

みんなのポジトリ

国立民族学博物館学術情報リポジトリ National Museum of Ethnology

Local Research, Global Audiences : Linguistic Hegemony and Transnational Publishing in the Information Age

メタデータ	言語: English 出版者: 公開日: 2009-04-28 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: Eades, Jerry メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://doi.org/10.15021/00001738

Local Research, Global Audiences: Linguistic Hegemony and Transnational Publishing in the Information Age

Jerry Eades

Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University

国内での研究・国際的読者：情報化時代における言語の主導権と国境を越えた出版
立命館アジア太平洋大学

Abstract

From the perspective of a foreign-trained anthropologist working in Japan for many years, the author reviews some of the recent history of academic writing and publishing in this country and internationally. He explains how differences in academic administration and publishing have influenced research directions and research writing in Japan and elsewhere. The emergence of an academic audit culture in Japan and the apparent world dominance of Anglo-American academic publishing are criticized. Also criticized is the lack of support for translating high-quality Japanese research into English. To modernize academic publishing in Japan, the author suggests that we try combining the best aspects of modern information technology, foreign practices, and existing local practices.

長年、日本で働いてきた外国仕込みの人類学者の視点から、筆者は昨今の日本と世界における学術論文の作成環境ならびに出版状況について論評する。本稿は、日本と諸外国を比較した場合、学術行政と学術出版にみられる相違が、それぞれの研究動向と研究論文の作成方針に、どのような影響を与えてきたかを説明する。具体的には、日本でも定着しつつある研究成果の評価傾向と世界の学術出版界を英米人たちが支配している点、日本語による高水準の研究を英語に翻訳することに対する支援がないことを批判したい。そして、日本における学術出版界を近代化するため、筆者は、最新の情報技術、外国の出版慣習、および既存の国内の出版慣習の最善点を組み合わせる試みを推奨する。

Much of the discourse surrounding the academic mode of production suggests that it is universal. It is generally assumed that higher education is a worldwide industry with similar standards and practices operating everywhere, that we are all colleagues in one great democratic universe of academe, and that practices, people, and therefore writings translate easily across national boundaries. Part of this feeling of universalism comes from the comfortable fact of Anglo-American hegemony. Generally because the American higher education industry is so large and so rich, it is the American schools that recruit the top scholars internationally, and the American journals and university publishing houses that set the trends in

publishing. The best American schools have more money to spend on individual students than any other schools on the planet, and as a result the libraries are also the best in the world. Harvard has 4.5 times as much to spend on each student as Oxford. Yale and Princeton have nearly as much as Harvard, and even Duke spends more than 1.4 times on each student as much as any university in Europe (Palfreyman 2001). English has become the *de facto* international language of choice at conferences, and even speakers of French who twenty years ago would have insisted on speaking in their own language, are willing to deliver in English. Scholars from the Benelux and Scandinavian countries have been doing so for much longer, and even Eastern Europe is fast moving from Russian to English as the academic *lingua franca*. Not surprisingly, the Japanese anthropologist, Takami Kuwayama, has seen anthropology as forming a “world-system,” with America and Europe as the “center” on the one hand, and the rest of the world as the “periphery” on the other (Kuwayama 2000, 2004).

In the real world however, hegemony is an on-going process, rather than an established fact, and many differences in national academic cultures and modes of production still persist. On arriving in Japan to teach anthropology twelve years ago, I was soon struck by the differences, not only in language, administration and research, but even in the way that people wrote up the results of that research and published it. Some years ago I gave a paper at the National Museum of Ethnology entitled “Why don’t they write in English?” (Eades 2000). It was a question prompted by the state of affairs in my own discipline of anthropology. In Japan there are around 2,000 accredited anthropologists (i.e. paid up members of the Nihon Minzoku Gakkai or Japanese Society of Ethnology).¹⁾ Many of these scholars are research active, pouring out papers and books for the massive Japanese publishing industry. Few of them are known in the West, and even fewer regularly publish in the mainstream western journals or through western publishing houses. This is in startling contrast with, say, France or Germany, where the works of leading gurus are translated into English (and Japanese) almost as soon as the ink on their manuscripts is dry. The result is peculiar. Japanese scholars read foreign materials freely and are well aware of the latest theoretical trends, while outsiders, with the exception of a small number of specialists on Japan who can read Japanese, are completely unaware of what is going on in Japan. In anthropology this is a pity: in fact Japanese anthropologists do comparatively little research in Japan itself, but they do outstanding work elsewhere in the world, including regions such as Africa where the material difficulties of research deter all but the most intrepid western scholars. In the more remote parts of Southeast Asia, most of the research is being carried out by Japanese.²⁾ Japan, as Shinji Yamashita has put it, has an intellectual balance of payments problem which mirrors that in world trade: they import too much, and export too little (Yamashita, Bosco and Eades 2004).

