International Sociological Association

e-bulletin

International Sociological Association
e-bulletin

E-Bulletin
International Sociological Association

ISA E-Bulletin, Number 15, March 2010

Contents

International Sociological Association
e-bulletin

In Conversation with Prof. Gavin W. Jones

Interview by *Sarbeswar Sahoo*

From the Editor

It gives me great pleasure to focus the first volume of the year 2010, on a topic of immense contemporary importance to social scientists located everywhere – the question of evaluations and assessments of the work that is produced in academia. The essays in this collection build on an earlier special focus on the same subject, conceptualised and edited by Michael Burawoy, and which appeared in the ISA E-Bulletin in 2009. The present focus adds four new voices to this on-going important conversation about social science knowledge production globally and the question of how to evaluate the same. The four pieces in this issue are: Charles Crothers' 'Mapping Sociology's International Pattern of Knowledge Production,' Bruno Cousin and Michèle Lamont's 'The Multiple Crises of the French Universities and the Protest Movement of Spring 2009,' Paul Kratoska's 'Online Access, Consolidation, and the Resurgence of Academic Journals' and Ho Chi Tim's 'The Intellectual and Institutional Origins of *JSEAH* and *JSEAS.*' I am keen to continue these critical debates in the pages of the ISA E-Bulletin, especially from diverse locations, and welcome all related suggestions and contributions. The 'In Conversation' segment of the ISA E-Bulletin continues to draw interest and I am pleased to carry here an important interview with the Sociologist and Demographer, Gavin Jones, by Sarbeswar Sahoo. As always, I welcome the input of ISA members in order to make this Bulletin an international forum for engaging issues of relevance to social scientists everywhere.

Vineeta Sinha
Academic Editor
socvs@nus.edu.sg
ebulletineditor@yahoo.com

Mapping Sociology's International Pattern of Knowledge Production

Charles Crothers
AUT University, Auckland
charles.crothers@aut.ac.nz

Charles Crothers is professor of Sociology in the Department of Social Sciences at the AUT University, Auckland. Prior to this, he has served as professor of Sociology at the University of Natal, Durban, South Africa, and has lectured in the Department of Sociology at the University of Auckland and the Victoria University. He had been the Secretary as well as the President of the New Zealand Sociological Association, and is currently the Vice-Chair of the History of Sociology Research Committee of the International Sociological Association. His research interests include Sociological/Social Theory (especially the analytical theories in the work of Robert K Merton to develop a robust conceptualisation of social structure), Social Research Methodology/Methods, Sociology of Science and Social Science (especially the Columbia Tradition of Sociology, National Sociologies, and most broadly comparative patterns in World Sociology and organisation of social research) and Studies of New Zealand (and other settler societies) and Auckland.

Although there have been a variety of published bibliographic investigations into the literature of Sociology, there has yet to be produced an overall description of the international dimensions of its literature in terms of countries contributing and the languages sociologists use. In a recent E-Bulletin article, Christian Fleck (2009) provided a sketch of the diversity within European Sociology; this article aims to extend Fleck's treatment to a world-wide scale.

There are several ways of attempting to map the extent of sociology knowledge production, although none of them are entirely satisfactory. This paper produces such a map using data available from key sources like *Sociological Abstracts, Sociofile* and *Social Science Citation Index.* This data is supplemented by *Urlichs Periodicals*

Directory, which provides information about journals, and the London School of Economics' (originally set up by UNESCO) *International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS)*, which provides information about books.[1]

Sociological Abstracts is particularly relied on because it is careful about the completeness of its coverage of Sociology as a subject-matter, has extensive geographical coverage, and provides a wider range of information about the material abstracted within it (such as subject-matter classifications and a thesaurus-ordered key terms). The information is presented in successive levels of detail: from books through journals to articles (since the patterns in the data are quite obvious, minimal commentary has been provided).

Information Production in General

A recent article (Lobachev, 2008) brings together a range of available data to provide a broad overview of a variety of intellectual and communications material. The picture is clear-cut. Although English-speakers are second in size in terms of literate population, this language dominates all of the information domains, particularly in terms of newspapers and internet pages and least so in terms of books and films/videos. Although German is a more distant third in information production (despite being 11th in terms of literate population) it is closely followed by Spanish, Chinese, French and Japanese.

[1] http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/IBSS/about/keyFacts.htm

Table 1: World Information Production

Language	Literate Pop.(Mill.)	Production Index	Information on Books Unesco,	Scholarly Journals	Internet Pages	Newspapers	Film & Video
Chinese	1468	4.85	10.99	6.51	2.38	3.90	.
English	1058	44.29	21.84	45.24	56.43	62.55	34.89
Spanish	547	5.91	8.88	5.66	2.96	6.93	5.12
Hindi	426	.96	.	.	.	2.93	.52
Arabic	424	.43	.	.	.	.	.
French	407	4.21	4.81	4.94	.	2.38	3.34
Russian	359	1.96	5.29	1.30	1.66	.95	.60
Portegese	354	1.68	3.64	1.70	1.45	.88	.71
Japanese	233	3.34	6.12	3.46	4.86	.	1.72
Bengali	199	.12	.	.	.	.	.
German	174	7.60	9.78	11.01	7.71	5.88	3.63
Korean	.	1.20	3.90	.	1.52	.	.
Italian	.	2.16	3.78	2.99	2.03	.90	1.08
Dutch	.	1.67	3.71	1.48	1.92	.	.76
Polish	.	.	.	1.70	.	1.10	.
Danish	.	.	.	.	.	.	.87

Source: Lobachev, 2008: Table consolidated by author.

Notes on Data Sources:

Books: UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 1995
Newspapers/Magazines: Urlich's Periodicals Directory, 2007
Scholarly Journals: Urlich's Periodicals Directory, 2007
Films/Internet: Internet Movie Database (IMDb), 1990-2007.
Webpages: Global-Reach, 1997-2004.
Literate Population: CIA World Fact book and Ethnologue
Index: Lobachev's compilation.

Sociological Knowledge Production

The IBSS located at the London School of Economics (LSE), which has a particular remit to cover a wide range of international social science material, reports that in its collection that goes back to 1951 'over 50% of journals covered published outside the US or UK and with 25% of references in languages other than English. Abstracts are provided for over 75% of current journal articles'. A broad definition of Sociology is used, and on this basis Sociology constitutes 25%-30% of total Social Sciences knowledge production. Its proportion appearing as books (approx. 15%) and as articles (approx. 85%) is similar to other social sciences disciplines. In this classification

Sociology appears to be of a similar size to the other two major social science disciplines – Politics and Economics. Several smaller areas of study are also described in Table 2.

Table 2: Material in IBSS (Library Estimates, rounded). Source: Website

Discipline	Total Items	Reviews& Journal articles	Books	Chapters	Journals	Discarded Journals
Sociology	789000	676000	113000	18000	875	285
Politics	716000	604000	112000	18000	730	260
Economics	740000	619000	121000	11000	670	300
Anthropology	435000	375000	60000	13000	520	570
European Studies	86000	72300	8500	5200	110	40
International Rels.	82300	67300	12000	3000	120	21
Policy Studies	282000	227000	41500	13500	175	60
Human Geography	78500	67000	8000	3500	170	25
Total					2800	1415

Sociology Journals

Sociological Abstracts covers some 2100 journals: "core" (approximately 25%), "priority" (c25%) and "selective" (c50%). This is smaller than the IBSS coverage but larger than the SCCI coverage of about 110 journals, which is circumscribed by SSCI's quality control mechanisms. The current lists of journals covered in *Sociological Abstracts* were then entered into data on "Sociology" journals provided by the *Ulrich's* database of journal details. (*Ulrich's* database includes journals, magazines and monograph series which are not covered here.) Language and country breakdowns of Journals are summarised below.

Sociology Journal Articles

Information on the characteristics of journal articles covered in *Sociological Abstracts* has been analysed for 1 year in 5. A range of information is available including year of publication, fields of study (a revised classification by the author), language and country of publication of the journal (this often reflects more on the ownership of the journal than the operational location of the editors).

However, the immediately available measures (mainly based on country of publication) remain quite indirect: it would be better to base these statistics on the country affiliation of the author or the geographical focus of the article. But both are difficult to obtain. One way of measuring the latter is to use the number of times a geographically-related thesaurus term was assigned to an article, thus ignoring more general material. Coders have identified which articles had a geographical relevance and what country or other spatial unit is involved. Taking only references to countries/nations/states yields the pattern described in Table 6 below.

Table 3 shows that sociology journal article production grew steadily up until the 1970s with a plateau through into the mid-1980s. At about this time production doubled to attain another plateau until the present. Of the stock of sociology articles, half have been published since the late 1980s.

Table 4 shows that the more popular of sociology fields of study include political sociology, economic sociology, family and socialisation, social control, health and theory together with history of sociology.

Table 5 shows how language varies by type of publishing outlet. English dominates, especially at journal level with both SSCI and Sociofile "priority" journals being over 85% English-specific. However, Sociofile "core" journals are less bound-up in English language and at the article level SSCI and Sociofile have similar levels (77-79%) of English articles. German and French are the next most important languages, with Spanish featuring to a lesser extent.

Table 6 shows that there is a similar pattern in terms of the regions of the world and Table 7 in the appendix provides detailed country information. The extent of concentration on North American and European writing varies slightly by particular source, but the overall picture is much the same. The geographical concentration of articles examining geographically-related subject matter is least concentrated although even then just over half of the articles are focused on the Atlantic world. Of the other regions only Asia receives any substantial attention. Perhaps there is some virtue in that while there is limited coverage of regions other than the cross-Atlantic, at least this attention is reasonably well shared.

Table 3: Sociology Journal Articles over Time

Year	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1955	1.7	1.7
1960	3.1	4.9
1965	4.6	9.5
1970	5.7	15.2
1975	7.0	22.2
1980	7.6	29.8
1985	7.8	37.7
1990	14.7	52.3
1995	14.8	67.1
2000	18.5	85.6
2005	14.4	100.0

Table 4: Fields of Study of Sociology Articles

	Percent		Percent
Methods	2.8	Stratification	1.8
History: theory	7.5	Feminist: gender	3.0
Practise	1.3	Rural	1.8
Policy etc	1.2	Urban	1.8
Radical	.8	Community: regional	.7
Social Psychology	4.3	Environmental	1.3
Cultural	2.7	Language: arts	2.4
Network	.4	Education	4.0
Organisations	1.6	Religion	2.9
Social Change	2.4	Social Control	5.7
Macro-sociology	2.3	Violence	.7
Mass Behaviour	1.3	Knowledge	.7
Opinions: communications	2.4	Science	2.5
Leisure: sports	1.8	Demography: H Biology	3.2
Transport	.0	Family: socialisation	7.2
Political	7.3	Health: medicine	4.8
Economic	7.1	Social problems: welfare	3.3
Military	.5	Poverty	.6
Group interactions	4.1	Total	100.0

Table 5: Language of Sociology Articles

Language	SSCI Journals	SSCI Articles	SocAb Core Journals	SocAb Priority Journals	SocAb Articles
Missing	3.0	.	.	.	.4
Afrikaans	.	.	.	.	.1
Arabic	.	.	.3	.	.0
Bulgaria	.	.	.	.	.0
Catalan	.	.	.	.	.0
Chinese	.	.	.3	.	.2
Croatian	.	.18	.6	.	.
Czech	1.0	1.96	.	.	.3
Danish	.	.	.6	.	.1
Dutch	.	.06	.9	.7	.9
English	86.1	77.22	71.0	86.9	79.5
Finnish	.	.	.3	.	.3
Flemish	.	.	.	.	.0
French	2.0	7.59	5.7	2.9	5.4
Galician	.	.	.	.	.0
German	4.0	7.36	2.7	2.2	2.8
Greek	.	.	.	.	.0
Hebrew	.	.03	.	.	.0
Hungarian	.	.	.3	.7	.1
Hupa	.	.03	.	.	.0
Italian	.	.	2.4	.7	1.8
Japanese	1.0	.20	1.2	.	.4
Korean	.	.14	.	.	.0
Latin	.	.	.	.	.0
Lithuanian	.	.	.3	.	.
Malay	.	.	.	.	.0
Multilingual	.	.	.	.	.0
Norwegian	.	.	.3	.	.2
Polish	.	.22	.6	.	.5
Portuguese	.	.03	3.6	2.2	1.0
Romanian	.	.29	.3	.	.1
Russian	1.0	3.22	.6	.	1.6
Serbo-Croatian	.	.	1.2	.	.8
Slovak	1.0	.	.	.	.2
Slovene	.	.46	.3	.	.2
Spanish	.	.	5.7	2.2	2.5
Swedish	1.0	.37	.	.	.1
Turkish	.	.57	.	.	.1
Ukrainian	.	.	.	.	.
Multilingual	.	.	.9	.7	.
Total	100.0	100.00	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6: Articles and Journals by Region

Region	Thesaurus terms (Socabst)	Socab arts. cop	SSCi arts.	SSCI journals	Core journals	Socab Other jls	Other Journals
North America	25.33	47.200	38.4010	49.50	35.90	46.00	16.70
Europe	30.50	35.930	27.3076	47.21	47.90	43.20	45.80
E Europe	9.53	2.500	3.6195	4.00	5.10	1.40	13.40
Mid East	4.52	.200	.7085	.30	.30	1.50	0.00
Asia	13.84	12.400	1.4902	2.00	3.65	6.40	5.40
Oceania	4.35	1.100	2.8723	3.00	1.50	3.70	2.70
Africa	6.17	.300	.2812	0.0	.92	7.00	.90
South America	5.76	2.300	.6584	.00	6.00	4.40	13.50

Citations

Finally, it is not just that the Atlantic world is particularly attended to, but publications from these two regions tend to be attended to more than those emanating from other regions. Data on citations are only available from the SSCI which covers a restricted range of Sociology publications. Table 7 shows that the most recent decade receives about the same amount of attention as its share of production while the 1990s receives double its share and earlier decades received about half of their “proper share” of attention: this fits with many other studies of citation practises in Sociology. The pattern in terms of region is a bit more complex: USA receives a larger share of citation share than its production share might predict and the more peripheral regions receive a paltry share of citations. Other countries or regions receive somewhat less attention than they might “deserve” given their production, with Canada being evenly placed.

Table 7: Visibility Scores from SSCI for the Topic/Subject Sociology

Data-bases	No. Publications	% Publications	Citations per article	No. Citations	% Citations
Decade					
2000s	7111	27.4	3.17	22542	26.3
1990s	6084	23.4	6.79	41310	48.2
1980s	4364	16.8	2.0	8728	10.2
1970s	4974	19.2	1.6	7958	9.3
1960s	2690	10.4	1.58	4250	5.0
1950s	726	2.8	1.34	973	1.1
Country					
USA	8747	48.8	5.53	48371	67.0
Canada	1227	6.8	3.91	4798	6.6
UK	3390	18.9	2.40	8136	11.3
Scandinavia	596	3.3	3.21	1913	2.6
France	1009	5.6	2.40	2421	3.4
Germany	951	5.3	2.78	2644	3.7
Southern Europe	234	1.3	2.17	508	0.7
Russia/ East Europe	483	2.7	.56	270	0.4
Asia	400	2.2	1.55	620	0.9
Australia/NZ	741	4.1	3.18	2356	3.3
Latin America	163	0.9	1.26	205	0.3

Summary

There is a world focus on trans-Atlantic, and especially USA, sociology production which is amplified further through differential reception. The control of the means of production of sociological knowledge through journals is concentrated in these areas of the West, and especially in their English-speaking aspects, although the production of knowledge is more dispersed.

References

Fleck, Christian (2009) "Diversity or Fragmentation in Europe's Sociology: Lesson to be Learned?" *ISA E-Bulletin.*

Lobachev, Sergey (2008) "Top Languages in Global Information Production," *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practise and Research* 3(2).

Appendix: Country-Level Coverage

Region	Country	% Geog. terms (Socabst)	Socab arts. cop	SSCi arts.	Socab SSCI journals	Core journals	Socab Other jls	Other Journals
North America	Canada	4.87	2.700	4.723	1.00	3.30	2.20	3.50
	Greenland	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	United States of America	20.45	44.50	33.68	48.50	32.60	43.80	13.20
Sum		25.33	47.20	38.40	49.50	35.90	46.00	16.70
Europe	Andorra	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Austria	.41	.300	.2002	.	.30	.	.90
	Azores	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Belgium	.01	1.000	.4312	.	2.70	.70	3.50
	Canary Islands	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Cape Verde Islands	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Channel Islands	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Cyprus	.01	.000	.0270	.	.	.	.
	Denmark	.05	.200	.3735	.	.30	.70	1.80
	England	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Faeroe Islands	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Finland	.90	.300	.4004	.	.30	.	.90
	France	4.19	3.100	3.885	2.00	4.20	2.20	6.10
	German Democratic Republic	.59	.000	.1463	4.00	4.80	5.10	5.30
	Germany	1.12	3.000	2.645	.	.	.	.
	Federal Republic of Germany	3.57	.	.8702	3.61	2.00	.	.

