Informationszusammenstellung – zu Allmende – und öffentlichen Zugang (open access)

(1) Wikipedia
(2) Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing - 2003
(3) Berlin Declaration
(4) ECHO-Charter (MPI)
(5) Budapest Open Access Declaration
(6) Fachmagazine (Science …) Monopoly des Wissens – Spiegel-online 9.9.08

Die **Allmende**, auch **Allmeind**, **Allmande**, in der Schweiz **Allmend** und im nordwestlichen niederdeutschen (niedersächsischen) Sprachraum **Meent** und in Teilen Südtirols **Gemoana** genannt, ist eine Rechtsform gemeinschaftlichen Eigentums. Das Wort bezeichnet auch das *Allmendgut* selbst, ein im Besitz einer Dorfgemeinschaft befindliches Grundeigentum als Gemarkung.

Allmenden sind heute insbesondere im Alpenraum als Wirtschaftsform noch verbreitet.

Inhaltsverzeichnis

[Verbergen]

Etymologie [Bearbeiten]

Der Begriff entstand im Hochmittelalter als mhd. *al(ge)meinde, almeine, almeide* („Gemeindeflur“).[1] [2] Im Hochdeutschen liegt die Betonung auf der zweiten Silbe, im Alemannischen steht das Wort mit Betonung auf der ersten Silbe und ohne Schluss-e. Im Norddeutschen steht dafür das Wort *Mark*.

Allmende als Rechtsform [Bearbeiten]

Allmende ist eine Sonderform von Gemeingut, vergl. Gemeinheit (Begriffsklärung).

Die Allmende ist jener Teil des Gemeindevermögens, der nicht unmittelbar im Interesse der ganzen Gemeinde zur Bestreitung derer Ausgaben verwandt wird, sondern an dem alle Gemeindemitglieder das Recht zur Nutzung haben. Die Allmende besteht meist aus

unbeweglichem Gut wie dem Anger, Wald, Gewässer zur Löschwasserversorgung oder einer Gemeindewiese, auf der alle Gemeindemitglieder ihre Nutztiere weiden lassen können (vgl. Alm).

Formen [Bearbeiten]

Die Allmende wird entweder von allen Gemeindemitgliedern oder nur von einzelnen bestimmten Berechtigten (der so genannten Realgemeinde oder Nutzungsgemeinde) benutzt:

- *Nutzung durch alle Gemeindemitglieder*: Im ersteren Fall benutzt sie entweder die ganze Gemeinde ungeteilt oder sie wird alljährlich nach Losen verliehen oder auch alljährlich unter öffentlicher Autorität verwaltet und nur der Ertrag wird verteilt. Ein typisches Beispiel ist der Anger.
- *Nutzung durch einzelne Berechtigte*: Im letztern Fall bleibt die Allmende zwar Eigentum der Korporation, jedoch mit der Besonderheit, dass ihre Benutzung nicht allen Gemeindegliedern, sondern nur einer bestimmten Anzahl, meist den Besitzern bestimmter Güter (Bauernhöfe, Hofgüter, im Gegensatz zu den bloßen Katen), zusteht.

Die einzelnen Nutzungsanteile (*Gemeindeteile, Rechtsame, Meenten, Waren, Gewalten*) sind in der Regel als Zubehörungen der betreffenden Bauerngüter zu betrachten. Diese Nutzungsrechte an den Allmenden hängen mit den Verhältnissen der alten Markgenossenschaften zusammen, welche an Wald und Wiese noch nicht ein Alleineigentum, sondern nur ein durch Hofbesitz bedingtes Miteigentum zu ideellen Teilen kannten (und kennen).

Gemeinsam ist den Formen aber, dass die Rechte nie an natürliche Personen, sondern an die Gemeinde selbst oder die jeweiligen Höfe (im Sinne einer *juristischen Person*) gebunden sind. Die Inanspruchnahme des Anrecht erfordert also Gemeindemitgliedschaft oder die Eigenschaft des Haushaltsvorstandes.

Geschichte und Entwicklung [Bearbeiten]

Im frühen Mittelalter gab es praktisch in jedem Dorf eine Allmende. Sie ging auf das Gemeineigentum der alten Markgenossenschaft, die „Gemeine Mark“ zurück. In Spanien gab es mit fortschreitender *reconquista* in den Gebieten mit freien Männern neu besiedelte Kommunen, zu deren Bestellung sich die Anrainer zusammenfanden. Daraus erwuchs eine bis heute vereinzelt erhaltene Grundeigentumsstruktur bedeutender *ejido*-Flächen (Feld-, Flur- und Waldgemeinschaften), die von den Kommunen in gemeinsamer Regie kultiviert und genutzt wurde.

Im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert eigneten sich in Deutschland und England in vielen Fällen die weltlichen Herrscher die Gemeindeflächen an, was ein wichtiger Grund für den deutschen Bauernkrieg war.

Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts wurde durch die Intensivierung der Landwirtschaft vielfach eine Teilung der Allmenden (Markenteilung oder Verkoppelung) herbeigeführt, welche juristisch nichts anderes war als völlige Veräußerung des Eigentums der Korporation an die Gemeindeglieder.

Das ursprüngliche Rechtsgut der Allmende hat sich nur noch sehr vereinzelt in Süddeutschland, den Alpengebieten Österreichs und der Schweiz erhalten, während in den meisten Fällen die Allmende in das Eigentum der Einzelberechtigten oder der politischen Gemeinde oder in dasjenige einer besondern Nutzungsgemeinde (Real-, Nachbar-, Alt-, Markgemeinde) übergegangen ist.

Weil vielfach die überlieferten Bewirtschaftungsregel für die Allmendeflächen nicht mit modernen landwirtschaftlichen Methoden in Einklang zu bringen waren, ging im 20. Jahrhundert die wirtschaftliche Nutzung der Allmende weitgehend zurück. Oft wurde dann auf solche Flächen z.B. für die Schaffung von Neubau- oder Industriegebieten oder Sportanlagen zurückgegriffen.

Moderne Allmenden [Bearbeiten]

Alpgenossenschaften [Bearbeiten]

Im ganzen Alpenraum existieren Allmenden auch heute, zum Beispiel in der Schweiz in *Allmendkorporation Reiti* in Horgen am Zürichsee. Unter anderem gibt es in den Kantonen Graubünden und Uri viele Alpweiden als Allmenden (Auch Allmeinen genannt). Die daran beteiligten Landwirte haben das Recht, ihr Vieh nach bestimmten Nutzungsregeln darauf weiden zu lassen. Die Nutzung wird nach „Kuhrechten“ vergeben. *Ein Kuhrecht* besagt, dass der Landwirt *eine* Kuh darauf weiden lassen darf.

Auch sind die Weide- und Triftwege, die zu den verschiedenen Wirtschaftsflächen der Bauern führen, meist Allmendgut.

Der Begriff der Allmende in der Volkswirtschaftslehre [Bearbeiten]

In erweiterter Form findet der Begriff auch in der Volkswirtschaftslehre Verwendung:

- So werden in der Mikroökonomie allgemein bestimmte Güter als Allmendegüter bezeichnet.
- Als *Wissensallmende* bezeichnet man gemeinsames Gut der modernen Informationsgesellschaft.
- Unter der *Tragik der Allmende* (*Tragedy of the Commons*) versteht man die These, dass unregulierte Allmenden stärker ausgebeutet werden, als dies ökonomisch sinnvoll ist.

