The Open Access Interviews: Jutta Haider

RICHARD POYNDER

9th May 2017

Many of us join causes and movements at different times in our lives, if only because we like to feel part of something bigger than ourselves, and because most of us have a healthy desire to improve the world. Unfortunately, movements often fail to achieve their objectives, or their objectives are significantly watered down – or lost sight of – along the way. Sometimes they fail completely.

When their movement hits a roadblock, advocates will respond in a variety of ways: "True believers" tend to carry on regardless, continuing to repeat their favoured mantras *ad nauseam*. Some will give up and move on to the next worthy cause. Others will take stock, seek to understand the problem, and try to find another way forward.

Jutta Haider, an associate professor in Information Studies at Lund University, would appear to be in the third category. Initially a proponent of open access, Haider subsequently "turned into a sceptic". This was not, she says, because she no longer sees merit in making the scientific literature freely available, but because the term open access "has gained meanings and tied itself to areas in science, science policy-making, and the societal and economic development of society that I find deeply problematic."

Above all, she says, she worries that open access has become "a business model, an indicator for performance measurement, tied to notions of development purely imagined as economic growth and so on."

This is not how open access was envisaged when the movement began.

Haider believes the turning point came in 2012, when the UK's Finch Report was published. From that moment "open access became gold OA, and gold OA became APC OA." In other words, pay-to-publish.

The implications of this have been significant, she says, not least because it has allowed legacy publishers to appropriate the movement, and by doing so to continue to control and make excessive profits from scholarly communication.

Open access has also been co-opted by governments and university managers, says Haider, to facilitate "the growing incursions of neoliberal control management into university governance and research policy, and the ongoing privatisation of research infrastructures."

She also believes that in being moulded to fit other agendas in this way, open access has enabled long-standing and intractable problems in science and scholarly communication to be migrated to the digital world, including science's Western-bias, and what she describes as its "idealised story

of how science progresses and of the role of the scholarly journal article (conference paper, published record)".

Most significantly, by putting a price on the scholarly paper APC OA has "marketised" science communication in a very direct and negative way.

In short, the triumph of APC OA means that rather than create a fairer and more equitable system of scholarly communication (as advocates promised) open access will leave many disadvantaged and disenfranchised, especially researchers in the Global South. Indeed, for them the situation is likely to worsen rather than improve, since contributing to science will increasingly require having the wherewithal to pay to have your work published, which is difficult if not impossible for many in the developing world. "I cannot fathom how a shift to APC open access becoming the dominant model will work to not further deepen the inequalities with production and contribution to the literature", says Haider.

Pay-to-publish gold OA has also seen the emergence of so-called predatory publishing. This has amplified the problems of trust in scholarly communication, and many believe those in the Global South are more vulnerable to the predators.

All very disheartening

Those who joined the open access movement in the expectation that it would create a more cost-effective, equitable and efficient research environment will find this is all very disheartening.

However, given the larger political and economic environment in which the research community is inevitably located, says Haider, it is not surprising. "Unless you change the entire economic system and society, there are really not so many options."

She adds, "Even if the scholarly article were not directly marketised, it would still be part of a system of science that operates within the conditions set by capitalist market economics."

Nevertheless, Haider believes there are ways of mitigating the worst excesses of this marketisation. "If you [have to] act within the political and economic climate that we have, then community-based crowd-funding models seem to offer solutions that would at least enable you to not have to sell out completely to interests that are not the ones you seek to promote."

She adds: "[N]ot all business interests automatically work in opposition to morality, equality and fairness. Those working with these large moral imperatives to promote open access, I assume, believe that they are not only mutually compatible, but they are even supportive of each other, in the right circumstances."

But in order for the movement to move forward in a more benign direction, she suggests, it is important to acknowledge what has happened to open access, and to discuss the issues openly and honestly, especially now that the debate is widening out to encompass open science. "What I hope for is an honest debate on open science, a debate which does not replicate the naivety of the early open access debates, and one where the term is not embraced regardless of who else fills it

with whatever meaning they favour, even to the point where it runs counter to making science open in any kind of meaningful way."