	Gibraltar	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Greece	.50	.000	.0616	.	.	.	.
	Iceland	.09	.	.0424	.	.	.	.
	Ireland	.54	.000	.2580	.	.	.30	.
	Italy	3.34	2.000	.5660	.	2.70	1.50	5.30
	Liechtenstein	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Luxembourg	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Malta	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Monaco	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Morocco	.14	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Netherlands	2.23	5.000	1.090	7.90	3.60	.70	4.40
	Norway	.79	.500	.4235	.	.30	.	.90
	Portugal	.62	.200	.0385	.	.60	.70	.90
	San Marino	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Spain	1.50	.900	.2426	.	2.70	.70	4.40
	Sweden	1.55	.300	1.070	1.00	.30	.	4.40
	Switzerland	.47	.500	.3927	.	.	.70	.90
	UK	7.70	18.63	14.05	28.70	23.10	29.90	6.10
	Vatican	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Weimar Republic	.05	.	.0963	.	.	.	.
Sum		30.50	35.93	27.31	47.21	47.90	43.20	45.80
EEurope	Albania	.05	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Armenia	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Belarus	.04	.	.	.	.	.	.90
	Belorussia	.05	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Bulgaria	.03	.000	.0501	.	.	.	.
	Commonwealth Of Independent State	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Croatia	.05	.200	.1386	1.00	1.20	.	.
	Czech Republic	.01	.200	.4620	.	.	.	.
	Czechoslovakia	.01	.300	.4389	1.00	.	.	1.80
	Estonia	.01	.000	.0077	.	.	.	.
	Georgia Republic Of	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Hungary	1.02	.200	.1232	.	.30	.70	.90
	Latvia	.07	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Lithuania	.02	.	.0193	.	.30	.	.
	Macedonia	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.

	Moldova	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.90
	Montenegro	.01	.400	.	.	.	.	.90
	Poland	1.41	.700	.3504	.	1.50	.	2.60
	Romania	.34	.000	.0270	.	.30	.70	.90
	Serbia	.23	.	.	.	.60	.	.90
	Slovak Republic	.28	.100	.2541	1.00	.	.	.
	Slovenia	.26	.200	.0193	.	.30	.	.90
	Ukraine	.16	.	.0385	.	.	.	1.80
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republi	2.56	.	.3196	.	.	.	.
	Russia	1.85	.	1.336	1.00	.60	.	.90
	Yugoslavia	.99	.200	.0347	.	.	.	.
Sum		9.53	2.500	3.620	4.00	5.10	1.40	13.40
MidEast	Afghanistan	.06	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Algeria	.18	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Aruba	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Azerbaijan	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Bahrain	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Egypt	.03	.	.0077	.	.	.	.
	Iran	.48	.	.0154	.	.	.	.
	Iraq	.10	.000	.	.	.	.	.
	Israel	2.18	.100	.5660	.	.	.60	.
	Jordan	.10	.	.0077	.	.	.	.
	Kazakhstan	.04	.	.0231	.	.	.	.
	Kuwait	.10	.	.	.30	.	.90	.
	Kyrgyzstan	.00	.	.0077	.	.	.	.
	Lebanon	.11	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Libya	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Oman	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Palestine	.18	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Qatar	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Saudi Arabia	.12	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Syria	.05	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Tajikistan	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Tunisia	.13	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Turkestan	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Turkey	.49	.100	.0809	.	.	.	.
	United Arab Emirates	.03	.	.	.	.30	.	.
	Uzbekistan	.04	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Yemen	.04	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sum		4.52	.200	.7085	.30	.30	1.50	.

Asia	Bangladesh	.04	.000	.0154	.	.	.	.90
	Bhutan	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Brunei Darussalam	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Burma	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Burma Burmese	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Cambodia	.04	.	.	.	.	.	.
	China	.05	.100	.	.	.	.	.
	Tibet	.04	5.000	.	.	.04	5.00	.
	Macao	.01	5.000	.	.	.01	.	.
	Hong Kong	.58	.	.	.	.	.	.90
	Comoro Islands	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	India	3.57	1.300	.6122	1.00	1.80	.70	1.80
	Indonesia	.53	.	.0077	.	.	.	.
	Japan	2.50	.600	.3350	1.00	1.20	.	.
	Laos	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Malaysia	.42	.000	.0270	.	.	.	.
	Mongolia	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Myanmar	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Nepal	.21	.	.	.	.	.	.
	North Korea	.13	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Pakistan	.30	.000	.	.	.	.	.
	Peoples Republic of China	1.91	.	.2310	.	.	.	.
	Philippines	.69	.200	.	.	.30	.	.
	Singapore	.32	.100	.1425	.	.	.70	.90
	South Korea	.66	.100	.0462	.	.	.	.
	Sri Lanka	.30	.000	.	.	.	.	.
	Surinam	.04	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Taiwan	.68	.	.0501	.	.30	.	.90
	Thailand	.45	.	.0231	.	.	.	.
	Timor Leste	.04	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Vietnam	.23	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sum		13.84	12.40	1.490	2.00	3.65	6.40	5.40
Oceania	American Samoa	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Australia	2.96	.700	2.360	.	.90	2.20	.
	Cook Islands	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Easter Island	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.

	Fiji	.07	.	.	3.00	.	.	.
	French Polynesia	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Guam	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Kiribati	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Mariana Islands	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Marquesas Islands	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Marshall Islands	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Micronesia	.06	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Nauru	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	New Caledonia	.01	.000	.	.	.	.	.
	New Zealand	.69	.400	.5044	.	.60	1.50	1.80
	Palau	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Papua New Guinea	.33	.	.0077	.	.	.	.90
	Samoa Samoan Samoans	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Society Islands	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Solomon Islands	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Tahiti	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Tonga	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Tuvalu	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Vanuatu	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Western Samoa	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sum		4.35	1.100	2.872	3.00	1.50	3.70	2.70
Africa	Angola	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Benin	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Botswana	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Burkina Faso	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Burundi	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Cameroon	.01	.	.0077	.	.	.	.
	Cameroons	.04	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Central African Republic	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Chad	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Congo	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.

	Democratic Republic Of Congo	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Djibouti	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Equatorial Guinea	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Eritrea	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Ethiopia	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Gabon	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Gambia	.04	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Ghana	.34	.000	.0116	.	.	.	.
	Guinea	.23	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Guinea Bissau	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Ivory Coast	.08	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Kenya	.47	.	.0077	.	.	.	.
	Lesotho	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Liberia	.05	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Madagascar	.05	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Malawi	.10	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Mali	.09	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Mauritania	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Mauritius	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Mozambique	.08	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Namibia	.06	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Niger	.05	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Nigeria	.85	.000	.0385	.	.	.	.90
	Rwanda	.09	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Senegal	.14	.000	.	.	.60	.	.
	Seychelles	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Sierra Leone	.08	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Somalia	.06	.	.	.	.	.	.
	South Africa	1.67	.300	.1887	.	.30	.	.
	Sudan	.17	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Swaziland	.04	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Tanzania	.28	.	.0154	.	.	.	.
	Togo	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Uganda	.16	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Zaire	.08	.000	.	.	.	.	.
	Zambia	.19	.000	.0116	.	.	.	.
	Rhodesia	.02	.	.	.	.02	7.00	.
	Rhodesian							
	Rhodesians							
	Zimbabwe	.33	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sum		6.17	.300	.2812	.	.92	7.00	.90

South America

Antigua	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
Argentina	.58	.200	.0770	.	.30	.	1.80
Bahamas	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.
Barbados	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
Belize	.04	.	.	.	.	.	.
Berrmuda	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
Bolivia	.02	.	.	.	.	.	1.80
Brazil	.02	.700	.3504	.	3.00	2.20	1.80
Cayman Islands	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
Chile	.05	.000	.0539	.	.	.	.90
Colombia	.41	.000	.0231	.	.	.70	1.80
Costa Rica	.02	.100	.	.	.	.	.
Cuba	.03	.000	.	.	.	.	.
Dominica	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
Dominican Republic	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ecuador	.02	.000	.0077	.	.	.	.
El Salvador	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
Falkland Islands	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
French Guiana	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
Grenada	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.
Guatemala	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.
Guyana	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
Haiti	.07	.	.	.	.	.	.
Honduras	.10	.	.	.	.	.	.
Jamaica	.21	.100	.0077	.	.	.	.
Martinique	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.
Mexico	2.42	1.000	.1001	.	1.80	1.50	1.80
Netherlands Antilles	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
Nicaragua	.20	.	.	.	.	.	.90
Panama	.04	.	.	.	.	.	.90
Paraguay	.16	.100	.	.	.30	.	.
Peru	.41	.000	.0077	.	.	.	1.80
Puerto Rico	.27	.	.	.	.	.	.
Saint Barthelemy	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
Saint Kitts Nevis	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
Saint Lucia	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.

Saint Martin	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
Saint Vincent	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sao Tome and Principe	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
Trinidad and Tobago	.12	.000	.0077	.00	.	.00	.
Tristan Da Cunha Islands	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
Turks and Caicos Islands	.00	.	.	.	.	.	.
Uruguay	.08	.	.0077	.	.30	.	.
Venezuela	.30	.100	.0154	.	.30	.	.
Virgin Islands	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sum	5.76	2.300	.6584	.00	6.00	4.40	13.50

International Sociological Association
e-bulletin

The Multiple Crises of the French Universities and the Protest Movement of Spring 2009[2]

Bruno Cousin and Michèle Lamont
bruno.cousin@sciences-po.fr
mlamont@wjh.harvardedu

Bruno Cousin is a FNSP postdoctoral researcher at the Observatoire Sociologique du Changement (OSC – Sciences Po/CNRS), Paris, France. Michèle Lamont is Robert I. Goldman professor of European Studies and professor of Sociology and African and African-American studies at Harvard University. She is the author of *How Professors Think: Inside the Curious World of Academic Judgment* (2009). She chaired the 2008 international panel of experts evaluating peer review practices at the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada. She was recently named at the Haut Conseil de la Science et de la Technologie, which is under the French Prime Minister's office.

Between February and June 2009, French universities were the theatre of an exceptional protest movement against the latest flavour of governmental reform concerning academic careers. Protest sometimes seems to be a way of life in the French academy, and in France at large, but this time the situation is serious, with potentially huge consequences for the future of the sector. Indeed, the nation that gave birth to *je pense, donc je suis* is in a deep crisis on the intellectual front, and nowhere is this as obvious as in academic evaluation.

The protest movement did not take off in the *grandes écoles* (which train much of the French elite), or in professional and technical schools. Instead, it took off in the 80 comprehensive *universités* - the public institutions that are the backbone of the French educational system. Until two years ago, they were required to admit any high-school

[2] This article first appeared in the *Times Higher Education*, n 1925, 3 December 2009 (http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?sectioncode=26&storycode=409383&c=2). We are grateful to the authors for agreeing to have it republished in the ISA E-Bulletin.

graduate on a first-come, first-served basis. A selection process was recently introduced, but even today most students are there because they could not gain entry elsewhere. Faculty work conditions are generally poor, as their institutions are chronically underfunded. Classes are large and programmes are understaffed. More than half of all students leave without any kind of diploma.

Public universities can be very different from each other and are research-intensive in varying degrees, but they carry out the bulk of French scientific research. Research is largely conducted in centres that are located within these institutions, and which often bring together overworked university teachers and full-time researchers who are attached to national institutes such as the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS). In a context where the output of these joint centres is not, or is only partially, covered by international ratings, French academics feel doubly underrated owing to the combination of low salaries and low ratings.

This feeling was exacerbated on 22 January when President Nicolas Sarkozy declared that the poor performance of French universities in international rankings was, above all, the consequence of the absence of continuous evaluation, which encourages sloth. Of course, he was displeased that the extensive set of higher education reforms undertaken by his Government during the preceding two years were met with opposition by large segments of the academic community.

Everyone agrees that the current system poses a great many problems, but there is no agreement on how to improve it and get beyond the current gridlock. It is *la société bloquée* all over again. To wit:

While most academics believe that the system is far too centralised, a 2007 law establishing the progressive financial “autonomy” (and accountability) of universities has been met with criticism and resistance, because it is perceived to be part of a strategy of withdrawal on the part of the State that will result in fewer resources being available for higher education. A number of scholars also fear that the increased decision-making power conferred on university presidents is a threat to the autonomy of faculty members.

While there is a need to design new, more universalistic procedures for evaluating performance and distributing resources, many academics are sceptical of the new institutions recently created to do this, namely the national agencies for the evaluation of universities and research units (Agence d'Evaluation de la Recherche et de l'Enseignement Superieur, or AERES) and research projects (Agence Nationale de la Recherche, or ANR). The former, in particular, has been criticised for its reliance on bibliometrics (publication and citation counts), even if the agency is now moving towards using less quantitative standards. Moreover, whereas the former mechanisms for distributing research funds depended on the decisions of elected peers (for instance, on the national committee of the CNRS), AERES appoints its panel members, and this is seen as a blow to researchers' autonomy. For this and other reasons, many academics have refused to serve on its evaluation panels.

While academics often agree that the old CNRS needed further integration with the universities, many denounce its gradual downsizing and transformation from a comprehensive research institution to a simple funding and programming agency as the work of uninformed politicians and technocrats intent on dismantling what works best in French research. In 2004, a widespread national protest arose against this dismantling, with 74,000 scholars signing a petition against it. Critics also say that the ongoing reorganisation of the CNRS into disciplinary institutes will reinforce the separation between the sciences, reorient research towards more applied fields and work against the interdisciplinary collaborations that are crucial to innovation in many fields.

While many agree on the need to improve teaching, moves to increase the number of teaching hours are among the most strongly contested reforms. French academics, who very rarely have sabbaticals, already perceive themselves as overworked in a system where time for research is increasingly scarce. These factors help to explain the resistance to expanded classroom hours and new administrative duties.

In the longest strike ever organised by the French scientific community, tens of thousands of lecturers and researchers began in early February to hold protests over a period of several weeks, demonstrating in the streets and (with the support of some students) blocking access to some university campuses. Many also participated in a national debate via print, online and broadcast media, and in general meetings. Some faculty members held teach-ins and action-oriented “alternative courses” for students. Several universities saw their final exams and summer holidays delayed and many foreign exchange students were called back by their home institutions. Despite this frontal assault, the Government did not back down: the much disparaged decree reorganising academic careers (with regard to recruitment, teaching loads, evaluations and promotions) and giving more prerogatives and autonomy to university presidents came into effect on 23 April.

This outcome will probably lead academics and their unions to rethink their strategies and repertoires of collective action. The traditional protest forms are losing legitimacy. As the dust settles, it is becoming clear that demonstrating has little traction in a context where the French public increasingly perceives academics as an elite bent on defending its privileges, even if it requires depriving students of their courses. Negotiation is also perceived as ineffectual, as many suspect that governmental consultations were conducted to buy time until the end of the academic year, when mobilisation would peter out. A third strategy – the radical option that would have prevented the scheduling of exams and the handing out of diplomas at the end of this spring – was ruled out even on the campuses most committed to the cause for fear of alienating the public even further.

As yet, however, no clear alternative has surfaced. We are now witnessing a cleavage between those who voice their opposition (in the main, scholars in the humanities) and the increasing number of academics (primarily scientists) who espouse a "wait-and-see" or a collaborative position as the only realistic path to improving the situation in their own universities. If the majority of academics appear to share the same diagnosis about what needs to be changed in the French system, they disagree on the solution (and on its scale - national or local). The root of the crisis lies not only in the Government's difficulties in generating consensus, but also in the academics' own scepticism, cynicism or fatalism about meritocracy, the absence of the administrative resources needed to support proper evaluation, the possibility of impartial evaluation, and the system's ability to recognise and reward merit.

Deep problems remain in the institutions charged with evaluating the work of academics. The interference of political power, and the (admittedly diminishing) influence of trade unions and corporatist associations have long been viewed as obstacles to a collegial system of academic evaluation. The legitimacy of the 70 disciplinary sections of the Conseil National des Universites (CNU) – charged with certifying individuals as eligible for faculty positions, and with directly granting some promotions – is under question. Some of its committee members are appointed by the Government and as such are suspected of being second-rate, of benefiting from governmental patronage, or of defending governmental interests. Others are chosen from electoral lists that include a disproportionate number of partisan members, who are often perceived to be there because of their political involvement rather than because of their scientific status.

The legitimacy of these committees is further called into question because they include only academics employed by French institutions and are often viewed as perpetuating a longstanding tradition of favouritism. To give only one particularly scandalous example: in June, panellists in the sociology section allocated to themselves half of the promotions that they were charged with assigning across the entire discipline of sociology. This led to the resignation of the rest of the commission and to multiple protests. Such an occurrence sent deep waves of distrust not only between academics, but also towards the civil servants charged with reforming a system that is increasingly viewed as flawed.

Peer review is also in crisis at the local level. While selecting young doctoral recipients to be *maîtres de conférences* (the entry level permanent position in the French academy, similar to the British lecturer), French universities on average fill 30 percent of available posts with their own graduates, to the point where local clientelism is often decried as symbolising the corruption of the entire system. The typical (and only) job interview for such a post lasts 20 to 30 minutes – probably the European record for brevity and surely too short to determine whether an individual deserves what is essentially a lifelong appointment. Many view the selection process as little more than a means to legitimise the appointment of pre-selected candidates – although the extent to which this is genuinely the case varies across institutions.

What is to be done? Because both the CNU and the local selection committees have recently been reorganised or granted new responsibilities, it seems the right moment to think about how to improve the evaluation processes in very practical ways. As part of a new start, academics should aim to generate a system of true self-governance at each level, grounded in more explicit principles for peer review. This would put them in a position to defend academic autonomy against the much-feared and maligned governmental or managerial control. While this is certainly occurring in some disciplines and institutions, progress is far from being equally spread across the sector.

Obvious and costless regulatory measures could easily be implemented – for instance, discouraging universities from hiring their own PhD graduates (as AERES recently started to), or forbidding selection committees from promoting their own members. One could also look abroad for examples of “best practice”. The UK’s Economic and Social Research Council has created colleges of trained academic evaluators who are charged with maintaining academic and ethical standards in peer review; although not all aspects of the British approach to academic reform should be emulated, this one is particularly worthy.

The Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Foundation) uses teams of elected experts to evaluate proposals, and academic reputation weighs heavily in determining which names will be put on electoral lists and who will serve on evaluation panels. Canada's Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council recently asked an independent panel of international experts to evaluate its peer review process in order to improve impartiality and effectiveness.

