

## CONTESTING ANGLO-AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL HEGEMONY IN PUBLICATION<sup>1</sup>

**GORDON MATHEWS**

*Department of Anthropology*

*The Chinese University of Hong Kong*

### ABSTRACT

This article explores the situation of non-native-English-speaking anthropologists in an increasingly globalizing and English-hegemonic academic world. I first discuss “the audit culture” and how it has shaped the contemporary academic world in terms of publication. I then examine the nature of academic knowledge in terms of the sciences and the humanities, and explore the differences between these different kinds of endeavors in terms of their production of global knowledge. I then consider anthropology in particular, and look at the nature and politics of language usage within the discipline. Finally, I examine the strategies that anthropologists in non-English-language societies use in order to convey their findings outside the reach of “the audit culture,” and consider the implications of this for anthropology at large in a new era of globalization. Can Anglo-American hegemony be ended? Certainly not at the low point of the present, but perhaps this day is coming.

In this article, I examine how non-native-English-speaking anthropologists find ways to avoid the hegemony of English, to present their work in their own languages and to their own audiences. Across the globe, English has become the

<sup>1</sup>This article is based on a paper presented at the Association of Social Anthropologists of the UK and Commonwealth (ASA) Biennial Conference 2012, New Delhi, 4 April 2012.

dominant language of academic publishing, and academics in many societies are “left with almost no choice but to publish in English in order to obtain international recognition” (Genç & Bada, 2010: 142; see also Crystal, 2003). This is because of the wave of globalization and managerialism that has swept over universities around the world over the past 20 years, causing universities to become increasingly concerned about obtaining high global rankings, in part through having their professors publish in English in prestigious venues. But there is a price to be paid for publishing in English—whereas in the hard sciences, knowledge can be thought of as global, in the humanities and social sciences, including anthropology, knowledge tends to be national and local in import. Thus when scholars publish in English and not in their own native languages, they may be denying knowledge of their findings to those who are most interested in those findings, and could most benefit from them.

I begin this article by discussing “the audit culture” and how it has shaped the contemporary academic world, not least in terms of publication. I then consider the nature of academic knowledge in terms of the sciences and the humanities, and explore the differences between these. I then turn to anthropology, and consider the nature and politics of language usage within the discipline. Finally, I examine the strategies that anthropologists in non-English-language societies use in order to convey their findings to people outside the reach of “the audit culture,” and consider the implications of this for the discipline of anthropology at large in a new era of globalization.

### **“THE AUDIT CULTURE” AND CONTEMPORARY UNIVERSITIES**

Universities across the globe are increasingly reacting to the forces of globalization, forces they ignore at their own peril (Lindsay & Blanchett, 2011; Nelson & Wei, 2012; Odin & Manicas, 2004; Sidhu, 2006). Universities around the world can no longer look inward, but must respond to the internationalization of their student bodies, and also to increased pressure to be rated highly within a common global arena.

A dominant transformation of the university in recent years has been its reshaping not as a community of scholars but as a corporation led by a chief executive and a phalanx of managers: higher education became transformed “from a collegial to a corporate enterprise. . . . Functionally, faculties began to adopt the role of corporate employees and students the role of full-fledged customers” (Margolis, 2004: 26–27). This movement first took place in Great Britain, as a part of Margaret Thatcher’s neoliberal efforts to roll back the role of the state in the early 1980s in public life, including the reshaping of British universities (Shore & Wright, 2000), on the basis of American theories of corporate management (Head, 2011). The ensuing “audit culture” of universities in the United Kingdom came to involve regular Research Assessment Exercises (REAs) evaluating research and Teaching Quality Assessments (TQAs) evaluating teaching, both involving much

paperwork, and, depending on the performance of a given university, the awarding or withholding of large amounts of money.

