

## EDITORS NOTE

---

We present first in this issue to our Readers the results of an intensive discussion that occurred at the meeting of the Committee of Future Studies “Poland 2000 Plus” on March 25, 2011 entitled *Idea of Open Resource of Knowledge versus Intellectual Property*. The opinions of the proponents of preserving public property of knowledge and the opposite proponents of privatization of knowledge resources, treating them as a commodity, thus strengthening intellectual property laws, clashed both in the papers presented and in the contributions to the discussion.

Ryszard Tadeusiewicz in a paper *Open Access as a Factor Boosting Development of Civilization* stresses that Open Access is new method of scientific results distribution, based on free access to newest and most valuable papers. Thanks to such method of “scientific broadcasting”, newest and most valuable scientific results become available for everybody. This new idea, definitely different from previously used model considering very limited papers distribution by expensive journals or even hiding of information and building a “wall o patents” preventing unauthorized use, has enthusiastic supporters, but has also declared opponents. The paper presents some arguments of both sides, but main goal is to stress arguments given by supporters. Such arguments are connected with three types of evaluations. First type is an economic one. Scientific research is very cost-consuming and expensive, somebody must pay for it. Up-to-day financing of scientific research is based on public funds in most countries around the world. It means that the entire society, all taxpayers are “sponsors” of scientific discoveries. Taking into account a general rule “who pays for something becomes owner of it” we must admit that most scientific results are property of the society. The only method for making scientific discoveries available to the whole society – is publishing them on the Open Access basis. Next type of argument is related to title of the paper. Civilization development is based on the permanent and mutual interactions between scientists. Every scientific result can be accepted and used if and only if it is published, tested and evaluated by other researchers. Open Access is the best method for acceleration of such process of scientific results exchange and scientific community internal

communication. Therefore, in the third, ethical type of argument, if progress in science and development of civilization can be assessed as a good thing, we must also evaluate Open Access as a good thing.

Jan Błeszyński presented a paper *Access to Knowledge Resources and the Intellectual Property Rights*, but did not send a paper. We quote in this issue the theses of his paper, in which he concentrates on specific issues of intellectual property rights, treating the general issue of strengthening them as obvious and already given.

Marek Niezgódka, Dominika Czerniawska i Karol Leszczyński in their paper *Open Models of Scientific Communications: Importance for Competitiveness in International Dimension* address problems of open access in the scientific field. Authors' main goal is to show a growing popularity of this model across the world as well as benefits of its introduction. The phenomena of knowledge privatization and commercialization of every aspect of scientific activities contradict basic principals of the nature of knowledge (non-competitive, non-rivalous, non-transparent). Neglecting significance of free knowledge circulation and its importance in knowledge production process can lead to diminishing the quality of contemporary and future science in Poland. Polish scientists actively supporting open access model not only have an opportunity to improve quality of science and higher education, but also join a worldwide trend redefining knowledge and its role in social life.

Wojciech Cellary in a paper *Knowledge Resources as an Economic Good in Knowledge Society* considers the problem of knowledge that becomes a dominating economic good in the knowledge based economy, while remaining a humanistic good as well. In close future, in a society where 50% of people will have university education and thus will like to sustain due to discovery, deployment and transfer of knowledge, the knowledge has to be a subject of sale and purchase. In this paper it is argued why from the economical point of view it is not possible to provide everybody with free of charge knowledge financed from public taxes, advertisement or intermediary. To complete analysis, threats following from unlimited privatization of knowledge are presented too. In conclusions, a need is expressed of development of a compromise economical model for knowledge based economy which consists of controlled knowledge sale.

Włodzimierz Bojarski in his discussion statement *Knowledge Monopoly and Open Access to Knowledge* maintains that the summary cost of an achieved scientific or invention success is always negligible when compared to the cost of former research, knowledge and experience of other people created often during many centuries and *today available for free*, but necessary and used to achieve the specific, new success. The

only real and natural possibility to repay this free use of knowledge developed and accumulated earlier by mankind is that today's researchers and inventors include their new results to the open accessible resource of public knowledge in order that they will be tested and used by others.

Janusz Gajda in his discussion statement *The Idea of Opening Knowledge Resources* expresses the opinion that opening knowledge resources is an idea that is important, actual, and controversial today, but actually is not new and was unquestionable in past time.

Andrzej Wierzbicki in his discussion statement *What is Knowledge? The Conflict about Its Property* expresses the opinion that treating knowledge as a simple commodity is a gross error of simplification. *Knowledge is not for selling it on the market* (we can sell as commodities only specific products of knowledge), *but for transferring it freely to our children and grandchildren* in the hope that it will help them to cope with future catastrophes such as at Fukushima. In economic sense, *knowledge is thus a common, public insurance resource*, not a commodity, and the value of this resource is much greater than the outlays for research and development made by governments of diverse countries (and incomparable to the negligible outlays for R&D in Poland). Moreover, *knowledge is a resource of specific properties: intensively and commonly used it grows, not diminishes*. Therefore, the classical *tragedy of commons*, the phenomenon justifying privatization of common resources in classical economic theory, *is not applicable to knowledge*; there is no justification to knowledge privatization, society is better off if knowledge is a common property. Unfortunately, as it was also noted by Lawrence Lessig in the book *Free Culture*, there are important groups (large corporations, lawyers) in which group interests might lay a strengthening of intellectual property rights, and support for such strengthening might have diverse though spurious justifications. For example, the argument that strengthening intellectual property rights serves the interests of individual creators of knowledge or culture is actually spurious, because individual scientists, inventors or even artists might be also interested in promoting their status through open access to their products. Therefore, for the coming era after informational revolution the main conflict might develop as *the conflict about property of knowledge, of three-sided nature: the public, corporate, and individual property of knowledge*.