In a recent book on peer review in the US, one of the present authors (Michele Lamont) showed the ways in which American social scientists and humanists operate to maintain their faith in the idea that peer review works and that the academic system of evaluation is fair. In this case, academics exercise their right as the only legitimate evaluators of knowledge by providing detailed assessment of intellectual production in light of their extensive expertise in specialised topics. The exercise of peer evaluation sustains and expresses professional status and professional autonomy. But it requires significant time (and thus good working conditions) and moral commitment – time spent comparing dossiers, making principled decisions about when it is necessary to withdraw on the grounds of personal interest, and so forth. Of course no peer review works perfectly, but US academics, while being aware of its limitations, appear to view the system as relatively healthy and they engage in many actions that contribute to sustaining this faith.

In our view, fixing the current flaws in the French system does not merely demand organisational reforms, including giving academics more time to evaluate the research of colleagues and candidates properly. It may also require French academics to think long and hard about their own cynicism and fatalism concerning their ability to make judgments about quality that would not be driven by cronyism or particularism, and that would honour their own expertise and connoisseurship.

Not that proper governmental reform is not needed, but sometimes blaming the Government may be an easy way out. Above all, it is increasingly a very ineffectual way of tackling a substantial part of the problem. A little more collaborative thinking and a little less cynicism among both academics and administrators – if at all possible – may very well help French universities find a way out of the crisis. And it will help the French academic and research community to become, once again, much more than the sum of its parts.

Online Access, Consolidation, and the Resurgence of Academic Journals

Paul H. Kratoska
National University of Singapore
hispaulk@nus.edu.sg

Paul H. Kratoska is Managing Director of NUS Press at the National University of Singapore. A former editor of the *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, he is currently a regional editor for the *International Journal of Asian Studies* and serves on the Council of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. From 2004-06 he was a member of the Board of Directors of the Association for Asian Studies and was on the committee that oversaw development of a digital version of the *Journal of Asian Studies*, and its transfer to Cambridge University Press. His research interests focus on the Japanese Occupation in Southeast Asia, the history of the rice industry in Asia, school textbooks, and scholarly publishing.

Abstract

In the late 1990s, academic journals faced very difficult times. Declining budgets and the high prices charged for SMT (Science, Medicine and Technology) journals were forcing libraries to cancel subscriptions to existing titles and making it extremely difficult to establish new journals. In the years that followed the situation changed dramatically with the growth of electronic access, the consolidation of journals in the hands of a small number of major publishers, and sales of journal packages to libraries and library consortia. The result was a substantial increase in the number of academic journals, and a shift from journals containing broad spectrum of subject matter to more narrowly focused publications.

Budgetary issues remain significant for publishers of academic journals. Proponents of open access see this approach as a possible solution, but the viability of

the business model underlying open access publishing remains uncertain, and academic publishers are approaching open access with a great deal of hesitation.

Academic Journals and Digital Publication

In 1998 the future shape of academic journals was unclear. Many were produced only in paper editions and publishers that offered electronic versions often did so only in conjunction with subscriptions to paper editions, fearing that electronic subscriptions would not be viable. The landscape changed rapidly. Within a decade, readers and libraries were demanding digital access and articles published electronically were being accessed by scholars throughout the world. A universal system for attaching metadata, including digital object identifiers, to articles permits citation and long-term access, and publishers have a business model that makes the system financially viable. Electronic journals are fully searchable, and publishers provide services that would have been impossible in traditional journals such as live links to sources cited in notes, extensive use of colour, and in some cases audio and video clips, with more innovations to come.

But just how does this business model work? Major publishers have been acquiring journals for some 20 or 30 years, and these publications have become a major source of income, particularly in the case of STM (Science, Technology, Medicine) journals. As of 2003, the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers estimated that worldwide there were 9,250 peer-reviewed journals produced by learned societies, professional associations and university presses. However, this figure does not take into account scholarly journals published in Asian languages. There are approximately 10,000 academic journals published in Southeast Asia, and around 90,000 in China.[3]

In 2003 the largest commercial publishers in the STM field by market share were Reed Elsevier, Thomson ISI, Springer, John Wiley and T & F [Taylor and Francis] Informa. Seven publishers, most of them European-based (Reed Elsevier, Thomson, Wolters Kluwer, Springer, John Wiley, Taylor and Francis, and Blackwell) accounted for 63% of Global STM publishing.[4] The years that followed brought further consolidation: Springer Science+Business Media merged with Kluwer Academic Publishers in late 2003, and Blackwell Publishing became part of Wiley Publishing in 2007.

The business of publishing and distributing scholarly journals is large and profitable, generating revenues amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars.[5] Much of the revenue comes from STM publications, which are very costly and consume a high proportion of library budgets. The price of a one-year institutional subscription to *Brain Research*, for example, is US$23,100, while *The Journal of Comparative Neurology* costs US$30,968, *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta* US$19,901, and *Nuclear Physics A* and *B* US$21,333.[6]

---

[3] Figures for Southeast Asia are derived from figures collected by the Library of Congress office in Jakarta. Figures for China are based on discussions with Chinese companies preparing databases of scholarly journals in the book exhibit area of the annual meeting of the Association for Asian Studies in Philadelphia in March 2010.

[4] House of Commons. Select Committee on Science and Technology, 10th Report, pp. 12-13. http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200304/cmselect/cmsctech/399/39902.htm

[5] See, for example, http://www.library.yale.edu/~llicense/ListArchives/0308/msg00234.html .

[6] Figures are taken from the websites of these journals:
http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/journaldescription.cws_home/622287/bibliographic
http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/aboutus/forLibrarians.html
http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/journaldescription.cws_home/524028/bibliographic
http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/journaldescription.cws_home/506062/bibliographic
http://www.elsevier.com/wps/find/journaldescription.authors/505716/bibliographic

Publishers mitigate these prices slightly by bundling journals, a practice generally known as the "Big Deal". Under this arrangement a library purchases a set of journals at a fixed cost for a fixed period of time. For example, Blackwell Publishing told a House of Commons' committee that 'a typical UK university would subscribe to 150 of our journals at a cost of £75,000. Our standard deal is online access to an additional 500 titles for £7,995'.[7] Compared with the prices charged for individual subscriptions, bundling seemed attractive at first, but publishers included all of their journals in the package and the list was non-negotiable, forcing libraries to carry titles they didn't need, and the long-term financial implications were not favourable. However, contracts for bundled journals contained strict non-cancellation clauses, and in some cases the library loses access to past issues if the agreement is not continued. For journals in the humanities and social sciences the price increases have generally been consistent with overall inflation, but changes in the charges for STM journals have significantly outpaced rises in the Consumer Price Index. In Britain these increases were of such concern that they became the subject of a parliamentary enquiry in 2003-04.[8]

Libraries at research universities paid high prices to remain competitive in attracting top staff and to give scholars in these fields access to current information, but they were forced to limit purchases of other materials as a consequence. Universities also expressed concern about a situation in which their staff originated the research reported in academic journals, and they were then forced to pay what they considered extortionate prices to obtain those journals. Recent decisions by certain major universities to resist the

---

[7] Ibid., Section 4 para 60. See http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200304/cmselect/cmsctech/399/39907.htm

[8] House of Commons. Select Committee on Science and Technology.

subscription payments requested by publishers seem likely reshape the landscape for journal publication. In 2004 Cornell University and Duke University announced significant cuts in subscriptions to journals published by Reed Elsevier. The University of California threatened to do the same, but ultimately negotiated special terms covering access to 1,200 of the company's journals.[9]

One seemingly positive outcome of bundling has been the appearance of new and increasingly specialized journals. By including these publications in the packages they offer to libraries, publishers allow strong and well-established titles to support weaker ones. Publications such as *The Journal of Asian Studies*, *The Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, and the *International Journal of Asian Studies*, contain material from a wide range of academic disciplines, but many newer journals have a tighter focus. In the past such journals would have faced severe difficulties because, while the worldwide audience for the material they publish may be large enough to sustain a journal, reaching that audience would have been a formidable challenge, but electronic distribution and bundling makes these publications viable.

Historically, a large number of academic journals have been published by societies or institutes, an arrangement that is becoming difficult to sustain. Some of these publications have been acquired by major publishers of scholarly journals, which include in addition to the STM publishers mentioned above, Cambridge University Press, the University of California Press, and the University of Chicago Press. For university presses with the resources to support large journal programmes, these activities have

[9] Lila Guterman, "The Promise and Peril of 'Open Access'", *The Chronicle of Higher Education*¸ 30 Jan. 2004, Research p. 10.

become a significant source of revenue and help support the publication of scholarly books.

Some smaller publishers have preferred not to become involved with these arrangements, but in order to remain competitive they need to offer electronic versions of their journals and were unable to provide such a service on their own. In 1993 Johns Hopkins University Press and the university's Milton S. Eisenhower Library launched Project MUSE, which offered a comparable service to small non-profit academic publishers. Project MUSE began digital distribution of Johns Hopkins University journals in 1995, and started accepting journals from other publishers in 2000. It operates on a not-for-profit basis and only offers subscriptions to institutions. In March 2010 the site had available 167,679 articles from 440 journals produced by 110 publishers.[10]

A further response came in 1997 in the form of an initiative by the Association of Research Libraries in North America, which set up a Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC), 'an international alliance of academic and research libraries working to correct imbalances in the scholarly publishing system'. The purpose was to take advantage of the networked digital environment 'to stimulate the emergence of new scholarly communication models that expand the dissemination of scholarly research and reduce financial pressures on libraries'. SPARC has member institutions in North America, Europe, Japan, China, and Australia, with an affiliated SPARC Europe created in 2001 and SPARC Japan in 2006. The concept is to work cooperatively to drive down the cost of journals, and to provide alternatives to overpriced publications.[11]

---

[10] Project MUSE Website: http://muse.jhu.edu/, accessed on 29 March 2010.

[11] http://www.arl.org/sparc/about/index.shtml , accessed on 29 September 2008. See also http://www.sparceurope.org/ and http://www.nii.ac.jp/sparc/en/ .

Another arrangement offering access to journal materials is JSTOR (short for Journal Storage), created in 1995 as a way of reducing the amount of space required for libraries to store back issues of journals.[12] JSTOR offers an extensive list of journals but only to older material, with a moving wall that allows access to materials after a certain interval, often five years. JSTOR was followed in 1996 by Proquest, an offshoot of University Microfilms (UMI), created in 1938 in order to preserve the scholarly works in the British Museum on microfilm but probably best known for microfilm copies of dissertations. Proquest has expanded on this base by operating as an aggregator of journal content, and by 2008 provided access to more than 125 billion digital pages scholarly material.[13] Similar arrangements are offered by EBSCO and (for science publications) by EMERALD.

Open Access

Spiralling costs have produced new models for publication of academic journals, the most important being open access. Under the traditional "user pays" system, subscribers (individuals or a libraries) cover the cost of a journal by paying a subscription fee. With open access, individual authors or a society pays the cost of a journal and makes it available to users free of charge, and a mixed model in which contributors to an electronic journal may opt to have their article available through open access by paying a fee. The open access model has faced considerable opposition from publishers of traditional, user pays journals, and also from academics who fear that the arrangement allows scholars to buy their way into print, despite assurances from open access

[12] http://www.jstor.org/
[13] http://www.proquest.com/division/aboutus/ , accessed on 29 September 2008.

publishers that the review process is carried out with the same rigour as with traditional journals. Societies are apprehensive because they depend on journal revenues to fund their activities, and universities also view the movement with some apprehension, fearing that they will face pressure to fund submissions to open access journals while still having to maintain costly subscriptions to traditional journals. Ultimately it seems likely that funding agencies rather than universities are likely to pay for open access by building payment arrangements into research grants, and two major funders of biomedical research, the Howard Hughes Medical Institute and the Wellcome Trust, have indicated that they are prepared to do that.[14] Also, in 2009 a group of five research universities signed a Compact for Open Access Publishing Equity, with the signatories promising to cover fees incurred by their faculty who publish in open access journals if funding from a research grant or other sources is unavailable.[15] For researchers in fields that are less generously funded, and for researchers in developing nations or at smaller institutions in the West, financial arrangements remain problematic.

Open access has gained traction as a way of making research findings available to a wide audience, thanks in part to support from organizations such as the U.S. National Institutes of Health (NIH), a major funding agency that requires scientists to submit peer-reviewed journal manuscripts produced using NIH funds to a digital archive (PubMed Central, a free digital archive of journal literature run by the NIH) upon acceptance for publication. These papers are made available to the public no later than 12 months after publication. Other major providers of open access STM material are the Public Library of

[14] Ibid.

[15] See http://www.oacompact.org/compact/. The original signatories were UC Berkeley, Cornell, Dartmouth, MIT and Harvard.

Science (PLoS) and BioMed Central, while HighWire Press (part of the Stanford University Library) has been an active pioneer in providing not-for-profit access to STM materials. A decision taken by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard University in February 2008 giving the university a worldwide license to place articles written by FAS faculty members in an open access repository where they will be available free of charge is likely to give the movement a significant boost, although faculty members are allowed to request a waiver and the impact is uncertain.[16] The arrangement is not, in fact, new: a survey carried out in 2004 by the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers found that more than half of the publishers in the survey allowed authors to post their articles in preprint or published form on personal or institutional websites. However, if the practice were to become universal, the impact on library journal subscriptions could bring major changes to academic publishing.[17]

Given the objections to the present model, its demise might seem like a positive development, but open access could become too much of a good thing. The present proliferation of journals, less of a response to a growing demand for additional information than to an increase in the number of manuscripts being prepared for publication, driven in many cases by the need to have publications for promotion and tenure exercises or evaluations of the research output of universities and departments rather than by the intrinsic value of the material being published. The sharp increase in the volume of scholarly publication over the past half century has created a surfeit of published information, making it difficult for researchers to keep abreast with the

[16] See http://www.news.harvard.edu/gazette/2008/02.14/99-fasvote.html, accessed 27 July 2008. Comparable but less far reaching resolutions have been passed by the Faculty Senates at other institutions, including the University of Connecticut and at Cornell University.
[17] Mark Ware, PALS *Report on Institutional Repositories* (Bristol, 2004).

literature in their fields.[18] As the volume has risen, so too have complaints about sub-standard publications, and about articles that seem to have been written solely to build the CV of a faculty member or a department, and not because the author had anything to say. Through their refereeing process, academic publishers provide a gate-keeping function, certifying materials as particularly worthy of attention.

Moreover, it is not clear that a shift to open access would bring universities significant savings. A calculation done in 2003 indicated that scientists and social scientists at Duke University published around 4,500 papers during that year. Based on a fee of $1,500 per paper for publication, payments amounting to $6.75 million would be required to cover the entire output of scholars employed at Duke University. Given that the university's budget for journals in 2003 was $6.6 million (including materials not covered by the survey), the open access model would have entailed even greater costs than the existing arrangement.[19] The following table shows fees currently charged to authors by publishers for inclusion of articles, mainly in the sciences, in open access publications.

Fees Charged by Publishers of Open Access Materials (2010)	
Publisher	**Fee (US$)**
BioMed Central	$625-$2,365 (Standard: $1,535)
Public Library of Science (PLoS)	US$1,250-$2,750
Elsevier	$3,000
Cambridge	$1,700
Oxford Journals	$2,250
Taylor & Francis	$3,100
Wiley InterScience	$3,000

18 See, for example, the discussion in David Nicholas *et al.*, "In their very own words: authors and scholarly journal publishing", *Learned Publishing* 18, 3 (July 2005), pp.212-20.
19 Guterman, "The Promise and Peril of 'Open Access'".

World Scientific	$2,500
Source: Data from UC Berkeley http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/scholarlycommunication/oa_fees.html	

Open access seems likely to become increasingly prevalent as universities set up research repositories and attempt to find alternatives to the publishing models of commercial academic presses. Present arrangements are unsustainable, but if open access allows scholars around the world to read work from North America free of charge but leaves them unable to contribute to the discussion, it seems like an unfortunate outcome.

The Intellectual and Institutional Origins of *JSEAH* and *JSEAS*

Ho Chi Tim
University of Hawaii at Manoa
natizeh@gmail.com

Ho Chi Tim has a B.A and M.A in History from the National University of Singapore. He is currently a Ph.D student in the University of Hawaii at Manoa, working towards a dissertation which will hopefully explore several aspects of social welfare history in Singapore. His other research interests include the historiography of Singapore and Southeast Asia, and the role and function of historical scholarship.

In 1961, the inaugural and only International Conference of South-East Asian Historians was held in Singapore, organised by the Department of History, University of Malaya in Singapore (hereafter "Department").[20] The conference brought together regional and international historians, many who went on to become household names in the fields of Southeast Asian history and Southeast Asian studies, and produced seminal papers, some of which are still mandatory readings today.[21] The other highlight of the conference, as a former participant recalls, was the announcement of a new academic journal edited by the

[20] The University of Malaya was an amalgamation of Raffles College and King Edward VII Medical College in 1949. In 1959, the university was divided into two divisions: University of Malaya in Kuala Lumpur and in Singapore. In 1962, the two divisions became autonomous, and the Singapore division was re-named University of Singapore.

[21] The best known are Harry Benda's "The Structure of Southeast Asian History: Some Preliminary Observations", *JSEAH* 3(1), 1962: pp.106-138, and John R.W. Smail, "On the Possibility of an Autonomous History of Modern Southeast Asia", *JSEAH* 2(2), 1961: pp.72-102. The programme and papers of the conference were collected as *Programme* and *Preliminary Papers: First International Conference of Southeast Asian Historians 1961*, Singapore: International Conference of Southeast Asian Historians, 1961.