Siehe auch [Bearbeiten]

- Gemeingut
- Privateigentum
- Prinzip des Gemeineigentums
- *Ejido*
- Feldmark

Literatur [Bearbeiten]

- Hartmut Zückert: *Allmende und Allmendaufhebung. Vergleichende Studien zum Spätmittelalter bis zu den Agrarreformen des 18./19. Jahrhunderts.* Lucius & Lucius, Stuttgart 2003, ISBN 3-8282-0226-8

Weblinks [Bearbeiten]

Wiktionary: Allmende – Bedeutungserklärungen, Wortherkunft, Synonyme, Übersetzungen und Grammatik

- Artikel *Allmend* im Historischen Lexikon der Schweiz

Einzelnachweise [Bearbeiten]

1. ↑ Nachweis in Schriftquelle des Mittelalters
2. ↑ Lexikoneintrag auf www.wissen.de

Von „http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Allmende“
Kategorie: Land- und Forstwirtschaft

http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/bethesda.htm

\\BFEW214\OltersdorfU$\Frei_OltersdorfU\eTexte\Literatur Archiv\BethesdaBerlinDeclarationOpenaccess.doc

Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing

Released June 20, 2003

Contents

Summary of the April 11, 2003, Meeting on Open Access Publishing

The following statements of principle were drafted during a one-day meeting held on April 11, 2003 at the headquarters of the Howard Hughes Medical Institute in Chevy Chase, Maryland. The purpose of this document is to stimulate discussion within the biomedical research community on how to proceed, as rapidly as possible, to the widely held goal of providing open access to the primary scientific literature. Our goal was to agree on significant, concrete steps that all relevant parties —the organizations that foster and support scientific research, the scientists that generate the

research results, the publishers who facilitate the peer-review and distribution of results of the research, and the scientists, librarians and other who depend on access to this knowledge— can take to promote the rapid and efficient transition to open access publishing.

A list of the attendees is given following the statements of principle; they participated as individuals and not necessarily as representatives of their institutions. Thus, this statement, while reflecting the group consensus, should not be interpreted as carrying the unqualified endorsement of each participant or any position by their institutions.

Our intention is to reconvene an expanded group in a few months to draft a final set of principles that we will then seek to have formally endorsed by funding agencies, scientific societies, publishers, librarians, research institutions and individual scientists as the accepted standard for publication of peer-reviewed reports of original research in the biomedical sciences.

The document is divided into four sections: The first is a working definition of open access publication. This is followed by the reports of three working groups.

Definition of Open Access Publication

An Open Access Publication[1] is one that meets the following two conditions:

1. The author(s) and copyright holder(s) grant(s) to all users a free, irrevocable, worldwide, perpetual right of access to, and a license to copy, use, distribute, transmit and display the work publicly and to make and distribute derivative works, in any digital medium for any responsible purpose, subject to proper attribution of authorship[2], as well as the right to make small numbers of printed copies for their personal use.
2. A complete version of the work and all supplemental materials, including a copy of the permission as stated above, in a suitable standard electronic format is deposited immediately upon initial publication in at least one online repository that is supported by an academic institution, scholarly society, government agency, or other well-established organization that seeks to enable open access, unrestricted distribution, interoperability, and long-term archiving (for the biomedical sciences, PubMed Central is such a repository).

Notes:

1. Open access is a property of individual works, not necessarily journals or publishers.

2. Community standards, rather than copyright law, will continue to provide the mechanism for enforcement of proper attribution and responsible use of the published work, as they do now.

Statement of the Institutions and Funding Agencies Working Group

Our organizations sponsor and nurture scientific research to promote the creation and dissemination of new ideas and knowledge for the public benefit. We recognize that publication of results is an essential part of scientific research and the costs of publication are part of the cost of doing

research. We already expect that our faculty and grantees share their ideas and discoveries through publication. This mission is only half-completed if the work is not made as widely available and as useful to society as possible. The Internet has fundamentally changed the practical and economic realities of distributing published scientific knowledge and makes possible substantially increased access.

To realize the benefits of this change requires a corresponding fundamental change in our policies regarding publication by our grantees and faculty:

1. We encourage our faculty/grant recipients to publish their work according to the principles of the open access model, to maximize the access and benefit to scientists, scholars and the public throughout the world.
2. We realize that moving to open and free access, though probably decreasing total costs, may displace some costs to the individual researcher through page charges, or to publishers through decreased revenues, and we pledge to help defray these costs. To this end we agree to help fund the necessary expenses of publication under the open access model of individual papers in peer-reviewed journals (subject to reasonable limits based on market conditions and services provided).
3. We reaffirm the principle that only the intrinsic merit of the work, and not the title of the journal in which a candidate's work is published, will be considered in appointments, promotions, merit awards or grants.
4. We will regard a record of open access publication as evidence of service to the community, in evaluation of applications for faculty appointments, promotions and grants.

We adopt these policies in the expectation that the publishers of scientific works share our desire to maximize public benefit from scientific knowledge and will view these new policies as they are intended —an opportunity to work together for the benefit of the scientific community and the public.

Statement of the Libraries & Publishers Working Group

We believe that open access will be an essential component of scientific publishing in the future and that works reporting the results of current scientific research should be as openly accessible and freely useable as possible. Libraries and publishers should make every effort to hasten this transition in a fashion that does not disrupt the orderly dissemination of scientific information.

Libraries propose to:

1. Develop and support mechanisms to make the transition to open access publishing and to provide examples of these mechanisms to the community.
2. In our education and outreach activities, give high priority to teaching our users about the benefits of open access publishing and open access journals.

3. List and highlight open access journals in our catalogs and other relevant databases.

Journal publishers propose to:

1. Commit to providing an open access option for any research article published in any of the journals they publish.
2. Declare a specific timetable for transition of journals to open access models.
3. Work with other publishers of open access works and interested parties to develop tools for authors and publishers to facilitate publication of manuscripts in standard electronic formats suitable for archival storage and efficient searching.
4. Ensure that open access models requiring author fees lower barriers to researchers at demonstrated financial disadvantage, particularly those from developing countries.

Statement of Scientists and Scientific Societies Working Group

Scientific research is an interdependent process whereby each experiment is informed by the results of others. The scientists who perform research and the professional societies that represent them have a great interest in ensuring that research results are disseminated as immediately, broadly and effectively as possible. Electronic publication of research results offers the opportunity and the obligation to share research results, ideas and discoveries freely with the scientific community and the public.

Therefore:

1. We endorse the principles of the open access model.
2. We recognize that publishing is a fundamental part of the research process, and the costs of publishing are a fundamental cost of doing research.
3. Scientific societies agree to affirm their strong support for the open access model and their commitment to ultimately achieve open access for all the works they publish. They will share information on the steps they are taking to achieve open access with the community they serve and with others who might benefit from their experience.
4. Scientists agree to manifest their support for open access by selectively publishing in, reviewing for and editing for open access journals and journals that are effectively making the transition to open access.
5. Scientists agree to advocate changes in promotion and tenure evaluation in order to recognize the community contribution of open access publishing and to recognize the intrinsic merit of individual articles without regard to the titles of the journals in which they appear.
6. Scientists and societies agree that education is an indispensable part of achieving open access, and commit to educate their colleagues,

members and the public about the importance of open access and why they support it.

List of Participants

Dr. Patrick O. Brown
Howard Hughes Medical Institute
Stanford University School of Medicine, and
Public Library of Science

Ms. Diane Cabell
Associate Director
The Berkman Center for Internet & Society
at Harvard Law School

Dr. Aravinda Chakravarti
Director, McKusick-Nathans Institute of
Genetic Medicine at Johns Hopkins University, and
Editor, Genome Research

Dr. Barbara Cohen
Senior Editor
Public Library of Science

Dr. Tony Delamothe
BMJ Publishing Group
United Kingdom

Dr. Michael Eisen
Lawrence Berkeley National Lab
University of California Berkeley, and
Public Library of Science

Dr. Les Grivell
Programme Manager
European Molecular Biology Organization
Germany

Prof. Jean-Claude Guédon
Professor of Comparative Literature,
University of Montreal, and
Member of the Information Sub-Board,
Open Society Institute

Dr. R. Scott Hawley

Mr. Arnold P. Lutzker
Lutzker & Lutzker, LLP
Outside Counsel for Open Society Institute

Ms. Elizabeth Marincola
Executive Director
The American Society for Cell Biology

Dr. Richard J. Roberts
New England Biolabs

Dr. Gerald M. Rubin
Vice President and Director, Janelia Farm
Research Campus
Howard Hughes Medical Institute

