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Opening Access to Archaeology

Nicholas Canny

Abstract – The article begins by explaining why, from its establishment in 2007, the European Research Council (ERC) encouraged all researchers to engage with Open Access. Its enthusiasm for OA derives from the early recognition by the Scientific Council of the ERC that OA enables the dissemination of new knowledge more rapidly and extensively than previously, and there seemed no reason to believe that OA would involve researchers in any significant additional expense. The author explains how assumptions concerning costs were challenged by some publishers particularly after several funding agencies, including the European Commission, made it mandatory to have all publications that resulted from the research they had funded, available on free OA platforms within 6 months of first publication. He details the undignified argument between authors, publishers and research funders over both journal costs and OA charges that ensued, and the author also alludes to some of the solutions suggested by various parties, including some European governments. While there is as yet no comprehensive solution to the controversies, the author urges researchers to abandon the opposition to OA. Rather, the author advises researchers to take OA seriously, and that they are appointed to govern the ERC declared itself to be in favour of OA both to research publications and to underlying research data. The members of that first Scientific Council were early advocates of OA because they recognized that it enabled researchers to expand their readership on a scale not previously thought possible. They, and their successors, have also been of the opinion that researchers who make use of discerning discipline-specific OA repositories can better succeed in bringing their publications to the early attention of leading researchers in their chosen fields of enquiry. This confidence relates to the previous experience of members of the Scientific Council belonging to the Life Sciences and Physical and Engineering Sciences domains, from working respectively with Europe Pub Med Central (Europe PMC; http://europepmc.org/) and arXiv (http://arxiv.org/).
The Scientific Council of the ERC therefore continues to encourage OA not only because it considers it to be the best means of furthering excellence by disseminating research findings more widely, but also because it believes that refined OA platforms enable busy researchers to cope with, and filter, the persistent increase in research publications that is perplexing researchers in all domains today. Consistent with this view, the Scientific Council recommends to researchers in Social Sciences and Humanities for which not many discipline-specific repositories are yet available, that they should, for the moment, make use of institutional or national repositories, pending the launching of more discipline-specific repositories that will take account of their particular requirements. In doing so, the Scientific Council hopes that such tailor-made OA repositories may, in time, become the first point of reference for researchers wishing to be brought up-to-date with developments in their various fields. If such repositories are developed, researchers in the Humanities may emulate their counterparts in the Life Sciences who make use of the Europe PMC platform to gain easy access to the most recent significant publications in the various areas in which they may be interested, to link them to other relevant resources such as databases, and to provide greater visibility to their own work.

What members of the Scientific Council of the ERC understood when they first became advocates of OA has since become known as Green OA. They then expected that all research findings published by ERC grant holders would be put on repositories and made available free of charge to any reader in any part of the world after the lapse of a recognized interlude. What was the normal practice at that time was an embargo of 12 months but the Scientific Council of 2007 preferred a ‘6 months maximum’ embargo and stated their desire to see the interlude between publication and OA becoming even shorter than that. In expressing their desire for earlier OA the Scientific Council of 2007 still understood (as was, and still is, conventional with Green OA), that what would be released on OA would be a final copy of the manuscript in which the author had taken all editorial recommendations into account, rather than the final printed copy. Then, given the constrictions just mentioned, that first Scientific Council, in compliance with Commission regulations, sanctioned those of their grantees who wished to release their publications on OA earlier than the conventional 12 months to compensate the journal publisher for the privilege of early release by payment of a fee out of their research grant.

**Implementing Open Access: Generic Difficulties**

While the first Scientific Council of the ERC experienced little difficulty in arriving at principles and general guidelines to direct its Open Access strategy, it, and its successors, have come to appreciate that implementing OA policy is not as simple in practice as was originally thought. Difficulties have since arisen principally:

1) because many, sometimes conflicting, interests are involved in the dissemination of research findings,
2) because the ERC caters for the full range of academic disciplines in every domain, and conventions that seem appropriate for some disciplines occasion difficulty for others,
3) because the wealth, and the associated availability of research support, in the several countries within the European Research Area is distributed very unevenly.