Please read the Q&A below with Jutta Haider for a detailed discussion of these issues.

The interview begins …

RP: Can you say who you are, where you are based and what your primary research interests are?

JHL: I research and teach in Information Studies at the [Department of Arts and Cultural Sciences, Lund University](), in Sweden.

I received my doctorate in the UK, at the Department of Information Science, City University London. I wrote my doctoral thesis on open access, specifically in relation to notions of development, and have since turned my research interest to issues of the changed conditions of knowledge and information in contemporary digital culture more broadly.

Theoretically, I am interested in issues of trust and in how meaning is made in and through practices, discourses and material conditions.

I have done work on contemporary encyclopaedias, on the ways in which information on environmental issues is shaped in social media and search engines, on the role the various invisible information infrastructures play for the shaping of information in everyday life, on information inequalities and on the scholarly communication system.

RP: There appear to be a number of different, and perhaps conflicting, definitions of open access, so can I first ask: What do you understand by the term open access?

JH: Terms gain their meaning through use. This is what a lot of my research is about and specifically my work on open access and information poverty has focused on charting and also understanding the various alliances, institutions, policies, discursive devices implicated in creating them, in making them meaningful.

Meanings are not firm but they are made and re-made as they are stabilised through being drawn into other relationships with other meanings, into various alliances, through institutions and so on. Open access is a perfect example of that. Clearly, its meaning has shifted considerably since its inception in the late 1990s and early 2000s and to how it is employed today by, for instance, the European Commission or by Elsevier.

In a large part this shifting, I think, has to do with ways in which it was made attractive for different established groups – e.g. funders, administration, politicians, researchers and so on – and where already existing unquestionable "truths" were used to establish open access as strengthening a norm, rather than challenging something.

But to return to the question of what I understand by the term open access, the answer has to be "not a lot anymore". I am in fact doubtful as to whether open access continues to be a meaningful term at all for anything aside of the very instrumental and technical meaning of online access to a text that is free on the side of the user. And maybe that's a good thing: To make the term open access more of a down to earth concept that describes just that, and to empty it from all additional meaning. Indeed, maybe that has already happened.

At the same time, today open science has taken over the ideological meaning of open access, but plays out on a considerably broader arena. Here we can see the "battle" fortifying and further expanding the commercialisation of public knowledge and in some instances also presenting a challenge to just that.

It is interesting how openness in science in relation to research data on climate change threatened by the Trump administration has gotten a very different sound to it than the business focus in which open science and open access are lumped together with open innovation, which is the predominant narrative in Europe now.

Maybe public science is a term that deserves to be re-invigorated to replace open science in this arena?

RP: How would you describe your attitude to open access: are you a proponent, a sceptic, neither for nor against, or what?

JH: This is a difficult question that ties into my understanding of the notion of open access. I started out, of course, as a proponent but turned into a sceptic – not because I do not see the merits of free access to the scientific literature, which I do, but because the term has gained meanings and tied itself to areas in science, science policy-making, and the societal and economic development of society that I find deeply problematic. For instance, it has become a business model, an indicator for performance measurement, tied to notions of development purely imagined as economic growth and so on.

I am not really surprised that it turned out that way. In all likelihood, this is the reason for its success. However, rather than continuing to rally around a term that now propels a quite different meaning, I think we should be open to re-invent what the notion set out to do in the beginning.

This could also mean highlighting instances where such a re-invention happens, and pointing out that it is in opposition to the dominant notion and not a proof of its inherent superiority.

If open access is the solution, what is the problem?

RP: In an essay currently in print you start out asking: "If OA is the solution, what is the problem it is meant to solve?" Do you have a settled answer to that question? If so, what is it?

JH: The short answer is I do not, or not conclusively. However, I want more people to ask this question and not just of open access, but also of other dominant concepts in research policy and politics more generally.