Prof. Robert Schloegl
Chair, Task Force on Electronic Publishing
Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, Germany

Dr. Vivian Siegel
Executive Editor
Public Library of Science

Dr. Anthony D. So
Health Equity Division
The Rockefeller Foundation

Dr. Peter Suber
Professor of Philosophy, Earlham College
Open Access Project Director, Public Knowledge
Senior Researcher, SPARC

Dr. Harold E. Varmus
President, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center
Chair, Board of Directors, Public Library of Science

Mr. Jan Velterop
Publisher

Genetics Society of America

Mr. Richard K. Johnson
Enterprise Director
SPARC (Scholarly Publishing and Academic
Resources Coalition)

Dr. Marc W. Kirschner
Harvard Medical School

Dr. David Lipman
Director, NCBI
National Library of Medicine
National Institutes of Health

BioMed Central
United Kingdom

Dr. Mark J. Walport
Director Designate
The Wellcome Trust
United Kingdom

Ms. Linda Watson
Director
Claude Moore Health Sciences Library
University of Virginia Health System

I'm not an official spokesperson for this statement, just a participant in the conference that drafted it (and maker of this HTML version). But I've agreed to collect comments on it and collate them for the participants in the follow-up meeting. If you have comments, please send them to me at peters@earlham.edu. Unless you tell me otherwise, I will assume that you consent to let me post your comments to one or another public discussion list. Thanks, Peter Suber.

http://www.zim.mpg.de/openaccess-berlin/berlindeclaration.html

Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge in the Sciences and Humanities

Preface

The Internet has fundamentally changed the practical and economic realities of distributing scientific knowledge and cultural heritage. For the first time ever, the Internet now offers the chance to constitute a global and interactive representation of human knowledge, including cultural heritage and the guarantee of worldwide access.

We, the undersigned, feel obliged to address the challenges of the Internet as an emerging functional medium for distributing knowledge. Obviously, these developments will be able to significantly modify the nature of scientific publishing as well as the existing system of quality assurance.

In accordance with the spirit of the Declaration of the Budapest Open Acess Initiative, the ECHO Charter and the Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing, we have drafted the Berlin Declaration to promote the Internet as a functional instrument for a global scientific knowledge base and human reflection and to specify measures which research policy makers, research institutions, funding agencies, libraries, archives and museums need to consider.

Goals

Our mission of disseminating knowledge is only half complete if the information is not made widely and readily available to society. New possibilities of knowledge dissemination not only through the classical form but also and increasingly through the open access paradigm via the Internet have to be supported. We define open access as a comprehensive source of human knowledge and cultural heritage that has been approved by the scientific community.

In order to realize the vision of a global and accessible representation of knowledge, the future Web has to be sustainable, interactive, and transparent. Content and software tools must be openly accessible and compatible.

Definition of an Open Access Contribution

Establishing open access as a worthwhile procedure ideally requires the active commitment of each and every individual producer of scientific knowledge and holder of cultural heritage. Open access contributions include original scientific research results, raw data and metadata, source materials, digital representations of pictorial and graphical materials and scholarly multimedia material.

Open access contributions must satisfy two conditions:

3. The author(s) and right holder(s) of such contributions grant(s) to all users a free, irrevocable, worldwide, right of access to, and a license to copy, use, distribute, transmit and display the work publicly and to make and distribute derivative works, in any digital medium for any responsible purpose, subject to proper attribution of authorship (community standards, will continue to provide the mechanism for enforcement of proper attribution and responsible use of the published work, as they do now), as well as the right to make small numbers of printed copies for their personal use.

4. A complete version of the work and all supplemental materials, including a copy of the permission as stated above, in an appropriate standard electronic format is deposited (and thus published) in at least one online repository using suitable technical standards (such as the Open Archive definitions) that is supported and maintained by an academic institution, scholarly society, government agency, or other well-established organization that seeks to enable open access, unrestricted distribution, inter operability, and long-term archiving.

Supporting the Transition to the Electronic Open Access Paradigm

Our organizations are interested in the further promotion of the new open access paradigm to gain the most benefit for science and society. Therefore, we intend to make progress by

- encouraging our researchers/grant recipients to publish their work according to the principles of the open access paradigm.

- encouraging the holders of cultural heritage to support open access by providing their resources on the Internet.

- developing means and ways to evaluate open access contributions and online-journals in order to maintain the standards of quality assurance and good scientific practice.

- advocating that open access publication be recognized in promotion and tenure evaluation.

- advocating the intrinsic merit of contributions to an open access infrastructure by software tool development, content provision, metadata creation, or the publication of individual articles.

We realize that the process of moving to open access changes the dissemination of knowledge with respect to legal and financial aspects. Our organizations aim to find solutions that support further development of the existing legal and financial frameworks in order to facilitate optimal use and access.

http://echo.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/ECHO/home

Charter of ECHO

Preamble

- ECHO is a collaborative research endeavour that provides active support for scientific and cultural institutions and projects in Europe that hold or enrich cultural heritage through new technologies and media.
- The ECHO Charter aims at defining the criteria for adequate exploitation of the new media's potential for archival preservation, scholarly and educational exploration, as well as public distribution of the shared cultural heritage of mankind.

ECHO values

- ECHO shall undertake all efforts to make cultural heritage accessible and understandable to the general public across national, cultural, and linguistic barriers.
- All ECHO content shall be made freely available on the Internet in the most technically adequate and feasible way possible.
- All ECHO tools shall be and remain freely available on the Internet.
- All standards that are used shall be fully documented in a freely accessible way.

ECHO goals

- ECHO shall support the preservation, exploration, and dissimination of content belonging to shared cultural heritage.
- ECHO shall provide the tools for accessing cultural heritage according to its context and semantic structures.
- ECHO shall take all measures to assure long-term archiving and accessibility for the content it includes.
- ECHO shall assure that all content is integrated and accessible through a common portal.
- ECHO shall make every effort to establish that interconnections within its content technically are possible .
- ECHO shall support existing open standards and their implementation, and, whenever appropriate, engage in the development of new standards.
- ECHO shall work towards the creation of a permanent network infrastructure that will provide upgrading and maintenance of the tools and outcome developed during the project.

- ECHO will actively support efforts to disseminate tools and outcome to both public and private content providers.

ECHO restrictions

- ECHO excludes any violation of intellectual property or person's rights.
- ECHO does not support work on content which, due to property right restrictions, cannot be made freely available on the Internet.
- ECHO does not adopt standards without providing the tools for their implementation.
- ECHO does not develop tools without using them to make cultural heritage accessible.

The Agora community

- All content, tools, and standards as well as all projects that comply with the above values, goals, and restrictions are viable for participation in the ECHO Agora.

Budapest Open Access Initiative - [Diese Seite übersetzen]
The **Budapest Open Access Initiative**: an international effort to make research articles in all academic fields freely available on the internet. **...**
Beschreibung: Aims to accelerate progress in the international effort to make research articles in all academic...
Kategorie: Society > Issues > Intellectual Property > Free Access Theory
www.soros.org/openaccess/ - 11k - Im Cache - Ähnliche Seiten

Budapest Open Access Initiative, FAQ - [Diese Seite übersetzen]
Budapest Open Access Initiative: Frequently Asked Questions. **...**
www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/boaifaq.htm - 46k - Im Cache - Ähnliche Seiten

ARL 220: **Budapest Open Access Initiative** - [Diese Seite übersetzen]
... Budapest Open Access Initiative. An old tradition and a new technology have converged to make possible an unprecedented public good. **...**
www.arl.org/newsltr/220/boai.html - 12k - Im Cache - Ähnliche Seiten

| SPARC | SPARC and SPARC Europe Support **Budapest Open Access ...** - [Diese Seite übersetzen]
Image. SPARC and SPARC Europe Support **Budapest Open Access Initiative**. February 14, 2002. The **Budapest Open Access Initiative** (BOAI **...**
www.arl.org/sparc/core/index.asp?page=f52 - 17k - Im Cache - Ähnliche Seiten
[Weitere Ergebnisse von www.arl.org]

Open Access Now | Who, What and Why? - **Budapest Open Access ...** - [Diese Seite übersetzen]
... The **Budapest Open Access Initiative** (BOAI) is a movement that aims to speed progress in making research articles from all academic fields freely available on **...**
www.biomedcentral.com/openaccess/www/?issue=4 - 13k - Im Cache - Ähnliche Seiten

Budapest Open Access Initiative: Frequently Asked Questions

Contents

- Open Access
- Self-Archiving
- New Journals
- Implementation
- Impact

This FAQ is also available in French, German, and Russian.