Department: the *Journal of Southeast Asian History* (*JSEAH*), which was succeeded in 1970 by the internationally renowned *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* (*JSEAS*).[22]

The following is an intellectual and institutional history of *JSEAH* and *JSEAS* as they developed within Singapore during the 1960s and 1970s. It focuses on the possible influences the historical context has had on the journals' direction and scholarship – defined as the act of wanting 'to know more, [believing] that we can know more…, and [struggling] to find better ways of knowing even more'.[23]

At first glance, the idea of contextualising history seems like a truism, as the principle of understanding the past as it was remains an essential cornerstone of professional historical scholarship. But in the wake of "poststructuralist criticism" during the 1990s, there are concerns over the impact of 'moral ambivalence and cultural relativism'.[24] In other words, it becomes negligently easy to accept or reject different perspectives, without taking a position which includes the 'responsibility and critical enquiry' necessary in scholarship.[25] Countering such relativism, Laurie Sears argues for "situated knowledges" – knowledges which are 'contingent upon their location' and understanding that 'each location will produce a different partial vision'.[26] Simply put, the immediate situation remains valid even within a broader context which may over-generalise.

[22] John Legge. E-mail to author. 25/02/2008.
[23] Wang Gungwu, *Scholarship and the History and Politics of South East Asia*, Flinders Asian Studies Lecture 1, The Flinders University of South Australia, 1970, p.2.
[24] Laurie Sears, "The Contingency of Autonomous History", in *Autonomous Histories, Particular Truths: Essays in Honor of John R.W. Smail*, (ed.) Laurie Sears, Madison, Wisconsin: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1993, p.19.
[25] Ibid. See in particular footnotes 30 and 31.
[26] Ibid.

Scholarship on Southeast Asia was irrevocably affected by the situation of the times. Reynaldo Ileto suggests that colonialism and national imperatives had more than a fleeting impact on early generations of Southeast Asian intellectuals.[27] Malaysian historian Cheah Boon Kheng was exposed to labour and union activism as a journalist during the politically-charged 1950s and 1960s, affecting his questions and perceptions of Malaysia's history.[28] The pursuit of knowledge cannot happen in a vacuum or remain isolated in ivory towers; it is affected by immediate (physical and intellectual) circumstances confronting the pursuer.

Hence, the focus on the location of the journals – the particular environment of the Department and University in post-WWII Singapore – rather than from the broader teleology of scholarship on Southeast Asia, which may reduce possible histories into one "linear schema" with pre-established origins.[29] It is admittedly easier to situate both journals within such a wider intellectual history. Most, if not all, key initiatives for Southeast Asian history and Southeast Asian studies had arguably extra-regional origins before and after 1945. Pre-WWII scholarship on the region was dominated by the imperatives of colonial enterprises and administration for non-local purposes. The scholarship they produced (while substantive) nonetheless seemed out-dated in the geo-political situation following the Second World War.[30]

---

[27] Reynaldo Ileto, "Contours of Social Science Scholarship in Southeast Asia: Voices from the Past", Malaysia-Singapore Forum Keynote Address, 26//07/2005. A point substantiated by Soedjatmoko, "The Indonesian Historian and His Time", in *An Introduction to Indonesian Historiography*, Jakarta, Indonesia: PT Equinox Publishing Indonesia, 2007, pp.404-416.
[28] Cheah Boon Kheng, "How I got into Malaysian History", in *Historians & Their Disciplines: The Call of Southeast Asian History*, (ed.) Nicholas Tarling, Kuala Lumpur: MBRAS, 2007, pp.27-40.
[29] Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, (transl.) A.M. Sheridan Smith, London: Tavistock Publications, 1972, pp.4,203.
[30] John Legge, "Clio and Her Neighbours: Reflections on History's Relations with the surrounding Disciplines", in *Dari Babad Dan Hikayat Sampai Sejarah Kritis: Kumpulan karangan dipersembahkan*

FILLING GAPS: THE ORIGINS OF *JSEAH*

In 1960, the first issue of *JSEAH* was published with the objective of 'provid[ing] space primarily for articles on Southeast Asia written by that growing body of specialists, the Asian historian. It welcomes also articles written on any aspect of Southeast Asian History, from the Stone Age to the contemporary scene, from scholars in any part of the world'. The preamble seems uncomplicated. *JSEAH* was supposed to be a journal for historical articles on Southeast Asia, with a broad definition of history.

But *JSEAH* was ground-breaking as it was arguably the first scholarly journal anywhere in the world to stake a claim on Southeast Asian history, an academic field still in its infancy in 1960. The terms "Southeast Asia", "Southeast Asian" and "Asian" were not defined and were perhaps taken for granted; but the emphasis on "Asian historian" was no accident. Its inclusion not only reflected the founding editor's approach to Southeast Asian history, but also wider intellectual trends in the historical discipline and political developments within the region.

Kennedy Gordon Tregonning (*JSEAH* Founding-Editor)

There was little notion of what "Southeast Asian" history entailed when Ken Tregonning first arrived in Singapore in 1953 to take up a teaching position at the four-year old University of Malaya. There were histories of constituent parts of Southeast Asia, but most, if not all, perceived the region's past and present as mere extension of Chinese or

---

kepada Prof. Dr. Sartono Kartodridjo, (eds.) T. Ibrahim Alfian, H.J. Koesoemanto, Dharmono Hardjowidjono, Djoko Suryo, Universitas Gadjah Mada: Gadjah Mada University Press, 1987, p.336.

Indian influence, or even of European or American histories.[31] Such histories were moreover dominated by missionaries, chartered traders or colonial scholar-administrators, which would somehow seem inadequate and irrelevant during the heights of nationalism in the immediate post-war period.

Indeed, such scholarship was anathema to an Australian who had wondered why his undergraduate classes did not cover the Near North, a region close to Australia. After the Second World War, Tregonning thought it was improper that classes could continue to focus on Europe and ignore the very real events happening in Asia – India attaining independence in 1947, China becoming a united communist republic in 1949, and the nationalist revolution in Indonesia against the Dutch.[32]

But the intellectual situation was changing too in tandem with the forces of decolonisation and nationalism. The very nature of Southeast Asian historiography was changing from histories of European enterprise in the region to a deliberate attempt to uncover and restore indigenous agency. Hall led the intellectual charge to redress the balance in 1955. In *History of South-East Asia*, he declared that the region's 'history cannot be safely viewed from any other perspective until seen from its own', that Southeast Asia's history should not start with cultural or political influences of India, China or western countries.[33] Van Leur's translated arguments against colonial history also sparked much excitement in providing a new method of approaching the region's past, that the history of the region should not be viewed from the 'decks of the ship, the

---

[31] For a detailed précis, see John Legge, "The Writing of Southeast Asian History", in *The Cambridge history of Southeast Asia, Volume One*, (ed.) Nicholas Tarling, Cambridge, UK; New York, NY, USA: CUP, 1992, pp.3-15; fn13 for literature examples.
[32] Ken Tregonning. Interviewed by Jason Lim, Oral History Centre (OHC), National Archives of Singapore (NAS). Accession No. 002783, Reel 1 of 6, 2003.
[33] D.G.E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia*, Basingstoke, Hants.: Macmillan, 1981 - 4th edition, p.xxix.

ramparts of the fortress, the high gallery of the trading-house', but from the shores of the region instead.[34]

The quest to emphasise the local perspective was perhaps the immediate motivation for Tregonning in starting *JSEAH*. There was a place for a journal 'devoted to Southeast Asian history, published in Southeast Asia with articles whenever possible by historians working in Southeast Asia' to reinforce the new approaches to historical scholarship argued for by Van Leur.[35] One of Tregonning's concerns was the one-sided perspectives of scholars writing from London or Paris without little knowledge or experiences of the subject-matter they were writing on; hence, the stress on the "Asian historian".[36]

In the late 1950s, Tregonning also saw a need for a journal with a "different emphasis" from *JMBRAS*.[37] *JMBRAS* has a publication history stretching back into the mid-nineteenth century, and carried a reputable scholarship with contributions by well-known scholar-administrators such as Richard Winstedt and R. J. Wilkinson.[38] But its intellectual concerns were mostly limited to the territories and people the British administered, and when set against a period of decolonisation, *JMBRAS* seemed quaint and conservative. Tregonning on the other hand wanted a journal which covers the whole

---

[34] Jacob Cornelis Van Leur, *Indonesian Trade and Society: Essays in Asian Social and Economic history*; translated by James S. Holmes and A. van Marle, The Hague: van Hoeve, 1955, p.261.
[35] Ken Tregonning, "Reflections of a Pioneer", in *Historians & Their Disciplines: The Call of Southeast Asian History*, edited by Nicholas Tarling, Kuala Lumpur: MBRAS, 2007, p.153.
[36] Tregonning admits loosely defining "Asian", including too the people living and working in the region, "regardless of race". Correspondence to author. 24/02/2008.
[37] Ken Tregonning, *Home port Singapore: an Australian historian's experience*, Nathan, Qld., Australia: Centre for the Study of Australia-Asia Relations, Griffith University, 1989, p.31.
[38] See Choy Chee Meh, "History of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society 1877-1983", unpublished academic exercise--Department of History, NUS, 1985.

of Southeast Asia as well as engage its history from a more grounded perspective within the region, not from colonial vestiges.

Tregonning was at that time visibly aware of the intellectual shifts and political happenings in the aftermath of the Second World War. He made clear his intellectual position on several occasions. In 1960, he presented a paper on Malayan history at the first International Conference of Historians of Asia held in Manila, stating that Malaya should be studied ‘in its regional setting’, by adopting a ‘non-Europecentric approach, by looking at both Asian and European elements in the make-up of the peninsula’, and to give ‘due weight to the indigenous moulding force’; in effect, to look out from Malayan perspectives, and not as before, outside in.[39]

Tregonning was more forceful in two book reviews. He lamented the detached attitude of *Malaya: A Political and Economic Appraisal*, suggesting that the author should have used Malayan sources.[40] In another book review, Tregonning was also scathing of claims that the Portuguese caused the ‘political disruption of the Malay World’. He thought it was inaccurate and dated (in 1958) to call the period 1500-1800 A.D. in Malayan history the “European Era”, and the Portuguese mere ‘heretical fish in a Muslim sea, never masters of more than a few square miles of land, and rarely a league of ocean’.[41] Such forceful comments inadvertently sparked off what was known as the centricity debates.

---

[39] Ken Tregonning, “The History of Malaya (A New Interpretation)”, in *Proceedings of the First International Conference of Historians of Asia*, Manila: Philippine Historical Association, 1960, p.112.
[40] Ken Tregonning, Review of *Malaya*: *A Political and Economic Appraisal*, by L.A. Mills, *JSSS* 14 (1&2), 1958, p.123.
[41] Ken Tregonning, Review of *Malaya*, by N. Ginsberg and C.F. Robert, *JSSS* 14 (1&2), 1958, p.124.

The "Centricity" Issue – Professionalism versus Nationalism

Present-day students of Southeast Asian history usually encounter the centricity issue first via Hall and Van Leur, and then moving on to examine John Smail's attempt at an autonomous history of the region, and perhaps Harry Benda's essay on the structure of Southeast Asian history. The debate was supposedly about perspective – whose eyes the scholar should look from; while Smail distinguished the factor of moral bias – basically the scholar's sympathies – from perspectives. But this framework hides another element in the so-called centricity debate. The debate was perhaps less of one over which perspective or moral viewpoint to take, but one which highlighted the tensions between nationalism and a professional ideal of historical scholarship.

In his inaugural lecture as the Chair of Southeast Asian History at the University of Malaya (Kuala Lumpur), John Bastin, another Australian historian specialising in Malaya and Indonesia, took issue amongst others with Tregonning's comments regarding the historical position of the Europeans in the region.[42] While not denying the prejudiced view of colonial history and the need for a more balanced context, he was concerned that the tendency to look from the inside outwards in tandem with nationalistic fervour could inaccurately erase the very real historical impact of the foreigner, or paint the foreigner in bad light simply to fit nationalistic purposes. Bastin thought that 'one of the most pervasive historical myths which seems to be generated in the formative development of modern national state – in Europe no less than in Asia – in the belief in a glorious

[42] Bastin also referred to Tregonning's comments that "Asia, not the European in Asia, must be our theme, and suddenly, if you think of that, it makes the Portuguese and the Dutch most insignificant, and almost extraneous", in "A New Approach to Malayan History: Look At Our Story from the Inside, not from Outside", *The Straits Times* (*ST*), 24/11/1958.

national past, which has somehow been subverted'.[43] He cited examples of Malaya elevating the Malacca Sultanate "into something that it was not", and the Indonesian emphasis on the Majapahit period and the exploits of Gadjah Mada.

His argument then was not so much against local perspectives or for the western element. Bastin was really arguing for a fair and honest representation of the past, holding firm to the professional standards of the historical discipline. He had unwittingly highlighted a very real tension between the idea of a professional history and a functional history for political purposes. The question then is whether nationalistic histories – which served a functional purpose to unite a nation of diverse peoples – could also be professional.

Histories always have had a functional purpose, even so-called professional history-writing, which arguably was almost always about great men or significant events. In Southeast Asia as in Europe, history was previously the domain of kings or court elites or the learned to justify their reign and authority. But it also became a useful unifying tool for nationalists attempting to "nationalise" diverse groups of people and ideas.[44] One example was Sukarno's idea of Indonesian history. Depicting the colonial period as a dark age, he looked back to the glorious past of Majapahit to underpin a modern national history which could unite the diverse Indonesian archipelago.[45] Motivated by contemporary political needs, he wanted to impart a sense of history, rather than the mere

---

[43] John Bastin, *The Study of Modern Southeast Asian History; An Inaugural lecture delivered in the University of Malaya in Kuala Lumpur on 14 December, 1959*, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya (Kuala Lumpur), 1959, p.18.

[44] Hong Lysa, "History", in *An Introduction to Southeast Asian Studies*, (eds.) Mohammed Halib and Tim Huxley, Singapore: ISEAS, 1996, pp.50-51.

[45] Ibid. Also see contributions on Indonesia in *Perceptions of the Past in Southeast Asia*, (eds.) Anthony Reid and David Marr, Singapore: Published for the Asian Studies Association of Australia by Heinemann Educational Books, 1979.

rote regurgitation of colonial facts and dates which may or may not have any relevance to his cause.

Such histories most certainly did not strictly follow the basic tenets of professional history-writing, such as being objective and basing research on critical analysis of source materials. Hall himself was scathing of Maung Htin Aung’s efforts, his former student, in writing a history of Burma, just as Wolters warned a new Filipino post-graduate student not to write history like Teodoro Agoncillo’s *A Short History of the Filipino Peoples*.[46] It was not that Hall or Wolters did not believe in a local perspective; it was perhaps more of them holding onto what they believed were professional standards of history-writing.

The use of classical kingdoms as start-points for new nation-states, while emotionally logical, was still unhistorical and factually difficult to prove. The debates were really about nationalistic histories versus professional standards of history – what was considered good or bad histories – and not merely about local versus colonial perspectives of the region. Smail’s attempt at an autonomous history of the region – a third way between nationalistic histories and colonial perspectives – must be seen in this context. Harry Benda too was wary about the ‘moral minuses of nationalist historiography’.[47]

[46] Reynaldo C. Ileto, ‘On the Historiography of Southeast Asia and the Philippines: The “Golden Age” of Southeast Asian Studies – Experiences and Reflection’, in *Can We Write History? Between Postmodernism and Coarse Nationalism: Workshop Proceedings for the Academic Frontier Project: Social Change in Asia and the Pacific, supported by Meiji Gakuin University and the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (Japan)*, Yokohama, Japan: Institute for International Studies Meiji Gakuin University, 2003, pp.5,12.
[47] Benda, “The Structure of Southeast Asian History”, p.118.

Bastin also noted two potential obstacles to a local perspective of Southeast Asian history. First, he wondered whether the Western-trained Asian historian could effectively escape western thought and cultural processes to write authentic Asian histories.[48] He also highlighted the lack of sources in indigenous languages, and hence the reliance on more readily available western-language sources. Commending Winstedt and Dutch historian H. J. De Graaf for using Malay literature and Javanese *babads* respectively, Bastin simultaneously betrayed an innate professional bias towards indigenous literary and historical traditions by suggesting that the Dutch-language sources De Graaf used were 'richer on points of detail, and on general matters of historical importance'.[49]

Bastin was probably not wrong in his analysis of De Graaf's sources. But such ideas reflected a professional snobbery towards the use of indigenous historical traditions, such as folklore, myths or legends. The idea of a modern professional historical discipline had an impact akin to colonial scholarship in marginalising indigenous perspectives. In this case, it was an uncritical perception of local literature – for instance, the *hikayats* or *babads* – enacting an unnecessary obstacle to scholarship.[50] Hence, while there were potential local source materials available, few of them outside of official chronicles or dynastic lists were deemed suitable for consultation during the early the formative stages of the field of Southeast Asian history.[51]

The issue then was perhaps not so much methodological – the quest for indigenous agency or an autonomous third way – but also the attitudes of scholars. The

[48] Bastin, *An Inaugural lecture*, pp.10-11.
[49] Ibid., p.11.
[50] Merle Ricklefs, "Indonesian History and Literature", in *Dari Babad Dan Hikayat Sampai Sejarah Kritis*, pp.199-200.
[51] Richard Winstedt adopted a similar attitude towards certain "Malay Chronicles from Sumatra and Malaya", in *Historians of South East Asia*, pp.24-28.

centricity issue was no more a debate about perspectives than a debate about who decides on what history is and should be. This was the intellectual situation *JSEAH* originated from. The field of Southeast Asian history was only beginning to take shape when *JSEAH* appeared. This is not to say that *JSEAH* influenced or directed the direction of the field and its lively debates and discussions. But as the journal was a product of the historical situation then, *JSEAH*'s origins provide a window into its surrounding intellectual context.

