CHAPTER 14

OPEN ACCESS AND THE SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD IN SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING

Kirsten Bell

> An old tradition and a new technology have converged to make possible an unprecedented public good. The old tradition is the willingness of scientists and scholars to publish the fruits of their research in scholarly journals without payment, for the sake of inquiry and knowledge. The new technology is the internet . . . Removing access barriers to this literature will accelerate research, enrich education [by] sharing the learning of the rich with the poor and the poor with the rich, make this literature as useful as it can be, and lay the foundation for uniting humanity in a common intellectual conversation and quest for knowledge.
>
> —Budapest Open Access Initiative, 2002

Introduction

Once considered 'hare-brained utopianism', open access to academic scholarship has today become an 'institutional imperative of science' (Willinsky 2016). Although guerrilla versions of open access abound,[1] it is increasingly being mandated by research funders and government agencies, and is widely embraced by corporate publishers themselves. For example, Research England has made it a requirement that all publications submitted as part of the national research audit of higher education are freely accessible and widely available, based on the premise that '[o]pen access research brings benefits to researchers, students, institutions, governments, public bodies, professionals and practitioners, citizen scientists and many others' (Research England 2019). Thus, liberal-democratic versions of open access sit side by

side with more radical, critical versions and those based on the logic of the 'knowledge economy' (Adema 2015). As Eve (2014: 7) observes, supporters of open access are today just as likely to be conservative politicians as unequivocal egalitarians, and advocates often find themselves accused of being an anti-corporate Marxist one day, and a neoliberal sell-out the next.

In this chapter, I reflect on these transformations in the open access movement and the question of how we got from there to here, namely from open access as a 'bottom-up, community-driven model' to one where the key driving forces seem to be 'commercial, institutional and political interests' (Schöpfel 2018: 57). At first glance, this is perhaps an odd topic for a book on ritual and, indeed, I am not interested in ritual per se. However, my inspiration is the broader theory of continuity and change that Turner develops as part of his work on liminality and communitas, and its implications for understanding contemporary scholarly publishing: the axis upon which academic systems of value rotate. In using Turner, my aim is not to extend his work in new conceptual or theoretical directions, but to illustrate the ongoing vitality of his ideas in understanding contemporary social movements – including academic ones, such as open access itself.

Open Access and Its Conditions of Possibility

The open access movement is intimately connected with the birth of the digital era, which brought with it a new sense of the possibility of unfettered knowledge – as alluded to in the Budapest Open Access Initiative's reference to an 'old tradition and a new technology' (see epigraph). This sensibility is captured in an influential paper published in 1993:

> In the world of remote relays made possible by digital and electronic communications, texts are no longer prisoners of their original physical, material existence. Separated from objects, texts can be transmitted; there is no longer a necessary connection between the place in which they are conserved and the place in which they are read. The opposition, long held to be insurmountable, between the closed world of any finite collection and the infinite universe of all the texts ever written is thus theoretically annihilated: now the catalog of all catalogs, ideally listing the totality of written production, corresponds to electronic access to texts universally available for consultation. (Chartier 1993: 48)

These projections of newly unconstrained knowledge reflected larger ideas circulating in the early 1990s about the internet itself as a site of liberty and freedom that could not be controlled or contained by any terrestrial government[2] (Kelty 2008). But while the new possibilities offered by digital technologies (and, equally importantly, the rhetoric surrounding

them) were a critical precursor to the open access movement, it would be dangerous to treat these technologies themselves as a straightforward agent of change.[3] This is because the open access movement was also integrally connected with broader shifts in the academy happening in the 1990s.

During this period, economic, social and political transformations in academia – commonly, albeit problematically,[4] framed through the lens of the 'neoliberal academy' – laid the groundwork for the open access movement on a variety of levels. Typically used as conceptual shorthand for the marketization, corporatization and metricization of the university, neoliberalism is surely an element of the story, but the lens it provides is simultaneously partial and totalizing. As Kelty (2008: 309) observes, '[t]he new economic demands on the university – all too easily labelled neoliberalization or corporatization – mirror changing demands on industry that it come to look more like universities, that is, that it give away more, circulate more, and cooperate more'. Moreover, calls for further accountability and transparency in academic knowledge emerged from various directions, including fields highly critical of the neoliberal turn, such as women's studies, indigenous studies and community studies (Larner 2012). Regardless of their origins, these social and economic transformations had an important role to play in stimulating the open access movement – as both a reaction against them, and a reflection of the new conditions they engendered.

The recasting of publications as 'outputs', the rise of systems for auditing them, and the newly digital environment of academic publishing produced two interrelated consequences: an exponential increase in the numbers of academic papers being published, and an exponential increase in the cost of subscription journals themselves. In the 1960s, when Price published the first data about the growth of science, he conjectured that 'at some time, undetermined as yet but probably during the 1940s or 1950s, we passed through the midperiod in general growth of science's body politic' (Price cited in Larsen and von Ins 2010: 576). Despite this predicted slowdown in scholarly publishing, the doubling of outputs every fifteen years has continued unabated[5] (see Larsen and von Ins 2010). Importantly, the dramatic increase in pricing in subscription journals witnessed in the 1990s was not driven by this greater volume of publications, especially given the burgeoning array of publishing options that the 'digital revolution' had facilitated. This can instead be explained by the growing emphasis on journal prestige as a proxy for researcher quality and impact (Burrows 2012).