These three variables combine to make it extremely difficult to win general acceptance for a common policy on OA that can be applied to all disciplines and throughout the entire European Research Area.

When it comes to identifying interested stakeholders we find that those concerned with OA policies include researchers and their employers, librarians, journal and book publishers, research funders, members of the public who may wish to have free access to research publications, politicians who authorize the use of public money to foster research, the owners of copyright material, the human subjects of research, and the managers of repositories. All, or most of these, consider OA to be ‘a good thing’, but different interest groups have different priorities which means that arriving at a scheme or schemes that will satisfy all of these, and other, stakeholders is challenging. And, unsurprisingly, reaching agreement on common strategies becomes even more complex when the variables of discipline diversity and wealth discrepancy are taken into account.

The fundamental issue with OA publishing, as with any initiative, relates to cost even if the advocates of what has come to be known as Green Open Access contend that the creation and
maintenance of an Open Access infrastructure should be cost neutral after an initial investment has been made. Those who thus approach the subject optimistically, argue that the initial costs would fall on individual Research Institutions, and/or national governments (either or both working in association with libraries), to create, and provide staff support for, OA repositories. This approach has been rendered more plausible because the European Commission has made a significant start up investment by establishing, and providing the initial running costs for, OpenAIRE (https://www.openaire.eu/), a project designed to ensure that the emerging Europe-wide chain of OA repositories will work to the common standards being decided upon by the staff of OpenAIRE in consultation with repository managers, thus enabling interoperability between repositories across Europe. This has worked reasonably well although it must be emphasized that OpenAIRE is not, in itself, a repository although it can guide researchers to the chain of institutional repositories that work to its standards.

Those who share the optimistic view that no further costs will be involved, contend that, up to now, many publishers of scientific journals (especially commercial publishers but including some learned societies) have been charging exorbitant prices for the journals and the services they provide to the research community. They further believe that these prices will be quickly ‘driven down’ - to use the market parlance of the debate - when national and EU research funding agencies require all of their grantees to make all of their research publications available free of charge on OA repositories. The logic of this, if I follow the argument correctly, is that under this new regime, journals would soon usually be published in online-only versions thus saving the publishers the expenses they currently incur in producing print versions of their journals and in distributing these to their subscribers. The economies achieved, it is suggested, would make possible a significant drop in the cost of journal subscriptions, which would bring considerable savings to Higher Education Institutions, or to the governments that support Higher Education Institutions. These savings, it is further argued, would cover the costs associated with the establishment and maintenance of OA repositories. Such arguments have been generally considered sound by heads of Universities and Research Institutes across the European Research Area many of whom have added their moral and financial backing to the drive for OA. Institutional heads are largely motivated by the belief that the immediate deposit by all members of staff of all their publications in an institutional repository (even if some publications may remain on closed access for specified months) will assist them with the internal evaluation of staff, and with strategic academic planning. Many heads of institutions also believe that an institutional repository, which heightens the visibility of the research publications of all members of staff, will assist them in elevating the positions of their institutions in the international ranking tables of universities, which some European governments (which are the principal paymasters of universities) consider to be important benchmarks of achievement.

Publishers, for the most part, acknowledge that change is coming, but they are reluctant to concede that change should oblige them to reduce their subscription rates. Rather, they (or at least the publishers of the more prestigious journals in Science disciplines) are strident in defending their prices, arguing that the principal service they provide is in offering a quality assurance for what they publish through the maintenance of rigid peer reviewing procedures. Therefore, they suggest, there is no reason why an immediate shift to OA publishing would bring about a reduction in the cost of journal subscriptions since it would do little to reduce their greatest outlay, which relates to the maintenance of quality. Many academics find this particular argument annoying because they normally read and report on publications for learned journals and academic publishers free of charge. They consider the quality argument even further vexatious when the publishers of the more prestigious Science journal titles (prestige being proven by citation measurement) link it to supply and demand considerations, pointing to the keen competition that exists among researchers to have articles accepted into their journals. Following from this, publishers argue that their outlays are related to the number of papers submitted to them and the number of rejections they issue, and they further contend that it is entirely reasonable that they should derive some financial reward from the reputation for quality and integrity they maintain at great cost to themselves. And a great number of publishers of Science journals provide further proof of their ‘reasonableness’ by pointing to their willingness to permit authors to put final versions of their papers on OA repositories after 12 months have elapsed from the date of formal publication.