Thatcher's neoliberal reshaping of British universities eventually spread to various societies around the world, in accordance with the global ascendance of neoliberal capitalism from the Thatcher-Reagan era onward and its reshaping of institutions across the globe. The reshaping of universities took place first in societies under the sway of Great Britain, such as Australia, New Zealand (Shore, 2010), and Hong Kong (Lin, 2009), but has increasingly taken place in a range of societies across the globe, from societies across Europe (Dubiel, 2010), to Japan (Iwasaki, 2010), Korea (Goh, 2010; Kang, 2010), China (Li, 2010), and Mexico (Diaz, 2010), among many others. In all these societies, we see, in Dubiel's (2010: 62) words, "the university's mutation from a genuinely public to a commercial organization . . . an *institution* is becoming a *firm*"; in Diaz's (2010: 89) words, "the administrative management and accounting of workers' actions is in the process of overriding research and academic work." And in all of these societies, to a greater or lesser degree, this transformation has led to an increasing emphasis on publication in international journals (Diaz, 2010), which largely means publication in English rather than in one's own native language: "Self-declared 'global' universities, supposedly in competition with universities worldwide, now routinely demand that their faculty members contribute to internationally renowned journals, especially those in the United States, by awarding faculty more 'points' for the papers published there" (Kang, 2010: 210).

This process of the neoliberal reshaping of universities has been comparatively muted in the United States. This is in large part because many American universities are private, and need not directly answer to politicians and federal bureaucrats in their decisions. Beyond this, most public universities in the United States are under state control, and while these universities must worry greatly about budgets, there is no omnipotent national bureaucracy to which they must toe the line, measuring all university departments against one another, as is the case in the United Kingdom (Head, 2011). In their relative resistance to neoliberal managerialism, universities in the United States in a sense resemble some universities from the developing world, which for different reasons—their sheer lack of money—have avoided the neoliberal onslaught.

There may be some good as well as bad aspects to this transformation of universities. For academics who were previously underachieving, the new external pressure to perform might cause them to work harder than previously. For academics from non-native-English-speaking societies, the new incentives and pressures to publish in English may be beneficial to them; MacLellan (2009) has described the processes through which his Japanese informant "Noriko," an academic in the natural sciences, became over the course of years comfortable in delivering her findings to international conferences because of the pressure she was under to present and publish in English in a newly internationalizing, neoliberalizing, and managerializing Japanese university setting. Nonetheless, it seems

clear that overall, the negative effects of this new neoliberal managerialism are far more profound, in terms of the ever-tighter management of academic careers: the increasing inability of academics to follow their own intellectual paths; their need to toe the line and justify their existence on a vast array of forms to the demanding bureaucrats. A question that a number of critics have recently asked (Iwasaki, 2010; Shore, 2008) is this: why have academics been so slow to challenge this process? How did they let this happen? One reason, as Shore notes, is that the system can only be challenged collectively; if individual or individual institutions challenge it, then they will merely be seen as losers, and will indeed lose out in the all-important funding wars (Shore, 2008).

Aside from the bureaucratization of the academy, there is also the direct effect of the new forms of measurement on publication. Academics in the UK and elsewhere now typically publish for the purpose of scoring highly on the Research Assessment Exercise, which may determine not only their department's future budget but also their own individual academic fate (Shore, 2008). All modes of academic publication are basically treated as alike in these exercises, despite their differences, with "Key Performance Indicators" applying "as much to philosophy, ancient Greek, and Chinese history as . . . to physics, chemistry, and academic medicine" (Head, 2011: 4). Those who decide on the fate of departments and individuals typically have not read any of the work they judge: they are typically on large committees evaluating large numbers of departments and individuals simply on the basis of the academic prestige of the venues in which they have published. The fact that individual academics increasingly publish not because of their own desire to promulgate their research but because of the demands of the Research Assessment Exercise leads to more publications, but also, inevitably, to much more work of bad quality being published (Head, 2011). The refereeing process, whereby any work submitted for publication to an academic journal or book publisher is sent to two, three, or four or more experts in the field who evaluate its suitability for publication, is designed to winnow out works of low quality, and to lead to the revision of works of promise. However, this process is far from foolproof, particularly in the humanities and social sciences, where quality is not necessarily objectively measurable. (For a discussion of the referee system and its benefits and costs, see Mathews, 2010.)

