

**Subject: RFI Public Access to Scientific Publications**

**Date:** January 6, 2012 11:26:34 AM EST

First and foremost, taxpayers should have full access to the results of the research our tax dollars fund. This access should be easy and free. Publicly funded research should provide public data. After all, we paid for it.

The benefits of such access will be a better informed public, more able to contribute to and support research and technology. Further, an educated and informed public will raise educated and informed children, who will be in a position to continue the role of the US as the world leader in R&D. Didn't Steve Jobs claim that the reason he moved production of Apple computing to Asia was because he needed better engineers? This should not be possible - America should have those engineers, American people should get those jobs, the American public should reap the benefits.

Most academics and researchers are doing peer-review for free now, and the editorial staff of most peer-review journals are likewise academics and researchers. In the case of state universities, these people are paid by the taxpayer (taxpayers who pay tuition pay twice), so the researching, writing, reviewing, rewriting and initial editorial costs are paid by the taxpayer. Therefore, it seems unreasonable to prevent Federal funding institutions like NIH or NSF from demanding that the taxpayer have access to what we have paid for. But when members of Congress are receiving contributions from major publishing houses, like Elsevier, then a conflict of interest occurs, and legislation is introduced to force the taxpayer to pay again, out of pocket, to read whatever work we have paid for. Since libraries, universities, museums and research institutes already pay for access to these publications, and most of the work is done by researchers, it seems we could channel that money into paying for the printing as well as the research, reviewing, etc.

There is also a problem in question #1. Why do we believe we need to "grow markets" related to access of scientific research? Why are we using the word market, or a market model? Why not think of this as education, as making knowledge more widely available? Why not conceive of this as augmenting public libraries and museums? If we are to grow as a nation, if we are to remain at the forefront of scientific research and development in the 21st century, then we need a public that understands science, applies science, and supports science. We cannot afford to put the profits of overseas companies ahead of American progress and the success and development of American people.

Best wishes,  
Roderick B. Salisbury