

EDITORS' NOTE: ON RENT EXTRACTION IN ACADEMIC PUBLISHING AND ITS ALTERNATIVES

Once again we are delighted to publish a new issue of *Suomen antropologi: The Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society*, our third issue as editors-in-chief. We have now reached the halfway point of our term as caretakers of the journal (see Tammisto and Wilenius 2022), since a single editor-in-chief term is two years (or six issues). This is also the first issue published online both as a PDF for the full issue and as individual PDF files for each individual article.

Since our last issue, our editorial team has expanded. Vanessa Fuller (University of Helsinki) began working as the journal's language editor in November 2022, and this is the first issue she has worked on. Fuller is a professional English-language editor *and* a medical anthropologist by training. As an English-language journal edited by non-native English speakers, we are extremely happy she joined our team. In addition, Tiina Järvi (Tampere University) joined the team as an editor. Järvi defended her PhD at Tampere University in 2021 (see Järvi 2021). Needless to say, we are equally happy that Järvi has decided to volunteer for the journal.

Along these lines, we want to reiterate that our editors—Matti Eräsaari, Laura Huttunen, Tiina Järvi, Anna-Riikka Kauppinen, Patricia Scalco and Pekka Tuominen—all work on a voluntary basis. While the journal can pay a modest fee to Vanessa Fuller and the editorial secretaries, Anna Pivovarova and Saara Toukolehto, the value of their labour greatly exceeds the fees we can pay them for their efforts. So, we are using this space to thank our editorial team.

Finally, the publication of scientific articles relies on external expert reviewers, all of whom agree to carefully read and assess manuscripts, a time-consuming effort which is particularly hidden since it is completed anonymously and on a voluntary basis. Our reviewers work based on the notion of generalised reciprocity and with a great deal of trust that, just as they devote their time to improving the manuscripts of others, someone else for another journal at another time will do the same for them.

OPEN ACCESS DEVELOPMENTS

Last year, we were approached by representatives of Jisc, a UK agency focused on digital, data and technology use in education and research,

regarding research funded by UK Research and Innovation (UKRI). Through Jisc, we learned that UKRI-funded research should be published open access without embargo and with a CC BY 4.0 license. The CC BY is the least restrictive Creative Commons license, which allows for free-of-charge sharing and adaptation of the work so long as the source is credited and the license and possible changes are indicated. We subsequently learned that most if not all major European funders, such as the Academy of Finland and other signatories to the Plan S initiative demanding open access publishing, also require the use of the CC BY 4.0 license. Since moving to a fully open access format in 2016, with no embargoes, restrictions or article processing charges (APCs), our journal has used the CC BY NC 4.0 license, which prohibits commercial use, but does not otherwise restrict sharing or adaptation of materials if properly credited. To our surprise, we learned that *Suomen antropologi* was, despite being fully open access and having no fees or embargoes, 'not compliant' with the open access policies of Plan S signatories.

Thus, after pondering the request from Jisc, we decided the easiest and best solution was to allow authors to choose under which Creative Commons license they wish to publish their work. In this way, authors can comply with their funders' requirements or set the terms themselves regarding the use and sharing of their published works. That said, we will continue to use the CC BY NC 4.0 license as the default, which allows us to remain 'compliant' with Plan S requirements. Here, we extend our thanks to Jyrki Hakapää in particular from the Academy of Finland, who took the time to explain the license and Plan S policies to us.

To our minds, we think that Plan S, which seeks to push scholarly publishing towards open access, is a worthy programme and ambition. However, it is primarily designed (and limited) to push large commercial publishers towards making publicly funded research available free-of-charge. Plan S has indeed made a larger volume of publications available to the public, which is great. But, large commercial publishers continue charging authors exorbitant APCs for open access publications. These charges can be prohibitively expensive for independent scholars or for institutions with limited funds available to them. Given that many of the journals owned by large publishers are voluntarily run by academics, depend upon the free labour of reviewers and publicly funded research to fill their pages, APCs often serve as rent, which publishing companies extract for publicly funded research. We hope that in future initiatives such as Plan S will seek to direct open access publishing towards nonprofit

publishing models, found amongst institutional open access publishers and community-owned nonprofit open access journals.

Our journal is funded by the membership fees paid to the Finnish Anthropological Association and through a small public publishing grant administered by the Finnish Federation of Learned Societies. This grant is about €5000 per year, or roughly equivalent to the APCs for three articles published in commercially owned journals. In addition to this, the federation hosts the Open Journal System publishing platform via which our journal is published. This rather complicated history and description serves to demonstrate that even a small amount of public support for nonprofit publishing goes a very long way.