During this period, the impact factor of academics' publishing venues became a form of symbolic currency that could be traded into a material economy of jobs, promotions, salaries and benefits (Eve and Priego 2017). Thus, while (or rather, because) academics were now publishing more than ever and had greater choices in publishing venues, the hierarchy of prestigious

journals, fortified by the 'journal impact factor',[6] merely intensified. Eve (2013) describes the result as a 'zombified' system of scholarly publishing, whereby the 'no-brainer' logic of selecting the most prestigious publishing outlet makes that outlet simultaneously *less* accessible and *more* desirable in a perpetual feedback loop that constantly drives up subscription prices. In Eve's words,

> the same valorization criteria bestowed upon journals drives the prices of those journals up, thus making it impossible for libraries to afford them. The model of esteem conferred by a researcher on a publisher within this culture implies the right to charge a higher premium for a title, which then restricts – owing to contracting library budgets – this same researcher's access to material. (Eve 2013: 108–9)

Thus, while the costs of publishing in the digital era were dramatically reduced, the fees publishers were able to charge became greatly inflated,[7] especially with the practice of bundling high prestige journals with lower prestige ones in 'big deals' that required libraries to pay for the full package in order to access the journals they wanted (see Bergstrom et al. 2014). These transformations served to make academic publishing an extraordinarily profitable business for the leading companies, who were busily consolidating throughout this period (see Larivière, Haustein and Mongeon 2015). As Suber notes, in an oft-repeated observation, 'the largest journal publishers earn higher profit margins than the largest oil companies' (Suber 2012: 32). This, in conjunction with declining library budgets, was a key contributor to the serials crisis of the late 1990s, which provided a critical trigger for the open access movement (Hamann 2013; Eve 2014). In sum, the past few decades have witnessed fundamental changes in the scholarly landscape, which has been 'a time of growing divergence between the different roles of academic publishing: as a means of disseminating validated knowledge, as a form of symbolic capital for academic career progression, and as a profitable business enterprise' (Fyfe et al. 2017: 2).

Open Access, Liminality and Communitas Utopias

These divergences were critical to the emergence of the open access movement, perhaps best articulated in 'A Subversive Proposal', published by Harnad in 1994. In his proposal, Harnad highlighted the Faustian bargain that the authors of 'esoteric' scholarly publications had made with publishers, '[t]o allow a price-tag to be erected as a barrier between their work and its (tiny) intended readership because that was the only way to make their work public in the era when paper publication (and its substantial real expenses)

were the only way to do so'. Arguing that the rise of digital networks had given academics the power to subvert traditional publishing structures, Harnad asserted that it was now possible for us to take our scholarship to 'the airwaves, where it always belonged', allowing the unimpeded flow of knowledge to everyone. Harnad's proposal, and the egalitarian vision of scholarly publishing it proposed, became a touchstone piece in the open access movement. This vision is articulated clearly in the 2002 Budapest Open Access Initiative, quoted in the epigraph, and its successors, the 2003 Berlin Declaration and 2003 Bethesda Statement (collectively known as the 'BBB' definition of open access).

The open access movement was dominated by scientists at the outset, although influential advocates also appeared in the humanities and social sciences[8] (e.g. Guédon 2001; Willinsky 2006; Hall 2008; Suber 2009, 2012; Fitzpatrick 2011; Eve 2014). According to Eve (2014), this bias is largely because of the origins of the free culture movement[9] within technological disciplines, coupled with the more challenging economic situation of science journals, which suffered the greatest increases in subscription pricing during the serials crisis. As Adema (2015) notes, the open access movement also caught on later in disciplines where books, rather than journal articles, were the most valued publication medium. However, although this gave the movement a decidedly scientistic bent, it was nevertheless a classically liminoid phenomenon:[10] it originated outside the boundaries of prevailing social, economic and political structures, and called for a revolutionary transformation of the official order (Turner 1969, 1974; Delfem 1991).

Indeed, as a result of the union between the academic and digital cultures that birthed it, we can consider the open access movement liminoid in several senses. First, it is worth noting that Turner saw universities as liminoid phenomena, characterizing them as settings 'for all kinds of freewheeling, experimental cognitive behavior' (1974: 65). Although this seems increasingly less true today, it nevertheless remains fundamental to the *idea* of the university that has, in part, driven open access – or at least some variants of it – as a place of dissent, whereby dominant structures and ideas can be challenged. As Hall observes of the open access movement, 'this is one arena where some academics *have* challenged the forces of neoliberal free-market economics in a reasonably effective manner (even if this has not always been as a result of conscious or overtly radical political intentions on their part)' (Hall 2008: 5, emphasis in original).

Second, the digital realm itself has been conceptualized as liminal in both form and content – that is, in relation to its heterogenous and decentralized infrastructure and the 'chaotic, voluntarist, and unpredictably fertile world' (Sassi 1996: 26) it has spawned. For scholars like Turkle (1995, 2005), who has been directly influenced by Turner's work, the internet represents

not a transitional space but a space of permanent liminality. While such views have been contested, 'liminal' does seem an apt descriptor of Free Software – the term for software source code created collaboratively and made freely available – and a key intellectual precursor to the open access movement (see Kelty 2008). Although Kelty does not use this terminology, his characterization of Free Software (and open access itself) as a 'recursive public' bears a certain resemblance to Turner's definition of anti-structure. For Kelty, a recursive public is both experimental and self-referential, enabling it to exist independent of, and as a check on, institutionalized structures and forms of power (Kelty 2008: 28–30).