However, while stating themselves willing to embrace change and to permit authors to use modern technology to increase the circulation
of the research papers originally published by them, the publishers have perhaps become more emphatic than previously that it is they (and not the researchers) who enjoy legal copyright to what appears in the pages of their journals, and that authors are at liberty to make the papers of which they are authors available on OA repositories free of charge only after the lapse of an embargo period, which, as we noted in relation to Science publications, is usually at least 12 months from the date of initial publication. Publishers contend that sanctioning the free circulation of publications on OA repositories before the elapse of the stated embargo period would possibly result in them losing the subscriptions that make it possible for them to publish the journals in the first instance. However many publishers have expressed themselves willing to give authors (and research funders) permission to circulate their research findings immediately upon publication on websites maintained by some of their journals, and then also on OA repositories, in return for a fee, which now goes by the name of an Article Processing Charge (APC). The term Gold Open Access is being used to describe various schemes that require the author to make such advance payment to publishers to compensate them for any potential loss in revenue they might suffer due to their adoption of such permissive policies.

What publishers considered a reasonable stance has given rise to increasing tension because other stakeholders who would have researchers place their publications on OA repositories earlier than 12 months from the original date of publication, see no reason why authors should be charged for doing so. Among these are some authors, particularly those in the Life Sciences, who consider it necessary to achieve early widespread dissemination of their publications with a view to accelerating their citation count; a factor that is important to them because high citation is considered essential in that domain to securing further research grants and to achieving career advancement. Research funders are also usually anxious to use OA to raise the visibility of the research they have supported since they have shouldered a great burden of the cost of research. Furthermore, many political figures in various European countries believe that the tax paying public, who are the ultimate providers of revenue to most funding bodies in Europe, are entitled to have free access to the publications that have resulted from the research they have paid for. All of these are united by the belief that publishers have already been adequately compensated for the part they play in bringing research to fruition, and there is widespread support among Scientists for the mandate of the European Commission that requires that all publications resulting from any research funding drawn from Horizon 2020, will be freely available on OA repositories no later than 6 months from the date of original publication. The only exception to this are publications in Social Sciences and Humanities disciplines where the embargo period may extend to 12 months. The interest of the Commission in furthering OA has also been made clear by its funding of OpenAIRE (previously mentioned) and by its undertaking a pilot study to investigate how Open Access to underlying research data might best be progressed. Several national funding agencies across Europe have fallen into line with the EU mandate for OA, which compounds the challenge that all these developments present to the publishers.

While these developments may have presented publishers of Science journals with a challenge they have also given them an opportunity. Publishers are being challenged because the debate concerning OA has brought the prices they have been charging for journals into such sharp focus that it has become difficult for them to contemplate any increase in subscription rates for the foreseeable future. On the other hand, the various mandates issued by several funding bodies, demanding that any research publications that may result from the funding they have provided be made available on OA repositories at a date earlier than the conventional embargo period, have placed journal publishers in the legal position where they can enjoy a second income stream through the exaction of APC charges from all authors who find themselves bound by such mandates. In most cases these APC exactions are charged to the grants that researchers have been awarded by the relevant funding bodies, and this has led several funding agencies, and their governments, to argue that publishers are now being paid twice for the journals they sponsor; first through normal subscription charges and then also through the exaction of APC levies.