This is part of my ongoing interest in trying to understand how the meanings of open access and also open science are shaped by their various alliances – some of which are stronger than others. In fact to ask this question, to see concepts as solutions to problems, is an efficient methodological maneuver to get to terms with what they are meant to do, and through this to understand why certain concepts succeed and in whose benefit they work.

In the case of open access there are of course many answers, but what you can see in the most mainstream version of open access is that it is positioned as yet another tool to contribute to solving the ever present problem of our economic system – economic growth.

Then of course it is a layered problem, and so open access is seen as the solution to a great many shortcomings in this world, from problems with knowledge flows between different groups, to issues with how research is evaluated, or difficulties with accountability and transparency.

Interestingly OA is today never – to my knowledge – seen as a solution to issues of preservation and building a (distributed) archive of the scholarly record.

RP: Much of the debate we have seen around open access has circled around the relative merits of green vs. gold open access. What are your thoughts on this debate and its relevance? Should these two types of OA be viewed as complementary or competitive?

JH: I am one of the few people who actually believes that green OA should be supported and developed more.

And I also believe that we need to highlight more actively that gold OA does not necessarily mean APC OA, but that there is a long history of OA that is financed and supported in other ways than the author pays version, a history that began long before the signing of the Budapest Open Access Initiative. Yet somewhere around the time of the issuing of the Finch Report in the UK, open access became gold OA, and gold OA became APC OA.

It is interesting how other alternatives just vanished, not in the sense that they were discarded or actively thrown out, but rather that they were buried as a result of the way in which the APC solution was advanced as so obviously best-suited. This led to everything else beginning to look

like the naïve alternative projects of hopeless idealists, or possibly the humanities, which do not count anyway and are often positioned as "lagging behind".

For instance, in the interests of seeing a larger infrastructure in which the scholarly record is archived and preserved in a meaningful way I think transnational, or at least interlinked national, approaches incorporating green OA should have been discussed as an option.

And I see the benefit here not primarily in providing internal formal scholarly communication in all the various disciplinary cultures, as green OA might be far too late or not adequate in all cases. But it could solve issues of accessibility for other groups (journalists, practitioners, students…) and if done right such a system might also be a way to build in mechanisms for establishing trust in these publications.

However, there is no one solution and there should not be. In fact this is a problem inherent in this whole discussion from the beginning. It starts from the idea that there is one system for scholarly communication and open access docks into that, but really it does not work that way. Scholarly communication, formal, informal and everything in between is manifold and messy, there are differences at all levels and we should be able to accommodate these differences also in open access – so maybe we should think about these matters in the plural.

One issue with green open access is that a very watered down version has emerged, but one which really works for many scholars. Here I am thinking of the likes of ResearchGate and Academia.edu. Again, however, this means putting control outside research institutions and into the hands, and onto the servers, of private companies. Fortunately, new scholar-controlled, truly alternative variants like the Humanities Commons have also appeared.

RP: There is a growing belief (and from what you say I assume you are one of those who believe it) that open access is currently in the process of being appropriated, both by legacy publishers (via costly pay-to-publish options), and by university managers (who have come to view institutional repositories and green OA as useful new tools for ramping up the bureaucratic scrutiny of researchers). Should we be concerned about thist?

JH: Yes and no, I am as I said earlier not surprised that it turned out this way. I guess it is part of the reason for the success of open access in the first place.

At the same time, we should be concerned at how academia and scholarly publishing are developing in general, and here open access can work as a magnifying glass revealing the growing incursions of neoliberal control management into university governance and research policy, and the ongoing privatisation of research infrastructures.

We should also not exempt open access from scrutiny, which due to misplaced loyalty to a meaning the notion was meant to have has become complicit in open-washing practices – by, for instance, large publishing corporations or research infrastructure providers. Such scrutiny could re-invigorate a discussion about open access, scholarly communication and the conditions of research and research funding more broadly, one that is not limited by the narrow imperative to implement a system or a policy goal.

The Global South

RP: You take a particular interest in the likely implications of open access for the Global South. What are the main issues here, and to what extent does OA work for/against those based in the developing world?