Last revised August 11, 2003.

Background

How did the Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI) arise?

On December 1-2, 2001, the Open Society Institute (OSI) called a meeting in Budapest of leading proponents of open access for scientific and scholarly journal literature. The goal was to see how far the many current initiatives could assist one another and how OSI could use its resources to help the cause.

Is this an Eastern European initiative?

No. It is a worldwide initiative. It is named after Budapest only because the Open Society Institute (OSI) is headquartered there and that is where OSI convened the meeting that planned the initiative.

There is a tradition of naming initiatives, public statements, and principles after the cities in which they were formulated and announced. For example, even limiting attention to our own general subject-area, there are important public statements named after Aarhus, Havana, Lund, Okinawa, San José, Sante Fe, Tempe, and Zwolle. We are consciously following this tradition.

What is the relationship between the Open Society Institute and the BOAI?

OSI convened the meeting that gave rise to the BOAI, and OSI is the first institutional signatory. OSI is committed to use its resources to advance this cause and to help recruit other institutions to join the effort.

What is the difference between the BOAI and the Public Library of Science?

(1) BOAI applies to all academic fields, not just to the sciences. (2) BOAI is equally committed to open-access journals and to self-archiving as a means to achieve open access. (3) BOAI has no plans to become a publisher. The two initiatives are highly compatible and mutually supportive. PLoS founders have signed the BOAI and BOAI founders have signed the PLoS.

What is the difference between BOAI and the Open Archives Initiative?

The Open Archives Initiative (OAI) is a protocol for collecting metadata about data files residing in separate archives. When the protocol is used by data services like search engines, they can process the data in separate archives as if they resided in just one archive. (In the technical jargon, the metadata harvesting protocol supports interoperability.) The BOAI supports OAI for all open-access literature, but BOAI is not part of OAI or vice versa.

What is the difference between BOAI and other initiatives to make various kinds of digital information free for users?

The BOAI is distinctive in its scope and its insistence on author consent. (1) BOAI focuses specifically on peer-reviewed research literature, and does not apply to software, music, movies, or anything else. (2) For BOAI, free access should depend on author consent, not just user need or desire. For more on the second condition, see our questions about consent and copyright below.

Will BOAI become a publisher?

No. BOAI will assist in the creation of open-access journals and open-access archives of articles published in other journals.

Research Literature

For which body of literature, exactly, does BOAI hope to secure open access?

BOAI only seeks open access for the scientific and scholarly research texts that authors give to publishers and readers without asking for any kind of royalty or payment. As the BOAI public statement puts it, "[p]rimarily, this category encompasses...peer-reviewed journal articles, but it also includes any unreviewed preprints that [scholars] might wish to put online for comment or to alert colleagues to important research findings." It does not include books from which their authors would prefer to generate revenue. It does not include any non-scholarly writings, such as novels or news.

While the BOAI does not specifically cover donated scholarship other than peer-reviewed journal articles and preprints, it could be extended quite naturally to all the writings for which authors do not expect payment. These include scholarly monographs on specialized topics, conference proceedings, theses and dissertations, government reports, and statutes and judicial opinions.

Do all scientists and scholars really consent to give away their writings?

No. BOAI makes an explicit and fundamental distinction between writings that scientists and scholars do and do not wish to give away for free. BOAI applies only to the former. The objective is that when authors do wish to give away their writings, then readers should not have to pay access tolls to read them. There should be open

access to such writings and only to such writings. The BOAI sees no need to estimate how many authors are in this category, and does not endorse attempts to provide open access to any work without its author's consent.

Authors of textbooks typically hope to make money from them. Therefore this initiative does not apply to textbooks. Most authors of scholarly monographs hope to make money from them, regardless of the true sales prospects. Therefore this initiative does not apply to most scholarly monographs. But by contrast, most authors of peer-reviewed journal articles do not expect payment for them and willingly publish them in journals that pay no royalties or fees. Such articles form the core of the literature to which this initiative applies.

Note that even authors who give away their writings in this sense may retain copyright and may find it important to do so. What's important is relinquishing payment, not relinquishing intellectual property rights or putting one's writings into the public domain. (Also see our question on how users ascertain author consent.)

What about previously published research literature?

This initiative is only about providing open access to future research literature. However, when the money, permissions, and standards can be arranged, then digitizing past literature and providing open access to it will be very desirable.

Open Access

What does BOAI mean by "open access"?

Here is the definition of "open access" from the BOAI: "By 'open access' to this literature, we mean its free availability on the public internet, permitting any users to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of these articles, crawl them for indexing, pass them as data to software, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. The only constraint on reproduction and distribution, and the only role for copyright in this domain, should be to give authors control over the integrity of their work and the right to be properly acknowledged and cited."

Is open access compatible with copyright?

Completely. The short answer is that copyright law gives the copyright holder the right to make access open or restricted, and the BOAI seeks to put copyright in the hands of authors or institutions that will consent to make access open. The long answer depends on whether we are talking about self-archiving or open access journals.

5. **Self-archiving**. Authors of preprints hold the copyright to them and may post them to open access archives with no copyright problems whatever. If the preprint is later accepted for publication in a journal that requires authors to

transfer copyright to the publisher, then the journal may or may not give permission for the refereed postprint to be posted to an open access archive. If permission is granted, then again there is no copyright problem. If permission is denied, then the preprint may remain in the open access archive because it is a different work from the postprint and the author never transferred the copyright on the preprint. Moreover, the author may post to the archive a list of corrigenda, or differences between the preprint and postprint. This is not quite as convenient for readers as seeing the whole postprint online, but it provides them with the equivalent of the full text of the postprint and is infinitely more useful than no free access at all. For more details, see the section on self-archiving.

6. **Journals**. Open access journals will either let authors retain copyright or ask authors to transfer copyright to the publisher. In either case, the copyright holder will consent to open access for the published work. When the publisher holds the copyright, it will consent to open access directly. When authors hold the copyright, they will insure open access by signing a license to the publisher authorizing open access. Publishers of open-access journals will have such licenses already prepared for authors. There are many ways to write such a license. For example, see the license written by the Public Library of Science.

The BOAI does not advocate open access for copyrighted literature against the will of the copyright holder or in violation of copyright law. Nor does it advocate any change in copyright law. It seeks to maximize open access within existing copyright law, in accordance with the wishes of the copyright holders. Also see our question on how users ascertain author consent.

Is open access compatible with peer review?

Completely. BOAI seeks open access for peer-reviewed literature. The only exception is for preprints, which are put online prior to peer review but which are intended for peer-reviewed journals at a later stage in their evolution. Peer review is medium-independent, as necessary for online journals as for print journals, and no more difficult. Self-publishing to the internet, which bypasses peer review, is not the kind of open access that BOAI seeks or endorses.

Is open access compatible with print?

Completely. Open access is online access, but it does not exclude print access to the same works. Open access is free of charge to readers, but it does not exclude priced access to print versions of the same works. (Because print editions are expensive to produce, they tend to be priced rather than free.) Open access does not exclude printouts by users or print archives for security and long-term preservation. For some publishers, print will exclude open access, but the reverse need never occur.

Is open access compatible with high standards and high quality?

Completely. The short answer is that the same factors that create high standards and high quality in traditional scholarly publications can be brought to bear, with the same

effects, on open-access literature. The long answer depends on whether we are talking about self-archiving or open-access journals.