OPEN-SOURCE TOOLS AND ACADEMIC PUBLISHING

Continuing on along a related theme, changing the citation and reference style of a manuscript to meet the requirements of a specific journal is a relatively tedious task for our authors. This is especially laborious for our editorial secretaries, who copyedit all our texts. One of our authors, Klāvs Sedlenieks (Riga Stradiņš University), wrote a CSL style sheet, which he then used with a reference management program to automatically apply our journal's citation style, and which he graciously shared with us. Inspired by his work, we wrote an expanded version of Sedlenieks' style sheet and submitted it to the Zotero citation style repository, where the code was peer-reviewed and tested on GitHub; following a final fine-tuning, the style sheet and code was added to the official repository (Suomen antropologi 2022). Now, authors who use a reference management software such as Zotero can download our style sheet file and automatically change the style of citations and references to meet our requirements. As journal editors and long-time users of Zotero in our research and writing, we wholeheartedly recommend the use of reference management software, not just to automate bibliography creation, but also as a memory aide in note-taking and searching through one's notes and references.

As representatives of an academic publication, we strongly recommend openly accessible and, especially, open source software, such as Zotero. Zotero is managed by a nonprofit organisation and was developed communally, is free to use and, most importantly, the source code is openly available. Thus, no single entity can take over the software. For example, should Zotero be sold to a for-profit company, the openness of the code ensures that the potential new owners cannot lock users out of

their data. This is unfortunately a real concern, given that another, rather popular reference management software, Mendeley, is owned by Elsevier, whose business model is based on rent-extraction from publicly funded research and the free labour of scholars, who not only write the manuscripts submitted, but also review and edit their journals. Given that Elsevier owns databases such as Scopus and the research profile software Pure (used by a vast number of institutions, ours included), Elsevier gathers detailed data on what users read and write while also charging those same users at various steps in academic publication process.

If a few for-profit companies own the journals we publish in, the tools we use to take notes and link citations as well as the databases that track the works we cite, the entire academic enterprise will be at their mercy. More so, they appropriate publicly funded research and the unpaid work of academics, and then charge the public to access research which that same public funded in the first place. It is, in short, rent extraction, producing precious little added value. Thus, we encourage our readers to relinquish the 'Master's Tools' and, instead, use community-driven means of production whenever and wherever possible.

THIS ISSUE

While this is not a special issue, through serendipity, all of the articles, research reports and essays in this issue discuss state policies, political-economic changes and various forms of local political participation in Europe and the US. The issue is comprised of three timely research articles revolving around the politics of mobility, contemporary capitalism, infrastructures and state policies. Ann Kingsolver (University of Kentucky) examines racialised capitalism, bordering and free trade zones (FTZs) in the UK and US; Ieva Puzo (Rīga Stradiņš University) examines the different kinds of actual work of individuals needed to make policy happen in the Latvian academy; and Elizabeth Wollin (Södertörn University) discusses how the official Swedish sustainability policy on transportation is based on urban norms without recognising the lived socio-geographic realities of the rural north. The discussion of politics continues in the three *lectio praeursoria*: Elina Niinivaara (Tampere University) examines political participation of young refugee men in Finland, Saila Saaristo (University Institute of Lisbon) discusses housing activism in Lisbon and Sonja Trifuljesko (University of Helsinki) examines the institutional reform of the University of Helsinki. Lastly, Albion Butters (University of

Turku) discusses the articulations around pro- and anti-gun activism at the University of Texas, Austin in the US.

In her very timely article, 'Sleights of hand: Bordering, free ports and the racial capitalist roots of economic nationalist strategies in the US and the UK', Ann Kingsolver examines the contradictory character of economic nationalist projects in the US under former President Donald Trump and in the UK under former Prime Minister Boris Johnson. Kingsolver notes that the economic nationalist projects conducted under the slogans of 'Make America Great Again' and 'Take back control' are not exactly the same, although they share similarities. Both were, and are, based on the strict bordering practices and the notion of 'hard borders'. As Kingsolver shows, the strict and militarised bordering practices were not restricted to physical borders, but diffused from the actual borders to selective policing within the countries, as was the case with the paramilitary Bortac forces whose 'operation zone' extended to a 100-mile (160.93 km) distance from the border. More so, these 'hard border' policies are based on more or less explicit racist notions which undermine the full 'cultural, market and/or national citizenship' belonging of racialised people. At the same time, these economic nationalist projects depend upon global circuits of capital and the work of immigrants or citizens whose full citizenship is questioned. The contradiction within these projects is materialised in the spatialised forms of 'free ports' and 'foreign (or free) trade zones' (FTZs), which are based on increased control and the hyperexploitation of workers on the one hand and increased mobility of capital on the other. Kingsolver notes that 'free' ports have always been linked to this contradiction within racialised capitalism, as Great Britain established free ports in part to secure the trade of enslaved people. However, as Kingsolver points out in the beginning of her article, such 'sleights of hand' do not always work, whereby dispossessed people are aware of them and make them visible.