JH: Early on OA was conceived as a way to help address information access inequalities and developing countries and "the poor" were specifically highlighted. There are many issues here and what we call the global south is really very many different kinds of places.

It is clear that there is a Western-bias in scholarly communication which cannot be denied. It is everywhere – in how the databases that measure productivity in science are compiled, in the way journals count as international and trustworthy, in the way in which research questions attract funding and so on. And of course, since the scholarly literature is very expensive there is a problem with access to the literature.

In this sense, open access could address some of the issues of access and that is of course a good thing. However, while it has certainly improved the access problem it has far from solved it, if you don't see SciHub as the solution (which you could).

That said, I cannot fathom how a shift to APC open access becoming the dominant model will work to not further deepen the inequalities with production and contribution to the literature in the first place.

What I find most concerning, however, is that open access in the early and mid-2000s really just reinforced prejudices and stereotypes about the "underdeveloped" and the "developed", the rich and the poor – or however this distinction is made – and how the various power-structures and regimes of dominance were smoothed over as a sort of anomaly that can be addressed with yet another technical solution and – as always – more access to western knowledge.

RP: In a 2007 paper, you argued that open access inhabits what you called two opposing/conflicting "discursive spaces". Can you clarify what you mean by that, and what you see as the implications for the development of open access?

JH: By that I mean that open access tries to articulate resistance to how science – or at least access to its records – is organised globally and locally, but at the same time re-affirms and fortifies many of the problems that led to this situation in the first place. It is quite commonplace to highlight this conflict today, but in 2006/2007 it was somewhat subdued.

To me, this dilemma became really obvious in the way in which development discourse was used to legitimise open access in the early 2000s. It was not the concerns articulated in postcolonial science studies or of post-colonialism more broadly that were employed, but the (often very brutal) reasoning of the mainstream development apparatus and the various economic organisations that perpetuate a – what seems to me and many others – fundamentally unjust

system whereby open access becomes just another tool for the advancement of market economics.

It is not unique in that way and maybe I – and some others – were naïve in believing that this must be a misunderstanding. Probably it is not. Maybe this is all there is, but I doubt it. And it seems to me that the many scholar-led projects that have recently gained ground in the humanities and arts-related fields can be seen as proof of a wider refusal to accept that.

Open access, like other "open" movements then and probably even now, wanted to be both – resistance and mainstream at the same time. As I say, open access is not unique in that way; rather it continues a tradition of "information for development", where more information is always seen as a good thing and nobody questions whose information it is, not to speak of what counts as information in the first place. I recommend the work of Dave Hudson in this area.

Idealised version of scientific progress

RP: OA is currently predominantly about scholarly journals. In 2007 you said that the scholarly publishing infrastructure we have inherited depicts an "idealised version of scientific progress". What do you mean by this, and what are the implications for the success of open access, especially for those based in the developing world?

JH: What I mean by this is that there exists an idealised story of how science progresses and of the role of the scholarly journal article (conference paper, published record) in this. The idea is that first you carry out the "science", then you publish your results. Other researchers then read this and build on it to further science, *ad infinitum* as we come closer and closer to the truth.

But we know that science, as life, is messy and diverse, and progress happens sometimes linearly but often just in irregular bounces. Moreover, sometimes things don't develop for the better, but turn out to be side-tracks and so on.

The role of the scientific paper in this is far more complicated than that of a vessel of content. It also plays a very significant role in conveying status and building careers. A scholarly text also needs to be guarded against "attackers" and so on.

Bruno Latour or Karin Knorr-Centina have written extensively about this. Clear to library and information studies, Bernd Frohmann has also discussed this. Science studies scholars know this, researchers know this, and yet somehow the idea persists of linear progress in which one paper leads to the next and all the good papers get read a lot and all the bad papers get ignored, and that this says something about how scientific knowledge progresses, and about quality.

It is this – admittedly compelling – idea that has influenced open access as a concept and the policy making surrounding it. This reasoning says that if only the so-called developing world can get access to all these records, journal articles and so on, they will find out where we are at in the real game of international science, and then they can play their part in building on it, and we will all be happily united and advance science together from now on.