5. **Self-archiving**. Scholars self-archive either unrefereed preprints or refereed postprints. Let's take these in order. (A) By calling preprints "unrefereed" we mean, of course, that they are not yet peer-reviewed. Their quality has not been tested or endorsed by others in the field. But this is because they are unrefereed preprints, not because an archive gives open access to them. As long as they are labelled as preprints, there is no misleading of readers and no dilution of the body of refereed or peer-reviewed literature. (B) Refereed postprints have been peer-reviewed by journals. The standards by which they have been judged and recommended are those of journals in the field, and these standards do not depend on a journal's medium (print or electronic) or cost (priced or free). The quality of the articles endorsed by these standards depends entirely on these standards, not on the fact that an archive provides open access to them.
6. **Journals**. The quality of scholarly journals is a function of the quality of their editors, editorial boards, and referees, which in turn affect the quality of the authors who submit articles to them. Open-access journals can have exactly the same quality controls working for them that traditional journals have. The main reason is that the people involved in the editorial process, and the standards they use, do not depend on the medium (print or electronic) or the cost (priced or free) of the publication. This is clearest in the case when the very same people who edit print or limited-access journals also edit open-access journals, either because their journal appears in two versions or because they resigned from a journal that didn't support open access and created a new open-access journal to serve the same scholarly community. Open-access journals do not differ from toll-access journals in their commitment to peer review or their way of conducting it, but only in their cost-recovery model, which has no bearing on the quality of the articles they publish.

If the real question here is whether those who call for open access are really calling for the abandonment of peer review, or for a kind of self-publication to the internet that bypasses peer review, the answer is *no*. See our direct answer to the latter question above.

Is open access compatible with an embargo period?

No. Open access is barrier-free access, and embargo periods are barriers to access. Many of the benefits of open access are not achieved when embargoes are in place. However, while delayed free access does not serve all the goals of the BOAI, it does serve some of them. Just as open access is better than delayed access, delayed free access is better than permanently priced access. Note that authors can always ensure immediate open access through self-archiving or by publishing in journals that provide immediate open access to their contents. Please see our similar reply to the question on initiatives to make journals affordable rather than free.

Why doesn't the BOAI call on scholars to put their works into the public domain?

Putting online works into the public domain is one way to create open access to them. But this method leaves authors with fewer rights than they might want, e.g. the right to prevent plagiarism or the publication of corrupted versions of their work, while using copyright law to protect authors' basic rights does not interfere with the kind of open access that matters for research and education. The primary purpose of BOAI is to enhance and accelerate research. Researchers do not need the right to publish mangled or misattributed versions of the work of other researchers. Hence, letting authors retain the right to control the integrity and proper citation of their work will not interfere with the kind of open access that BOAI endorses.

Must users ask the author (or copyright holder) for consent every time they wish to make or distribute a copy?

No. The author's consent to open access for a given article is manifested by self-archiving the article in an open-access archive, by publishing it in an open-access journal, or by some explicit statement attached to the article. Open-access archives and journals will help readers by making clear that they offer open access to all their contents, and they will respect authors by offering open access only to the works for which their authors have consented to open access. However, if a copyrighted work is on the internet but not in such an archive or journal, and there is no other indication of the copyright holder's wishes, then users should seek permission for any copying that would exceed fair use.

Isn't this wishful thinking? Do you really believe that online archives and journals are free?

"Free" is ambiguous. We mean free for readers, not free for producers. We know that open-access literature is not free (without cost) to produce. But that does not foreclose the possibility of making it free of charge (without price) for readers and users. The costs of producing open-access literature are much lower than the costs of producing print literature or toll-access online literature. These low costs can be borne by any of a wide variety of potential funders, among which BOAI has no preferences. For more detail, see our questions on how to provide free access to literature that isn't free to produce and how open-access journals pay their expenses.

If open-access publications are not free to produce, how can they be made free for readers?

Open access does not require the infusion of new money beyond what is already spent on journals, only a redirection of how it is spent. As it is currently spent, the money buys access only for the buyer, so that access is limited to those who can afford the price. If instead the money covers the costs of disseminating articles online, then the articles could be freely accessible to everyone. In short, the solution is to use existing funds to pay per outgoing article (dissemination), not per incoming article (access). The article charges to cover the costs of dissemination could be paid by the universities that employ the authors, the foundations that fund their research, or other possible sources.

The money already spent on journals will suffice. By one estimate, journal revenue from subscriptions and licenses averages $4000 per article, while other estimates put the figure even higher. By contrast, the primary expense of open access journals is

peer review, whose cost lies in or near the range of $200-500 per article. A recent survey of the literature puts the cost of peer review at about $400 per article.

Moreover, there are good reasons to think that the money required to provide open access will be significantly less than the money now paid for restricted access.

How do we know that open-access publishing is economically sustainable?

Our confidence arises from (1) existing journals that give us hope, and (2) background reasons already evident to think that open-access publishing will be economically sustainable.

The background reasons are of two kinds: first, evidence that the costs of open-access publishing are significantly lower than the costs of traditional publishing, and second, reasons to think that the money to cover these significantly reduced costs can be found, even if only by redirecting the sources now paying the higher costs of traditional publication. We enumerate both kinds of reasons in our answer to the question how open-access journals pay their expenses.

The open-access model is far more sustainable than the current model, under which journal prices have been rising faster than inflation and faster than library budgets for three decades. On the open-access model, journal costs will drop. Paying for them will be easier even if no additional money is found. The money already spent on scholarly literature will be more than adequate rather than increasingly inadequate.

What is the difference between Open Access and Open Source?

Open source software, like free software, is a kind of software, namely, software whose source code is freely available for inspection or modification. Open access is a kind of access or availability. This kind of access could apply to any digital content, such as software, music, movies, or news. But the BOAI only calls for open access to a certain kind of scientific and scholarly literature. Also see our question on how the BOAI differs from other initiatives to make digital information free for users.

Self-Archiving

See our Self-Archiving FAQ for answers to a large number of questions. Here are some of the most basic.

What is self-archiving?

Answer.

How can I or my institution create an Eprint Archive?

Answer.

Who should self-archive?

Answer.

What about copyright?

Answer.

Is self-archiving legal?

Answer.

New Journals

How do open-access journals pay their operating expenses?

The answer to this question has two parts. (1) First, open-access journals cost much less to produce than print journals or toll-access online journals. (2) Second, there are funding models that do not require limiting access by charging readers or their institutions. Let's take them in this order.

1. Open-access journals will realize significant savings by publishing online-only, rather than in print, and by dispensing with the costs of managing subscriptions and the expensive apparatus for distinguishing authorized users from unauthorized users and blocking access to the unauthorized. Moreover, there is now free and affordable software to automate nearly every operation of an online journal except the exercise of judgment by editors and referees.
2. Any funding model that does not charge readers or their institutions for access can work here. That means no subscription fees, no licensing fees, no pay-per-view. Where else could the money come from? There are many possible sources, and the BOAI does not favor one over another. As the BOAI puts it, "[t]here are many alternative sources of funds for this purpose, including the foundations and governments that fund research, the universities and laboratories that employ researchers, endowments set up by discipline or institution, friends of the cause of open access, profits from the sale of add-ons to the basic texts, funds freed up by the demise or cancellation of journals charging traditional subscription or access fees, or even contributions from the researchers themselves. There is no need to favor one of these solutions over the others for all disciplines or nations, and no need to stop looking for other, creative alternatives."

For more details on the business model of open-access journals, see the Open Society Institute's Guide to Business Planning for Launching a New Open Access Journal and Guide to Business Planning for Converting a Subscription-Based Journal to Open Access.

Implementation

My university wants to create an institutional archive for self-archiving. How do we do it?

See the answer to this question in our Self-Archiving FAQ.

I would like to launch a new open-access journal. How do I do it?