From the outset, open access advocates positioned themselves against a system that prioritized profit over access and 'the traditional hierarchical and elitist culture that has prevailed in the research community since time immemorial' (Poynder 2018: 1). A form of ideological communitas was therefore foundational to open access, with participants working towards a 'communitas utopia' (Turner 1974: 80). Indeed, the movement has clear millenarian undertones: advocates anticipate a future in which knowledge will be universally accessible regardless of wealth or geography, which, according to the aforementioned Budapest Declaration, will 'lay the foundation for uniting humanity in a common intellectual conversation'. Thus, critical to the concept of open access is the commons (Moore 2018a) – a term frequently employed to describe the ideal scholarly publishing ecosystem, whereby an artificially (pay)walled space will be 'unlocked' to enable unimpeded entrance.

The imagery of the open lock and the walled-up commons are not just surface metaphors for the open access movement but key symbols in Turner's sense: they are vehicles employed to instigate action and 'channel its direction by saturating goals and means with affect and desire' (Turner 1974: 56). The notion of the 'paywall' is critical to the morally charged nature of open access, given the way it shifts the emphasis from opting in to locking out. As Horvath, Benţa Marius and Davison (2019: 3) observe, 'walls have the power to separate space and to charge it with such qualities as inside/outside, accessible/forbidden, [and] on this side/on the other side'.

To date, a diverse array of initiatives have been created under the banner of open access: from mega-open-access publishers like the Public Library of Science (PLoS), to scholar-driven publishing collectives and independent journals committed to experimenting with the form and function of academic writing. Although many of these experiments are Western in origin, there are also a variety of open access initiatives from the academic periphery, including SciELO: a combined bibliographic database, digital library and cooperative electronic publisher of Latin American open access journals. Open access publishers have also emerged in regions such as South Asia, the

Middle East and Africa, although they are frequently (and problematically) dismissed as 'predatory' (see Bell 2017). While the effects of some of these initiatives have been conservative – for example, PLoS's author-pays model of open access ultimately became widely adopted and co-opted by corporate publishers[11] – all were novel in the ways they reassembled elements to create new forms. Indeed, precisely because of its liminal attributes, open access has been a significant source of innovation within mainstream scholarly publishing. As Turner notes of liminality:

> I see it as a kind of institutional capsule or pocket which contains the germ of future social developments, of societal change, in a way that the central tendencies of a social system can never quite succeed in being, the spheres where law and custom, and the modes of social control ancillary to these, prevail. Innovation can take place in such spheres, but most frequently it occurs in interfaces and limina, then becomes legitimated in central sectors. (Turner 1974: 76)

In effect, the anti-structural origins of the open access movement created a space for new voices, with many initiatives, including those spearheaded by emerging and Southern scholars and organizations, quickly gaining momentum in ways that would have been impossible under the traditional publishing regime.

HAU: Anthropology, Millenarian Movements and Open Access

A key anthropological example is the success of *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, founded by a doctoral student, Giovanni da Col, in 2011. As Kapferer (2018) notes of the journal, '*HAU* is the creature of increasingly digitalized realities and the associated political economic transitions, transformations, reconfigurations, reassembling, or whatever of social life and its institutional orders (including those of academia and scholarship) that is occurring'. In this respect, it makes a fascinating case through which to explore the dynamics of structure and anti-structure, because *HAU* was positioned – and positioned itself – as a liminal entity born of a communitas spirit. Fully digital and lacking an institutional home, *HAU* was a self-conscious experiment in open access publishing that aimed to revitalize anthropology by bridging 'the old into the new, a continuity from the traditions of the subject's foundation into a concern and relevance for the problematics of the present and future' (Kapferer 2018). Da Col's installation as editor-in-chief symbolized *HAU*'s egalitarian ethos, seeming to embody the spirit of a journal founded on its democratizing promise and the possibility of 'overcoming the restrictions inherent in the hierarchies of the discipline' (ibid.).

At the beginning, the sense of excitement *HAU* generated was palpable (Green 2018): 'some argue that we have started a movement', the inaugural editorial somewhat immodestly declared (da Col and Graeber 2011: xiv). This theme was elaborated on in the 2017 editorial in which da Col announced that the journal would be moving away from open access to a 'free access' format, which looked to many observers suspiciously like a traditional subscription-based model (LaFlamme et al. 2018). To quote from the editorial:

> *HAU* has grown to encompass not only a journal, but also a book publishing project, an international network of over forty supporting institutions, and ultimately a movement, a cultural phenomenon in itself, a small revolution within the discipline that has attracted more than fifty thousand followers on social media. Within the broader field of scholarly research, *HAU* has made a powerful intervention, offering a new paradigm for academic publishing. (da Col 2017: ii)

In many respects, *HAU*'s path from self-declared 'revolutionary' open access publisher to mainstream subscription journal exemplifies Turner's (1969, 1974) discussion of the dynamics of millenarian movements as a manifestation of communitas. After all, it was the spontaneous communitas surrounding *HAU*'s formation that enabled the journal's authority to be grounded entirely in the charisma (in Weber's sense of the word) of its founder.[12] As Green (2018) has noted in her reflections on *HAU* and the tyranny of structurelessness, 'this was a small, informal, idealistic project based on trust and mutual excitement about its potential; everyone imagined that everything could be ironed out later'. The result, as we now know, is that da Col had, in Green's words, 'virtually unimpeachable power'. This problem is largely prefigured in Turner's own analysis, where he highlights attributes of millenarian movements such as homogeneity, equality, anonymity, humility, unselfishness and 'total obedience to the prophet or leader'[13] (Turner 1969: 111). Indeed, in his recent valedictory editorial, da Col seems to actively embrace the mantle of failed cargo cult leader (his own analogy), noting:

> We spent everything we had – including our careers – in a beautifully accursed share, overturning every economic principle, surrendering luxuriously the highest achievements in the field in sumptuous editorial productions with no expectation of reciprocity or capital gain. The project was overambitious and it came with costs for everyone involved. I overworked myself to exhaustion, and expected members of the staff to have the same commitment to the project and the discipline that I had. (da Col 2019: 1)

Although da Col attributes the journal's success[14] to an occult economy of publishing achieved through 'a sorcerer's magical exploitation of the vitality of labour', central to the journal's success was the ways it wedded

open access to the prestige economies of the Ivy League–Oxbridge axis (see Kalb 2018; Kapferer 2018; Thorkelson 2019; Todd 2019). While this might seem out of step with *HAU*'s declared revolutionary agenda, Turner was clear that 'communitas does not represent the erasure of structural norms from the consciousness of those participating in it; rather . . . [it] might be said to depend upon the way in which it symbolizes the abrogation, negation, or inversion of the normative structure in which its participants are quotidianly involved' (1974: 78). In *HAU*'s case, this happened via the juxtaposition of works by renowned and emerging scholars in the pages of the journal, which were symbolically brought into egalitarian relation. The result, according to Kalb (2018), was the renewed capture of the field by an old, elitist anthropology in a way that felt new and hip – revolutionary even, at least for a while. However, its most recent incarnation as a subscription-based journal grounded in the bureaucratic authority of a board of directors speaks to Turner's (1969) points about the ways in which the impetus for millenarian movements is soon exhausted. Ultimately, they become one institution among many, giving way to the very social and political hierarchies against which their egalitarian zeal was initially directed (Turner 1969; Kapferer 2019).

Co-optation, Exteriority or Both?

For many observers, *HAU*'s stratospheric rise and equally spectacular fall seems to epitomize the broken promise of the open access movement more broadly,[15] which numerous observers suggest has merely served to entrench the capitalization of knowledge. To quote Kalb (2018):

> OA [open access] has lent itself perfectly to brute academic capitalism and hierarchy, just as internet platforms in other sectors have not brought the horizontalist information society promised by early internet utopias. On the contrary, OA is one of the academic forms in which the disruption generated by the current techno-financialized rounds of creative destruction and monumental forms of rent taking by capital in the wider society appear.

Likewise, Herb and Schöpfel (2018: 9) question whether open access is the beginning of a more egalitarian era of scientific communication or 'just another Trojan horse, allowing private companies to extend their control of the Big Data now generated by science'; and Mirowski (2018) highlights the ways in which open access and open science are effectively re-engineering research along the lines of platform capitalism. Indeed, as open access has increasingly been mandated, corporate publishers are moving apace into the

acquisition of the infrastructure that surrounds scholarly publishing (Posada and Chen 2017), and those corporations already in the infrastructure game are consolidating their positions (Bell 2018).

Clearly, as various open access ideals have become mainstream, the scholarly commons is being treated as a self-evident good, regardless of the infrastructure and power structures it supports (Moore 2018a). There is something of this feel to the American Anthropological Association's decision to develop an open access repository 'for the common good' utilizing the services of its corporate vendor (see Kelty and Corsín Jiménez 2018). Processes of restructuration are therefore happening in a way that seems to be maintaining rather than challenging existing flows of capital and the inequalities they have cemented (Guédon 2007; Schöpfel and Herb 2018). Or, rather, they appear to have created new opportunities that illustrate 'capitalism's capacity to develop ever-new guises for profit expropriation and social oppression' (Kapferer and Gold 2017: 33). Haider (2018: 28) describes the result as a type of *deus ex machina*, 'in which a specific kind of ideologically confined, technical openness becomes part of an imagined transformative system change that is almost entirely impregnated in the language . . . of economic necessity, commercial interests and technological determinism'. But to suggest that this is the end of the story would be an oversimplification of open access, and, indeed, of Turner's arguments about the dialectical relationship between anti-structure and structure. For Turner (1992), these are not linear processes in which one becomes the other; instead, they exist in a perpetual figure-ground relationship, with each constantly curbing and penetrating the other.