This is incredibly naïve, and even to a degree insulting I would say. The very rules of the game, and of the setting of the game, work in favour of the Western academic, and mostly of the white male academic. So, while access to journal articles is certainly a good thing, it does very little about the larger issues at stake in this field. And by promoting this one-dimensional vision of linear scientific progress it might even hinder the emergence of different stories and of different models.

Once again, it provides a solution to a problem without considering the actual roots of the problem. And if it does not work out in the "happily ever after"-way envisaged, the blame can be put on the recipients. I am of course exaggerating to make a point, but only slightly.

RP: So this idealised vision of scientific progress needs to be viewed through the prism of colonialism. I am conscious that last year a video circulated on the Web of a student at the University of Cape Town in South Africa suggesting that before African de-colonisation could be complete it would be necessary for the whole of science to be "scratched out" and rebuilt from an African perspective. The video was [dubbed](...) "Science must fall?"(in a reference to the [Rhodes Must Fall](...) protest movement). I assume the student was speaking tongue-in-cheek, but what she said does point to some real issues about the way in which science is predominantly a product of, and still controlled by, those based in the Developed World. Scratching science out is clearly not an option, but what if anything can be done to create more of a level playing field in the global research endeavour?

JH: This is the most difficult question, but also the most fundamental one. However, I have to start by saying that I don't have the answer to it. It would be presumptuous and limitlessly arrogant to claim anything else.

Science is one of the most powerful and most successful forms of knowledge we have and it has benefited humankind enormously. However, science has also damaged humankind and our living environment and ecosystems. Colonialism is not external to science, neither is racism or sexism. Science was part of all these projects and feminist and post-colonial science scholars have shown how this is and was the case.

So we have to accept that and work from it. We cannot pretend that this is external to science; that science somehow miraculously is outside society. It is not, nothing is. Neither is society outside science. They are integrated and constitutive of each other. But this does not mean it is all the same, and all knowledge systems work to the same effect and nothing matters. We cannot go down the road of a misconceived vulgar relativism, which seems to be in vogue right now.

In this sense, the speaker in the video is absolutely right, science is through and through grounded in a European epistemology and in violence and cannot – and should not – be thought outside or above this. And the general lack of awareness of how science contributed to "de-developing" the Global South in the first place is sometimes mind blowing, and quite understandably induces anger.

Now as you point out, scratching out science is not an option and if it were I would not advocate it. [Arjun Appadurai](...) developed a vision of what he calls a strong internationalisation of research

and science, which involves conversations about the very ethics in which we ground knowledge production. I like this vision and I think that if open access, or public access, aligned itself with such a principled internationalisation it would be a more positive force.

Trust

RP: In discussing the 2013 [Bohannon "Sting"](#) of OA journals you [pointed out](#) that at the heart of any discussion about the Sting lies the issue of trust, not least trust in the infrastructure of scholarly communication that we have inherited, including traditional peer review. Since today's global, networked world allows people to so easily move around in an anonymised and/or sock-puppet environment can the level of trust needed for scholarly communication to work effectively really exist anymore? If not, what are the implications of this for the research endeavour?

JH: As has been pointed out repeatedly, in order to know we have to trust, first other people. And since it is in many cases impossible to hinge trust just on personal knowledge of other persons, we have also developed various mechanisms, systems and institutions to build and mediate trust. Increasingly, technical systems are part of this mediation and increasingly invisible mechanisms like algorithms have a role to play.

Peer-review, the scholarly journal, the scholarly monograph, and yes also publishers and so on are part of how trust in science and research is created and maintained. Personal knowledge still plays a role of course, but it is hard to transfer that to realms outside a narrow disciplinary community.

And yes, despite scholarly communication working just fine internally in many disciplines, I think we can talk of a crisis of trust. The trust of the public in science. And this happens on many levels.