Why is this? Part of the answer is language. It is not easy for non-native speakers to publish in English without extensive editorial help. You not only have to be able to write English well, but you also have to know the latest buzz words and theoretical concepts that are popular in the leading university departments in each discipline, and be able to use them fluently. These change extremely fast, and by the time major works containing them are translated into other languages, they may already be out of date amongst the scholars who introduced them.

But other barriers to communication are less often recognized: these stem from the academic mode of production itself. There are major differences between the publishing industries of different countries, and scholars in different countries also tend to publish in different kinds of places. Before the Second World War, forms of writing and publishing in the major academic countries were more similar than they are now. To judge from the journals from this period, the main object of publishing was to make available the facts gathered during the course of research. Journals carried many research notes that largely consisted of raw data, and included contributions not only from scholars but also from administrators and amateur researchers on a wide variety of topics. Classic books from the period typically contained enormous amounts of new data, forming a marked contrast with the very short bibliographies, often running only to a page or two in total.

This was particularly true in British anthropology. From the time of Malinowski onwards until about the late 1960s, scholars headed for the field, wrote down what they saw, returned to their own countries, got jobs in the expanding universities of the period, and eventually published most of the information they had collected, writing in the ethnographic present to suggest that nothing had really changed. Soon after their return from the field, or in some cases even while they were still in the field, they would write short articles for conferences or journals. Many colonies had their own research institutes, with their own journals and publication series. Early articles then became chapters of theses, and most theses were eventually published as books. Journal articles were therefore not valued all that highly because they often appeared in some rather obscure journals, and were seen as raw material which would end up in a more polished form in books. Books were more prestigious and more important for getting jobs and promotion than journal articles, but the major purpose of all publishing was to present information rather than advance theory.³⁾

Much of this has remained true for Japan until the present. Most Japanese universities publish their own journals (*kiyō*) and monographs series, which are only open to members of that university. They are often short of material, given the small number of potential authors, so it is not difficult for academics to find space for their work. Shiga University, where I taught for six years, had fewer than 2,000 students, but it supported several journals, one of which appeared six times a year,

plus a monograph series and a working paper series. About 80% of the publications by the Shiga professors appeared in these outlets. Publication times were correspondingly quick – literally a few weeks between finishing a paper or monograph and seeing it in print. With publication assured, the researcher could then get on with the next piece of research and writing.

Economics and Change

So far I have argued that research, writing and publishing practices used to be similar in Japan and the West, and in Japan much of this system still survives. This raises the question of what happened in the West to make the system change? The answer is complex and tentative, but some of the main factors would appear to be the following: In the post-war period there was a considerable expansion of universities in most of the advanced industrial countries in times of economic growth, but these were often followed by long periods of recession, in which the universities were forced to retrench and become much more competitive to retain their ranking in the hierarchy. The kind of rethinking that has become necessary in Japan since the economic bubble burst in 1991 took place in the West much earlier (cf. Eades 2001). Western universities were increasingly forced to compete for the best teachers, the brightest students and the biggest research grants, and evaluating the quality of teachers and researchers became a major problem. It is not easy to evaluate teaching before hiring a new professor, but evaluating research is much easier. In America, where the competition was most intense because of the number of schools relying on the market rather than the state, the main measure of research output became articles in the leading refereed journals. Refereeing or peer review (usually anonymous review by other experts in the same field) was the basis on which these journals selected the papers to publish, and this was increasingly seen as a guarantee of quality in research and academic publication.