One of the key limitations of the diagnosis of 'neoliberal capture' is its inability to conceptualize the complexity of the dynamics involved in the open access movement (and, indeed, the growing array of phenomena the term is increasingly being used to explain). As Kapferer and Gold observe:

> The current bundle of multiple crises is put down, at least partly, to the ideological effects of neoliberalism and programs of austerity. There is much to be said in favour of such opinion. But too much is being forced into the frame of neoliberalism, sustaining left/right distinctions of the recent past that are losing their relevance and much of their analytical bite. Moreover, such discourse becomes itself an ideological blind governed increasingly by what may be glossed as economistic thinking or economic reductionism, a feature of anti-neoliberal just as much as neoliberal discourse – a Hegelian identity of opposites. (Kapferer and Gold 2017: 31)

For example, economistic thinking was integral to some of the earliest definitions of open access, so this is far from new (see Haider 2018). Consider

Harnad's focus on 'esoteric' publications, which he defined as non-trade, no-market scholarly works – although he later renounced this distinction in favour of an emphasis on giveaway vs. non-giveaway writing, which he defined as writing produced for research impact vs. royalty income (see Harnad 2004). Thus, in this framing, 'value' was structured from the outset in terms of a market/non-market binary, despite being used to advocate *against* market-driven models of scholarly publishing.[16] However, the open access movement has always been amorphous – impossible to categorize in an ideological sense beyond its commitment to removing barriers to scholarly work. This is largely because its development has a number of distinct lineages that preclude a consistent set of values (Moore 2018b, 2019), making the concept of an 'open access movement' more a matter of symbolic unity than analytic coherence (Šimukovič 2018). These countervailing tendencies are part of what makes the movement liminoid: they have enabled a degree of 'play' and experimentation.

Despite the current restructuration of publishing that is clearly under way, and attempts to narrow the scope of open access to certain conventional patterns and templates,[17] a flourishing array of experiments point to cultural processes still very much in the 'subjunctive mood' (Turner 1992: 133). Moreover, some of these experiments are engendering further transformations that go well beyond questions of access to challenging fundamental tenets of scholarly publishing – from the assumed closure of texts and the systems of credentialing they are entailed within, to the nature of academic authority itself (see Fitzpatrick 2011). These transformations, of course, echo much broader cultural shifts in knowledge and authority that the digital era has produced, but they also speak to the ways in which questions about the future of scholarly publishing are ultimately questions about the future of the academy (Hall 2008; Fitzpatrick 2011). Gloomy predictions to the contrary, these questions are far from settled. For the present at least, the milieu of open access – or key variants of it – remains that of exteriority. As Adema (2015: 5.2.4) argues, 'the sheer variety that makes up the "schools of thought" on openness and open access . . . serves to counter the vision that open access is intrinsically connected to neoliberalist discourses and practices . . . [instead] it can, at least potentially, be used as a powerful critique of these systems'. Indeed, this exteriority is being self-consciously cultivated by a number of open access advocates – like the Radical Open Access Collective, who see open access not so much as a model to be implemented but more as a space of ongoing struggle and resistance (Adema and Hall 2013). As Kelty notes of recursive publics, modulation is constantly occurring, 'for experimentation never seeks its own conclusion' (Kelty 2008: 301).

Conclusion

As the result of a series of social, economic and material transformations over the past few decades, scholarly publishing is currently in a period of major transition. Critical to these transformations has been the emergence of open access – which is a product of the ruptures in the publishing landscape, and is now fundamentally reshaping it. No longer a fringe movement with strong millenarian undertones, several of its core values and ideals have become decidedly mainstream, to the extent that many wonder whether open access has become yet another neoliberal instrument of the 'knowledge economy'. But Turner's work on the dynamics of restructuration suggests that the hold of neoliberalism is neither so totalizing nor complete as we might assume. For Turner, the demands of structuration itself entail an interfacial region wherein 'the past is momentarily negated, suspended, or abrogated, and the future has not yet begun' (1974: 75); thus, hierarchicalizing dynamics do not negate the possibility of transitional egalitarian spaces – this is not a zero-sum scenario. Whether this remains possible in the realm of open access in the long-term is unclear, but one thing is certain: 'Change is coming to scholarly publishing, one way or another' (Fitzpatrick 2011: 195). And if academics abandon open access prematurely there is no surer way of transforming it into what some fear it has already become.

Kirsten Bell completed her PhD in social anthropology at James Cook University in Australia in 2000; she also has a Master of Publishing from Simon Fraser University in Canada. She has held appointments at universities in the USA, Australia, Canada and the UK, and is currently a senior research fellow in anthropology at Imperial College, London.

NOTES

1. Such as Sci-Hub, a roving pirate website that provides access to more than 74 million 'paywalled' academic papers.
2. Although it is worth noting that the internet was subject to intensive discussion right from the outset regarding its potential to undermine as well as promote 'universality, equality and democracy' (Sassi 1996: 29). Thus, the contemporary ambivalence regarding its possibilities and limitations is nothing new.
3. Although open access is often described by advocates in precisely such terms. However, as Kelty (2008: 306) notes, 'neither the Internet nor the computer is the cause of a reorientation of knowledge and power, but both are tools that render possible modulations of settled practices, modulations that reveal a much older problem regarding the legitimacy of the means of circulation and production of knowledge'.