Parkinson and the Department

JSEAH also had roots in local institutional efforts to support and teach Southeast Asian history. When Tregonning first arrived in Singapore, he was met by Cyril Northcote Parkinson, the first Raffles Professor of History (and originator of Parkinson's Law). Tregonning had expected to teach Malayan history, since his postgraduate research in Oxford had focused on Borneo and the British North Borneo (Chartered) Company. Hence, he was taken aback when Parkinson informed him that he would be lecturing instead on World History, but with a twist; because in doing so, Tregonning was supposed to 'emphasi[s]e…the past – hitherto neglected – of Asia in world history'.[52]

Parkinson had recognised the needs of an independent Malaya. Fully aware of the changing political circumstances in post-war Malaya, he was not interested in 'telling Asian students about the history of Europe or America' and the Department should instead be 'exploring the History of Southeast Asia' and proving that this history 'was far

[52] Tregonning, "Pioneers", p.152.

more important' than its counterparts elsewhere presumed.[53] Parkinson ensured that students taking the Honours programme must research an original topic concerning Malaya or Singapore.[54] Some early graduates of the programme included Wang Gungwu, Wong Lin Ken and the Malaysian historian Khoo Kay Kim, and future editors of *JSEAH* and *JSEAS* like Eunice Thio, R. Suntharalingam, and Chiang Hai Ding.

In many ways, teaching Malayan or Southeast Asian history was a formidable task for a fledging Department with not many historians of Asia, let alone Southeast Asia. Most of the faculty's interest in the region came via European activities – where most of the accessible sources were. Parkinson had published on naval histories concerning Asia and Malaya, while Tregonning's interest in the region came via British trading companies. Turnbull remembers the lecturers themselves were on a steep learning curve as there was little to no prior research done on Malaya and the region, and hence few history publications or textbooks ready to be used.[55]

***Bulletin of Southeast Asian History* (1958)**

The gaps in the field of Southeast Asian history are best illustrated by the proceedings of Preliminary Conference for Southeast Asian Historians held in Penang in 1957. The primary purpose of the conference was to set the stage for a full-fledged conference for Southeast Asian history sometime in the immediate future, but the delegates also discussed specific issues concerning the research and teaching of Southeast Asian history. Different committees discussed the 'desirability and possibility of establishing a research

[53] Parkinson, "History in Malaya", *The Historical Annual*, Singapore: University of Malaya Historical Society, 1952-53, p.4.
[54] Tregonning, *Home Port Singapore*, p.11; Also, C. Mary Turnbull. Interviewed by Shashi Jayakumar. OHC, NAS. Accession No. 003025, Reel 1 of 2, 2006.
[55] Ibid.

centre and a journal of Southeast Asian History', 'the exchange of students and staff and proposed medium of expression and publication', and the 'preservation and availability of historical materials in Southeast Asia'.[56]

The 1957 conference was convened by Parkinson and the Department. Parkinson openly credited the impetus behind the conference to an earlier conference held a year earlier at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), where Hall made the call for more Southeast Asians to participate in conferences held in the region.[57] Conducted in English, the proceedings of the Penang conference were then edited by Parkinson and published by the Department as the *Bulletin of Southeast Asian History* in 1958 – arguably the direct predecessor of *JSEAH*.

The committee looking into the possibility of a journal concluded that any publication on Southeast Asian history would better serve as a bulletin, as opposed to a scholarly journal; that a research centre would not be a "worthwhile project" and that the bulletin can serve as an effective exchange medium instead. They agreed that 'the primary function of any publication should be to report on work being undertaken on Southeast Asian History in different countries of Southeast Asia and in other countries, *rather than to include purely historical articles*'.[58] They took a broad view of history, agreeing that the region's past should include 'political history, social and economic

[56] *Bulletin of Southeast Asian History*, (ed.) C. Northcote Parkinson, Singapore: Department of History, University of Malaya, 1958, p.15.
[57] Ibid., p.8. The proceedings of the SOAS conference are published in *Historians of South East Asia*.
[58] Ibid., p.16, (my emphasis). The committee comprised of history teachers, a teacher-trainer and a headmaster, all from Penang.

history, historical geography, linguistic studies, cultural history, bibliographical work, archaeology and anthropology, biography and other general historical research'.[59]

The practical needs of the field were clear, as demonstrated by the emphasis on establishing networks of information and availability of source materials. Parkinson called for contributions relating to the 'whereabouts and preservation of documentary evidence' for the second issue, and also urged a wide circulation of the *Bulletin* by the conference delegates and others receiving a copy.[60] There is no evidence of a second issue and it would appear that the bulletin idea died stillborn. The proposed conference of Southeast Asian Historians was held only three years later in 1961.[61]

The conference proceedings, rather than the presence of the *Bulletin* itself, provided some foundation for *JSEAH*, particularly concerning approaches to Southeast Asia and its history. First, there was an attempt to think regionally. In his opening address, Parkinson had tentatively defined the region according to the various nation-states emerging from colonial rule – Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Indonesia, Malaya and British Borneo.[62] But he then went on to suggest national histories should only be the beginning for further exploration of inter-state political and economic relations. Parkinson observed that it would not be possible to study Malaya's history 'without knowing something…of the history of Thailand, Java and Sumatra'.[63]

---

[59] Ibid., pp.16-17. The delegates proposed funding to be sought from UNESCO and the publication be based in Bangkok and published in English.
[60] Ibid., Preface.
[61] Tregonning had begun planning for the conference as early as 1959. Tregonning to Tarling. 20/02/1959. Tarling Private Papers.
[62] *Bulletin*, p.8. Parkinson did not include the Philippines was as they "are academically, and the purposes of research, well provided for by the United States."
[63] Ibid., p.9.

From national histories, Parkinson envisioned a “latter stage” when ‘historians with a wider outlook can write with new confidence as Southeast Asia as a whole’.[64] Hailing the region’s diversity and its historical receptiveness to outside influences, he also attempted to define a citizen of Southeast Asia, as a ‘man of mixed Malay and Indian ancestry, with a Chinese wife, a western education, an English love of games, some Australian friends and an American car’.[65] Putting aside the obvious slant towards western ideas of modernity, it was a calculated effort to move beyond narrow definitions of nationalism based on race or religion, ostensibly to propose a form of (stable) unity during a period of political flux.

There was also the intent to situate the study of Southeast Asia within Southeast Asia. Parkinson hailed the conference as the first to include all historians “whose work actually lies” within Southeast Asia, and not merely “concerned with Southeast Asia”. Compared to the SOAS conference, the immediacy of the delegates in the Penang gathering was striking. The list of delegates showed attendances not only by faculty members of the history department in the University of Malaya, but also teachers and staff from schools and teacher training centres around Malaya. Conference delegates included lecturers from Thailand, as well as historians from India, Hong Kong and Australia.[66]

The Penang conference had partly been encouraged by the SOAS conference, but there were also broader strategic considerations involved indirectly. Since 1950, the British have been considering the feasibility of establishing in Malaya or Hong Kong a

[64] Ibid.
[65] Ibid., p.12.
[66] Ibid. The list of delegates is published on pp.6-7.

research centre for regional studies, in the same vein as Cornell and Yale.[67] Since such initiatives were intricately linked to decidedly non-Southeast Asian strategic motives – as seen by Parkinson's suggestion of what "Southeast Asian" could mean – there are legitimate questions over the subsequent institutionalisation and nature of local-based scholarship about the region.

But that goes beyond the point that the creation of *JSEAH* was situated at the cross-currents of local as well as broader intellectual and institutional changes. The purpose and origins of *JSEAH* represented a snapshot of the times: it was a product of the intellectual shift towards a local perspective; it had roots in institutional attempts to support the new academic field of Southeast Asian history; and finally, the establishment of the journal demonstrates the merits of individual initiative during a period of change and opportunities.

TREGONNING AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF *JSEAH*

JSEAH 1(1) had a relatively modest start. The issue contains three edited versions of honours academic exercises from students of the Department, one review article co-written by a future Raffles Professor and his father, and five book reviews shared between three historians who were in one way or another connected to the Department. If the use of student essays at the beginning was due to the initial lack of contributions, it would appear that after the first issue, the journal was quickly established as the practice of using academic exercises was repeated only once more in *JSEAH* 2(1). Another

[67] Shaharil Talib, "The Department of Southeast Asian Studies, University of Malaya, 1976-1993", in *Toward the promotion of Southeast Asian studies in Southeast Asia*, (eds.) Taufik Abdullah and Yekti Maunati, Jakarta: Program of Southeast Asian Studies, Indonesian Institute of Sciences, 1998, pp.31-32.

indication of how quickly the journal grew was the sharp increase from a modest start of ninety pages in the first issue (including articles, book reviews and correspondence), to an average of a hundred and fifty pages of articles alone per issue by the ninth issue in 1964.

Credit must go to Tregonning for sustaining the journal during the early years. *JSEAH* arguably benefited from the founding editor's activities in promoting research on the region and establishing contacts with other research centres. One example was Tregonning's convening of the first International Conference of South-East Asian Historians, held in Singapore in 1961– where Smail and Benda presented their seminal papers on Southeast Asian history.[68] *JSEAH* effectively began with the conference as most of the presented papers did appear in latter issues of *JSEAH*, and spawned a separate publication of collected papers focusing on Malayan history.[69]

In 1963, Tregonning became the Secretary for a newly-established Centre for South-East Asian Studies in the Social Sciences in the University of Singapore. The Centre brought together the departments of Economics, Geography, History, Law, Political Science and Social Studies, as well as the university's library, with the objective of sponsoring and encouraging post-graduate interdisciplinary research in common problems.[70] The Centre however never really took off despite much initial promise in bringing in international scholars, the establishment of staff exchanges, and supporting

[68] See *Programme* and *Preliminary Papers*, Singapore: International Conference of Southeast Asian Historians, 1961.
[69] *Papers on Malayan History: papers submitted to the First International Conference of South-East Asian Historians, Singapore, January 1961*, (ed.) Ken Tregonning, Singapore: Journal of South-East Asian History, 1962.
[70] *Centre for South-East Asian Studies in the Social Sciences, 1963-1964–v.1: A brief history; v.2: Members*, Singapore: University of Singapore, Dept. of History, 1964.

publications and bibliographic work.[71] However, it did certainly precede the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS) and could be seen as a predecessor to the present-day Department of Southeast Asian Studies at NUS.[72]

The establishment of contacts and networks via the Centre and the 1961 conference however could not have harmed the development of *JSEAH*. Tregonning's efforts would have increased awareness of the journal as well as research in Singapore in a pre-Internet world. The differences in time and space were brutally highlighted by two published correspondences: one highlighting the difficulties of in getting a book edited and published in separate parts of the world;[73] and another apologising for responding late to a book review in the journal as he did not see that particular issue of *JSEAH* until a few months after.[74] Illustrating a time before electronic-mail and word-processors, a former editor who was a student during the 1960s also recalls having to physically bring the galley proofs down to the printer for printing and binding.[75]

Intellectually, the journal was the sole property of Tregonning and the Department. *JSEAH* was produced independent of the university as funding was initially sought and obtained via the Lee and Asia Foundations.[76] To ensure a good starting circulation, Tregonning addressed eight hundred fliers to international universities, and apparently received two hundred subscribers before *JSEAH* 1(1) was published.[77] As such, the journal was entirely self-sufficient and funded by subscriptions very soon after

[71] See Appendix H for newspaper reports of Centre activities.
[72] The Department was inaugurated as a programme in 1991. See *Handbook*, Singapore: Southeast Asian Studies Programme, NUS, 1993/1994.
[73] Leon Comber to Editor. *JSEAH* 1(2), 1960: p.117.
[74] M.A.P. Meilink-Roelofsk, "European Influence in Southeast Asia 1500-1630–A Reply", *JSEAH* 5(2), 1964: p.184. The book review was published in 1962.
[75] Edwin Lee. Personal communication to author. 26/11/2007.
[76] Tregonning, "Pioneers", pp.153-154.
[77] See images of brochures in Appendix G.

the start, leaving contributions by the foundations untouched. Financial self-reliance allowed the journal to pursue scholarship without strings attached and avoid accusations of foreign interference – as was directed at the Center for Southeast Asian Studies at Kyoto University for receiving grants from the Ford Foundation.[78]

Tregonning also initiated a somewhat aggressive policy for book reviews. Instead of soliciting reviews from "in-house" faculty members, he sought reviews from internationally-renowned scholars, establishing from the start valuable networks with international scholars. The other members of the initial editorial team, Eunice Thio and Wong Lin Ken, would contact publishers and request copies for review, assuring them that the books would be reviewed by "international authorities".[79] During the ten years of publication, the majority of book reviewers came from outside Southeast Asia.[80] Coupled with an opportunistic distribution practice, it would appear that the reach of *JSEAH* was instantly international.

The international orientation of the journal is best illustrated by the demographics of the Editorial Advisory Board. Over the ten years of publication, it included several notable Southeast Asian and Asian scholars – such as S. Arasaratnam, O. D. Corpus, Truong Buu-Lam, Soedjatmoko, Vishal Singh, Wang Gungwu, Sartono Kartodirdjo – as well as the familiar names of western scholars: C. D. Cowan, Harry Benda, Brian Harrison and Oliver Wolters. The board also included non-historians, such as the geographer Paul Wheatley and the cultural anthropologist P. de Josselyn de Jong from Leiden.

[78] Akira Nagazumi, "Southeast Asian Studies in Japan", *Archipel*, 9, 1975: p.13.
[79] Tregonning, "Pioneers", p.155.
[80] See Appendix E.

In his written accounts, Tregonning is obviously very proud of *JSEAH*, especially when references to the journal started appearing in other academic publications. He did not really achieve his original objectives due to very practical limitations. Though befitting the intellectual and nationalistic mood of the times, the intention to provide a space for the "Asian historian" arrived perhaps too early. There were few "Asian historians" waiting to immediately contribute articles, let alone substantive research done by Asian scholars to begin with in the late 1950s leading up to 1960.[81] And even for the existing few, the choice of language for *JSEAH* could have been a stumbling block for Asian and Southeast Asian scholars outside of the English-speaking territories of British Malaya and Burma, and the American-influenced Philippines. Hence, it is not surprising to see proportionally more Malayan (including both present-day Malaysia and Singapore) and Filipino-related topics appearing the first few issues of *JSEAH*.

One possible contribution Tregonning made to Southeast Asian history was to establish and more crucially sustain an academic platform for an exchange of ideas in a field of study increasingly gaining recognition. Just as Hall bestowed credibility upon the idea of a Southeast Asian history, *JSEAH* could be seen as one building block in supporting the academic field. The journal provided a focal point for scholars and historians to publish their research, contributing intentionally or otherwise to the idea of a "Southeast Asian" history – and hence, a "Southeast Asia" – despite the absence of a clear definition.

[81] The majority of the delegates in the 1961 Conference were non-Southeast Asian in origin. See *Programme*.

FROM "*HISTORY*" TO "*STUDIES*": THE ORIGINS OF *JSEAS*

JSEAS 1(1) first appeared with an editorial preamble explaining the title-change from *JSEAH*: 'This is a reorganised format of the *Journal of Southeast Asian History*. Since the latter's appearance in 1960, it has developed into a publication of international stature, providing an outlet for scholarly contributions on the history of the region. More recently, the Journal has also published articles from…the social sciences, *in the belief that multi-disciplinary approaches will deepen and enrich our understanding of Southeast Asia*. In changing the title to the *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, this new orientation is given formal recognition'.[82]

The statement was a clear break from *JSEAH*'s initial objective. In 1970, the aim to provide a space for the "Asian historian" was secondary to achieving a "deeper and enriched" understanding of the region. The only link to Tregonning's goals, and a tenuous one at that, was a request for contributions by all scholars, 'especially those working in Southeast Asian universities and research institutions'. The objective of encouraging and developing local Asian histories was really made in response during a period of decolonisation and nationalism for most of the 1960s. In the 1970s, this objective was tempered somewhat by the interesting fact that most of the editors were, at least in the geographical sense, Southeast Asians and Asians. But they were now historians editing a multi-disciplinary journal, creating a theoretical conflict in disciplinary loyalties.

[82] *JSEAS* 1(1), (my emphasis).

Southeast Asian History and the Social Sciences

Driving home the multi-disciplinary point, *JSEAS* 1(1) published six articles by historians, economists, political scientists and sociologists. But by 1970, the presence of non-historians was not too out-of-place. Political scientists, economists, sociologists and anthropologists were sharing a journal supposedly devoted to historians of the region ever since the first *JSEAH* issue. In 1965, the initial objective of providing a space for the Asian historian was replaced by a more generic call for articles on Southeast Asian studies. A 1967 issue on “Party Systems in Southeast Asia” was put together and edited by a visiting political scientist, with all but one of the articles contributed by political scientists.

Post-war regional events played a major role in directing the attention (and methods) of scholars. Pre-war scholarship tended to focus more on day-to-day administration of colonial territories and knowledge of the people living within them. Hence, there was more emphasis on language and culture. Post-war geo-political concerns conversely raised different kinds of issues – of nationalism, political and economic development and modernisation. By the 1970s, as the borders of the region became more or less consolidated, the attention of the individual countries turned from independence movements to more domestic concerns of state and nation-building. In the broader context of the Cold War, where the region was seen as one strategic chess piece (with disparate parts), pressing policy imperatives made it necessary for more applied knowledge about the region.

Such needs manifested institutionally, as demonstrated by the British efforts to create a regional research centre within Southeast Asia and the founding of area studies programme in American universities during the 1950s and 1960s. Particularly in the American programmes, there was a strong emphasis on multi-disciplinary approaches to better understand a diverse region. Historian Barbara Andaya recalls attending informal seminars during her time in Cornell where scholars from various disciplines attended and exchanged ideas.[83] For her, the title-change was a natural progression within Southeast Asian history and reflected the growing emphasis on multi-disciplinary approaches.