Launching an open-access journal has much in common with launching a print journal. Apart from the people and the funding, there is the niche to fill, its size, its coverage by other journals, and the risk of failing to attract enough authors or readers. But if you have decided to move forward, and have competent, experienced, and energetic people ready to serve as editor and editorial board, and committed to open access, then you should examine the software packages available to automate most of the tasks of operating an online journal. Some offer a turn-key solution. For more specific and detailed help, see the links and advice collected on the following web pages (alphabetical by sponsoring organization).

- Taking Your Journal Online, from the Canadian Association of Learned Journals
- Publishing Support Initiatives, from the International Network for the Availability of Scientific Publications
- Electronic Publishing: Guide to Best Practices for Canadian Publishers, from the National Library of Canada
- Guide to Business Planning for Launching a New Open Access Journal, from the Open Society Institute
- Gaining Independence: A Manual for Planning the Launch of a Nonprofit Electronic Publishing Venture, from SPARC.
- Tools and Resources for Online Journal Editing and Publishing, from the University of Nevada at Reno Libraries.

I'm an editor of a journal whose publisher resists open access. What can I do?

You can seek a publisher more accommodating to your vision of open access. If you find one, then you can declare independence from your existing publisher. Here are some examples of journals that have already done so.

I publish a journal that does not offer open access. But we're now ready to do so. How do we make the transition from subscription and licensing fees to alternative funding models?

First see OSI's Guide to Business Planning for Converting a Subscription-Based Journal to Open Access. Part of the answer is to reduce costs e.g. by publishing online-only rather than in print, using software to automate common tasks, and providing essentials without inessentials. The most important essential for an open access publisher is peer review. (Open access publishers needn't spend any money managing subscriptions or blocking access to non-subscribers.) The rest of the answer is funding. For some journals, the cost of providing open access can be supplied by the author's university or the grant funding the author's research (waiving this fee for authors who have no source to pay these costs). This can be construed as buying electronic reprints (as conceived by Thomas Walker) or as covering the cost of dissemination as part of the cost of research (as practiced by BioMed Central). Over time many journals will find that they can replace subscription or license fees with article charges and thereby provide open access to a growing portion of their content. For more specific and detailed help, see the links in our question about launching new open-access journals, above.

Where can I apply for money from OSI or other BOAI institutional signatories?

Please contact Melissa Hagemann at MHagemann@sorosny.org.

Impact

What's the point of the signatures?

Signatories are pledging to help the cause in any of the ways open to them as individuals or organizations. The principal reason to solicit signatures is to solicit these pledges of assistance and participation. But an important secondary consideration is that all of us can draw strength and encouragement from the particular names and the growing number of signatories. For example, individual scholars who share our vision might feel powerless to the extent that they feel alone; the list of signatories should encourage them to act, e.g. by self-archiving their articles or submitting them to open access journals. Journals and publishers might defer change if they believe the demand for it is small; seeing the list of signatories should support a decision to move toward open access.

The long and public list of signatures to the Public Library of Science (PLoS) open letter has clearly given proponents of open access this kind of encouragement. While our initiative differs from PLoS, PLoS participated in the formulation of the BOAI and we encourage those who signed the PLoS open letter to sign this initiative as well.

What consequences do you foresee from this initiative?

We expect to gather a large number of signatures from individuals and organizations. We expect that each signatory will work to advance this cause in at least some of the ways that they can. We expect to see many more universities create institutional archives for self-archiving and adopt policies encouraging faculty to make their preprints and refereed postprints freely accessible through them. We expect to see new journals in every field committed to open access. We expect to raise a significant amount of money to expand the scope of self-archiving, to launch new open-access journals, and to convert existing journals willing to adopt open access. We expect to see a steady growth in the open-access portion of the peer-reviewed research literature. We expect that younger scholars will enter the academy expecting open access as a matter of course, both for their own writings and the writings they wish to read for their research. We expect that taxpayers will demand open access to research funded by the government. We expect that the beneficiaries of research, such as medical patients, will demand the removal of unnecessary and artificial barriers to research so that the contributions to knowledge freely donated by their authors will be freely available for use by researchers everywhere.

What is the intended impact of BOAI on journals that do not offer open access to their contents?

Journals that do not wish to provide open access have nothing to fear from BOAI except competition. We do not endorse the piracy or expropriation of their intellectual property. We do not demand that they change their access policies and do not threaten them with boycotts or other sanctions if they do not change. We encourage them to offer open access, and will help find the money to defray the costs of the transition to open access for journals willing to make the change. We hope that journals not offering open access will at least cooperate with authors who want to self-archive their articles. We will also help to launch new open-access journals, which will compete with journals that do not offer open access. Our goal is not to put for-profit publishers out of business, but to provide open access to as much as possible of the peer-reviewed research literature. If publishers are willing to help this cause, we will welcome them. If they are unwilling, we will pursue our goal without their help.

Our project is constructive, not destructive. We will help launch new journals that test, refine, and take advantage of new cost-recovery models. At the same time, we will help provide immediate open access through self-archiving. Both methods are within reach of scientists and scholars themselves. For our constructive activity to succeed, no institution or business needs to change its policies. However, we welcome the assistance of all who share our vision.

Will BOAI harm the good causes subsidized by journal revenues?

No, in the sense that journals subsidizing the activities of professional societies or money-losing publishing projects of university presses (or other worthy causes) need not stop charging subscription fees.

Yes, in the sense that open-access journals will exert additional competitive pressure on all priced journals.

However, the downward pressure on journal revenues is occurring regardless of BOAI. As Association of Research Libraries data demonstrate, library budgets are not rising fast enough to keep pace with the rising costs, forcing libraries to cut back journal subscriptions. To many societies it has been clear for some time that they must become less dependent on institutional subscription revenue.

We believe that the opportunity created by the internet for open access to peer-reviewed research literature should be seized even if the revenue from priced editions of this literature supports good causes. If a significant public good can be made available free of charge, then it shouldn't be priced simply to subsidize another good. If the second good is worthy, there must be some other way to support it.

What is the intended impact of BOAI on libraries that wish to acquire and curate all kinds of literature?

We do not call on libraries to stop acquiring or curating priced literature of any kind. We do not call on libraries to change their serials policies, since they already take price into account alongside other criteria such as usage and impact. We do not call on libraries to cancel subscriptions based on price alone or to put price above other criteria. We do not ask libraries to boycott any kind of literature or any kind of publisher.

The BOAI is about a particular kind of access to a particular body of literature. It is entirely compatible with other kinds of access to other bodies of literature. Even for the body of literature that concerns us, much of it will not be accessible in the way we desire for some time. Libraries should serve their patrons today by offering them the literature they need, and support them tomorrow by helping us make more and more of that literature freely available. In addition to supporting open-access journals, libraries can advance this cause by assisting faculty in self-archiving their research articles and hosting the institutional archive.

What is the intended impact of BOAI on researchers, teachers, consumers, and others who wish to buy, assign, or use priced literature?

We do not ask researchers, teachers, consumers (or anyone else) to boycott any kind of literature or any kind of publisher. If the literature they need for their research, their courses, or their pleasure is not freely available online, then they should buy or borrow what they need. We ask them to help this cause by making their own writings freely available online, not by distorting their research projects or coursework by favoring open-access literature that doesn't meet their needs.

What is the intended impact of BOAI on initiatives to make scholarly literature affordable rather than free?

We hope these initiatives succeed, because their success will make scholarly literature more accessible than it is today. However, we believe that the specific literature on which BOAI focuses, the peer-reviewed research literature in all disciplines, can and should be entirely free for readers. If the initiatives working on affordable literature are persuaded by the case we have made, then we welcome them to join us. If they are not persuaded, then we wish them success in making progress toward wider access.

FACHMAGAZINE

Monopoly des Wissens

Von Jens Lubbadeh

SPIEGEL ONLINE

09. September 2008, 08:27 Uhr

Sie haben kaum Kosten, wenig Konkurrenz, saftige Abo-Einnahmen - und einen ehrwürdigen Ruf: Der Markt für wissenschaftliche Fachmagazine wie "Science" oder "Nature" ist lukrativ und genau aufgeteilt. Doch in Zeiten des Internets und freier Information regt sich Widerstand gegen das Wissensmonopol.