Such ‘double dipping’, as it has come to be known, has given rise to further debate which, in turn, has led to the intervention of some governments, most forcefully that of the UK, but the government in the Netherlands has also become involved, in devising an alternative business model for the dissemination of research findings to that contemplated by journal publishers. This alternative model contends that
the only means of promoting OA while preventing double dipping is to develop what might best be described as a Pure Open Access model. Under such a scheme all subscriptions to journals (or at least subscriptions to journals produced within the jurisdiction in question) would cease, and instead all researchers seeking to publish their articles in scientific journals would, upon acceptance of their papers for publication, pay the journal an Article Processing Charge (APC), which would become the sole source of income for the journal publishers. The advocates of this business model for journal publication contend that once governments, and/or research libraries in Higher Education Institutions, are released from their commitment to pay annual journal subscriptions they will have a considerable sum of money available to them that would then be used either to add a publication budget to research grants which would go to meeting APC charges, or to create a fund within each Higher Education Institution from which APC subventions would be made available to researchers at that institution on a competitive basis. Such an arrangement, it is argued, would guarantee publishers just compensation for the costs they have incurred in publishing research papers and in seeking to guarantee the quality of their journals. Another possible benefit to such a comprehensive scheme that is sometimes cited is that it would increase competition between journals to secure publishing rights to the better research papers being produced and thus force a reduction in APC charges.

This scheme, which as I already mentioned, is favoured by some national governments in Europe (particularly those who have a responsibility to strike a balance between the interests of influential publishing houses located in their countries and the amount being paid by Higher Education Institutions for journal subscription charges) seems, on first sight, to provide the perfect solution to the problem. However, it is being objected to within the Scientific community on the grounds that it would cause particular difficulty for researchers located in countries or universities where financial support for research is limited and for whom APC charges in the range of €1,500 to €5,000 per journal article would be impossible to contemplate, much less pay. Proceeding with this model, it is held, would further privilege researchers based in the more affluent countries of Europe (or the world) and render it impossible, on financial rather than on merit grounds, for researchers in the poorer countries of Europe, or in countries currently challenged by financial austerity programmes, to have their research published in the more prestigious journals. Another possible mal-consequence is that any business model conceived in purely national terms would likely result in scholars publishing only in journals that had entered into agreements with governments on such schemes which, most likely, would be journals produced in their own countries. Any such development would contradict the universalization of knowledge that is a vital element of the philosophy governing OA. The combination of these factors suggests that a move to Pure OA will accelerate only if global agreement can be reached to proceed gradually in that direction.

Implementing Open Access: Difficulties for the Humanities

While it is possible to identify these, and other, generic objections to the implementation of a Europe-wide or even a Global OA policy, those who have been most articulate in voicing objections to the various OA strategies being contemplated by governments and funding agencies are scholars in Humanities disciplines, including in Archaeology. In the course of these debates, some critics are hesitant about acquiescing to the OA policies being adopted by their governments or institutions while others are openly hostile to the entire project.

Some of the objections being raised are based on emotive or cultural grounds, which we may address before proceeding to consider more practical matters. One frequently voiced objection is that all models being considered for OA publishing are tailored to meet the needs of Science publishing and take little account of the realities of publishing in the several Humanities disciplines. Another popular argument is that journal costs in Humanities disciplines tend to be modest because people holding academic positions, including senior positions, offer more of the work associated with editing journals voluntarily. Furthermore, it is argued that professional recognition has always been given to such pro bono involvement with publishing because it is considered necessary to uphold standards in academic disciplines and because it provides a service to the academic community by keeping the price of research publications low. Those who argue in this fashion also insist that journals in Humanities disciplines were not responsible for the cost inflation that threaten library budgets, because the business
model that maintains their journals involves modest charges to many individual subscribers (usually career academics but also some people in civilian life) rather than the model used for Science journals which assumes a relatively small number of institutional subscribers at high cost. Another difference they point to is that articles in several Humanities disciplines tend to be much longer (40 to 50 pages) than is the case in Science, and that as much importance is attached to verbal felicity and literary style as to content. Because of this, many Humanities scholars remain attached to print publication and believe that the on-line-only publishing that is increasingly associated with OA policies will expedite the end both of publishing in print and of stylistic standards. And many feel that a move to on-line-only journals would set a precedent for the publication of monographs which are considered essential to knowledge dissemination in some disciplines, including Archaeology. Another issue that is of particular concern in Anglo-phone areas of Europe is that a rapid move in Europe towards mandatory OA policies will place a rift between scholars in Europe and scholars in North America where the OA strategies being proceeded with in the realm of Science have, as yet, hardly impinged upon publishing in Humanities disciplines. Those who are concerned that OA policies being adopted in Europe will effect a breach with the practice and culture of scholarly publishing in North America are most concerned with the concept of APCs, because, in the US, it is considered unethical for an author in a Humanities discipline to make payment to have academic work accepted for publication; the practice of doing so is known contemptuously as ‘vanity publishing’.