A contributor to both *JSEAH and JSEAS* (and a visitor to the Department in 1966), Craig Lockard was not surprised at the title-change as he remembers the editors struggling to find "good essays", and a broader scope would bring in better quality articles. He thought the change was "inevitable" as historians formed only a small minority within the Southeast Asia scholarly community.[84] Non-historians also saw the benefits of the title-change in enlarging the scope of the journal. Martin Rudner, a specialist in politics and economics, saw the title-change as a step forward as it would allow scholars from various disciplines to share knowledge about the region.[85]

The intellectual shift within Southeast Asian historiography coincided with a renaissance of sorts within the historical discipline in a "positivistic" quest for objectivity during the 1960s and 1970s.[86] Influenced by the French Annales School, cliometrics and

---

[83] Personal communication to author. 28/11/ 2008.
[84] E-mail to author. 06/03/2008.
[85] E-mail to author. 09/03/2008. A view also shared by Keith Taylor, *JSEAS* editor (1983-1986), who recalls learning "a lot" from other disciplines on the job. He also sees history as "fundamentally interdisciplinary". E-mail to author. 19/02/2008.
[86] Vincent Houben, "Southeast Asian History: The Search for New Perspectives", in *Southeast Asian Studies: Debates and New Directions,* (eds.) Cynthia Chou and Vincent Houben, Singapore: ISEAS, 2006, p.142.

Marxist historiography, there was a reaction against "hermeneutical history" – history of events and linear chronology. Social scientific methods offered opportunities 'to discover the regularities in the behaviour of people and the development of societies', hence a basis for objective history.[87] Historians were also driven by the political and social turmoil of the post-war period and journals such as *Past and Present*, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, the *Journal of Social History* and the *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, became the 'main sites of the resulting interdisciplinary conversation' in the English-speaking world.[88]

This search for a more objective truth matched the intellectual context of Southeast Asian historiography in the post-war period; but the dearth of indigenous sources and the abundance of foreign records made the writing of Southeast Asian history challenging, particularly when set against the debates over centricity. Responses to the Vietnam War also partly illustrate the intellectual shift. The event changed the questions asked by historians and scholars (and hence the direction of scholarship), as the assumptions and rationale for American involvement were questioned by faculty and students alike.[89]

The intellectual rationale for *JSEAS* is very persuasive, particularly when considering the increasing emphasis on social sciences within the historical discipline, as well as the influence of multi-disciplinary approaches espoused by area studies programmes. But there were local institutional factors which did encourage the change in title and scholarly emphasis.

[87] Ibid.
[88] Geoff Eley, *A Crooked Line: From Cultural History to the History of Society* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005), p.41.
[89] Andaya. Personal communication.

Southeast Asian Studies in Singapore

The impact of gaining independence in uncertain times and the pressing need for socio-economic development were reflected to some extent in the establishment of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), an indigenous organisation formed by Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore and the Philippines in 1967.[90] The presence of ASEAN provided another focus apart from Cold War politics for academic research, which inevitably called for a more varied approach in studying the region. Indeed, ASEAN was less a political organisation than a co-operative to improve socio-economic relations, as seen in the terms of the 1967 Bangkok Declaration.[91]

One of the objectives stated in the Bangkok Declaration was the "promotion of Southeast Asian Studies." This was partly answered by the establishment of the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS) in Singapore. In 1968, ISEAS was established by an Act of Parliament, reflecting the uncertainty of Singapore's position within the region – being a Chinese-majority country in a Malay-speaking area – and hence the strategic need to better understand its neighbours.[92] The success of ISEAS is well-known, but its initial presence – which was moreover government-supported – could have also encouraged a change in the title and scope of an almost independently-operated journal in order to stay a step ahead of potential competition for a limited audience.[93] ISEAS did

[90] Thanat Khoman, "ASEAN–Conception and Evolution", in *The ASEAN Reader*, compiled by K. S. Sandhu, Sharon Siddique, Chandran Jeshurun, Ananda Rajah, Joseph L.H. Tan, Pushpa Thambipillai, Singapore: ISEAS, 1992.

[91] *Bangkok Declaration (1967)*, http://www.aseansec.org/1212.htm. Accessed 24/05/2008.

[92] *Institute of Southeast Asian Studies: a commemorative history 1968-1998*, compiled by Patricia Lim Pui Huen; with the assistance of Triena Noeline Ong [et al.], Singapore: ISEAS, 1998, p.ix.

[93] Yong Mun Cheong commented that the title-change happened because of the presence of ISEAS. Personal communication to author. 21/11/2007. Edwin Lee also thought that the title-change was a business

consider publishing a journal during the initial years, but was put off by 'considerable problems'.[94]

Regional studies in Singapore do have a longer history than ISEAS. *JSEAS*, and indeed *JSEAH*, could also be seen as part of a local intellectual landscape which supported scholarship on Southeast Asia. Besides Tregonning's Centre for South-East Asian Studies in the Social Sciences, an Institute of Southeast Asia was established within Nanyang University in 1957 led by a Singapore scholar, Hsu Yun-Ts'iao.[95] After leaving Nanyang, Hsu established Centre for Southeast Asian Researches in 1961 and edited a short-lived bilingual *Journal of Southeast Asian Researches* (*JOSEAR*), (*东南亚研究, dongnanya yanjiu*), from 1965 to 1971. Hsu was also a former editor of the *Journal of South Seas Society* (*JSSS*) – the first regional Chinese-language journal based, focusing mainly on the ethnic Chinese in Malaya and Singapore, but also other regional issues after the Second World War.[96]

There is no evidence to support a direct connection between the title-change and the presence of other institutions for Southeast Asian studies. But putting them together allows for a wide-screen viewpoint on the character of scholarship of Southeast Asia

---

decision, as ISEAS and the journal shared the same audience. Personal communication to author. 26/11/2007.

[94] Draft Minutes of Meeting. 27/11/1969. NASGRID, "Institute of South East Asian Studies (Executive Committee)–Agenda and Minutes of Meetings", Ministry of Education (MOE) 2260/67PTB.

[95] Hsu edited and published the first and only issue of the *Bulletin of the Institute of Southeast Asia* (*南洋研究, nanyang yanjiu*) in 1959, a multi-disciplinary tri-lingual journal on Southeast Asia, and a predecessor of *JOSEAR.*

[96] For South Seas Society publications and scholarship in general, see 许苏吾, *南洋学会与南洋研究* [*South Seas Society and Southeast Asian Studies*], 新加坡: 南海编译所出版, 1977; also see 杨, "A survey of the Southeast Asian Chinese Studies".

based in Singapore, and also further supports arguments for local origins of Southeast Asian studies.[97]

On the other hand, there were immediate institutional changes within the University of Singapore which could also have encouraged the title-change. The Faculties of Arts and Social Sciences had existed as separate entities until 1969 when then Vice-Chancellor Toh Chin Chye merged both faculties into one. As part of his wider purpose to involve the university more in national development, one of the side-effects of the merge was the emergence of “double-barrelled” departments – English Language and Literature being the prominent example. Indeed, the History Department was to have been merged with Political Science, a move resisted rigorously ‘particularly by the historians’.[98]

University restructuring – along with the general shift towards the social sciences – clearly had an impact, as several former editors thought that the title-change was due to the general movement towards the social sciences; one also speculating the title-change came about to accommodate the newer departments which may not have the resources for self-publication.[99]

---

[97] See Anthony Reid and Maria Serena I. Diokno, “Completing the Circle: Southeast Asian Studies in Southeast Asia”, in *Southeast Asian Studies: Pacific Perspectives*, edited by Anthony Reid, Tempe: Arizona State University Program for Southeast Asian Studies, 2003, pp. 93-107.

[98] Edwin Lee and Tan Tai Yong, *Beyond degrees: the making of the National University of Singapore*, Singapore: SUP, 1996, pp.137-138.

[99] Ernest Chew. Personal communication to author. 21/08/2007. This comment has some truth as the Political Science department was decimated after recognition of a subject worthy of government scholarship was removed, forcing students hoping to land government jobs to apply for other subjects. See Roland Puccetti, “Authoritarian Government and Academic Subservience: The University of Singapore”, *Minerva*, 10(2), 1972: pp.234-235.

Wong Lin Ken (*JSEAS* Founding Chairperson)

Just as Tregonning is to *JSEAH*, the present-day scope and structure of *JSEAS* have its foundations in the initiative of the late Professor Wong Lin Ken, the first (and last) local Raffles Professor of History. Wong graduated with first-class honours in 1954 and completed a Masters dissertation on the trade of Singapore in 1956.[100] He received his Ph.D. from the University of London and joined the Department in 1959. Wong was active in politics, serving as a director of the People's Action Party's external affairs bureau in 1964, a Member of Parliament, and Minister for Home Affairs from 1970 to 1972. In 1969, he assumed academic responsibilities as the Head of Department and Chairperson of the *JSEAH*'s Editorial Board after a two-year stint as Ambassador to the United Nations and Brazil.[101]

Within a year, Wong took an academically established journal which was floundering administratively and ensured it entered the 1970s organised, free of ambiguity with a new identity and purpose. It is unclear whether the Department wanted the responsibilities of managing a journal, or whether Tregonning wanted to take *JSEAH* back to Australia. A former editor – a student at that point in time – remembers Tregonning wanting to retain the journal when he left in 1967, but was prevented by the Department.[102] Chiang Hai Ding, a local graduate with a Ph.D. from the Australian

[100] Published as *The trade of Singapore, 1819-69*, Singapore: Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1961.
[101] Wang Gungwu, "In Memoriam–Professor Wong Lin Ken (1931-1983)", *JSEAH* 14(2), 1983.
[102] Ernest Chew. Personal communication to author; also mentioned by Edwin Lee.

National University (ANU) in 1963 on the foreign trade of the Straits Settlements, eventually took over *JSEAH*.[103]

On the other hand, Tregonning recalls his colleagues were reluctant to claim *JSEAH*. At that point in time, the Department was small and stretched by teaching and research duties.[104] Tregonning also thinks that part of the reluctance came from some suspicion over the journal's financial status. There was perhaps some basis for such suspicions as Chiang's first order of business was to try to entangle the Department and *JSEAH* from a three-way legal wrangle between them, the Dutch publishing firm, Swet & Zeitlinger, and Malaysia Books Ltd., a subsidiary of Malaysia Publishing House (MPH) based in Singapore.

Some background is necessary at this point. In the first five years of its existence, *JSEAH* was published by the Department – that is Tregonning and two administrative staff personally handled matters of sales, distribution and subscriptions. In 1965, Tregonning transferred business management of *JSEAH* to Malaysia Books as circulation grew from about "200 to 1,000".[105] A year before, Tregonning had signed with Swet & Zeitlinger, giving them the right to reprint *JSEAH* issues declared "out-of-print" by the Proprietor of the journal, in this case, Tregonning himself.

In 1966, Swet & Zeitlinger requested Tregonning to declare certain journal volumes "out-of-print" after Malaysia Books gave notice that the stocks for those volumes were very low. Tregonning referred the request to Malaysia Books, which

[103] Tregonning to Swets & Zeitlinger. 08/11/1966. Department of History, NUS, "Swets & Zeitlinger" (S&Z) 000175.
[104] Staff strength was eleven in 1969. Edwin Lee, "History", in *Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences, National University of Singapore: 60th anniversary, 1929-1989*, Singapore: The Faculty, 1989, p.14.
[105] "Notice of Change", *JSEAH* 6(2).

unfortunately gave a reply stating they had additional stocks coming off their press – legally speaking, an encroachment on the Dutch firm's right to reprint. Receiving no reply to their repeated calls for clarification, Swet & Zeitlinger accused Malaysia Books of dishonesty and requested Tregonning to intercede as they held him liable to ensure the terms of the contract they signed.

From the records made available, this issue was not resolved two years later in 1968. Chiang was most anxious to move on and was urging the University's Registrar's Office to act quickly. He did not even seem to be aware of the agreement signed between Tregonning and Swet & Zeitlinger as he complained to the Registrar's Office about the firm reprinting *JSEAH* issues without permission.[106]

Hence, there was some confusion in the wake of Tregonning's departure. It did not help that Malaysia Books and its parent company, MPH – facing financial distress – were bought over by a Chinese-Indonesian consortium in 1966 and entered new management. Chiang was eager to settle contractual arrangements with the new MPH as it was still handling the journal's business matters without a proper contract in place. This had ramifications later as the Department, through Wong, sought legal assistance to recover unpaid royalties.

The four issues published in 1967 and 1968 reflected the confusion in terms of the editorial structure. Except the special issue edited by Robert Gamer, there was no specific indication of editorial responsibilities. There was only an initial instruction to address all articles to Chiang and Suntharalingam, which was later changed to a more collective "Editors". The Editorial Board at this stage seemed to involve all Department staff, and at

[106] Chiang Hai Ding to Registrar. 08/10/1968. S&Z 000154.

one stage even included C. D. Cowan and Wang Gungwu as Consulting Editors with no clarification of their roles.

This was the situation confronting Wong in 1969. Later that year, Wong and the Department decided to change the journal's title, to cease all business arrangements with MPH – which had apparently not remitted any royalties since 1967 – and to sign with McGraw-Hill Far Eastern Publishers.[107] Intriguingly, Wong had also sought legal clarification whether prior arrangements with Swet & Zeitlinger could be abrogated in the event the journal changed its title. A title-change was worth considering as it would legally free the Department from unwanted contractual arrangements and also provide *JSEAS* with a stable foundation to move forward.

In the letter to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor of the university, Wong gave various reasons for the title-change. He noted legal assistance was retained so as to ensure 'a proper legal footing'. He also explained that the title-change came about because they have been 'taking articles written by Sociologists and Political Scientists on contemporary subjects. This change in nomenclature is more appropriate to our range of publications then our old name of Journal of Southeast Asian History'.[108]

There were hence a variety of possible reasons for the title-change in 1970. The change made sense as the intellectual currents of the time were heading towards the social sciences and multi-disciplinary approaches. There was plenty of institutional "encouragement" within Singapore and the University itself. *JSEAH* had to be reinvented in order to stay relevant. And finally, just as Tregonning's presence was crucial to *JSEAH*

[107] Wong Lin Ken to Dennis Lee. 01/11/1969. Department of History, NUS, "Journal of Southeast Asian Studies–Contract Agreements with Publishers" (JSEAS Contract) 000084-5.
[108] Wong Lin Ken to Deputy Vice-Chancellor. 05/11/1969. JSEAS Contract 000082-3.

Wong Lin Ken's role cannot be understated. Regardless of the various reasons, it was his initiative to adjust the purpose and scope of the journal.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF *JSEAS* (1970S)

After a brief period of confusion, the physical appearance and editorial structure of *JSEAS* reflected a polished professionalism. Moving away from the various colours used for *JSEAH*, each *JSEAS* cover was standardised in appearance: green in colour with black and white letterings. *JSEAS* had a more organised Editorial Board. A Chairperson was introduced (usually the Head of Department), separating departmental head and editorial duties, which was combined under Tregonning. There was an apparent system of succession for editing responsibilities, with editors moving from Book Reviews to Associate Editor, then to Editor. The Editorial Advisory Committee replaced the Editorial Advisory Board in *JSEAH*. It was local in orientation, and in keeping with the new multi-disciplinary approach, included academics from other disciplines within the university. ISEAS was also represented in the Committee by its directors.

The number of regional and international scholars was considerably larger than in *JSEAH*, reflecting the institutional expansion of Southeast Asian studies since the 1960s. Adding to well-known names such as SOAS, Ohio, Cornell or Yale, *JSEAS* included a wider variety of universities from Europe and North America, Australia/New Zealand, and Asia: (including Jawaharlal Nehru University). More Southeast Asian universities were also included but were limited to Malaysia and Indonesia. By the late 1970s, *JSEAS* was firmly established. The Department sold about a thousand copies per issue, with more than half of total subscriptions coming from outside the region – the United States taking up more than fifty percent of subscriptions.[109]

The second decade of the Department's editorship also saw a more varied roster of editors. There were ten different editors, all of which barred one graduated from the Department and were furthermore either born in Singapore or Malaysia. From 1970, or indeed since 1967 when Tregonning left, *JSEAS* was edited by Southeast Asians until 1983, when American historian Keith Taylor became Editor. Most of them were educated in England or Australia, and based their research within the geographical proximity of Singapore and Malaysia. This presents a small opportunity to explore the position of history, as perceived by the Department editing *JSEAS*.

The Purpose of History (in Singapore)

With the title-change, we are left with the question: what happened to History? The historical discipline became only one of many available ways used to comprehend the changes in the region: 'The main emphasis of this publication is on the peoples and governments of Southeast Asia: how societies, cultures and institutions have evolved *in the past* and are evolving in the present; how indigenous forces have interacted with exogenous elements in shaping developmental patterns; how East and West are contending to determine the destinies of nations in the region; how the conflicts between *traditional* and modernising forces are being resolved; and how the problems of economic development are being solved'.[110]

[109] Wong Lin Ken to Chan Kai You. 03/05/1977. NASGRID, "University of Singapore Newspaper Cuttings (English)", MOE 15/55.
[110] *JSEAS* 1(1), (my emphasis).

In a sense, the historical elements of the "past" and the "traditional" must also be engaged as they are also present in contemporary issues. History, as a former editor commented, was happening all around then.[111] This particular portion of the preamble did not appear again during the 1970s, but it perhaps is representative of the intent to focus more on economic developments, socio-cultural transitions and interactions in Southeast Asia, on specific regional issues rather than just Southeast Asian history. The statement displayed a keen awareness of the fundamental changes the region and its inhabitants were experiencing coming to terms with a turbulent past and present, and moving into an uncertain future; in trying to move away from a dependency imposed by colonialism and at the same time, dealing with its not-so-subtle political, social and economic impact on society.[112]

The above statement reflected the changing perception of what history encompassed by the editors, or more accurately, by *JSEAS*' founder, Wong Lin Ken. The debate over centricity was seemingly less important than the need to understand the contemporary changes happening in the region at that point in time. Just as the nationalists of an earlier period used history for nation-building purposes, history while still being harnessed for similar functional purposes, now took on a more professional outlook.

---

[111] Yong. Personal communication to author.