In this process of measurement and judgment, articles are rendered generally preferable to books: since scholars are evaluated over a period of just a few years, and since articles take far less time than books to produce, it is safer to focus on articles. Generally speaking, safety and conformity are to be evaluated over risk-taking of any kind, since the latter might impede the all-important process of getting into print in journals that rank highly on citation indexes—because just one referee's negative evaluation may be enough to prevent one from getting into print, why take the chance of producing any work that is controversial, or anything other than conventional? In this way, scholarship is distorted, becoming, in the words of one scholar, "spirit-crushing" (Head, 2011: 7).

The United Kingdom emphasizes Research Assessment Exercises more than many other societies, in that in the UK the budgetary implications of a less than optimal score may be profound, leading to the destruction of academic departments (see Shore, 2008). But such assessment has become practiced in various ways in societies across the globe, leading to a massive push to publish in journals listed near the top of the citation indexes. This forces scholars to publish not in local or national venues, where their work in many disciplines might have the most impact, but in international venues, where it may be ignored. They are also largely forced to publish in English, the dominant language of publication (see Global Higher Ed., 2011). As scholars such as Canagarajah (2002) have discussed, this emphasis on English and on Western academic theorizing results in the marginalization of scholars from other discourse communities, particularly those from the developing world. Ironically, the emphasis on publishing in the academic center may lead to an increasing marginalization of those who are not from that center: as all the world's academics become more and more forced to play by Anglo-American academic norms, then those norms increase in importance, diminishing any knowledge that is outside them.

But before proceeding in this argument within the particular discipline of anthropology, let me discuss the nature of academic knowledge. For there is a significant difference in the implications of scientific knowledge as opposed to knowledge in the humanities and social sciences.

### **THE GLOBAL ACCUMULATION OF KNOWLEDGE**

In the hard sciences, knowledge is generally assumed to be universal. Chemistry, physics, engineering, or medicine will not fundamentally differ from place to place in their findings. The laws of physics or chemistry do not take on a different character in China and South Africa as opposed to the United States. Developments in medicine, or physics, or engineering are often made on a platform of expensive equipment. Western societies, as well as societies in East Asia, have the funding for such equipment in their universities, as well as for subscriptions to the expensive journals through which knowledge is spread. Universities in societies in Africa, South, Southeast, and Central Asia, and much of Latin America lack the money to enable the widespread accumulation of such knowledge. This is why, for example, Nobel Prize winners in chemistry, biology, physics, and medicine tend to be far more often from the United States, the United Kingdom, or Japan than from Pakistan, Nigeria, or Indonesia. That wealthy societies are better positioned to contribute to this global pool of knowledge than poorer societies is an inevitable consequence of the fact that the pursuit of knowledge requires money; this is unjust, but no more so than all the discrepancies between rich and poor societies that are so apparent in the world today.

However, in disciplines in the humanities and in some social sciences, the idea of a global arena of knowledge is less clear. Each different society has its own concerns; the study of literature, or history, or sociology, or anthropology will differ in universities from society to society. Knowledge is thus more particular than universal in focus. While the global pool of knowledge will indeed increase because of the different developments of knowledge in all these societies, there is no commonly agreed-upon basis of measurement for what is an advance in knowledge, other than the accumulation of data. A scholar of literature or history or anthropology in Nigeria or Kenya or India cannot easily be judged against a scholar of literature or history or anthropology in the United States, France, or Japan. Their intellectual concerns and theoretical apparatuses are likely to differ; who can confidently say which is better or worse as scholarship, the advancement of knowledge? The intellectual concerns and theoretical apparatuses used by scholars of social science and the humanities from wealthier societies may be matters of intellectual fashion rather than scientific paradigm, and thus comparing one presentation of knowledge against another is problematic. (This may be partially true of the hard sciences as well, with many scholars after Kuhn [1962] questioning the ultimate validity of scientific knowledge; but the difference between knowledge in the sciences as opposed to knowledge in the humanities remains fundamental, I think.)