Ein Bäcker backt Brötchen, ein Wissenschaftler schafft Wissen. Schmeckt ein Brötchen mal nicht, ist das ärgerlich. Ist Wissen aber faul, hat das ernste Konsequenzen. Denn jede neue Erkenntnis ist ein Baustein, der auf alten aufbaut. Keiner will, dass Teile des großen Hauses Wissenschaft in sich zusammen brechen.

DDP

Uni-Bibliothek Konstanz: Auf Fachmagazine angewiesen

Um das zu verhindern, braucht es Prüfmechanismen. Renommierte Fachmagazine wie " Science", " Nature", "Cell", "Lancet" und andere organisieren die Überprüfung wissenschaftlicher Ergebnisse und veröffentlichen diese. Zugleich kontrollieren sie aber auch den Wissensfluss. Das ist nicht unumstritten, denn wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse werden meist mit öffentlichen Mitteln finanziert. Und Fachmagazine wollen Geld damit verdienen. "Das ist ein Problem, das die Wissenschaftler seit langem beschäftigt", sagt Alexander Borst, Direktor am Max-Planck-Institut für Neurobiologie in München SPIEGEL ONLINE.

Sehr genau überprüfen andere Wissenschaftler, ob der neue Baustein des Kollegen taugt oder nicht. Dieser Selbstkontroll-Mechanismus, Peer Review (englisch: peer = Gleichrangige, review = Prüfung) genannt, hat sich etabliert im Wissenschaftsbetrieb. Er greift, bevor das neu geschaffene Wissen veröffentlicht wird.

Hoch spezialisierte Magazine, hoch spezialisierte Leserschaft

Eine gute Sache, aber dieser Kontrollmechanismus muss organisiert werden. In der Regel tun das nicht die Wissenschaftler selbst, sondern die Fachmagazine. Sie tun damit einen wichtigen Dienst an der Wissenschaft. So weit, so uneigennützig.

Doch nicht jedes Fachmagazin ist gleich angesehen. Die Publikations-Liste eines Wissenschaftlers entscheidet über seine Karriere. Und eine Veröffentlichung in einem großen Fachmagazin wie "Nature" oder "Science" ist der Ritterschlag. Die Tradition reicht weiter zurück als der Nobelpreis: "Science" gibt es seit 1880, "Nature" seit 1869. Sie sind Institutionen, die der deutsche Stammzellforscher Hans Schöler mit Wimbledon vergleicht, dem renommiertesten Turnier im Tennissport.

Es gibt eine Rangfolge unter den Fachmagazinen. Nicht etwa die Auflage zählt hier, sondern die "Wucht" eines Magazins, der sogenannte Impact Factor. Dafür ist entscheidend, wie oft andere Magazine aus ihm zitieren.

So versuchen Wissenschaftler zunächst in Magazinen mit hohem Impact Factor zu veröffentlichen - eben auch "Science" und "Nature" - und dann in den Nischenmagazinen.

Der Ablauf bis zur Veröffentlichung einer wissenschaftlichen Arbeit sieht folgendermaßen aus: Ein Wissenschaftler reicht sein Manuskript ein, es wird von den Magazin-Redakteuren kurz auf generelle Annahme oder Ablehnung geprüft. Bei positivem Bescheid durchläuft es dann den monatelangen Peer-Review-Prüfprozess.

Embargo auf den Wissensfluss

Bis zur Veröffentlichung verhängen die Magazine ein sogenanntes Informationsembargo über die Arbeit. Der Wissenschaftler darf bis eine Woche vor Veröffentlichung über seine Ergebnisse nicht mit der "gewöhnlichen" Presse sprechen. Eine Missachtung hat Konsequenzen: "Autoren, die vorzeitig aktiv auf die Medien zugehen, gefährden ihre 'Science'-Publikation", sagt "Science"-Sprecherin Natasha Pinol SPIEGEL ONLINE. Nicht anders hält es "Nature": "Wir behalten uns das Recht vor, die Annahme einer Arbeit zu überdenken, wenn diese Bedingung verletzt wird", sagt Grace Baynes, Sprecherin von "Nature".

Kaum ein Wissenschaftler, der sich dem widersetzt. Wer will schon eine Publikation in einem der wichtigsten Magazine riskieren?

So sichern sich die Magazine die Exklusivität an den Forschungsergebnissen - und das ohne Kosten. Denn im Gegensatz zu normalen Magazinen, die Autoren Honorar für die Abtretung des Copyrights zahlen, zahlen "Science", "Nature" und Co. den Wissenschaftlern kein Geld. Die üblicherweise mit öffentlichen Mitteln finanzierte wissenschaftliche Arbeit gehört dann dem Magazin - und ist im Archiv nur noch kostenpflichtig abrufbar. Bis zum Jahr 2005 durften Wissenschaftler ihre eigenen "Nature"-Publikationen nicht einmal selbst archivieren und öffentlich zur Verfügung stellen.

Damit nicht genug: Fachmagazine machen ihren Autoren auch noch strenge Vorgaben, wie das Manuskript inhaltlich und formal aufgebaut sein muss. Bei Nichtbeachtung droht Ablehnung. Typische Redakteurs- und Layouter-Aufgaben übernehmen die Wissenschaftler praktischerweise auch noch gleich mit.

Während des Prüfprozesses ist es den Wissenschaftlern untersagt, ihr Manuskript einem anderen Magazin anzubieten. So kann es also passieren, dass ein Manuskript bei "Nature" einreicht, im Peer-Review geprüft und schließlich doch noch abgelehnt wird. Erst dann - Monate später - kann das ganze Spiel dann bei "Science" von vorne beginnt. Ein nicht unwahrscheinlicher Vorgang - laut "Nature" werden von den jährlich eingereichten Manuskripten letztlich nur sieben Prozent veröffentlicht.

Leser, die nicht davonlaufen können

Im schnellen wissenschaftlichen Wettbewerb kann so wertvolle Zeit verloren gehen. Denn die Lorbeeren für eine Entdeckung heimst der ein, der sie zuerst veröffentlicht. Nicht der, der sie zuerst gemacht hat.

Der Klimaforscher Hans von Storch plädiert daher dafür, beim Peer Review eine zeitliche Obergrenze einzuführen: "Sagen wir von drei Monaten." Storch weiter: "Andererseits kann man natürlich in der Zeit ausführlichere Arbeiten zum gleichen Thema vorbereiten, die

ohnehin erst erscheinen werden, wenn die Sache bei 'Science" oder 'Nature' längst gelaufen ist". Der Begutachtungs- und Veröffentlichungsprozess dauere bei den meisten Journals nämlich deutlich länger.

Auch Journalisten der Publikumspresse müssen sich dem Embargo unterwerfen - sonst haben sie keine Chance, an Informationen über wissenschaftliche Entdeckungen zu gelangen. Denn die Wissenschaftler haben ja einen Maulkorb verpasst bekommen. Die Journalisten können einen Pressezugang bei "Nature" und Co. beantragen und erhalten dann in der Regel eine Woche vor Veröffentlichung Zugang zu den zu Manuskripten. "Diese Verbreitungspraxis gibt den Journalisten Zeit, die komplexen Informationen zu verstehen und korrekt zu berichten", sagt Natasha Pinol. Und wehe, ein Journalist bricht das Embargo.

"Journalisten, die sich nicht an die Embargopolitik von 'Science' halten, wird der Zugang zu unseren Vorabinformationen entzogen", sagt Pinol. Und auch Grace Baynes, ihre Kollegin von "Nature", bestätigt: "Wir behalten uns das Recht vor, einen Journalisten, der das Embargo bricht, von unserer Presseliste zu nehmen. Für wie lange hängt ab vom Inhalt des Embargobruchs."

Public Library of Science - der Gegenentwurf zu "Nature" und Co.