Next, Ieva Puzo examines questions of neoliberalism, state policy and labour, but in the context of academic work in contemporary Latvia. In her article, 'Living and working research policies: The case of international scholars in Latvia', she examines the desire of Latvian officials to internationalise research. 'International', 'internationalisation' and 'international cooperation' have become catch-phrases in official policy related to academia in Latvia, what Puzo refers to as a non-hegemonic academic periphery. Having conducted 'patchwork' ethnographic fieldwork in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic in Latvia, Puzo investigates what kinds of work make the dreams of policy become a reality, or whose work makes internationalisation happen. Based on in-person and remote

ethnographic fieldwork, Puzo shows that internationalisation, that is, the work of international researchers in Latvia, hinges upon the unseen work completed by individual international researchers who navigate the bureaucratic practices of immigration and funding, while their Latvian colleagues and university assistants and administrators all perform interpretive and infrastructural labour, which often also remains unseen. For example, local researchers help translate documents and funding applications from Latvian to English, and provide international scholars instruction on what policy lingo is needed. In addition to this, there is the often demanding and fully informal care work that is needed to maintain communities. As Puzo shows, this informal labour is also often recognised by officials—as individuals—but remains invisible structurally. Internationalisation literally hinges on this work: the work of international scholars in Latvia is based on these networks of interpretive, infrastructural and care work. And, conversely, it often fails, meaning that there are few international scholars in Latvia because the effort to internationalise the Latvian academy is simply too great.

In her article 'Rural mobilities, urban norms', Elizabeth Wollin examines the politics of sustainability in Sweden by focusing on transportation and mobility in rural areas. Based on research in rural Sweden, and especially in the northern rural parts of the country, Wollin shows how dominant discourses of 'sustainability' do not adequately capture the realities of life in sparsely populated rural areas. Well-meaning conceptions of 'environmental sustainability' in traffic and transportation, which promote public transport via trains and buses, ignore what Wollin terms 'social sustainability' and the long history of differentiation between rural and urban Sweden, uneven development and structural changes in Swedish society—intersected by questions of class. Wollin shows how public transportation such as buses represents important modes of transportation in the rural north. But, due to long distances and their infrequency, they cannot cater to all of the needs of the rural population. More so in rural areas, people need not only to transport their own bodies, but often bulky cargo or their animal companions. Dominant discourses of environmental sustainability focus on modes of transportation, but not societal expectations regarding the speed of movement, which largely rely on urban norms. Bus connections to rural villages not only serve as modes or transport for rural people, but also provide evidence of the state's and society's recognition of the existence of rural places and people. Conversely, increasing central coastal train connections at the cost of rural bus connections, as one example, not only means reducing rural transportation

infrastructure, but indexes the wider politics of uneven development. Wollin quite convincingly shows that 'sustainability' discourses must incorporate notions of 'social sustainability' and take into account the varied contextual political and geographic realities.

In addition to the three research articles, this issue consists of three research reports in the form of *lectio præcursoria*, the short lecture given by doctoral candidates at their public defence of their thesis. *Suomen antropologi* publishes these public lectures from the fields of anthropology and related disciplines, often by candidates trained in anthropology, to showcase the state-of-the-art research conducted in the discipline in Finland. The PhD theses introduced in this issue also examine the intersection of political agency, state structures and participation in various settings—complementing the discussion of the research articles.

In her *lectio* and thesis, Elina Niinivaara examines social and political participation of young men with refugee backgrounds in Finland. The general assumption in Finnish society is that youth and young men, especially those labelled as immigrants, do not actively participate in the political sphere. Based on careful long-term ethnographic research, Niinivaara counters this assumption and shows that the young men, who come from a wide range of backgrounds, are acutely aware of how Finnish society seeks to position them. More so, through their everyday acts as well as long-term projects, these men seek to affect the othering they encounter and stubbornly pursue roles and positions not readily assigned to them, such as higher education. More so, through their mundane or everyday political participation, these men seek to cultivate solidarity and a form of respective coexistence. Unfortunately, the young men often face societal obstacles, frustrating their efforts and losing their potential. In her important concluding remark, Niinivaara notes that Finnish society would do well to participate in the project of respectful coexistence these men began.