4. There is little question that the 1990s were a period of intensive change in the academy, but many of the debates during this period regarding the role of the university and its relationship with the state were evident well before the neoliberal turn (see, for example, Perkins 1966).
5. Indeed, the digital era introduced new temporalities of publishing, which were no longer constrained in the same material ways as analogue publishing (although they continued to be constrained by the materialities of digitality itself – such as access to computers, servers and networks). This, in turn, facilitated new ideas of research acceleration that were critical to the emergence of the open access movement (see Haider 2018) and more recent offshoots such as open science.
6. This measure was initially developed by the Institute for Scientific Information as a means of helping librarians to make decisions about what journals to subscribe to. However, it has since become the lucrative heart of their business model (see Bohannon 2016), and impact factor calculations are increasingly used to allocate research resources in the form of money, merits and power on an international scale (Larsson 2009).
7. As a side note, these rising subscription costs occurred in a period when 'quality controls' (primarily peer review) had become increasingly difficult to procure – in large part because of casualization of academic labour that accompanied the defunding of universities. This situation starkly highlighted the exploitation intrinsic within scholarly publishing in terms of its reliance on unremunerated academic labour to generate profits. While such activities had always been part and parcel of the responsibilities of a traditional tenured academic, in conditions of growing academic precarity, peer review was increasingly reconceptualized *as* labour. Moreover, this labour was largely invisible under academic audit regimes, in contrast to the hypervisibility of 'outputs' themselves. Compounding these issues has been the sheer escalation in academic publishing that this new environment enabled: the proliferation of journals, the growing pressure to publish and the relentless stream of peer-review requests. The rise of platforms like Publons are a direct response to the resultant crisis in peer review, upon which corporate publishers rely in order to differentiate themselves from 'predatory' publishers, given their own profit-seeking motives. Such platforms simultaneously aim to make visible the labour of peer review and financialize it in new ways, as these databases of 'accredited' reviewers are then sold back to publishers for profit. This speaks to Kapferer and Gold's (2017) point about the dynamic of capital (and the concomitant rise of the corporate state), whose contradictions manifest themselves as a crisis of oppositions (neoliberal/anti-neoliberal, right/left, private/public, etc.) that are both internal to its logic and crucial for its expansion.
8. Various scholars have pointed to separate lineages in relation to open access in the arts and humanities, such as DIY publishing (see Adema 2015; Moore 2019).
9. In part a reaction to restrictive copyright laws, the free culture movement promotes the free distribution of creative works – Creative Commons is one of its inventions (see Kelty 2008 for further discussion).
10. Here I am using the term in a more metaphoric than literal sense, in keeping with Turner's later elaborations of the concept. In his view, this metaphorical usage 'may help us to think about global human society, to which all specific historical social formations may well be converging' (Turner 1974: 76).

11. As author-pays models of open access have become widely accepted, corporate publishers have enthusiastically endorsed open access as a means of generating new revenue streams. So-called 'hybrid' open access has been a particular boon for such publishers, allowing them to derive revenue not only from institutional subscriptions but from article processing charges paid by individuals to make their work openly available. Thus, publishers are effectively paid twice for the same content, a phenomenon widely critiqued as 'double dipping'.
12. Turner's analysis of communitas and millenarian movements bears considerable resemblance to Weber's (1968) work on the relationship between charisma and institution building, with the former arising outside of social structures but becoming reconciled with them through processes of routinization – Turner was clearly aware of this connection, and alludes to it in passing (see Turner 1969: 199).
13. These qualities will sound strikingly familiar to anyone who has followed the *HAU* controversy and the allegations that have swirled about its founder and the working conditions of its employees.
14. This is posed as a rhetorical question, but seems to be the line of argument da Col favours at other points in the editorial.
15. This is certainly the line pushed by da Col (2017) in the editorial in which he disavows the viability of open access. However, it was clear to many from the outset that the journal's lavish production model, lack of institutional support, and over-reliance on the networking skills of its 'editor-inspirator' (Kapferer 2018), undermined its long-term sustainability (see LaFlamme et al. 2018).
16. See Dawney, Kirwan and Brigstocke (2016) for similar points about discussions of the commons.
17. Evident, for example, in attempts to frame 'gold' open access as synonymous with author-pays models (see Fuchs and Sandoval 2013).

REFERENCES

Adema, Janneke. 2015. *Knowledge Production beyond the Book: Performing the Scholarly Monograph in Contemporary Digital Culture*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Coventry. Retrieved 11 January 2023 from http://www.openreflections.org/?page_id=103.

Adema, Janneke, and Gary Hall. 2013. 'The Political Nature of the Book: On Artists' Books and Radical Open Access', *New Formations* 87(1): 138–56.

Bell, Kirsten. 2017. '"Predatory" Open Access Journals as Parody: Exposing the Limitations of "Legitimate" Academic Publishing', *Triplec: Communication, Capitalism & Critique* 15(2): 651–62.

———. 2018. 'Is It Still Paranoia If They're Really Out to Vet You? On Clarivate Analytics', *Cost of Living*, 15 August. Retrieved 13 November 2023, from https://www.cost-ofliving.net/is-it-still-paranoia-if-theyre-really-out-to-vet-you-on-clarivate-analytics/.

Bergstrom, Theodore C., Paul N. Courant, R. Preston McAfee and Michael A. Williams. 2014. 'Evaluating Big Deal Journal Bundles', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 111(26): 9425–30.

Bohannon, John. 2016. 'Hate Journal Impact Factors? New Study Gives You One More Reason', *Science Magazine*, 6 July. Retrieved 11 March 2023 from http://

www.sciencemag.org/news/2016/07/hate-journal-impact-factors-new-study-gives-you-one-more-reason.

Budapest Open Access Initiative. 2002. *Read the Budapest Open Access Initiative*. Retrieved 15 August 2023, from https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read.

Burrows, Roger. 2012. 'Living with the H-Index? Metric Assemblages in the Contemporary Academy', *The Sociological Review* 60(2): 355–72.

Chartier, Roger. 1993. 'Libraries without Walls', *Representations* 42(Spring): 38–52.

Da Col, Giovanni. 2017. 'Free Gifts That Must Be Invented', *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 7(3): i–vii.