The trend spread more slowly elsewhere. In the UK until the 1980s, books remained more important than journals in hiring and publication, so scholars concentrated on writing books. In America, on the other hand, journals became important earlier, partly because it became easier to rank the influence of journals, scholars and individual books or articles using the citation index. This was the brainchild of Eugene Garfield who had the brilliant idea of selecting the best journals in each field, putting together lists of references cited in each paper, and calculating the number of times the work of each author was cited. The results were published in the *Science*, *Social Science* and *Humanities Citation Indexes*, and became the standard measure of the academic impact of a particular scholar, journal, or published work. The journals most often cited became the most prestigious, and the numbers of scholars trying to publish in them increased, turning peer review into a major industry. The review process became longer and longer, as more and more

papers were sent back to the authors for revision and resubmission, with the result that the interval between research, writing and final publication also expanded. By the mid-1990s, many articles in the West were taking two or three years to appear in print, assuming that they were accepted at all, which meant that many were effectively out of date by the time they were printed.⁴⁾

So if the facts are dated, how else can the importance and quality of publications be judged? The answer is in terms of “theory,” though much theory in the qualitative social sciences is not theory in the scientific sense of propositions that can be tested, but more a system of categories and vocabulary with which research results can be written up. As demands for “theoretical relevance” in publications increased, the result was that scholars were forced to read and cite more works in their publications to establish their own theoretical credentials. Currently, articles in leading journals in American anthropology contain only 50% text, while the other 50% consists of footnotes and bibliography.⁵⁾ The number of citations on average is continually increasing, and articles in American journals typically have twice as many as their counterparts in Japanese journals. Writing styles have also changed, and become increasingly “theoretical,” i.e. laden with the latest jargon and increasingly difficult to write and understand, or for that matter to evaluate. This trend has made the task of writing in English for non-native English speakers increasingly difficult.

This emphasis on peer review, journal publication and theory is now spreading as the American model is followed elsewhere. Part of this is due to the spread of what is now known as the “audit culture” in university life, and this is starting to appear in Japan, as in the Center of Excellence Program over the last two years.⁶⁾ The audit culture is a political culture in which people and governments increasingly question the costs and benefits relating to public institutions, including colleges and universities. There is increasing concern with whether education is meeting the needs of the country, whether investment in education represents good “value for money”, e.g. in terms of the economic growth which it stimulates, and with what ways teaching and research can be measured and improved. The question of how to measure quality is easily met by following the lead of the US publishing industry, with more emphasis on peer review, journal articles, and citation indices, which are then used as the basis for hiring, promotion, and allocation of research funds.

The ultimate example of the effects of the audit culture – and one which has been influential in the thinking of the Japanese Ministry of Education as well -- is that of the United Kingdom. Under the Margaret Thatcher government (1979-92), the universities began regular research reviews about every five years, the RAE or “research assessment exercise.”⁷⁾ The published output of each department in each university was scored (by peer review, i.e. by a committee of academics from the

same field) on a seven-point scale. In ascending order, these are 1, 2, 3b, 3a, 4, 5 and 5*. In addition to the quality of publications, the RAE also measures things like the number of research students in each department, the number of publications in refereed journals, and earnings from research funds, and the final rank is arrived at through an arithmetical formula. Roughly speaking, a ranking of 3a indicates an average department with some nationally-known scholars, a ranking of 4 indicates a department whose members are nearly all recognized nationally, a ranking of 5 indicates a department whose work is recognized internationally, and a ranking of 5* indicated a department which is recognized as outstanding internationally, i.e. of world class. A proportion of the total higher education funding available from the government is distributed on the basis of this grading, and the amounts of money involved are considerable. Universities with higher research ranking receive a lot more money to do research in future, and universities and departments regularly use high ranks as part of their advertising for staff and students.

Typically, the leading research universities such as Oxford, Cambridge or the leading London Schools (Imperial College, LSE, UCL), have departments which are nearly ranked all 5 or 5*. Middle ranking universities have mainly departments ranked 3b, 3a or 4, with a smattering of 2's and 5's, while the lower ranking universities have mainly 2's and 3b's. Oxford, Cambridge and London have a huge advantage in research, because of the quality of the libraries, and these institutions attract a huge number of research students, both domestic and international, and a huge share of government research funding. They also attract the best scholars. The "new" universities, many of them former city polytechnics, carried out little research until their conversion into full universities in the early 1990s, so their research ranking is generally much lower, and their income from research correspondingly small. An alternative source of income is to enroll more undergraduate students, resulting in higher staff teaching loads and less time for research. The result of the audit culture and the RAE is that the university system is becoming increasingly polarized in terms of income, quality of students, and quality of research and publications, between the rich students and the poor, with institutions in the middle desperately competing to get onto the up rather than the down escalator.