Saila Saaristo, like others in this issue, analyses neoliberal state policies and various forms of politics in her *lectio* on housing and housing activism in Lisbon, Portugal. In her activist ethnography, Saaristo examines, on the one hand, the global trend of the commodification of housing and the neoliberalisation of housing policy in Lisbon. On the other hand, Saaristo examines various forms of housing activism against homelessness produced by the commodification of housing, the global inability of states to secure housing and the neoliberalisation of social housing in Lisbon. One form of activism Saaristo examines is house occupation, which is an 'everyday practice' used to resist homelessness. What Saaristo notes is that it is also a

heavily gendered form of activism given that the majority of occupiers are women and often mothers, making house occupation a markedly 'feminised tactic'. Among mothers threatened with homelessness, it is a way to avoid living on the street and risking the loss of caring for their children to social services. In her thesis, Saaristo also shows how these various tactics, informal networks of care and mundane politics are made visible to officials and state actors through more formal social movements centred on housing activism.

In her thesis and lectio, Sonja Trifuljesko tackles the intersection of state politics, institutional reorganisation and local political action in Finland. Trifuljesko examines how changes in the global economy of knowledge production affected the University of Helsinki. In the mid-2010s the University of Helsinki was radically restructured following a managerial logic of doing away with local administration and centralising administrative services, merging old departments and disciplines into new entities and even terminating professorships. The reform coincided with massive cuts to education made by the then right-wing government coalition composed of the Centre party, the right-wing National Gathering party and the far-right Finns party. This reform also resulted in massive lay-offs of both teaching and administrative staff. Trifuljesko's thesis is an ethnography of an institution undergoing changes that sought to maximise the exploitation of knowledge work and make the university into a 'world class' institution by restructuring and doing away with existing social relations at the institution through reorganisation and lay-offs. As Trifuljesko shows, these attempts were only partially successful and the 'weeds' of autonomous sociality began to emerge from the ruins of the restructured institution. More so, Trifuljesko's thesis shows that the unintended and often adverse effects of the reform were the result of the reformer's failure to understand that the institution is based on existing social relations and silent knowledge, and not merely on formal administrative structures.

As in Puzo's article and Trifuljesko's lectio, education, institutions, state policies and the struggles over them are the focus of Albion Butters' timely essay. Butters examines the effects of the 2016 Campus Carry law, which allowed for the concealed carry of firearms at the University of Texas (UT) at Austin in the US. Based on ethnographic research at UT Austin, Butters examines how gun-control activism, uniting both staff and students, articulated with pro-carry activism. More so, Butters employs and develops the concept of 'articulation' to make sense of the communication between the three parties: gun-control activists on campus, pro-campus carry activism and the university as an institution. Butters notes that initially

those supporting the carrying of firearms on campus were less willing to express their stance publicly or to the researchers—partly because the law allows concealed carry, whereas the open carrying of firearms or making its presence openly known is illegal. Gun-control activists were more vocal. They also used humorous stunts, such as distributing dildos, which are classified as ‘offensive’ materials making their ‘open carry’ illegal, to highlight the hypocrisy in policies which allow individuals to carry deadly weapons. This stunt provoked responses and even threats to gun-control activists voiced mainly online by pro-carry people, eventually entering into on-campus debates. Butters shows how the stances articulated with each other resulting in different kinds of communicative actions, such as carrying firearms, displaying them, seeking to reframe the discussion as one over education and so forth.

Finally, our issue is completed by two book reviews: Áron Bakos reviews Rosa Hartmut’s book, *The Uncontrollability of the World* and Aila Mustamo reviews the volume *Dwelling in Political Landscapes*, edited by Anu Lounela, Eeva Berglund and Timo Kallinen.

TUOMAS TAMMISTO AND HEIKKI WILENIUS
Editors-in-chief

REFERENCES

Järvi, Tiina 2021. Lectio Praecursoria: Negotiating Futures in Palestinian Refugee Camps: Spatiotemporal Trajectories of a Refugee Nation. *Suomen antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society* 45 (2): 57–61. <https://doi.org/10.30676/jfas.v45i2.103111>.

Suomen antropologi 2022. Citation Style Language style for *Suomen antropologi*. <https://www.zotero.org/styles/suomen-antropologi-journal-of-the-finnish-anthropological-society>. <Accessed 06 February 2023>

Tammisto, Tuomas and Heikki Wilenius 2022. Editors’ note. *Suomen antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society* 46 (2): 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.30676/jfas.v46i2.116018>