production (the commodities) are open to anybody even when they cannot pay (although they must have access to the Internet). In truth, this is perhaps the great leveler given to us by the Internet; the non-rivalrous object form that can be disseminated at a near infinitesimal cost has caused many intermediaries to wither away across a distributed network. In theory, a neutral peer network validates the intellectual soundness (and, by extension, normativity) of material that is disseminated within it, and where production and consumption are open to anyone. In practice, of course, things do not work out so well as open access unfolds within capital.

Leadership, mass intellectuality and open access

Indeed, open access is prone to co-option and recuperation. It is situated within a discursive field where its positive rhetoric of sharing and liberation is often outflanked by commercial constraints. Commercial publishers will only move to open access when they are sure that they are no longer in competition with the other entities seeking to extract surplus value from academic labour. It is worth noting, though, that several commercial publishers look to be enacting a twenty-year plan to control other sites of value extraction in the academy (such as research data management) to militate against the collapse of the subscription market. However, for those who would like to align OA with the goals of mass intellectuality, outside of these extant frameworks, then, the question becomes one of realignment. How is it possible to conceive of OA within a 'common ability to do, based on our needs and capacities and what needs to be done'? How can OA be made to intersect with 'what needs to be done […] at the level of society' (University of Utopia n.d.)?

Alongside its grim culture of audit and assessment, scholarly publishing has evolved to fulfil the need for communication of ideas and facts that have been found to accord with current epistemological systems. The end-goals that this communication serve vary by area of study, even if such 'disciplinarity' is of dubious construction. If there is a societal need for medicine, then there is a foundational need for a system to communicate the latest research on disease. If there is a societal need for an understanding of aesthetics, then there is a foundational need for a system to communicate the latest research on art. The current division of labour, however, perceives that the 'need' for such understandings should be isolated to specific factions of society: 'academics', those who labour within the increasingly marketized and financialized academy, the university. This is what can make possible an author-pays model, since it is supposed that a limited subset of knowledge producers will have recourse to institutional funding in order to remunerate publisher labour.

In other words at present, scholarly communication is predicated upon the division of labour, of technical specialization and of expertise founded on competition. Such a system purports to serve societal needs but does so by incentivizing individual gain. After all, the medical advances in the twentieth century were astonishing and they

were predicated upon intense specialization. However, the advantages conferred by these new understandings were denied to vast swathes of the world's population on the basis of capital and legacies of colonialism. This is not to say that democratization of information dissemination would, on its own, rectify the problems of the concentration of the means of production. This is the fallacy that draws a parallel between the rhetoric of information liberation and social liberation. It is instead to note that such a process is a step in the right direction. Such a division of labour also accounts for the problems of library leadership in spurring the open-access movement. While many in the academic library world have seen the potential advantages of open access, they have often been unable to persuade academic colleagues which is at least in part due to the hierarchy of power within universities that would deem librarians to be 'support staff'.

While, then, open access presents a way of giving access to research that is vastly better suited to the mass consumption of information produced by the academy, the political overtones of the situation can be traced back to Karl Kautsky's orthodox Marxist writings at the turn of the twentieth century. Kautsky identified, in his essay 'The Intellectuals and the Workers', a set of antagonisms between the intelligentsia and the proletariat. While Kautsky noted that 'An intellectual is not a capitalist' and that, therefore, 'the intellectual does not stand in any economic antagonism to the proletariat' (a statement some may, now, find hard to swallow), a more general problem lies in the fact that 'The intellectual, armed with the general education of our time, conceives himself [sic] as very superior to the proletarian'. In other words, according to Kautsky, the intellectual perceives, in the proletariat, a 'low level of intellectual development, which it is the intellectual's task to raise. He sees in the worker not a comrade but a pupil'. Kautsky concludes that:

> The alliance of science with labour and its goal of saving humanity, must therefore be understood not in the sense which the academicians transmit to the people the knowledge which they gain in the bourgeois classroom, but rather in this sense that every one of our co-fighters, academicians and proletarians alike, who are capable of participating in proletarian activity, utilise the common struggle or at least investigate it, in order to draw new scientific knowledge which can in turn be fruitful for further proletarian activity. Since that is how the matter stands, it is impossible to conceive of science being handed down to the proletariat or of an alliance between them as two independent powers. That science, which can contribute to the emancipation of the proletariat, can be developed only by the proletariat and through it. What the liberals bring over from the bourgeois scientific circles cannot serve to expedite the struggle for emancipation, but often only to retard it. (Kautsky 1946)

Although Kautsky's thinking is clearly more broadly applicable to the role of the academy, rather than specifically concerned with publication, in the contemporary era it applies equally within this sphere. If the goal of revolutionary projects remains to abolish the hierarchy of labour – an aspect that becomes ever more difficult and distant – then collective dissemination alone is insufficient. Open access does little

at present to achieve a longer-term goal of co-production. It is, though, a necessary prerequisite to that project. Whether or not OA will be integrated within such an agenda will depend upon how hard its advocates are willing to fight against the co-option and recuperation of open dissemination by big business. It will also depend upon a thorough assessment of the populist/specialist divide. To demonstrate this final assertion, I will only finally turn to the symbolic economy of research dissemination.

If research publication takes place within an economically predetermined field, it is one that is stratified because of the aforementioned patronage basis on which research in the university is produced. Researchers do not need to sell the product of their work to earn their salaries, although they do sell their labour power. This frees academics from the need to produce popular work (which comes with commensurate downsides for mass intellectuality and co-production). However, researchers' salaries are directly determined by the need to place their research material in specific venues. Particular journals and publisher brands are used to stand in as proxy measures for the quality of the work within when it comes to stretched hiring and tenure panels. That is, we know that researchers could technically publish wheresoever they might like. However, in a time-short economy, many researchers want filtering systems to determine whether work is of a good standard. They tend to turn to publisher and journal brands as a shorthand, even if we know that prestige of these venues and the quality within cannot be direct correlates of each other. (Every academic, e.g., can think of the poor article or book that was nonetheless published by a 'top' press.) Various systems of managerial pressure and configurations of leadership also tend here to take on a coercive function within a complex and interdependent ecosystem of motivations for the placement of articles and books.

This system of proxy measures acts, once more, to conservatively concentrate power into the hands of existing entities who may oppose broader dissemination or more collaborative production. It furthermore isolates the Anglo-American world from the rest of the global research community as academics grow used to expecting to find 'quality' research only in specific venues that they have pre-canonized with authority. It also flags, though, the financialized nature of research production, mediated by a symbolic economy of prestige, even in a world where it looks as though researchers are free from market imperatives. The gross misalignment of personal incentives for researchers with mass-intellectual co-production makes the task of bringing research publication to this debate one that is far from easy. It is, though, a task that is extremely important. I would suggest that engaging with the OA agenda as pre-compromised but as a nonetheless positive step towards the goals of mass intellectuality is a serious area to which scholars of co-production and the future of the university should devote themselves. I also suggest, for further reading, that examples of such leadership might be taken from Eileen Joy, at Punctum Books; from Rupert Gatti, at Open Book Publishers; from Gary Hall, at Open Humanities Press; and perhaps from the organization that I founded, the Open Library of Humanities.

Notes

1 I understand co-production, in this context, to mean a mode in which intellectual research outputs are created by a variety of actors from across a variety of spaces, not confined to an academy isolated from other spheres of production. This is more than the 'independent scholar' phenomenon and instead refers to those from all walks of life co-contributing to the development of intellectual outputs. I will return to a definition of mass intellectuality shortly.

2 Much of the material in this chapter is reworked from my book on open access. This work is available itself under a CC BY-SA license (Eve 2014).

3 I use the term 'left-spectrum' here for those OA advocates who wish to eradicate the profit motive from scholarly communications.