Despite the distinctly regional character of their knowledge, however, knowledge in the humanities and social sciences is increasingly being measured on a common global framework in many parts of the world, as we have seen. This is not because these disciplines have become more like the sciences in the universality of the knowledge they discover; there has been no such theoretical advance. Rather, this is because universities across the world increasingly seek a global measure by which to evaluate their scholars and rise in increasingly influential worldwide rankings. This is done in part through global rankings of publication venues in citation indexes or other measures, whereby scholars' productivity and "worth" can be measured. A scholar who publishes an article in X journal based in the United Kingdom will typically be ranked as more worthy than a scholar who publishes in Y journal based in Accra or Bangkok or Buenos Aires, because X journal ranks higher on citation indexes than Y journal. There are exceptions to this geographical rule, but they are atypical. The fact that knowledge produced in the humanities and social sciences in different societies may be incommensurate doesn't matter in this game. Scholars from non-Western societies in the humanities and social sciences who seek to publish in highly rated venues must typically address theoretical concerns that are of interest to Western readers, but not to the worlds that these scholars themselves come from. Because of the increasing pressure to publish in top-ranked global venues in much of the world, the arts and social sciences are becoming Westernized and Americanized, in a new form of cultural imperialism.

In order to demonstrate more clearly how this is the case, let me now focus on one particular discipline, that of anthropology.

### **Anthropology and Cultural Imperialism**

Anthropology follows the broad trends outlined above, but, because it is a single discipline, enables a more specific examination. Across the globe, anthropologists, like academics in a range of other disciplines, are being rewarded or penalized for publishing or failing to publish in top-ranked journals as rated by citation indexing services. To see a wide range of these, one simply needs to Google “anthropology journal rankings” or “anthropology citation indexes.” One such index, largely typical of them all (SCImago Journal and Country Rank, 2012), shows that 14 of the top 20 cited journals are American. Twenty-seven of the top 50 are American, 35 of the top 50 are British or American; 39 of the top 50 are Canadian, Australian, British, or American; and 47 of the top 50 are Anglo-American or European. Only 3 of the top 50 are outside this Western orbit: one of these is from Japan and two are from India. This listing is a touch ambiguous, as are most such listings, since it mixes together cultural anthropology journals and physical anthropology journals—disciplines that are in the same departments in the United States, but in different departments in the United Kingdom and many other societies—but nonetheless clearly shows the broad trend: Journals based in native-English-speaking societies dominate journals based outside such societies, and more broadly, the West dominates the rest.

This is distinctly uncomfortable from an anthropological perspective. Lewis Henry Morgan and Edward Burnett Tylor were the founding fathers of cultural anthropology in the late 19th century, setting forth evolutionary schemas showing, in Morgan’s terms, the passage of societies around the world from “savagery” through “barbarism” to the eventual pinnacle of “civilization,” and designating Western societies, and particularly the United States and Great Britain, as the pinnacle of civilization, and all other societies as more or less trailing behind. Anthropologists have long intellectually transcended the idea that “West is best”; generations of anthropologists after Morgan and Tylor devoted themselves to repudiating their legacy. Today, perhaps the most sacrosanct term in anthropology is “cultural relativism,” the concept that one society cannot be judged as better or worse than another, since their cultural values are incommensurate. But in contrast to these *intellectual* shibboleths of anthropology, in the actual practice of the discipline, judging one society as better or worse than another is exactly what we now see, with many anthropologists across the globe seeking to publish in the American or Western center, largely in order to satisfy their own universities’ desires for higher international rankings. In this sense, “West” indeed remains “best”: Morgan and Tylor live on.

