

> From: LibLicense-L Discussion Forum [mailto:LIBLICENSE-L@LISTSERV.CRL.EDU]
> On Behalf Of LIBLICENSE
> Sent: Sunday, December 08, 2013 12:13 PM
> To: LIBLICENSE-L@LISTSERV.CRL.EDU
> Subject: Elsevier's Unforced Error
>
> From: "Hamaker, Charles" <cahamake@uncc.edu>
> Date: Sun, 8 Dec 2013 16:11:37
>
> <http://svpow.com/2013/12/06/elsevier-is-taking-down-papers-from-academia-edu/>
>
> For those who are unhappy with decades of Elsevier's policies, practices,
> pricing, and even their recent purchase of Mendeley, their unforced error
> in issuing take-down notices is an amazing, mistaken and ultimately
> self-destructive decision on Elsevier's part.
>
> Anyone who has any disagreement with Elsevier on any issue: copyright, OA
> policies, hybrid journals, OA pricing, pricing in general, control of
> backfiles, text mining, any of a myriad of issues including, their crazy
> if you mandate it you can't do it IR policy and their standard
> refusal to permit re-printing "their" research, should publicize
> this far and wide.
>
> Elsevier, no matter what they say, has demonstrated beyond any reasonable
> doubt in this action, their limited understanding of their remit, their
> control of scholarly research, They are nobody's friend's except their
> shareholders. They have demonstrated their DNA, their belief in their
> right to control the content scholars and researchers create and publish
> with Elsevier. They are wrong.
>
> What copyright law says is irrelevant in this, what authors want to do
> with their own research is paramount.
>
> It might have been masked before under the guise of impact factors and
> collegial editorial board meetings in locations worldwide and smart as a
> whip editors, and outreach at conferences, and invitations to "publish
> your research with us" and PR, and more or less "green" OA policies,
> and
> excellent inhouse readings of directions in future trends, and all the
> other trappings and expertise they have in academic publishing which is
> at
> the top of its game. Those trapping are insufficient.
>
> Elsevier and its cynical relationship with authors and institutions, has
> been demonstrated by Elsevier itself. No one could have done this to them
> but themselves.

>
> The tide of OA, of authors making sure people who need to see it, get to
> read their research, OA in all its guises, is inexorable and if handled
> correctly even by such behemoths as Elsevier, will lift all boats in the
> publishing stream, despite the scaremongers and naysayers in publishing,
> or the mistaken advice of some in libraries, or even among OA advocates
> themselves. It's logic is persuasive, its goals commensurate ultimately
> with what authors want for their own research. To put up and enforce
> barriers to what scholars want to distribute that they themselves produce
> is antediluvian.
>
> Elsevier's unforced error may be more effective than any boycott.
>
> Chuck Hamaker
>