On a more practical level, many academics in Humanities disciplines conclude that the OA policies being promoted by the European Commission and by several national governments, bring ‘much pain but no gain’ to them because, to date, there have been few OA repositories developed that are tailored to the needs of particular Humanities disciplines. Of those who give thought to what benefits such discipline-specific OA repository might bring, many laud its potential archival possibilities because, unlike their counterparts in the Life Sciences, researchers in Humanities disciplines may have more frequent need to consult a learned article published 40 years ago than one published yesterday. This means that for many Humanities researchers the repository of choice would have to have the benefits of the American on-line library Jstor (http://www.jstor.org/) that many scholars in several academic disciplines use regularly as an aid to undergraduate and graduate teaching as well as to further their research. It seems pertinent to make reference to Jstor not only because doing so allays the suspicion that scholars in Humanities disciplines are techno-phobic, but also because doing so makes it possible to illustrate the shortcomings of any models for OA repositories that are purely imitative of those used by Scientists. The principal virtue of Jstor is that it is an on-line archival repository of past issues of primarily English-language journals augmented with finding aids. It (or any modification thereof) cannot meet the OA mandate of the EU Commission because it is available only to those who pay for the service, and because the back issues of journals become available on its portal only after the lapse of 36 months from the date of initial publication. On the other hand, from the perspective of a Humanities scholar it is superior to any OA repository currently in use in Europe because it includes an in-built archival service that researchers in several Humanities disciplines consider essential to their work. Librarians have also welcomed Jstor because it reduces the demand for very expensive interlibrary loan services and because it justifies them in freeing-up shelf space by destroying back issues of journals in their collections. In the light of such experience it would seem that anybody giving thought to developing discipline-specific repositories that will be welcomed by Humanities scholars would be well advised to incorporate such an archival feature that would make a Humanities repository very different from the generic models that have been fashioned to the needs of researchers in Science disciplines.

The fact that we can, from the Humanities perspective, point to one major deficit in the kinds of OA repositories currently available in Europe, underlines the rashness of the presumption that what is good for Science (or at least for the Life Sciences) is appropriate for researchers in all disciplines. A further, and more blatant, insufficiency in the OA policies being proposed is that they proceed from the assumption that those wishing to publish in high impact journals are holders of research grants, or that they control budgets from which relevant APC charges might be met. However, such grants and budgets are not readily available to a great number of scholars in Humanities disciplines even in the wealthy countries of Europe, and certainly not to many younger scholars who have not yet secured
an academic posting and for whom it is all the more necessary to get academic work published to advance their careers. Neither are supporting funds usually available to senior scholars who, in a great number of Humanities disciplines, continue as publishing researchers long after they have retired from academic positions. And the proposers of the Gold OA models cannot at all envisage scholars (and this has particular relevance to Archaeology where much research is privately sponsored) who may have important research findings to publish but who make careers outside academia.