Publishing Companies

Publishing companies also form an important part of the ranking system in the West. Academic publishing is roughly speaking divided between commercial companies and the university presses, though the distinction is not always clear. Some of the commercial presses run series in association with particular universities or institutes, such as the Routledge/Nissan Institute Series in Japanese Studies, or the books on the Asia Pacific that Routledge publish for the Open University. With the restructuring of the media industry, some of the commercial companies have

become very large in the last twenty years. To give one case, one of the largest academic publishers in Britain and America is Taylor & Francis. This includes a number of “imprints” some of which originated in separate publishing companies, with Routledge being one of the largest of these.⁸⁾ Routledge itself developed out of an earlier series of mergers in the late 1980s, and it currently publishes about 1,200 books a year. Taylor & Francis also publish extensively under other imprints, including both books and an increasing number of journals. The British and American markets have other examples of similar conglomerates which have grown as a result of mergers (e.g. Ashgate and Palgrave), though on a smaller scale. All three of these companies publish mainly academic monographs, that is to say a large number of titles with small print runs for each title. Some of the other large commercial players in the academic market, such as McGraw Hill and Prentice Hall concentrate more on the textbook market, with smaller numbers of titles, larger print runs, and frequent new editions. Compared with monographs, these textbooks provide an elaborately produced and designed product at a cheaper price, and the cost can be offset through print runs of tens of thousands rather than hundreds of copies. (After the expense of setting up the print run, once the first 500 copies have been printed, the production cost of each extra copy declines rapidly to that of the paper and ink consumed.)

Of the university presses, Cambridge and Oxford are in a class of their own in terms of size, because of their large school and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) textbook markets, but both publish regular series of academic monographs as well. Most other university presses, whether in Europe or America, are much smaller, typically publishing between 50 and 300 books a year.⁹⁾ The most prestigious are Princeton, Harvard, Stanford and Yale, followed by California (one of the largest), Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, SUNY and so on. Some have a near monopoly in closely defined niche markets, such as Duke (in cultural studies), or Hawaii (in Asia Pacific Studies). Many of these presses employ commissioning editors in the main fields in which they are interested, and these meet and discuss projects with academics at the larger academic conventions. Alternatively, they rely on series editors, usually academics who are recognized experts in their fields, to stimulate and sort through projects for their particular series. There are pendulum shifts in these markets: sometimes single-authored monographs are in fashion, and sometimes edited volumes which are easier to use as course texts. There is also the issue of whether or not to print a particular book in hardback or paper, or both. Some firms like Routledge or Edward Elgar with some of their series recoup their investment through sales to a small number of libraries at very high prices, to the distress of academics and students who find these prices exorbitant. Best-selling titles may be published in paper later. Other companies aim for the student market and publish their titles either in cloth and paper, or paper only, from the outset.

There are also many smaller commercial publishers, typically one or two-office operations, which put out around 50 books a year, and which typically concentrate on a narrow range of subjects or areas of the world. To keep costs of production and distribution down they often collaborate on series or individual projects with companies in different regions – e.g. on the other side of the Atlantic. In recent years, many of these small companies have been bought up by the big ones: a good example in Asian Studies is Curzon, which had already bought up some small Asian lists itself, and which was recently bought up by Routledge. Finally, there are very small university presses in North America and the UK, producing 10-50 books a year. These are typically one-office operations, with just a couple of permanent staff and most of the work subcontracted out.

There is considerable competition to get books published by the more prestigious university presses, with the result that queues and bottlenecks develop because of the lengthy review and editing processes. Two to three years is usual in the west between a book being completed and being published, compared with a fraction of that in Japan. Why does it take so long? First finding expert readers and getting them to evaluate the manuscript can take six months or longer, particularly if a vacation intervenes. Second, decisions may be slow even after the readers' reports are in. One publisher I co-edit a series for,¹⁰ State University of New York (SUNY) Press, has an editorial committee which makes all publishing decisions but which only meets three times a year. The next delay comes with copy-editing by a professional who goes through the manuscript, checking style, footnotes, lists of references etc. Much of this work is to get rid of inconsistencies of expression and repetition – which are a problem in English, but not necessarily in Japanese. Copy-editing can take several months, depending on the availability of editors and the amount of work required by the manuscript. After that, answering the copy-editor's questions and getting permission to cite other people's material can take many months more. Final checking, type setting, proofreading, indexing, and printing can also take many months, though things may speed up if the authors can carry out some of these tasks themselves. All these processes involve different groups of people and the delays can add up. Everything can of course be done very quickly if the publishers, printers and writers are coordinated, and if there is an instant market for a book, like books on Iraq or Al Qaeda after the 9/11 attacks, but this seldom occurs.¹¹ By contrast, publishing houses are much more efficient in Japan than in the West, with books typically taking only 3-6 months to be published. Print runs are typically longer, 2,000 or more copies compared with 700-1,000 for many books in the West.