Because the anthropological journals in the center tend to use referees from the center to evaluate the different submissions they receive, authors from the anthropological periphery must intellectually conform to the intellectual fashions of the center. As Kuwayama (2004: 9–10) has argued,

The world system of anthropology defines the politics involved in the production, dissemination, and consumption of knowledge about other peoples and cultures. Influential scholars in the core [center] countries are in a position to decide what kinds of knowledge should be given authority and merit attention. The peer-review system at prestigious journals reinforces this structure. Thus, knowledge produced in the periphery, however significant and valuable, is destined to be buried locally unless it meets the standards and expectations of the core.

Foreign scholars who seek to be heard in the core are forced to adopt the discursive norms of the core, Kuwayama is saying. By and large, this means citing theorists from the Anglo-American center to justify their own research in societies seen as being at the anthropological periphery. This center is portrayed as the pinnacle to which all anthropologists should aspire, largely because the top-ranked journals come from this center, and its referees require that the theoretical contributions of this center be paid homage to.

This requirement of the center is likely to be largely unconscious. Referees from the center do not willfully seek to promulgate the center's dominance; rather, they simply reflect in their judgments the anthropology that they know, and that is the anthropology of the center. I have made the critique set forth in this article to various prominent anthropologists in the United States and the United Kingdom, and while some recognize its validity, others are incredulous: as far as they are concerned, the anthropology of the center that they have based their professional lives on is the only valid anthropology, and the voices from the periphery are simply peripheral, and suitably ignored. They would not make this statement so baldly, but this is what they implicitly believe.

Top anthropological journals in the United States, such as *American Anthropologist* and *Current Anthropology*, have made an effort to bring onto their editorial boards more international members, who may serve as referees, but the problem remains, since these international members are those known to American and Western scholars, and thus likely to share American and Western modes of discourse. An international anthropologist must generally conform to Anglo-American anthropological norms and forms of argument to be published in the Anglo-American center.

An argument could be made that “the West” really is “best,” in that journals published in the United States and the United Kingdom really are at the pinnacle of knowledge in cultural anthropology. If anthropological theorizing is cumulative—if anthropology is a science—then this could indeed be validly claimed. Today, however, only a minority of cultural anthropologists claim that the discipline is a

science; while empirical data about different societies is doubtless accumulating, the dominant view seems to be that theory is not so much improving as simply changing to fit changing times. There was much controversy in 2010 when the American Anthropological Association removed the word “science” from its long-term mission statement (see Xiao, 2010; Wade, 2010). This turn away from anthropology-as-science has been the case since the 1970s, when the interpretive anthropology of figures such as Clifford Geertz became the dominant form of cultural anthropology; this continued into the 1980s and 1990s, with postmodernism, and has not appreciably shifted in the early 21st century, with its emphasis on globalization. Anthropological theorizing today is no doubt better at analyzing the world today than anthropological theory of 50 years ago, but whether it is better in a purely objective sense, in the way that physics or medicine are better (who among us would prefer the medical knowledge of 50 years ago to the medical knowledge of today?) is something that many cultural anthropologists today would not be prepared to argue. Thus the idea that “West is best” in anthropological theorizing and publication does not seem valid, at least in accordance with the prevailing norms of the discipline today. The fact that, in publishing and prestige, “West” is indeed deemed “best” is a matter not of any advance of objective knowledge, but rather of the ongoing encroachment of globally oriented managerialism over the anthropological world.

### **BREAKING FREE OF THE STRANGLEHOLD**

There is thus an increasing stranglehold over anthropological research, one affecting anthropologists the world over. However, the degree to which this stranglehold must be conformed to, particularly in terms of the necessity of publishing in English, differs according to the anthropological and linguistic situations within different societies. As Bošković and Eriksen (2008: 9) have noted, “In Cameroon and Kenya, anthropological works are published almost exclusively in the colonial languages—English and French. The Dutch, Turkish, Serbian, Slovenian, and Norwegian anthropologists tend to be bilingual, while Russian, Japanese, Brazilian, and Argentinean anthropology is chiefly published in a non-English language.”