———. 2019. 'New Publishing Demands New Magic', *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 9(1): 1–5.

Da Col, Giovanni, and David Graeber. 2011. 'Foreword: The Return of Ethnographic Theory', *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 1(1): vi–xxxv.

Dawney, Leila, Samuel Kirwan, and Julian Brigstocke. 2016. 'Introduction', in Leila Dawney, Samuel Kirwan and Julian Brigstocke (eds), *Space, Power and the Commons: The Struggle for Alternative Futures*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–27.

Deflem, Mathieu. 1991. 'Ritual, Anti-Structure, and Religion: A Discussion of Victor Turner's Processual Symbolic Analysis', *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 30(1): 1–25.

Eve, Martin Paul. 2013. 'The Botnet: Webs of Hegemony/Zombies Who Publish.' In *Zombies in the Academy: Living Death in Higher Education*, edited by Andrew Whelan, Ruth Walker and Christopher Moore, 105–118. Bristol: Intellect Books.

———. 2014. *Open Access and the Humanities: Contexts, Controversies and the Future*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eve, Martin Paul, and Ernesto Priego. 2017. 'Who is Actually Harmed by Predatory Publishers?' *Triplec: Communication, Capitalism & Critique* 15(2): 755–70.

Fitzpatrick, Kathleen. 2011. *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy*. New York: New York University Press.

Fuchs, Christina, and Marisol Sandoval. 2013. 'The Diamond Model of Open Access Publishing: Why Policy Makers, Scholars, Universities, Libraries, Labour Unions and the Publishing World Need to Take Non-Commercial, Non-Profit Open Access Serious', *Triplec: Communication, Capitalism & Critique* 11(2): 428–43.

Fyfe, Aileen, Kelly Coate, Stephen Curry, Stuart Lawson, Noah Moxham and Camilla Mørk Røstvik. 2017. 'Untangling Academic Publishing: A History of the Relationship between Commercial Interests, Academic Prestige and the Circulation of Research'. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.546100

Green, Sarah. 2018. '#Hautalk: The Tyranny of Structurelessness and No End in Sight'. *Allegralab*, 16 October. Retrieved 9 November 2023 from http://Allegralaboratory.Net/Hautalk-the-Tyranny-of-Structurelessness-and-No-End-in-Sight/.

Guédon, Jean-Claude. 2001. *In Oldenburg's Long Shadow: Librarians, Research Scientists, Publishers, and the Control of Scientific Publishing*. Washington, DC: Association of Libraries.

———. 2007. 'Open Access and the Divide between "Mainstream" and "Peripheral" Science'. Retrieved 15 November 2023 from http://eprints.rclis.org/10778/1/brazil-final.pdf.

Haider, Jutta. 2018. 'Openness as a Tool for Acceleration and Measurement: Reflections on Problem Representations Underpinning Open Access and Open Science', in Joa-

chim Schöpfel and Ulrich Herb (eds), *Open Divide: Critical Studies on Open Access*. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, pp. 17–30.

Hall, Gary. 2008. *Digitize this Book! The Politics of New Media, or Why We Need Open Access Now*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hamann, Nikolaus. 2013. 'Openness, Libraries and Political Transformation', *Triplec: Communication, Capitalism & Critique* 11(2): 535–42.

Harnad, Stevan. 1994. 'A Subversive Proposal'. Retrieved 22 January 2024 from https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/253351/.

———. 2004. 'June 27 2004: the 1994 "Subversive Proposal" at 10'. Retrieved 1 August 2018 from https://www.southampton.ac.uk/~harnad/Hypermail/Amsci/3809.html.

Herb, Ulrich, and Joachim Schöpfel. 2018. 'Introduction: Open Divide Emerges as Open Access Unfolds', in Schöpfel and Herb (eds), *Open Divide: Critical Studies on Open Access*. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, pp. 7–13.

Horvath, Agnes, Ion Benţa Marius, and Joan Davison. 2019. 'Introduction: On the Political Anthropology of Walling', in Horvath, Benţa Marius and Davison (eds), *Walling, Boundaries and Liminality: A Political Anthropology of Transformations*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–16.

Kalb, Don. 2018. 'HAU Not: For David Graeber and the Anthropological Precariate'. *Focaalblog*, 26 June. Retrieved 9 November 2023 from http://www.focaalblog.com/2018/06/26/don-kalb-hau-not-for-david-graeber-and-the-anthropological-precariate/.

Kapferer, Bruce. 2018. 'The Hau Complicity: An Event in the Crisis of Anthropology'. *Focaalblog*, 9 July. Retrieved 9 November 2023 from http://www.focaalblog.com/2018/07/09/Bruce-Kapferer-the-Hau-Complicity-an-Event-in-the-Crisis-of-Anthropology/.

———. 2019. 'Victor Turner and the Ritual Proccess', *Anthropology Today* 35(3): 1–2.

Kapferer, Bruce, and Marina Gold. 2017. 'The Cuckoo in the Nest: Thoughts on Neoliberalism, Revaluations of Capital and the Emergence of the Corporate State. Part 1', Arena 151: 31–34.

Kelty, Christopher M. 2008. *Two Bits: The Cultural Significance of Free Software*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Kelty, C., and A. Corsin Jiménez. 2018. 'Public Statement on the AAA's Repository for the Common Good'. Retrieved 25 September 2023 from https://docs.google.com/Forms/D/E/1faipqlsd2_4o7c6gblblp6jbb4ijaht22jm6xjktr_Ci7lsbq9mhiqw/Viewform.