There are some other considerations with publishing that are also important to understand. First, the production costs of a book are only 8-12% of the sale price:

50% goes to the dealer, 30% to the publisher and distributor, and only about 10% to the author. It is difficult to make any money out of writing books unless you are writing for a publisher like Penguin, which produces cheap books that sell lots of copies, or you are writing a popular textbook for the American market. In fact, most books in the West have print runs of between 500 and 1,000: they sell many fewer copies than the average book in Japan, which sells around 2,000. Book reviews also have very little effect on sales. Like everything in journals, book reviews can also take a couple of years to appear, by which time over 90% of the copies of the book that will ever be sold will have already been sold. Most copies of most books are bought by libraries which have placed advanced orders, and they are bought within a few days of the book being published.

Because the costs of book production are fairly low in relation to the sale price, the impact of information technology on book production has also been surprisingly limited. This impact is also quite old now – the larger presses were already typesetting books by computer 25 years ago. But much of the publishing industry still operates by sending around bits of paper marked up with red pencil, for instance for copyediting and proofreading. Much more important are the economies of scale to be brought about by distribution, and this is one of the main reasons for the restructuring which has taken place recently. So there are actually fewer companies interested in publishing the average scholar's books than there were a few years ago, and these companies are increasingly worried about profits. Publishing academic monographs may be prestigious, but there is not much money in it.

The alternative for aspiring authors is simply to publish on the Internet, which is both quick and cheap, so why don't they? It is mainly because unless their work comes from a prestigious press and is clearly peer-reviewed, it will be ignored by other scholars and will count for little when it comes to finding jobs and promotion. It is the peer review system that to a large extent is helping to keep the traditional publishing industry going using methods which now, from a technological point of view, seem rather antiquated.

But will the publishers themselves use the Internet to distribute their work? In the journal market, this is already happening, because on-line journals are much easier to search and collect material from than the old paper hard copies. It is less likely to happen in the book market. Most people, it seems, actually prefer reading books on paper rather than computer screens, as books are generally smaller and more convenient to carry around. The interests of authors and publishers differ here. Most writers make very little from their books, but are happy to see the work read and cited by other scholars. But publishers need to sell books and make a profit, and so are much more worried about the possibilities of being copied from the Internet. There are a few exceptions. The University of California Press has realized that it will make no more money out of its older books, so it is offering many of them

either free or on a subscription basis on the web, the subscriptions providing the Press with a new source of income from its old list.¹²⁾ There is also the possibility that a reader will be willing to pay for the convenience of having a paper copy of a particular book, and so the site includes an order page as well, through which hard copies can be ordered. Some scholars argue that putting a book on the web actually increases rather than decreases sales, as some people will want to buy a hard copy having seen the text. It remains to be seen whether many publishers will take the risk and put all new books on the Internet, though some scholars insist on this when they publish, as they are primarily concerned with their work being disseminated.

All of this creates a quandary for scholars in Japan who want to develop an international reputation. To do so, they realize that they should probably write in English, but this takes time, western publishers are slow for the reasons listed above, and the audience will be more limited than it is in Japan. Not surprisingly, many of the Japanese authors give up the struggle and continue to publish only in Japanese, which is quicker, easier, cheaper and sells more copies.

So despite globalization and internationalization, it is actually difficult for scholars from other countries to contest Anglo-American hegemony, given that the international language of higher education is increasingly English. Translations would be one way forward, but these are expensive, difficult to finance, and are seen by publishers as a risky investment. Not all work is suitable for translation – for instance, a former Japanese colleague of mine wrote extensively in Japanese on a major European sociologist, and wanted to translate his books into English, for a sociology market already awash with similar books. Not surprisingly, he was unable to find a publisher who was interested.

In anthropology, however, the lack of translations is a pity. The Japanese-based scholars still stress the importance of finding facts and reporting them, much more so than their more theoretical western counterparts. These Japanese works are a repository of primary data, and in twenty years time may seem much more valuable than many western works, when the theoretical language in which the latter are written has become dated. The problem is that these works are written mainly in Japanese and so will remain largely unknown by and inaccessible to Western scholars.