Hannerz (2010) has discussed this matter at some length, explicating why this is the case. The pressure to publish in English is more or less global, including in his own Swedish university, as Hannerz relates. Still, in societies with languages spoken by large numbers of people, including Chinese, Japanese, French, German, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish, there is room for academic anthropology to take place in the anthropologist’s native language (Hannerz, 2010). Whether the anthropologist writes for fellow academics or for a lay audience in her own language, there are sufficient readers to make it somewhat less necessary to write in English to be heard, despite the pressures one may be under from one’s own university in its search for higher global status, as earlier discussed. On the other

hand, in societies with languages spoken by a smaller number of speakers—Swedish, Dutch, Polish, Hebrew, and many others—there are small enough numbers of anthropologists that a scholarly framework for journal publication in these languages cannot fully exist. Thus these scholars are pushed to write in English for an academic anthropological audience, but to write in their own native language for a nonacademic audience. The linguistic situation of one's society thus makes a substantial difference in terms of how one can best counter the push toward writing in English to satisfy one's university overlords in their pursuit of high global rankings.

Bearing this in mind, let me now catalogue some of the different ways in which anthropologists outside the Anglo-American anthropological centers can go about their careers without wholly conforming to the dictates of those centers, as channeled through their own universities. I write this as an American who has spent the past 18 years teaching anthropology in Hong Kong, and interacting closely with my Hong Kong colleagues who are grappling with the issue of language in their own writings and career pressures—I quote several in the pages that follow. I also am closely involved with anthropologists in Japan and China, as well as Brazil, India, and continental Europe, and have spoken to them at length about their situations as anthropologists. The fact that I am American may make me less sensitive to language issues in anthropological writing—I am, after all, a native speaker of English, writing almost entirely in my native language—but may also provide me with a degree of detachment in my analysis. I am not a non-native English speaker complaining about my lot in having to write in English, but rather, a native English speaker commenting on the absurdity of the situation at large, whereby many of the world's anthropologists are being more or less compelled to write in my language.

There are several different ways in which this Anglo-American stranglehold can to some extent be circumvented in an international anthropologist's career. None of these ways is foolproof: although the situation varies from society to society, as we have seen, in most societies if a given anthropologist does not have permanent employment (“tenure”) and refuses to play the game at all, his or her career will be in jeopardy. Anthropologists in societies on the periphery, just like anthropologists in societies at the center, must typically meet the minimum standard of publication to survive. Beyond that, however, there may be a degree of breathing room to develop one's career as one chooses.

### **Two Parallel Writing Tracks**

One way to proceed is to have two parallel writing tracks, one in English following Anglo-American norms, and the other in one's native language, dealing with a different set of themes and concerns. This is what a number of anthropologists I know, in societies as diverse as Hong Kong, Sweden, and Brazil, have done. In societies such as Brazil, there is a thriving anthropological community,

enabling anthropologists to publish in refereed journals in their own society and in their own language, following their own anthropological norms. In societies such as Sweden and Hong Kong, this is impossible, either because one's linguistic community is too small to enable such a community (as in Sweden) or because a reliable referee system does not exist (as in the case of Hong Kong academics publishing in mainland China, which does not yet have a fully functioning national anthropology).

Scholars in societies such as these often write works in their own language, whether books or magazine articles, for popular consumption, and write scholarly works in English. This is a highly effective strategy in the sense that it helps bring anthropology to a larger world outside the academy, into the larger consciousness of one's society. In the Anglo-American center, anthropologists are typically ignored outside the academic world, because their writings are largely incomprehensible to that world: an American outside the academic world typically cannot name a single anthropologist, and is likely to have no idea what anthropology is. But this is often not the case for anthropologists working outside the center and writing in two different languages, simply because these anthropologists write for their lay fellow citizens, and attempt to communicate with these lay fellow citizens.

