

The *Nations and Nationalism* team strongly opposes the proposal to implement Plan S as it stands. It sees no reason why the current Green OA model is unacceptable. Plan S envisages that all journals will move from a subscription funding model to one of Open Access publication by payment. We have been informed that the charges are likely to be in the range of £1800 to £2000 per article. The idea is that this transition occurs by 2020.

In principle, it is an admirable democratic idea that since most academic research is publicly funded in Britain and (the rest of ) Europe, it should be immediately available to all. However, we have five main concerns: the damage to scholarly associations like ASEN; the possible pressures on journals to publish by quantity rather than quality; the threat to academic freedom; the loss of access to publish by important sectors of the academic world within Britain and Europe; and the dangers to international scholarship.

First, we see this as threatening the existence of many scholarly societies dependent on the income they derive from subscription journals. ASEN stands to lose the portion of our income that comes from subscriptions that funds its other activities. The shift of funding model is likely to reduce our membership, since the incentives to join ASEN would be greatly reduced when members would no longer enjoy access to the journals at preferential rates.

Second, the effects on journals are unpredictable. Under a publication by payment model, editors could come under pressures to reduce quality controls in favour of quantity. There are practical issues to be overcome such as how we charge for contributions, given *Nations and Nationalism* contains a range of formats: lectures, articles, introductions to special issues, research notes, exchanges, review articles, book reviews. Do we do this by the page? It is unclear what the psychological effect on our referees will be if we start charging for publication, especially if they are unable to afford to pay to publish their own research. It could destroy that sense of community of researchers upon which publishing depends.

Third, this infringes the academic freedom to publish, since it appears to permit only a limited set of publication venues. Scholars will lose their funding for research if they publish in other than Plan S approved Gold OA journals. Under the subscription model all researchers have (in principle) the freedom to disseminate their research in any venue they choose, and it is the quality of their research, and not their access to finance that counts.

Fourth, there are several dangers all of which revolve around the question of access to funding for scholars. Part of the explicit rationale is to drive down the costs of publishing and of accessing research by forcing publishers to compete (and reduce prices) with the hope of attracting article writers. This seems to assume that the money available to universities through public bodies must be constrained. But academics will be reliant on their higher education institutions which will have to be funded to obtain the ability to publish. Where will this money come from?

Will this encourage the Government to press the higher education sector to reduce costs by differentiating into research and teaching institutions, with the staff of the latter given no access to funds for publishing or required to apply for external

research grants, assuming they have the time or energy to do research after their teaching hours? There are already pushes in that direction.

In research universities how will research monies be allocated by what formulae? One can envisage that scientific departments will make a bid for funds at the expense of the frivolous humanities. Even within departments there is likely to be a power struggle between senior and junior scholars, between supporters of fashionable and less fashionable areas, and between the prolific and the less prolific. If funding goes via departments, what happens to interdisciplinary areas that are not 'owned' by anyone. We have seen at the LSE how easy it is for an interdisciplinary field like nationalism to disappear. Will departments privilege mainstream disciplinary journals?

This has the potential to exclude from the publishing community part-time staff, to staff on temporary contracts, to younger scholars between jobs, to early career scholars, all of whom will need to publish if they wish to enter the academic profession. Since women at present are overrepresented in junior and insecure positions, this has serious gender implications. Will they and all others marginalised by their departments be forced into a desperate competition for external research funding? The costs of publication too will be prohibitive for most retired staff.

Finally, it is not at all clear that Plan S can or will be implemented outside Europe. If this is the case, Plan S will severely hamper the internationalization of PhD students and postdocs, and discourage collaborations between the cOAlition S countries and the rest of the world. An effect could be to price academics from poorer countries out of international scholarship. Since the field represented by our journal is global, this will have very damaging effects on our quality as well as on excluded contributors. We regularly receive submissions from Russian, Georgian, Ukrainian, and Central Asian scholars and it is doubtful if they would ever have the means to pay the kinds of sums that are being suggested. This cuts across the drive for diversifying higher education curricula to include more scholars from the global south.

In sum. it is likely to entrench the haves in the system against the have nots.