What we need therefore is either a massive government-financed program to fund translations of the best Japanese academic works, or for non-economic forces to come into play. If translation was seen as a valid scholarly exercise, and was rewarded accordingly, scholars might be more prepared to spend more time engaged in it, rather than leaving it to their students or professional translators who lack the necessary training in the discipline. It is possible that translation programs will make translation between some languages easier as the software improves. Machine

translations between e.g. Japanese and Korean, which have similar structures, are apparently already very good, as are those between some European languages. Unfortunately translation programs between English and Japanese generally produce such poor results that it is quicker to translate from scratch rather than edit the output from a program.

Conclusion

In this paper I have argued that beneath the assumption that academic norms and values are universal – an assumption encouraged by the consolidation of Anglo-American academic hegemony – national differences still persist. The surprising lack of interaction between the very large number of Japanese anthropologists and their counterparts elsewhere is a typical symptom of this, as is the one-way flow of information that goes with it. This is not only a question of language, though the increasing stress on theoretical jargon and citations in the West certainly makes it difficult for non-native speakers to write in the approved style. There are also differences in the structure of the publishing industry, for instance the survival of in-house publishing in Japan versus the increased stress on peer-reviewed journals and monograph series in the West.

These differences are not caused so much by different academic traditions in different countries as by rapid change in the West in the postwar period. This in turn is due to increased competition that has led to the spread of the audit culture, bolstered by the popularity of citation indexes as research and evaluation tools. Part of the reason for the increased stress on theory is that, because of lengthy reviewing and publication lead times, many of the facts reported in social science journals are actually out of date by the time they appear, in striking contrast with Japan. It can be argued that one effect of the prolonged economic recession in Japan is that the audit culture is starting to spread rapidly there as well, as in the Center of Excellence Program launched in 2002-3. This can be expected to result in even greater polarization between elite and non-elite institutions in Japan, with some of the latter going to the wall over the next few years because of the fall in the birthrate.

The Japanese scholars who will benefit most from this will be the multilingual and multicultural jet-setters who can survive in the face of increasing western hegemony, but increasingly the best of them will be absorbed by the American academic system, because of the rewards and research facilities on offer. Academic hegemony may also lead to academic brain-drain.

At the same time, the academic publishing industry is undergoing restructuring itself, and cannot be relied upon to bridge the gap between academic cultures on its own. One result of the restructuring is actually a more limited choice of publishers for academics, as the smaller companies are swallowed up in increasing numbers by the larger ones (the Taylor & Francis syndrome). The larger and more prestigious

university presses will survive, sometimes subsidized by their parent institutions, but many of the smaller ones may be squeezed out. Some firms such as Routledge and Edward Elgar may decide to make available more material by non-western scholars in translation, but in small quantities and at prices that mean that these works will find their way into few libraries. They will have little impact on students. Meanwhile, the bottlenecks in the western industry which result from competition and the peer review system make it likely that non-western scholars will continue to publish mainly locally and in their own languages, rather than internationally.

Information technology has been around in the publishing industry for some time, and will probably have little effect on actual book production, given that production costs are only a fraction of the final selling price. On the other hand, it is already having a profound effect on the journal market, though this is also generally under the control of the major publishers as well (Oxford, Cambridge, Elsevier, and Taylor & Francis being good examples).

To bridge the gap between the center and periphery in the academic world system, two specific moves might be helpful in relation to Japan. First, there is a need for the government, and specifically the Ministry of Education, to take the lead in financing good quality translations on a much larger scale. Secondly, universities themselves should give much more emphasis to translation as an important exercise when evaluating staff performance.

More generally, to break the logjam in academic publishing and drag it into the 21st (or even the 20th) century, there is need for a major and prestigious university, a consortium of universities, or a publisher to take the lead in organizing a peer-reviewed web-site on which good-quality monographs or edited volumes can be published quickly and efficiently (i.e. in months rather than years), focusing on a single discipline or area. Chinese studies or Japanese studies would be excellent candidates for this treatment, because (a) China and Japan are extremely important countries in their own right, so there is a large market for works on them, and (b) both countries have massive publishing industries in their own languages, so there is a huge body of work which can only be made available to the international scholarly community through translation into English. With appropriate technology, such an operation could be coupled with a publish-on-demand system in which printed copies could be printed as and when ordered. This would eliminate the need for storage space and inventories, and would still permit those who require a printed copy to obtain one. But the main benefit would be quicker and more efficient dissemination of work of guaranteed quality than is possible under the present English-language publishing system – a system characterized by long lead times, antiquated production methods, and (in some cases) outrageous prices.