First, while for someone inside a scientific field it might be quite straightforward to establish what and who is trustworthy and what and who is not, this is not at all a given for those outside, for journalists, PR people, students and so on. So, we have to find better ways of establishing this trustworthiness in ways that make sense to those outside the narrow disciplinary community, and which work in the ecosystem of digital networked information overload that we now exist in.

On top of that, as I said, a kind of vulgar relativism has gained ground and now seems to have reached the mainstream discourse around, for instance, climate change, where scientific consensus is beginning to be reduced to mere opinion.

This is dangerous and undermines a general trust in scientific knowledge. There are of course a lot of complicated issues connected to that and developing the theme would be a book-length project, which others are better suited to write.

But to return to the issue of open access: I find it intriguing how the mainstream open science project works in part by building up an image of a scientific community in which fraud is rife, peer review is failing, and where the individual scientist is trying to be as secretive as possible in

some sort of lab-shaped ivory tower, but open science can come to the rescue and show these nerds the right way.

This is not only counterproductive in terms of getting the support of the scientific community, it is also dangerous in times where mistrust in all forms of expertise is rife.

RP: You say in your unpublished paper (and you made this point earlier) that in the wake of the UK Finch Report open access has become "primarily a business model". I think you imply that libraries have helped in this, by initially viewing OA as a solution to the "serials crisis", and then treating it as a way of "redirecting the cash flow from subscriptions to open access publications". So how would you characterise the role that librarians have played in determining the direction the open access movement has taken and the current solutions on offer? Have they perhaps enabled publishers to appropriate open access, and by doing so failed to resolve the affordability problem that drew them to open access in the first place?

JH: Yes, perhaps so. Some librarians have certainly contributed to that. I would contend that this has to do with the somewhat simplified understanding of scholarly communication and the role of the published work in the research process that I outlined earlier. It might also have to do with the institutional status of libraries and librarians.

Open access became a high-profile issue that in the beginning excited librarians and engaged them in a larger cause that is closely aligned to the mission of the library. I have enormous respect for that and it is the reason why I personally fell for open access in the first place.

However, the constant lobbying of the various responsible people in the hierarchies of research funding and university administration has probably taken its toll. And as OA has become more high-profile the issue has also moved away from libraries.

So yes, I do think that libraries partly opened up the direction in which OA has developed. To be fair, they have also highlighted problems, but probably too late.

Interestingly this also happened around the same time as bibliometrics became a serious part of the library's work, and this is also a pull away from the researchers to the management side of the university administration.

At the same time, as I said, there is a general tide moving in this direction, and this makes it hard to argue that it could have turned out very differently. Although, rather than continuing to embrace the new form of open access, these conflicts should have been made visible by the library profession much earlier.

Anyway, my point in the paper you refer to is that although libraries and librarians have done this enormous amount of work embedding open access in the mainstream, lobbying, undertaking policy work, making it more widely known and successful and, yes, also contributing to turning it into a business model, they are now reduced to near irrelevance so far as the bigger issues are concerned, assigned simply to handling the cash flows that go to the very same publishers that caused them to start rallying around the issue of open access in the first place.

This is almost beyond ironic, and I very much hope that with this new experience librarians will take back some control over the issue, and in a way that allows for different approaches and inventive solutions outside the streamlined, clean, official version of open access we have ended up with.

Doubt cast on the whole *raison d'être* and agenda of open access?

RP: As you noted, one of the consequences of viewing open access primarily as a business model (rather than a way of communicating science) is that the pay-to-publish model looks set to dominate. Apart from high (and rising) APC levels, this has given rise to so-called predatory publishing, which we discussed with regard to the Bohannon "Sting". This in turn has raised issues about transparency, both of costs and of processes, and of how best to fund scholarly publishing in an online world. It feels to me that this is very similar to the "fake news" crisis we see in mainstream media today. I was struck therefore when I read recently that the inventor of the Web, and long-time advocate for openness, Tim Berners-Lee has suggested that one solution might be the reintroduction of "subscriptions and micropayments as alternative ways for companies to generate income." In other words, relying on advertising and pay-to-publish models seems to have had undesirable and even dangerous consequences. Does Berners-Lee's suggestion not cast doubt on the whole **raison d'être** *and agenda of the open access movement?*

JH: I think he has a valuable point. Unless you change the entire economic system and society, there are really not so many options. If you act within the political and economic climate that we have, then community-based crowd-funding models seem to offer solutions that would at least enable you to not have to sell out completely to interests that are not the ones you seek to promote.