LaFlamme, Marcel, Dominic Boyer, Kirsten Bell, Alberto Corsín Jiménez, Christopher Kelty and John Willinsky. 2018. 'Let's Do This Together: A Cooperative Vision for Open Access'. *Anthrodendum*, 27 June. Retrieved 17 July 2023 from https://anthrodendum.org/2018/06/27/lets-do-this-together-a-cooperative-vision-for-open-access/.

Larivière, Vincent, Stefanie Haustein and Phillippe Mongeon. 2015. 'The Oligopoly of Academic Publishers in the Digital Era', *Plos One* 10(6): E0127502.

Larner, Wendy. 2012. 'Beyond Commercialisation', *Social Anthropology* 20(3): 287–89.

Larsen, Peder Olesen, and Markus von Ins. 2010. 'The Rate of Growth in Scientific Publication and the Decline in Coverage Provided by Science Citation Index', *Scientometrics* 84: 575–603.

Larsson, Staffan. 2009. 'An Emerging Economy of Publications and Citations', *Nordisk Pedagogik* 29: 34–52.

Mirowski, Philip. 2018. 'The Future(s) of Open Science', *Social Studies of Science* 48(2): 171–203.

Moore, Sam. 2018a. 'The "Care-Full" Commons', in Sam Moore and Mattering Press (eds), *The Commons and Care*. Post Office Press & Rope Press, pp. 16–25.

———. 2018b. 'Open/Access: Negotiations between Openness and Access to Research', in Joaquim Schöpfel and Ulrich Herb (eds), *Open Divide: Critical Studies on Open Access*. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, pp. 41–55.

———. 2019. 'Revisiting "the 1990s Debutante": Scholar-Led Publishing and the Pre-History of the Open Access Movement', *Humanities Commons*. Retrieved 20 November 2023 from http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/gty2-w177.

Perkins, James A. 1966. *The University in Transition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Posada, Alejandro, and George Chen. 2017. 'Publishers Are Increasingly in Control of Scholarly Infrastructure and Why We Should Care', *The Knowledge G.A.P.* (Blog). 20 September. Retrieved 1 August 2023 from http://knowledgegap.org/Index.Php/Sub-Projects/Rent-Seeking-and-Financialization-of-the-Academic-Publishing-Industry/Preliminary-Findings/.

Poynder, Richard. 2018. 'Preface', in Joaquim Schöpfel and Ulrich Herb (eds), *Open Divide: Critical Studies on Open Access*. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, pp. 1–6.

Research England. 2019. 'Guidance on Submissions', *REF2021 Research Excellence Framework*. Retrieved 29 July 2023 from https://www.ref.ac.uk/Media/1092/Ref-2019_01-Guidance-on-Submissions.Pdf.

Sassi, Sinikka. 1996. 'The Network and the Fragmentation of the Public Sphere', *Javnost – the Public* 3(1): 25–41.

Schöpfel, Joaquim. 2018. 'The Paradox of Success', in Joaquim Schöpfel and Ulrich Herb (eds), *Open Divide: Critical Studies on Open Access*. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, pp. 57–68.

Schöpfel, Joaquim, and Ulrich Herb (eds). 2018. *Open Divide: Critical Studies on Open Access*. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.

Šimukovič, Elena. 2018. 'Open Access, a New Kind of Emerging Knowledge Regime?' in Joaquim Schöpfel and Ulrich Herb (eds), *Open Divide: Critical Studies on Open Access*. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press, pp. 31–40.

Suber, Peter. 2009. 'Knowledge as a Public Good', *SPARC Open Access Newsletter*, 139. Retrieved 5 November 2023 from http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/newsletter/11-02-09.htm.

———. 2012. *Open Access*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Thorkelson, Eli. 2019. 'The Politics of Hau and French Theory'. *Decasia*, 2 July. Retrieved 17 July 2023 from https://decasia.org/academic_culture/2019/07/02/the-politics-of-hau-and-french-theory/.

Todd, Zoe. 2019. 'I'm Too Tired to Read Your Work: On Refusing Hau Journal'. *Anthrodendum*, 1 July. Retrieved 18 July 2023 from https://anthrodendum.org/2019/07/01/im-too-tired-to-read-your-work-on-refusing-hau-journal/.

Turkle, Sherry. 1995. *Life on the Screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

———. 2005. *The Second Self: Computers and the Human Spirit*. Second Edition. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Turner, Victor W. 1969. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

———. 1974. 'Liminal to Liminoid, in Play, Flow and Ritual: An Essay in Comparative Symbology', *Rice University Studies* 60(3): 53–92.

———. 1992. 'Morality and Liminality', in Edith Turner (ed.), *Blazing the Trail: Way Marks in the Exploration of Symbols*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, pp. 132–62.

Weber, Max. 1968. *Max Weber on Charisma and Institution Building: Selected Papers*, edited by S.N. Eisenstadt. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Willinsky, John. 2006. *The Access Principle: The Case for Open Access to Research and Scholarship*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

———. 2016. *The Common and Cooperative Strength of Academic Libraries: The Past and Future of Access to Learning*. Retrieved 15 November 2023 from http://openscience.ens.fr/open_access_models/other_models/open_access_cooperatives/2016_03_07_john_willinsky.pdf.