Notes

- 1) The English name will be changed to the Japanese Society of Social and Cultural Anthropology from 2004.
- 2) As an example, see the list of references in Hayami (2001), who lists work being carried out by Japanese scholars in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and Myanmar, as well the more accessible parts of the region.
- 3) This was particularly true in West Africa, which until the 1970s was one of the most important regions for anthropology research in the UK. I worked there from 1969-76.
- 4) Based on a survey of *American Ethnologist* for 1996. This journal actually gives for each article the original date of submission plus later revisions and acceptance.
- 5) Also based on the example of *American Ethnologist*.
- 6) For an excellent discussion of changes in higher education in East Asia and the spread there of the audit culture, see Goodman (2001). On the Center of Excellence program see also Eades (2001). The phrase “audit culture” comes from Shore and Wright (1999).
- 7) The results of the 2001 RAE and previous exercises are available at the British Higher Education Funding Council site, <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/Research/assessment/default.htm>.
- 8) The other members of this group are Bios Scientific Publishers, Brunner-Routledge, Carfax, CRC Press, Europa, Garland Scientific, Martin Dunitz, Psychology Press, Routledge, RoutledgeCurzon, RoutledgeFalmer, Spon Press, Taylor & Francis Asia Pacific, and Taylor & Francis.
- 9) A quick way of working out numbers of publications is through the Publisher search facility for a single year on the COPAC site (copac.ac.uk) run by the University of Manchester. This site includes the catalogues of most of the major British university research libraries.
- 10) *Japan in Transition*, co-edited with Takeo Funabiki of Tokyo University.
- 11) Of over a dozen books which I have authored or edited, the quickest took five weeks to publish, the longest nearly four years.
- 12) See <http://repositories.cdlib.org/escholarship/>.

References

Eades, J.S.

- 2000 ‘Why don’t they write in English?’ Academic modes of production and academic discourses in Japan and the West. In Pamela Asquith (guest ed.), *Japanese Scholarship in International Academic Discourse. Ritsumeikan Journal of Asia Pacific Studies* 6: 58-77.
- 2001 Reforming Japanese higher education: Bureaucrats, the birthrate, and visions of the 21st century. In Roger Goodman (guest ed.), *Higher Education Reform in East Asia: A Comparative Perspective. Ritsumeikan Journal of Asia Pacific Studies* 8: 86-101.

Goodman, R.

- 2001 The state of higher education in East Asia: Higher education in East Asia and the State,” In Roger Goodman (guest ed.), *Higher Education Reform in East Asia: A Comparative Perspective. Ritsumeikan Journal of Asia Pacific Studies* 8: 1-29.

Hayami, Yoko.

- 2001 Within and beyond the boundaries: Anthropological studies of mainland Southeast Asia since the 1050s. *Japanese Review of Cultural Anthropology* 2: 65-104.

Kuwayama, T.

- 2000 Native anthropologists: With special reference to Japanese studies inside and outside Japan. In Pamela Asquith (guest ed.), *Japanese Scholarship in International Academic Discourse. Ritsumeikan Journal of Asia Pacific Studies* 6: 7-33.
- 2004 The 'world-system' of anthropology: Japan and Asia in the global community of anthropologists. In S. Yamashita, J. Bosco and J.S. Eades (eds), *The Making of Anthropology in East and Southeast Asia*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn.

Palfreyman, D.

- 2001 Higher education in the United Kingdom: A viable elite-mass 'Third Way'? In Roger Goodman (guest ed.), *Higher Education Reform in East Asia: A Comparative Perspective. Ritsumeikan Journal of Asia Pacific Studies* 8: 30-41.

Shore, C. and S. Wright

- 1999 Audit culture and anthropology: Neo-liberalism in British higher education. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (NS) 5: 557-75.

Yamashita, Shinji, Joseph Bosco and J. S. Eades

- 2004 Asian Anthropologies: Foreign, Native and Indigenous. In S. Yamashita, J. Bosco and J.S. Eades (eds), *The Making of Anthropology in East and Southeast Asia*, Oxford and New York: Berghahn.