But it doesn't have to be subscriptions, donations could be a way. Wikipedia is doing that successfully and they are not accused of undermining openness. Donations and grants should also come from other funders.

In the case of open access to research, taxpayer-financed research funders could play a much more active role in enabling various alternative solutions aside from the mainstream APC model, but there is little evidence that they do.

RP: Is it not therefore hard not to conclude that OA is unlikely ever to be widely viewed as anything but a business model in today's global, neoliberal world, a world in which practically everything is marketised. If that is right, do you think there is some irony in the fact that OA advocates promoted open access primarily in terms of morality, equality and fairness?

JH: Perhaps so, but I don't want to think about this in terms of irony. It is of course true that everything is marketised and there is virtually no outside. Even if the scholarly article were not directly marketised, it would still be part of a system of science that operates within the conditions set by capitalist market economics.

Yet, to be fair, not all business interests automatically work in opposition to morality, equality and fairness. Those working with these large moral imperatives to promote open access, I assume, believe that they are not only mutually compatible, but they are even supportive of each other, in the right circumstances.

In this sense, I don't think it is ironic. However, I consider it a shame since I think as a society we would have a lot to win by considering the record of public scientific/scholarly knowledge a public good that should be exempt from near mandatory marketisation, and considered a commons.

At the same time, politics is not always receptive of nuance and I assume there was no real way to promote an alternative vision and to be taken seriously without making broad claims.

Moreover, alluding to far-reaching moral obligations, which by the way do not require any commitment, also makes it very difficult to argue against a proposal which then becomes so obviously the right thing to do.

RP: It has also often occurred to me that since OA was initially driven primarily by moral arguments, rather than scientific evidence, what evidence has been adduced has often been the product of what one might call [advocacy science](), and so perhaps not as objective/rigorous as OA advocates claim?

JH: This is good point, and yes, I see this as hugely problematic and different organisational interests have certainly shaped the outcome of the open access discussions.

A much more thorough consideration of the research carried out in fields such as the sociology of science, [STS](), information studies, the public understanding of science and similar areas would certainly have been beneficial, and hopefully led to a more nuanced outcome.

This is actually the case with much research-policy making, it seems, at least in the country I live and work in.

RP: How do you envisage the open access debate playing out in the next decade or so? Do you expect it be good, bad or indifferent for those in the Global South?

JH: I do not expect any elaborate open access debate in the near future, aside from the one involving SciHub of course. But really, if the business model is flipped then I expect debates about who gets to publish in the first place, which texts should be seen, and a discussion of who should make these decisions. Will it be part of managing the cash flow to decide on that?

And as always, these discussions will be very different in different institutions, disciplines, countries and so on. However, they will not always be polite, and the outcome will in all likelihood be another administrative layer in the west and other forms of development funding guiding local research policy making.

What I hope for is an honest debate on open science, a debate which does not replicate the naivety of the early open access debates, and one where the term is not embraced regardless of who else fills it with whatever meaning they favour, even to the point where it runs counter to making science open in any kind of meaningful way.

I want people to pause and to ask the simple question: what is the problem that is seen as being solved in this proposal or that policy by open science, before embracing it just because it makes use of the word "open".

RP: Thank you very much for taking the time to answer my questions.

Jutta Haider is associate professor in Information Studies (Library and Information Science) at the Division of ALM, Department of Arts and Cultural Sciences, Lund University, Sweden. She holds a doctorate in Information Science from City University, London, UK and also has a background in German philology from the University of Vienna, Austria. She has researched and published internationally on the shaping of public knowledge in contemporary digital culture, including on open access, encyclopaedias, search engines and social media.

RICHARD POYNDER 2017