[112] Such a perspective was of course not unique to the Editors. John Legge noted historians participating in post-war Asian studies were concerned more with recent past rather than the remote past in "Clio and Her Neighbours: Reflections on History's Relations with the surrounding Disciplines", in *Dari Babad Dan Hikayat Sampai Sejarah Kritis: Kumpulan karangan dipersembahkan kepada Prof. Dr. Sartono Kartodridjo*, edited by T. Ibrahim Alfian, H. J. Koesoemanto, Dharmono Hardjowidjono, Djoko Suryo, Universitas Gadjah Mada: Gadjah Mada University Press, 1987, p.336.

In contrast to Tregonning's "history from within" approach, Wong thought that the study and practice of history should be contemporary, that it should have a practical influence on society. Perhaps perceiving society wearing his politician hat, Wong felt that the study of history can and should be applied for the benefit of Singapore. In a speech on the purpose of a new history syllabus for primary school in 1970, he noted that 'the pragmatic reason for introducing the teaching of history in schools is to promote common ideals of citizenship, to develop a sense of national identity, loyalty to the state, and to instil a sense of ownership of a piece of territory called country. The teaching of history is also aimed at inculcating a set of moral, social, and political values accepted by society'.[113] There was hence a distinct purpose to history and scholarship in general as perceived by the chairperson of *JSEAS*. To look beyond the obvious political overtones of his approach, the context of the times must be taken into consideration at this point.

Whereas Tregonning's Singapore of 1959 was perhaps more volatile but hopeful, Singapore after its separation from Malaysia in August 1965 left the island-state vulnerable. The acrimonious division had a strong communal overtone, casting doubts in the minds of the Malay minority in Singapore's multi-ethnic population. The impending withdrawal of the British military moreover had negative consequences for a fragile economy already threatened by regular labour unrest. Support moreover was still strong for the main opposition party, the Barisan Sosialis. Although in charge of a functioning government and economy in 1965, the leaders of the PAP could not be certain of unanimous support in a politically and socially divided country.

---

[113] "Telling the Singapore Story to Singaporeans", *ST*, 26/07/1970. Full speech published as "The New History Primary Syllabus: Purpose and Scope", *Journal of the Historical Society*, Singapore: University of Singapore Historical Society, 1970/71, pp.16-21.

That uncertainty was demonstrated in the relations with the University of Singapore. During the early 1960s, the PAP was suspicious of a university staffed by a fair number of expatriates and attended by supporters of the more conservative sections of society.[114] Tensions had existed between the nationalistic PAP government and the expatriate teaching community. The foremost example was the Enright Affair in 1960, when Dennis Enright supposedly criticised the PAP's cultural policies. In 1964, worried about left-wing dissidents entering university, the government enforced the Suitability Certificate, whereby suspected students were barred from university education. The fallout of this issue indirectly led to the resignation of Vice-Chancellor B. R. Sreenivasan in 1963.[115]

Teaching staff also began to take sides. In 1964, several local staff (Malaysian at point in time) broke away from the Academic Staff Association (ASA) to form the Kesatuan Akademis Universiti Singapura (KUAS). Wong Lin Ken was one of the founders of KUAS and was allegedly rather anti-expatriate.[116] Chiang Hai Ding also (allegedly) remarked that 'it was against [his] moral principles to join any organisation that allowed expatriates to be members'.[117]

Hence, during the period when the Department decided to change the journal's title, there were strong nationalistic feelings amongst the intellectual elite, perhaps driven by feelings of vulnerability and the consequent necessities for survival. Turnbull, a long-

---

[114] Puccetti, "Authoritarian", p.224. Generally speaking, the PAP's main base of support came from the Chinese-speaking Chinese – ably harnessed by Lim Chin Siong and Fong Swee Suan, and not the English-speaking Chinese.
[115] Ibid., pp.224-225; also see Lee and Tan, *Beyond Degrees*, pp.129-133.
[116] Ibid., p.235, fn44. Apparently, Wong had fears that expatriates could still dominate with a minority within the union.
[117] Ibid., p.236, fn48.

time teaching member of the Department and one of few remaining expatriates, recalled it was rather uncomfortable living in Singapore by the late 1960s, hence easing her decision to leave the university in 1971.[118]

As noted earlier, the university was also harnessed by Vice-Chancellor Toh for national development purposes. The vagaries of academic freedom were decidedly not conducive to nation-building. Wong himself had suggested in a speech on the role of intellectuals and the university in Singapore, that academic freedom should be considered in the context of a country looking to survive, in a sense implying that sometimes such freedoms should laid aside for the better of the nation.[119]

Seen together with the contemporary focus of *JSEAS*, the immediate context of Singapore lent a more practical element to Wong's approach to history. *JSEAS*' stated purpose indirectly reflected the purpose of history in Singapore going into the 1970s. A former teaching member of the Department remembers Wong trying to encourage "contemporary history", changing the attitude that 'only events more than [fifty] years old were respectable history'.[120] For instance, he actively encouraged honours students to research political history for their academic exercises.[121] Out of sixty-nine submitted academic exercises from 1970 to 1979, twenty-eight focused on elections and the various components of governance and nation-building.[122]

---

[118] Turnbull, NAS interview.
[119] "The Intelligentsia in a Nation of Immigrants", *ST*, 29/07/1966.
[120] "Singapore varsity to place new stress on history", *ST*, 01/04/1969.
[121] Lee. Personal communication to author.
[122] *Researching History: List of Academic Exercises (Honours)–1970s*, http://citizenhistorian.com/2008/04/01/researching-history-list-of-academic-exercises-1970s/. Accessed 24/05/2008.

Wong also had a rather centric view of Singapore's position in the region. He noted as early as 1967 that the 'course of history in South-east Asia will also be influenced by the way in which countries of the region regard and accept the contribution which Singapore can make towards the economic development of the area'.[123] This seemingly nationalistic tendency harkens back to Bastin's earlier concerns over the distortion of history for nationalistic purposes.

Wong however was an internationally recognised historian and cannot be easily accused of misrepresenting history. Indeed, he placed greater weight on the integrity of scholarship than trying to uncover Asia-centric perspectives or nationalistic histories. Reviewing *Southeast Asian History and Historiography*, Wong argued for the integrity of scholarship, rather than the pursuit of an Asian-centric history, recognising that centricity was the result of choice of subject and the use of sources, of which western sources were sometimes the only ones readily available. He also took a pragmatic view of the debates concerning history and the social sciences, stating that the "historian should get on with their researches, and not be paralysed by debate.[124]

A former editor describes Wong's idea of history as "participant history", in the sense that in the absence of documentary evidence, historians must be willing to immerse themselves in all possible experiences of the object of their study.[125] This is perhaps another "third way" akin to Smail's autonomous history. For instance, in order to write

---

[123] "On Our Part in S-EA History", *ST*, 08/06/1967.
[124] Wong Lin Ken, Review of *Southeast Asian History and Historiography: Essays Presented to D.G.E. Hall*, (eds.) C.D. Cowan and O.W. Wolters, *JSEAS* 8(2), 1976, pp.236-237. Wong also noted the lack of Southeast Asian contributors, and wondered whether "Southeast Asian conditions were not conducive towards scholarship", as scholars "are drawn into the service of the nation" or "overwhelmed by political, economic, and other circumstances."
[125] Yong Mun Cheong. E-mail to author. 04/02/2008.

political history, one has to participate in politics in order to relate and empathise with past political experiences; to write economic history, one has to understand economics and statistics; to understand the working class, one has to empathise with them – similar to James Warren's attempts to [re-]discover the hardships of rickshaw coolies.[126]

Experience then could overcome somewhat if not completely, the shortfall in documentary sources the historian relies on. Wong had urged his fellow academics to step out of the academic "vacuum" and to be wary of "concepts and principles" which may not be applicable to the "realities of Singapore and Asia". He went on to suggest that 'participation in…decision-making process based on the facts of life will help to overcome' the tendency to think 'in a kind of vacuum'.[127]

There is no evidence that Wong tried to exert influence on the intellectual scope of *JSEAS*, aside from his role in creating the journal in 1970. So in that sense, the articles published in *JSEAS* were completely up to the decisions of individual editors, the whims of the academic market, or both. On the other hand, the new purpose as stated in *JSEAS* 1(1) does shed some light on how history was perceived after the title-change – which seemingly relegated the historical discipline in importance. History most assuredly did not die, but its purpose was adjusted to meet the changing situation of post-1965 Singapore.

[126] James Warren, *At the edge of Southeast Asian history: essays*, Quezon City: New Day Publishers, 1987, p.xv.
[127] "Step out of vacuum into the hurly-burly world of politics, dons urged", *Sunday Times*, 07/09/1969.

SCHOLARSHIP AND CONTEXT

The above has paid close attention to the intellectual and institutional context surrounding the initial and subsequent evolution of *JSEAH* and *JSEAS*' objectives. Scholarship does not happen in a vacuum, neither does it respond only to the perceived dominant intellectual trends its respective fields and disciplines. As the origins of both journals illustrate, the basis of scholarship – or the search and organisation of knowledge – may not necessarily be linked solely to intellectual currents, but also the institutional requirements of the time, individual initiative and local conditions. It would be interesting to further explore how historians and scholars in general balance their presumed intellectual obligations with arguably more pragmatic needs of developing Southeast Asian nation-states in the aftermath of war and colonialism.

International Sociological Association

e-bulletin

Interview with Professor Gavin W. Jones

Interview by Dr. Sarbeswar Sahoo
sarbeswarjnu@yahoo.co.in

Gavin Jones is a professor at the Asia Research Institute and the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, National University of Singapore. He has followed an academic career closely linked with consultancy assignments in the areas of population and development, educational planning and urban planning. After completing his Ph.D degree at the Australian National University, Canberra in 1966, he joined the Population Council, where he worked first in New York, then in Thailand and Indonesia, before returning to Australia. He was with the Demography and Sociology Program at the Australian National University for 28 years, serving as head of program for six years. He has been Population Council Advisor to the National Economic Development Board, Bangkok, Thailand (1969-72); Short-term Advisor to Ministry of Planning and Employment, Colombo, Ceylon (1969-70); and Consultant to the Ministry of Population and Environment, Jakarta, Indonesia (1985-86). At various periods, he has also been consultant to the World Bank, Ford Foundation, Population Council, United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Population Fund, United Nations Centre for Human Settlements, Australian Development Assistance Bureau, and the International Labour Organization. He is the Editor of the journal *Asian Population Studies* (Singapore), and has been in the Editorial Board of a number of prestigious academic journals such as *Journal of Population Research* (Canberra)*; Population Research and Policy Review* (U.S.A); *Pakistan Development Review* (Islamabad); and *International Family Planning Perspectives* (New York). Besides this, he has written and edited several books and published articles in various esteemed international journals (arigwj@nus.edu.sg).

Sarbeswar Sahoo is a Visiting Fellow in the Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore. His research interests include Civil Society and Democratization, Hindu Nationalism, and the Politics of Neo-liberal Globalization. His articles have appeared in *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism; Journal of Comparative Social Welfare;* and *Journal of Contemporary Asia* (forthcoming).

SARBESWAR SAHOO (SS): Prof. Jones, thank you very much for agreeing to give this interview. Let me begin by asking you about your academic training as an undergraduate and graduate student. Could you please tell us something about your experience?

Prof. GAVIN W. JONES (GWJ): Well, I did my undergraduate training in a small university in Australia: the University of New England. I did honours in Economics there, then worked for a year as a tutor in Economics before I went on to do my Ph.D. I did not do a Masters; it was sometimes possible to go straight from an honours degree to a Ph.D in that point. So that's what I did. I went from there to Canberra to the Australian National University (ANU) where there was a department of Demography, because I found that was more interested in population and demography, which of course you can come to from different backgrounds like Sociology, Statistics, Economics, Anthropology, etc. The topic of my thesis at ANU was the growth of Malaysia's labour-force. Jack Caldwell, who was later to become an internationally renowned demographer, had recently finished his Ph.D there on the population of Malaysia. He said 'I have covered the population of Malaysia, why don't you move on to use your economic background to work on the labour force?' And that's what I did.

SS: What exactly motivated you to do demography or population studies?

GWJ: The interest grew over time. I remember a geography lecturer who taught about population geography, and that interested me quite a lot. At that time in the early 1960s, the concern about rapid population in many parts of the world was building up. A big gap had opened up between the fertility and mortality rates. Mortality rates had been brought down sharply by medical advances and public health programs. But fertility norms take time to adjust to altered survival prospects. This seemed an important area to be looking at from a policy point of view and also from a theoretical point of view.

SS: Could you please tell us something about your graduate school experience?

GWJ: Well, it was a very international group at the Australian National University. I think we had three Australians out of about fifteen Ph.D students in that group. They were from all over the world – from various parts of Asia, Africa, and one or two from Europe. I did take some graduate Economics courses while I was doing my Ph.D with a view to keeping a foot in Economics, although later in my career I have tended to move into more sociological approaches to things. We were allowed to do fieldwork. I spent six months on fieldwork in Malaysia which at that time included Singapore as well. I had a very interesting time in the fieldwork and of course in writing up afterwards. The Australian Ph.D was very British. There was no coursework involved.

SS: What motivated you to work on Malaysia and Malaysian labour-force?

GWJ: It was sort of accessible and, as I mentioned earlier, Jack Caldwell, who had just worked on Malaysia, encouraged me to carry on from where he had left off. So there were rather pragmatic reasons that led me to work on Malaysia.

SS: So, what were the demographic problems in Malaysia that time?

GWJ: It was not so much that there were demographic problems, it was a matter of understanding what was going on. Malaysia was not particularly densely populated but it did have rapid population growth. But you would not put it in that category of countries that you might think of as being in a crisis situation because of rapid population growth.

Throughout my career I have found demography to be interesting even if there are no crises to deal with, just in terms of the dynamics and changing structures that link to society in a more general way, and the developmental aspects are very important. And from that point of view Malaysia was a very interesting study. For example, as a part of my thesis I did a small survey in very small towns up and down the west coast of Peninsular Malaysia to find out what the employment structure was like in those small towns. I did that because there was no good data available on that.

SS: You mentioned that you spent six months doing fieldwork in Malaysia. What kind of fieldwork did you do – qualitative or quantitative?

GWJ: It was more quantitative. I collected a lot of data from the Labour Departments in Singapore and Kuala Lumpur. I went to Sarawak and Sabah as well. So a lot of it was collecting quantitative data, including the small survey I did in the small towns. But at the same time I was travelling around and observing a lot, and gaining broader impressions of society and of the country. I think the discussions with people that I met and mixed with over that time were a very important part of my understanding, so I suppose there was a qualitative dimension but not in an ethnographic sense.

SS: You said that you have been trained as an Economist and then as a demographer; you also did a little bit of fieldwork, which is Anthropological

although not very Ethnographic. Also you mentioned that you have followed sociological approaches in your studies on demography. So, how do you think these four disciplines – Economics, Demography, Anthropology, and Sociology – are related to each other?

GWJ: I have increasingly come to the view that social sciences should be approached more broadly. The barriers that we raise between disciplines are often quite obstructive of useful research. Through my own experience I find it very hard to say at this point "what is this piece of research that I am doing? Is this Sociology? Is this demography or Economics?" I think the boundaries are (and should be) very porous. So the more we can take a rather broader approach to social sciences, the better.

Demography is often not considered as a "real" discipline. In most American Universities it is part of Sociology Departments. In some parts of the world, it's part of Economics. There are almost no departments of demography in the world. I think our department at the ANU was the only department of demography as such at that point. So demography is one department that will be aware of its links with other disciplines. If you look at the core of demography it is very statistical. For myself, I have always been an applied demographer, a social demographer, interested in the application of demography to other issues.

SS: Would you then advocate for a very interdisciplinary kind of social sciences rather than having rigid disciplinary boundaries between social sciences?

GWJ: Well, I don't think you can do away with the disciplinary departments totally. But a lot of universities these days have a school of social sciences or school of humanities and social sciences, which you didn't have in the past. You had these departments existing independently. The idea behind schools of social sciences is that these are a family of disciplines that do interact to a great deal. I think in terms of teaching, here at the National University of Singapore (NUS), you have a lot of taking of courses across departments. But you could have courses (for example, in Statistics and some of the theoretical and methodological areas) without referring necessarily to any particular discipline. On the other hand, the sociologists tend to use a different set of statistical tools and approaches than the psychologists and economists. Then there are very discipline-specific ways of doing research. So developing courses that would appeal across the social sciences is a challenge.

SS: I think one of my understandings is that what differentiate these disciplines are their theories and their methods. But these theories and methods are becoming very interdisciplinary because we talk about many different aspects and all these different aspects are very interrelated. In this sense, at some point we should be very interdisciplinary and at some point we should be rigid about the disciplinary boundaries. What would you like to say about it? In a sense, how would we differentiate the disciplines?

GWJ: That is a difficult question. For example, if you look at the labour market, demography is important in that the labour supply has been generated by demographic forces, and demographers are good at looking at factors influencing differential labour force participation across sub-groups. Sociology is also important in examining reasons why potential workers may be in the job market or not. On the demand side, the Economists come into their own in examining the forces that are influencing the labour absorption in different sectors. But sociologists can also contribute understanding about the role of social networks, for example in the job search process. If we want a holistic understanding of labour markets, all these things are interrelated.

Each discipline develops its own sets of theories and concepts. But I think it would be very desirable to look across the boundaries. It would be nice if more Economists knew about Bourdieu, and if more sociologists knew how economists deal with utility theory. There are techniques that are used in Economic research that perhaps could be made more use of in Sociology. A lot of theory does become very discipline specific and that sometimes is problematic. Even the language (jargon) becomes discipline specific. I don't see economists talking constantly of everything being a "site of" something or "interrogating" everything. In different disciplines you have periods where particular approaches take over, for example post-modernism.

SS: If I may ask you how much of influence Sociology has had in your life and academic training what would you say?