Vergleichsweise günstig nimmt sich dagegen "Nature" aus: 199 US-Dollar pro Jahr kostet das Abo für eine Person, eine Institution oder Bibliothek muss allerdings schon 2730 US-Dollar bezahlen. "Science" kostet 231 US-Dollar pro Person und 855 US-Dollar für Institutionen.

Weil Wissenschaftler und Uni-Bibliotheken auf die Magazine angewiesen sind, kommen sie nicht umhin, sie zu abonnieren. Anders als beim SPIEGEL, "Stern" oder "Focus" können die Leser also nicht so einfach davonlaufen.

Reviewer erhalten kein Honorar

Es ist ein lukrativer Markt: Die Verlage kassieren Abogebühren und Anzeigeneinnahmen. Auf der anderen Seite zahlt man keine Autorenhonorare, und eine teure Dokumentationsabteilung, die alles auf inhaltliche Richtigkeit überprüft, braucht man auch nicht - schließlich hat man die Wissenschaftler, die das für einen erledigen. Umsonst übrigens - denn Reviewer erhalten kein Honorar für ihre Prüftätigkeiten. Ein Prüfer müsse unbestechlich sein, sagt Natasha Pinol.

Übrigens wird "der Peer Review als Teil der Pflichten eines Wissenschaftlers gesehen". So empfinden das auch die Wissenschaftler. "Insgesamt ist der Peer-Review-Prozess unentgeltlich absolut okay", bestätigt Alexander Borst. "Das ist der Dienst an der Gemeinde."

Kaum Kosten, kaum Konkurrenz, saftige Abo-Einnahmen - Fachmagazine, ein publizistischer Traum?

Die beiden renommiertesten Wissenschaftsmagazine unterscheiden sich: Hinter "Nature" steht der britische Verlag Macmillan Publishers Ltd., der wiederum der Verlagsgruppe Holtzbrinck gehört. Die erzielte 2005 vier Prozent am Gesamtumsatz mit wissenschaftlichen Fachzeitschriften - und der beläuft sich weltweit auf 19,24 Milliarden US-Dollar. "Nature" hält sich bedeckt, was seine Profite angeht. "Wir sind ein Privatunternehmen und veröffentlichen unsere Finanzen nicht", sagt Grace Baynes.

"Science" hingegen wird herausgegeben von der US-amerikanischen American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) - einer Non-Profit-Organisation und die weltweit größte wissenschaftliche Vereinigung. "Die Einnahmen helfen dabei, die Mission der AAAS zu erfüllen", sagt Natasha Pinol. "Wissenschaft weiterzubringen und der Gesellschaft zu dienen." Dieses Ziel erreiche man mit Initiativen in Forschung und Forschungspolitik, internationalen Wissenschaftsprojekten, wissenschaftlicher Bildung, Wissenschaft im Dienste der Menschenrechte, öffentlichem Engagement und der Verbreitung von Wissenschaft.

"PLoS ist mittlerweile absolut etabliert"

Reed-Elsevier ist der Marktführer in diesem Geschäft, setzt rund 2,5 Milliarden US-Dollar mit wissenschaftlichen Fachzeitschriften um. Andere große Verlagsgruppen sind Thompson, Wolters, Wiley und Springer Science + Business Media.

In Zeiten des Internets kommt einem das Gebahren der Wissensverwalter überholt vor. Und tatsächlich gibt es Bestrebungen, das Monopol der Fachmagazine zu brechen. Ein Gegenentwurf zur Embargopolitik der arrivierten Magazine ist die " Public Library Of Science", kurz PLoS, die 2001 von Wissenschaftlern gegründet wurde. Die Non-Profit-Organisation ist mittlerweile eine reine Online-Veröffentlichungsplattform für wissenschaftliche Ergebnisse - die Print-Version wurde im Jahr 2006 eingestellt. Mittlerweile gibt es schon sechs Ableger von "PLoS ONE" - darunter "PLoS Biology" und "PLoS Medicine".

Das Ziel: Wissenschaftliche Artikel sollen für jedermann jederzeit frei verfügbar sein - trotz eines normalen Peer Review. Zudem besteht die Möglichkeit für Wissenschaftler, veröffentlichte Manuskripte zu kommentieren. Dennoch - Kosten gibt es. Die tragen die Wissenschaftler, die bei PLoS veröffentlichen wollen. Für eine Veröffentlichung fallen etwa um die 2000 US-Dollar an.

PLoS wird trotzdem angenommen. "PLoS ist mittlerweile absolut etabliert", sagt Alexander Borst. Erst kürzlich beschloss die Max-Planck-Gesellschaft für Veröffentlichungen ihrer Wissenschaftler die Kosten direkt zu übernehmen und sie nicht den einzelnen Max-Planck-Instituten zu überlassen.

Warum setzen renommierte Wissenschaftler, die sich nicht mehr beweisen müssen, dann nicht ein Zeichen und publizieren nur noch in PLoS? Hans Schöler hält das für unrealistisch: "Selbst wenn man selbst vielleicht das Renommee nicht mehr erwerben muss - die Karrieren der Mitarbeiter hängen von Publikationen in möglichst hochrangigen Journals ab."

"Nature": Nur geringes Interesse am Open Peer Review

Es gibt Bewegung, ein bisschen zumindest. "Nature" startete im Jahr 2006 den Versuch eines Open Peer Review: Wissenschaftlern, deren Manuskript nach erster Begutachtung angenommen worden war, bot man an, parallel zum normalen Peer Review die Arbeit vorab online auf der "Nature"-Webseite zu veröffentlichen. Doch nur 71 von 1369 angefragten Autoren stimmten dem zu, wie "Nature" berichtet. Zugleich bestand die Möglichkeit, dass andere Wissenschaftler die vorab veröffentlichen Manuskripte kommentierten. Auch hier zeigte sich laut "Nature" nur geringes Interesse.

Dennoch will man es nicht bei diesem einen Experiment belassen. "Ein einziger Versuch sagt uns noch nicht, ob etwas Bestand hat", sagt Grace Baynes auf das Open-Peer-Experiment

angesprochen. Der Peer Review sei jedoch so wichtig für die Qualität und Genauigkeit, dass man ihn achten solle. Gleichwohl ist auch er kein Garant vor Betrügern, wie der Fall des Klonforschers Hwang zeigt, der seine vermeintlich bahnbrechenden Klonerfolge gefälscht hatte.

"Wir haben kein Interesse, nur den Status Quo zu verteidigen", so Baynes. Ein Stück weit aber doch: "Ein neues Modell könnte vielleicht den jetzigen Prozess verstärken, statt ihn komplett zu ersetzen."

Und auch ihre "Science"-Kollegin Pinol gibt zu: "Die Möglichkeiten, die die Online-Welt anbietet, haben wir gerade erst begonnen zu erkunden."

URL:

- http://www.spiegel.de/wissenschaft/mensch/0,1518,576313,00.html

ZUM THEMA AUF SPIEGEL ONLINE:

- *Drittes Reich: Als die Nazis "Nature" verboten (23.10.2007)*
  http://www.spiegel.de/wissenschaft/natur/0,1518,512817,00.html
- *"Stammzell-Sensation": Fachblatt "Nature" korrigiert Mitteilung (28.08.2006)*
  http://www.spiegel.de/wissenschaft/mensch/0,1518,433834,00.html
- *Stammzellenforschung: "Science" zieht weiteren Artikel zurück (10.01.2006)*
  http://www.spiegel.de/wissenschaft/mensch/0,1518,394574,00.html

ZUM THEMA IM INTERNET:

- *"Science" Magazine*
  http://www.science.com
- *"Nature" Magazine*
  http://www.nature.com
- *"Nature": Peer-review policy*
  http://www.nature.com/authors/editorial_policies/peer_review.html
- *PLoS - Public Library of Science*
  http://www.plos.org
- *Overview: Nature's peer review trial*
  http://www.nature.com/nature/peerreview/debate/nature05535.html