This situation thus has real advantages: if anthropologists, as well as other academics in the humanities and social sciences, seek to contribute to their society, then writing in a language that their fellow citizens can understand is a key way to do this, although most anthropologists in the center seem to have forgotten it. If a medical doctor or an engineer makes a discovery, then this may eventually benefit the layperson, despite the fact that the layperson has no understanding of what the physician or engineer writes. However, this is not the case in the humanities and social sciences. Anthropology, in its cross-cultural explications, could be of extraordinary benefit to the world at large, but anthropologists of the center have largely abdicated this role, since they write only for their fellow professional anthropologists. Only on the non-English-speaking anthropological periphery has this pivotal anthropological educational role been preserved.

Nonetheless, this may lead to a curious kind of schizophrenia between languages. As a Hong Kong ethnographer told me, "I write books about Hong Kong in English that help my scholarly career, but that nobody in Hong Kong ever reads. . . . I write popular books in Hong Kong in Cantonese that many people read, but that have no relation to my scholarly career." He said that for him, finally, all that really counted was that he be read by people in Hong Kong, but for the sake of his career, he had to play the academic game in English as well. But his heart lay in being read in Hong Kong, and indeed he is read in Hong Kong. His situation is mirrored in the careers and lives of a number of anthropologists in societies around the world. Because their universities require or strongly recommend that they write in English, they must do so to survive and prosper professionally. Because their societies do not or will not read much in English, they also seek to write in

their own native language, in forms that may not be academic but that may reach a far larger audience than their academic writings in a foreign language ever will. While some anthropologists thrive in balancing these two different professional paths, others feel distinctly overstretched, pulled, in their professional efforts, in two different, contradictory directions.

### **Books**

A second way to break free of the Anglo-American stranglehold is to focus on books rather than articles, as books are not quite so tied to the tyranny of citation indexes, whether published in one's native language or in English. Books and articles published in the Anglo-American anthropological center are all refereed, unless published by a popular press, where an editor, rather than referees, will decide on publication. However, refereeing for books is somewhat different than refereeing for academic articles, simply in that the form is different: an 8,000-word article is tied to academic conventions far more tightly than is an 80,000-word book, which can make its own arguments, and which can also be based far more on ethnographic experience. Books in English, as several anthropologists from different non-native-English-speaking countries around the globe have told me, allow for substantially greater freedom of expression than articles in English.

Scandinavian anthropologists such as Ulf Hannerz and Thomas Hyland Eriksen show this in their work: they have become influential in the Anglo-American center not through articles but through books that have established their reputations. This path is certainly not shared by all non-Anglo-American anthropologists, a few of whom do indeed write influential articles in the center, but is in any case another way in which the hegemony of the Anglo-American center can be to some extent overcome. Because of their brevity, articles require their authors to follow the academic norms of the Anglo-American center far more closely than do books, which, because of their length, can to a greater degree set forth their own premises and make their own arguments apart from Anglo-American norms.

However, while books provide an advantage in enabling a degree of independence from the conformity sometimes required by journal refereeing, books are at a disadvantage in research assessment exercises simply because of their length, as earlier touched upon. If anthropologists, as well as other scholars, are asked, as they typically are in such exercises, to provide four or five "best publications" to account for their previous five years of professional activity, books lag behind articles in value simply because no one can write more than one or at most two academic books in that time frame. Because of their brevity, many more articles can be churned out—and despite the disclaimers in the instructions for such exercises, when five items are being requested of each scholar, five had better be provided, it is commonly assumed. In this sense, the mechanism of assessment favors scholarly articles over books. Another problem with books is of course their

language; if they are written in the anthropologist's native language, they cannot be read beyond the author's own linguistic community, and are unlikely ever to be translated; but if they are in English, they are aimed at an audience far from the author's home. Nonetheless, because books by their nature are more widespread in their distribution—for sale on amazon.com and other web sites and in bookstores rather than buried in anthropology journals that may never be widely seen—there is at least the possibility that they may break free from a narrow disciplinary stranglehold, to transcend the audit culture discussed in this article.