GWJ: It is not so much the discipline of Sociology per se, which I've never been trained in. I think in my career over time I have become more dissatisfied with some of the economic approaches to understanding reality. I have come to see that sociological perspectives and anthropological perspectives for that matter have a great deal of bearing on the issues. So it has not been so much a choice of one discipline over the other, but rather of dealing with particular issues using the approaches that seem relevant. For example, in understanding the low fertility in the East Asian region I think you need perspectives from various disciplines. It is partly an economic matter, influenced by the way the economy functions these days, but it also has to do with changes in norms and relationships in the family.

SS: Given the political situation in Southeast Asia did you have any problem doing fieldwork in Malaysia?

GWJ: No, not really. Actually, it was a long time ago and I am embarrassed to say that it was not necessary to get the sorts of permissions that you get these days. I just blundered in and started doing things and nobody stopped me doing them. If I look back now it was a lot easier for me. But on the political side it was the time of confrontation between Indonesia and Malaysia. I did have one incident when I was in Sarawak on a boat going up to the Rejang River and we hit another small boat in the fog near the bank. Happily nobody was hurt. There were military things happening on a fairly small scale between Indonesia and Malaysia at that stage. Otherwise there were no problems doing fieldwork.

I had contacts of people in Malaysia through professors at the ANU and I contacted those people and they were very helpful including Professor Ungku Aziz who headed the Economics department at the University of Malay at that time. It was fairly easy to do fieldwork at that time.

SS: What did you do after finishing your Ph.D?

GWJ: Well, I went off to New York to join the Population Council. This was a foundation which was largely funded by the Rockefeller Foundation and Ford Foundation, and was working on population issues. It had three divisions at that time – the Demographic division, the Technical Assistance division, and the Biomedical division. The Biomedical division dealt with the development of contraceptive devices; the Technical Assistance division worked with countries in developing family planning programmes; and the Demographic division, where I was based, was dealing with demographic research and understanding of what was going on. At that time, as I said, everyone was very concerned about the very rapid population growth.

I was lucky because the Population Council was a well reputed organization and the demographic work being done there was good. It linked quite closely with the top demography programs in the U.S in particular, like Princeton and Michigan. You got to meet all the top demographers around and for me, as a young researcher (like a post-doc), it was a great experience.

SS: How did you manage to get there?

GWJ: Demography is a relatively small field around the world and the head of my department in Canberra had been a visiting fellow at Princeton and knew the leading U.S demographers. He put me in contact with the Population Council and they were looking for somebody like me at that time and it worked out. So I was offered a position there. The work was partly managing projects but partly also doing research of a quite interesting kind. For example, I worked on a paper on Roman Catholic fertility and contraception, pulling together the available data, which showed that, when you controlled for various background variables, there was hardly any difference between Catholics and non-Catholics in various countries in their use of contraception, despite the Church's strictures about it.

SS: How many years did you spend there?

GWJ: I spent almost three years in New York. I was at the Council for 10 years but I went off to Thailand and Indonesia under the Council auspices. In Thailand I went as a consultant to the National Economic Development Board. (It did not have "Social" in its name at that time). For some years, they had been considering formulating a population policy of some kind because population growth was very rapid at that time. They wanted somebody to come and work with them on a proposal to put to the Cabinet. It was a wonderful opportunity for me to work with Thai colleagues in developing a proposal for such a policy, to be considered by the Cabinet. Of course, it had to go through various drafts, with interesting debates along the way, but finally in 1970 it was adopted by the government and became official policy. The key objective was to get the birthrate down. Prior to that, some in government had continued to be very pro-natalist, believing that it was a good thing to have more and more population.

When the policy was adopted, they decided to set up a small population unit within the National Economic Development Board. I was asked to come back and work with that unit and I worked there for about two years.

SS: And how was your experience in Indonesia?

GWJ: That was again under Population Council auspices. The University of Indonesia had a Demographic Institute and they wanted to develop the discipline of demography across Indonesia. So I was asked to go and work with them in developing a programme and helping to teach it. We brought lecturers from the State Universities to Jakarta for a five-month training programme and then they went back to develop demography in their own universities. So, each of these State Universities had the mandate to set up a Demographic Institute or Lembaga Demografi as it was called there. Of course some of them remained very weak and did not go anywhere and others did grow quite well. That was what we had expected – the idea was to get them established everywhere and see what happened.

The director of the Demographic Institute felt that there needed to be a national fertility-mortality survey, because there were no good data for analysis at that point. You would expect that a big survey like that would have to be done by the Department of Statistics in any country, but he took it on himself to do it out of a university programme. And how he managed to do it was to involve all the lecturers from regional universities who had been trained to run it in their province, using their students as enumerators. We ran a survey that totalled about 52,000 respondents, and was representative of the main islands of Java, Sumatra and Sulawesi, 80 percent of the country.

It was a fascinating experience for me. I travelled all over Sumatra helping with the training of the supervisors, distributing funds, etc. This rather ambitious undertaking, while of course it had its shortcomings, produced a set of data on which we did quite a lot of analysis. It helped to really establish what was going on demographically in Indonesia.

SS: How do you think your work with the Population Council helped you in the growth of your academic career?

GWJ: I was lucky, to be honest, because being there in New York you had access to a lot of data from all over the world coming out of various surveys. These days it is fairly easy to access data on the internet but at that time it was not; and access to data was very important. So I think I was lucky both in access to data and in the contacts with the leading demographers. It certainly helped my career. For example, I wrote a book at that time about the impact of declining fertility on the attainment of educational goals. Sponsored by the Population Council, I went to Paris and talked with the UNESCO and the International Institute for Educational Planning, and that helped me move ahead with the book. I had a lot of good opportunities for research. If I had taken a position in a university somewhere I just would not have had that kind of access. So, I think I was very fortunate in that way.

SS: What did you do after your job at the Population Council?

GWJ: Well, after that I decided to go back to Australia. I had children growing up then and I thought they should probably know what country they were from. So I took a position in the demography programme back at the Australian National University. I worked there for 28 years, but quite a bit of that time was spent in Southeast Asia in one way or another. I had over a year teaching at the University of Malaya; at one stage I worked with the Ministry of Population and Environment in Indonesia for over a year; and I had various other research projects and consultancies.

SS: Could you please tell us something about your teaching and research experience during the 28 years at the ANU?

GWJ: We did not do any undergraduate teaching at all. The only teaching that I did was at the Master's level and I supervised over 30 Ph.D candidates. The teaching side was great because the classes were very international; quite a small proportion of students were Australians. There were scholarships available at that time from the U.N and also from the Australian Development Assistance Bureau which could bring students from Southeast Asian countries and African countries to study demography. Jack Caldwell, who I mentioned before, was now Head of Department and very famous in Africa as he had done a lot of research there. So, we got an unusual number of students from Africa who were attracted by the fact that he was at ANU.

On the research side, I branched out a lot there from what I had done with the Population Council, because at the Population Council the focus was very much on problems of rapid population growth, high fertility, etc. At the ANU, there was a very strong interest in Indonesia, and some very good research going on. I welcomed the chance to branch out in my Indonesian research. For example, I wrote a paper on Religion and Education in Indonesia. It was looking at the historical data from the Dutch colonial Census of 1930 and also the more recent data, with a focus on how the colonial experience and religious diversity affected where education progressed more or less rapidly, and all the dynamics that went along with that. I also did quite a bit of work on labour markets in Indonesia, urbanization and things like that.

SS: You also did a lot of consultancies during that time. Could you please tell us something about that experience?

GWJ: Yes, I did a lot of different consultancies at different stages. A lot of these were related to population policy issues but then there were other things too. For example, I worked with the National Urban Development Strategy Project in Indonesia which was looking at the whole field of urban planning in Indonesia. Then there was another large project funded by the Australian Development Assistance Bureau (AUSAID) on population research relevant for development planning in eastern Indonesia, which is where the Indonesian government asked Australian aid projects to be focused. That was an interesting one because it was truly collaborative research between the Australian researchers from the ANU and the Indonesian researchers from the National Institute of Sciences (LIPI). We did joint fieldwork on a number of different projects related to maternal and child health, to educational advance, to environmental issues and to other issues in eastern Indonesia. That went on for some years and I liked that project a lot. We produced the reports normally in both languages – Indonesian and English. I think it was a good model but unfortunately, as far as I know, this was the only such research project that AUSAID ever funded.

SS: Most of your research work is very much relevant to policy. How do you think this kind of research has implications for the governments and other agencies in this part of the world?

GWJ: Well, I suppose that has always been my interest, doing development related research that does have some implications for policy. The implications of such research are there but they are not always picked up by the governments and by the agencies. The trick is how to package the research findings in a way that government planners can pick them up and work with them. There is a problem of communication between the researchers and the planners. Even where the research is supposed to be directed to planning, it usually has little impact. Frequently, the researchers say “here are the findings” and at the end they just throw in policy implications almost as an afterthought. The policy implications are very superficial and not very specific. So the planners do not pick them up and there is no real dialogue between the researchers and the planners. In our Eastern Indonesia project we had annual workshops with the planners to overcome this problem.

SS: In Sociology there is a distinction between policy-oriented research and pure academic research, and it seems to be most often the case that pure academic research is highly regarded. What would be your opinion about this distinction?

GWJ: Yes, the way the universities reward research tend to be very much focused on its theoretical or methodological contribution and applied research tends to get a lower ranking. Also in more highbrow environments there is frequently the attitude that people who do the kind of applied research on development issues must therefore necessarily be of lower quality. In my experience that’s not always the case. I was fortunate that a lot of my career was not in the universities. I was not having to wonder constantly whether the kind of research that I was doing was going to earn me enough brownie points to get the next promotion or whatever.

But, young researchers now coming in to the universities definitely have to be thinking constantly about that. I think it does mean that there is a downplaying of applied research, although that kind of research is very much needed to guide policy. It is a good thing when established researchers with strong reputations get into applied research because of an interest and concern about issues; because they are established figures, there tends to be a degree of acceptance of their findings and arguments.

SS: I would now like to ask you that after spending 28 years at the ANU why did you decide to come to Singapore.

GWJ: Well, I had never liked the idea of settling back and warming the chair in one place until retirement. Then there were a number of professional and personal reasons. A former colleague of mine, Prof. Anthony Reid, who had been recruited by NUS to set up the Asia Research Institute, contacted me and said that he wanted to have a research cluster on Changing Families in Asia and asked whether I would be interested in heading that up. That appealed both because it is one of the real areas of interest that I have and also because Singapore is a good location for the research I do. I had to go Bangkok the other day to do some work; you can travel in the morning and get a fairly full day’s work in, but if you are travelling from Canberra to Bangkok it is a major expedition by the time you get there. On a personal level, I was remarrying and my wife is Indonesian, so Singapore was a good location for us.

SS: You have been heading the Changing Families in Asia cluster since 2003. Could you please tell us something about the cluster and the kind of research that you are involved in there?

GWJ: One of the things we look at is the rising age of marriage in East and Southeast Asia, and the increasing proportion of people who never marry. We try to understand what is going on, and also look at the enormous difference between these patterns and the South Asian patterns which remain more traditional in its marriage arrangement.

We have looked at other aspects of marriage as well. We brought out a book from one workshop on "Muslim-Non-Muslim Marriage in Southeast Asia". We are doing a research project on international marriage including the recruitment of brides from countries like Vietnam through agencies. That has become more common in more developed countries in the region like Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and Singapore.

We have covered a wide area. Last year we organized an Inter-Asian Roundtable which we called "Gender Relations in 21st Century Asian Family". That sounds a bit presumptuous but anyway it was an attempt to bring researchers from East, Southeast, and South Asia together to discuss some issues on which researchers from these different regions tend not to be communicating with each other. It was a very stimulating discussion. This year we are organizing a large conference on "Economic Stress and the Family" – not only stress through crisis situations like the global economic crisis but also more "normal" stresses resulting from poverty. In addition, we are organizing one on divorce in Asia, another on fatherhood issues, and one on domestic violence.

SS: In your last 45 years of research how would explain the changing population and demographic structure of Southeast Asia?

GWJ: It has been truly revolutionary. Recently I was in Bangkok and discussing whether Thailand should be adopting pro-natalist policies. When I first went to work in Thailand the issue was exactly the opposite – the need to have anti-natalist policies because the birth rate was so high. Over 40 years the situation has totally changed. Fertility came down – it went to replacement, then below replacement and now well below.

But while the whole situation has changed, over time planners have found it difficult to change their ideas. In some of these countries family planning programs were promoted for 30 years or more. Indonesia is a good example. It is quite hard for governments who have been doing that to change. You get bureaucracies built up. One thing I have written about recently is the delay in adapting policies to the changing circumstances, and you see that throughout East Asia. Singapore was the first case – fertility went below replacement, but it took 15 years before policies were changed. Korea, Taiwan, China – they all had long delays before reversing the goals of policy, and China has still not done so.

SS: What could be the reasons for the declining fertility rate in Singapore?

GWJ: The key is the changing situation of women in the changing economy. These days you have high levels of education for women, a lot of opportunities for them in the workforce, but it's a workforce situation that is not very friendly towards combining work and family. Consumerism and changing expectations mean that there is a felt need for two income families and in any case women want to be in the workforce, they want those opportunities. But they do find it hard in the circumstances to combine fulltime work with child-raising. The traditional attitudes about male role in the household remain. Even where both spouses are working fulltime, the housework and child-raising activities tends to be done by the women.

So married women are not having many children, and as well as this, many women are not marrying. In Singapore, cohabitation is perhaps becoming more acceptable, but having children in cohabiting relationship is not. So marriage is still the "gatekeeper" to having children, and where marriage is being delayed that is going to have a fairly big impact on fertility. Then along with colleagues like Paulin Straughan, I argue that raising a "successful" child is also an important thing for Singaporeans. There are strong pressures on parents to raise children who are succeeding academically and in other ways, but these are extra pressures on parents and they work against people deciding to have children. And then of course there is the financial cost. I think those are the most important factors, not just in Singapore but also in the East Asian countries.

SS: You have edited a book on Muslim and Non-Muslim Marriage in Southeast Asia. Could you please say something about it?

GWJ: The book examines the issues, in the countries of Southeast Asia, when a Muslim and a non-Muslim want to get married but do not want to change their religion. If the non-Muslim decides to become a Muslim of course it is not a problem for them to marry. But what about where they each want to maintain their religion? This is impossible in Malaysia, and possible but very controversial in Indonesia. The book examines legal and political controversies surrounding this issue, and the human costs of the present unclear situation.

SS: Migration seems to be a very important issue in Singaporean context. What kind of relationship you think exists between migration and the population structure in Singapore and what kind of implications it has for the society?

GWJ: Well, this is a hot political issue too. If you look at the National Day speeches over the years, you can trace changes in government thinking. A few years ago the Prime Minister more or less acknowledged that there does not seem to be any way they are going to succeed in raising the fertility rate much. And if that is the case there will have to be substantial levels of in-migration – just to keep the population and labour force from declining. But Singapore is also, like many other countries, looking at the human capital aspect of migration. Singapore is a small country, there are going to be some particular skill needs, which can best be met by immigration. But they are competing with many other countries that are having the same view and competing to attract skilled migrants from the same international "pool".

But, in the Singapore context it is complicated by the need to bring in labour migrants in the lower-skilled end to work in construction work and in domestic service. These migrants are in a strange situation in Singapore society. When you study the family in Singapore, the labour migrants are "invisible" – they have no family in Singapore, but they do have family relationships back where they come from. And of course many of them would love to form families in Singapore, but this option is denied them.

SS: Do you think culture has anything to do with the low fertility rate in Singapore or East/Southeast Asian context?

GWJ: I think we often use culture as a grab-bag when we really don't know what's going on. I have written quite a bit about the Malay and Chinese fertility differences in the region. These are partly explained by economic factors, but political and institutional factors are also important. Culture is certainly not irrelevant to the low fertility among the Chinese – the strong emphasis on economic success, children's success and so on, and these sorts of things are not compatible with large families. But institutional factors play a role – for example, in Malaysia the effect of the NEP in restricting career opportunities for the Chinese in government and the universities, and so reinforcing the tradition of focusing on business and economic success. If you look at differences in fertility rates between the Chinese and the Malays in Singapore, the same factors are certainly impinging on everybody but the way they affect fertility does differ between the different groups – but partly because of their different economic situation, not just because of their culture. The Malay rates have come down a lot recently to below replacement again.

SS: What kind of policy advices will you give to deal with the population problems that the countries in Southeast Asia are facing currently?

GWJ: Southeast Asia has a range of situations/circumstances. There are countries like the Philippines and Cambodia where there is still a great need to lower fertility rates; then there are countries like Indonesia, Malaysia and Vietnam that are just above the replacement level. That's a fairly comfortable position to be in but you have to keep an eye on what is happening and what policy changes you might need to make it stop going down. I was in Vietnam last week and I was making a case that if Vietnam looks at what has been happening in other East Asian countries it would be sensible at this point to begin modifying the policies that have been in place for a long time. But a lot of the planners do not see that.

In Thailand, where fertility has gone a long way below replacement and in Singapore, I think if the government wants the fertility to go up to anywhere near replacement level they have to be pretty serious about their policies and approaches. One need is to partly cover the financial expenses of child bearing but frankly policies will never be able to pump enough money into families to go anywhere near offsetting the full cost of raising children. Other policies have to do with making the workplace more family-friendly; better maternity leave; better child care leave; and then modifying the attitudes of employers and husbands. I think without those modifications success will be limited.

The Scandinavian countries have been fairly successful in keeping fertility rates up. Singapore planners have certainly looked at their approaches, but I doubt that you can really adopt Scandinavian style family policy without adopting a more Scandinavian style welfare system. I do not think that Singapore is about to do that, so I wonder how relevant these Scandinavian policies are to the Singapore context. Each country has to consider its own circumstances and work out the policies on that basis.

SS: Thank you. It was very nice talking with you.