Another deterrent that is of critical importance to academic archaeologists but is of relevance also to art historians, musicologists, students of architecture and even students of contemporary literature, concerns the reproduction of material to which third parties hold the copyright. Whenever any such researchers have need to support the arguments being advanced by them in their research publications by reproducing visual images or sound recordings, or by citing passages from plays, poems or creative fiction by living, or recently-deceased, authors or artists, they are legally obliged to secure permission from the holders of the copyright to all such material. These may be cultural institutions (museums, art galleries or libraries), or living creative artists or those who have inherited copyright to their work, or the owners of art objects. Permission to reproduce images of artistic objects, or to cite extracts from creative works, is usually conceded gratis, or by payment of a nominal fee, when the author can give an assurance that the copyright material is being used for scholarly purposes and will appear only in a particular named publication with a specified print run; usually some hundreds of copies. Such generosity usually ceases when publications using such copyright material are to be subsequently made available for free viewing on OA repositories from which further reproduction would be difficult to control and monitor. Under such changed circumstances, permission can either be withheld or granted only in return for the payment of a substantial fee, which makes the cost of publishing prohibitive for many researchers. Already some researchers in such disciplines who are mandated by funding bodies, or by their employers, to make their research publications available on OA repositories, overcome the permissions problem by blanking out on the OA version of their publications whatever material is bound by copyright. In doing so they are complying with the letter of the mandate but not with the spirit of OA publishing since articles that have been truncated in such a fashion are of little worth to anybody.

Overcoming the difficulties

While it is possible to identify these, and other, challenges for academic scholars working in Humanities disciplines that have been occasioned by the OA policies being currently implemented or contemplated in particular European countries or at EU level, this does not justify (as some would wish) any withdrawal from the process by scholars in Humanities disciplines. Essentially, as I see it, technology is on the side of OA publishing and those who wish it to go away are being as unrealistic as those who believe that the format of their daily newspaper ten years from now will be identical with what it is today. Therefore it would seem that the most urgent need for researchers in Humanities disciplines is to combine their resources across Europe, ideally through learned societies, to work with the promoters of OA to mould the system to better suit their particular needs. The first point on any agenda should be to explain the unsuitability for Humanities researchers of the Pure OA models being contemplated because the collection of APC: is alien to publishing in most Humanities disciplines, and its immediate application would likely lead to the financial collapse of a great number of existing journals. It may be out of recognition of this reality that the EU Commission has conceded under the Horizon 2020 research framework programme, that funded scholars in Humanities and Social Science disciplines are permitted an embargo period of 12 months before their publications must be made freely available on OA repositories. If scholars, and the publishers of Humanities journals, are not convinced that this embargo period is of sufficient duration to preserve the subscription base of journals from being eroded by cancellations, then they should collectively lobby to have it extended to what may seem appropriate (24 months is frequently mentioned, although I personally consider 12 months adequate).

If such an extension is conceded, and if it is also applied by National Funding Agencies in all countries of the European Research Area, scholars must, I believe, consider that what is being granted provides them with no more than a reprieve because I am not at all certain that the individual subscription model for funding Humanities
journals is as secure today as it was when I was at the outset of my career. The difference is that early stage researchers of today seem less willing, or less able, to sustain subscriptions to journals as I, and my contemporaries, were when we first began to publish. Moreover (and this is the issue that traditionalists have difficulty in accepting) many younger scholars prefer to keep abreast of developments in their discipline on-line rather than in print format, and several on-line-only journals flourish in Humanities disciplines even if being ‘born digital’ does not always earn the same professional recognition as publishing in traditional print outlets. Also, while Humanities scholars may insist smugly that they did not occasion the inflation in journal prices that is the most fundamental fiscal plank in the argument of those wanting a more rapid move to OA, they are immediately linked to a spiraling in the price of monographs, which are considered to be the essential research output in several Humanities disciplines, including in Archaeology.