The second main theme of this issue is *Perspectives of Poland 2050*. An introduction to this theme is given by the short paper of Jerzy Kleer *Poland 2050: An Outline and Conceptualisation of Studies (Theses)*. The paper describes the motivation and the main vision of the project Poland 2050 – *the minimisation of civilization distance of Poland with respect to developed countries of European Union*. The paper de-

scribes also the studies of the project already initiated by the Committee "Poland 2000 Plus", main barriers of civilization development of Poland identified during the initial studies, a proposed model of civilization development and suggestions for further work.

Teresa Bal-Woźniak in the paper *Innovativeness in the Role of Universal Competence in Popularising Civilisation Development* proposes a change in the paradigm of thinking of innovativeness. The very basic assumption relies on a currently dominating technocentric approach to innovativeness that arises from individualistic creativity. Consequently, the innovative potential of network economy and information society is not properly used for harmonising technology development along with other walks of human life. The author reckons that popularisation of innovative competences is limited to delays in institutional adjustments to challenges and threats to globalization, liberalization and technocentric culture of the era of informationism. In order to overcome such threats it is useful to adopt an integrated approach towards innovativeness which appreciates the subjective aspect of an individual within an innovative process. As a result, the author perceives institutions as the subsystem of correlated complexes and drive forces or barriers to innovative behaviours. Such an approach is posed by a perspective of making innovativeness a universal competence and its application in popularising civilisation development.

To the theme of future civilisation development of Poland contributes also, from a more transcendental perspective, the paper of Zbigniew Król *Discourse of Fundamental Values and Development of Poland and Polish Society*. The paper considers the problem of the system (hierarchy) of values of the Polish society together with some long-term trends of its change. There is a general problem whether values are objective and independent from some historical and economic determinants or from the given social structure. The problem of objectivity of values is important from the point of view of politicians because some systems of values can be perceived as an effective, useful and desirable tool in democratic social engineering. In connection with the above, the axiology of constitutional values present in the Polish constitution is discussed and some examples of the statistics concerning the values empirically accepted and the basic legal frames determining every possible change of the constitutional axiology in Poland are considered.

Another section of this issue contains *Materials Sent*. Leszek Kuźnicki in the paper *Poland 2010 in Confrontation with Its' Visions from the Year 1995* presents an ex post assessment of the book *A Perspective of the Year 2010* edited by the Committee of Future Studies "Poland 2000 Plus" in the first half of 1995. It appears that only some elements

belonging both to optimistic scenarios (an improvement of natural environment in Poland, admission to European Union and to NATO), and to pessimistic scenarios (relations to Russia growing worse, lack of constitutional reforms, impact of demographic peak coming to labour market without chances of employment, lack of systemic reforms in agriculture, an underestimation of the importance of education) were actually realized. A general conclusion is that *the traditional approach to forecasting based on pessimistic, optimistic and neutral scenarios is illusive*, because it forces a concentration on all pessimistic or optimistic (or neutral) aspects, while the real art of forecasting consists of a proper selection of these aspects which most probably will develop positively and of those that will develop negatively.

Kamil Zubelewicz sent an excellent analytical material *Resources of Public Finance Sector in Poland 1990-2010* that illustrates the unbalanced character of sources of public finance in Poland. The author maintains that the balance of the public finance sector in Poland has been systematically deteriorating in the recent years. A reason for this is the wrong structure of the revenue side of the sector. 90% of the funds come from nine sources. The individual personal levies dominate, especially the labour levies at a high level of 58% of the net remuneration. The corporate income tax, in turn, is of a relatively minor importance, since it is characterised by the low share in the legal persons' revenue (0.44%). A large number of taxpayers hinders the efficient work of the treasury administration and – in the case of VAT – does not contribute to an increase in the revenue from this tax. Granting the small own incomes to the local governments results in their dependence on the subsidies from the central sector.

Leszek Jerzy Jasiński in his paper *Brothers' Bratkowski's Thinking About Future* presents a critical review of the book *Game for Future 2* of Stefan and Andrzej Bratkowski. This is a new version of the book that in 1971 arouse a great interest and discussions. The editor of the book writes "We are presenting to the Readers a book that is "explosive" and "challenging". It is explosive in the sense that it should start discussions and contention; challenging, because it requires that we reflect on future." How is actually *Game for Future 2*? In over three hundred pages we find analyses and assessments of the authors concerning many social, economic and political problems. However, from the perspective of today's knowledge about the world and future studies it is difficult to say that the selection of these problems concerns issues decisive for the civilisation development of contemporary Poland. Even if not all notions of Stefan and Andrzej Bratkowski we perceive today as convincing, they are nevertheless interesting and knowing them has an educational value.

The issue is concluded by news *From the World*, concerning thinking about future (the future of social security, the speed of globalization, controversies concerning global warming, evolutionary justification of ethics and value systems, vision of artificial intelligence and radical evolution of humans, etc.), as well as *Chronicle* reporting the activities of the Committee of Future Studies “Poland 2000 Plus” in the first half of 2011 and information about new publications of the Committee.

The Editorial Board