Suggesting a solution to the crisis in monograph publishing is beyond the scope of this paper, but any remedy will have to allow that on-line only publishing is likely to be part of any solution devised to resolve the many problems involved. Certainly, persistence with the publication of short runs of monographs in print only, and at prices that are proving prohibitive for libraries not to speak of individuals, seems no longer sustainable. Moreover, for those who might benefit from Horizon 2020 funding, publishing books in print form only does not comply with the OA mandate. Some remedies for this problem have already been proposed, and the one to which the ERC has given most sympathetic consideration is the OAPEN on-line library (http://www.oapen.org/). Those who take advantage of the services of OAPEN, or other such facilities, enter into contracts with print publishers in the usual way, but with the additional responsibility of explaining to their publishers that they are bound by the terms of their research grant to make their research findings available also on an OA repository free of charge to the reading public. Where publishers cannot facilitate this on platforms of their own they will usually be agreeable, in return for a financial contribution, to sanction OA publication on on-line facilities such as OAPEN. In the case of OAPEN, authors who approach them will have to satisfy them that their print publisher, who in the words of OAPEN will ‘be predominantly academic publishers’, have applied ‘proper and transparent procedures for peer review of manuscripts’ before the monograph can be included in OAPEN’s on-line library. Whether the OA version of a monograph becomes available on the publishers own website or on an independent OA platform, such as that maintained by OAPEN, publishers will demand a fee to compensate them for any loss in sales revenue they might suffer as a consequence of the book being available on-line and free of charge. At this early stage, best estimates of the total cost to the author of having a printed monograph made available on an OA platform range from € 5,000 (a low experimental figure cited by Brill) to € 15,000.

If scholars, publishers and the promoters of OA policies can agree that the existing business model for funding Humanities journals and monographs should not be disturbed in the short term, scholars should set themselves to thinking what other model of funding will sustain their publishing needs once present practices begin to falter. As they do so, Humanities scholars need to explain what qualities they would expect from any OA repository that might be designed to meet the needs of specific Humanities disciplines. My own personal view is that any Humanities OA repository designed to meet the needs of my subject, which is History, is likely to be considered fit for purpose by practicing Historians only when it has a major archival component supplemented with effective finding aids that will enable researchers to track down articles in at least all the major European journals (and in all the languages of Europe) from the date of their very first issue. If this can be achieved for History, and I imagine that scholars in Literature would have similar requirements, another urgent objective should be the establishment of discipline specific repositories to meet the needs of those Humanities disciplines that most rely on the reproduction of visual or audio material to sustain the arguments being put forward by them in their research papers. Here, when it comes to Archaeology, I would suggest that those learned societies supporting Archaeological research across Europe should engage in conversations with the major Archaeology museums in Europe who are the copyright holders of a great number of the objects from which Archaeologists would hope to take images to reproduce in their publications. The purpose of such a meeting would be to persuade the museums to establish and manage (or to work with the learned societies in doing so) an OA repository for publications in Archaeology that would become the sole OA repository for those outputs for which permission to include depictions...
of artifacts held in the collections of any of the participating museums had been granted. Only a discipline specific repository of this nature would, as I see it, overcome the problems associated with the reproduction on an OA repository of material bound by institutional copyright. Under such an arrangement the museums would continue to enjoy copyright to, and thus would continue to monitor and control further reproduction of, any images of any objects to which they hold custody on behalf of the public. Museums should then have no difficulty with these images being put on public view on an OA repository because the repository would be the collective property either of Europe’s museums or of museums and learned societies working in consort. An arrangement of this kind would also help resolve many problems associated with granting OA to data underlying the research of scholars in Humanities disciplines. And if Archaeologists could set an example in this way it may become the first step towards the establishment of a suite of Humanities specific OA repositories designed to meet the requirements of the great variety of disciplines within our domain. The benefit of such developments would not only be a removal of many of the obstacles that are making too many Humanities scholars reluctant to engage with OA, but it would also provide them with the opportunity of achieving greater visibility for their work which is the ultimate desire of every scholar.

The critique presented here of how the OA policies currently being formulated at national, European and even global levels, might impact upon academic scholars working in Humanities disciplines is very much my own opinion, and the possible solutions to the real, or imaginary, difficulties that such Humanities scholars have identified are also my own. However, I am confident that my colleagues on the ERC Working Group on OA, as also my colleagues on the Scientific Council as a whole, are as anxious as I am to see Humanities scholars engage actively in all debates relating to the continuing development of OA policies. Only by doing so will they ensure that whatever OA policies are decided upon by governments and funding bodies will take account of their identified special needs and with due account being taken of the integrity of their several disciplines.
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