Thus far the examples I have given are from non-Anglo-American societies that are socioeconomically on a par with Anglo-American societies. This matters: anthropologists from the societies I have mentioned are generally able to access books and journals from the Anglo-American center, simply because the academic institutions they belong to have the money to subscribe to expensive journals. But what about those who do not have such access? In this case, the situation becomes more complicated: anthropologists who cannot access the anthropology of the center can hardly avoid being seen as unsophisticated and naive by the anthropology of the center. Anthropologists from poorer societies may be seen as doing old-fashioned anthropology, the anthropology of earlier generations rather than of today. This is largely because these anthropologists do not have access through their institutions to the anthropology of the Anglo-American center, because it is too expensive; they are thus forced to be “backwards,” again echoing Morgan and Tylor. It is ironic that anthropology transcended the intellectual legacy of Morgan and Tylor, but that this legacy was reasserted institutionally, and thus again became reestablished intellectually as well.

The above critique applies both to books and articles, but probably somewhat more to articles, in that books—typically, for cultural anthropologists, ethnographies, the detailed description of cultural worlds—tend to be based less in past literature and its arguments than are articles. Riveting works of ethnography such as, to take just one example, that of Khosravi (2011) need not be tied to Western theoretical premises but can stand on their own terms: and at least a few do. But this is only a partial path out of the problem, because publishing, after all, is still a game dominated by the center. The abovementioned ethnography was, after all, published in New York; had it been published in Nairobi or Kolkata, I would probably never have known of it.

### **Publishing on the Internet**

One way out of this situation, and a third way of breaking free from the stranglehold of the Anglo-American center, is to avoid the Anglo-American publishing center entirely, by publishing on the Internet, in open access venues. In the hard sciences, more and more journals have become open access, but this trend has been slower in the humanities and social sciences. In anthropology, it is interesting that journals from the periphery are far more likely to be open access than journals

from the center, due to the fact that the latter more than the former can make substantial profits by charging for access to the knowledge they purvey. The World Council of Anthropological Associations (2012) provides a portal to the world's anthropology journals that clearly reveals this trend. Those journals that are not open access are typically available only through the university libraries of those institutions that can pay for their subscription fees.

Many anthropologists have made their work available to a limited degree, placing their published works on sites such as academia.edu or researchgate.edu, where other academics can read what they write without having to go through libraries. Journals such as *Hau*, from the anthropological center, and a vast array of journals from the periphery (see World Council of Anthropological Associations, 2012) are open access. This is an extraordinarily valuable development, and one that I hope grows by leaps and bounds, because it really can help to level the playing field between the anthropology of the Anglo-American center and all other anthropologies. (Even though I must confess that for the journal I coedit, *Asian Anthropology*, we have reluctantly chosen not to go to open access, simply because we cannot afford to.) But so far it tends to be used to publicize already published articles rather than replacing that process of publication, largely because tenure and promotion cannot yet be obtained through publication in open access venues. However, this may be changing. What if sites such as these, or other sites, came not simply to augment the process of publication but to supplant it? If this were to happen, then the global rating system I described at the start of this article would be forced to give way. We could escape the world of neoliberal academia and its constant measurement.

Or would we? Would we come to be rated instead not by the status of the journals we publish in but by our hit counts, or the number of followers we have? Would the audit culture of constant measurement simply come up with new means by which to audit us? Perhaps. These new forms of measurement would be based not on expert referees and prestige, but instead on the degree of interest drawn, and indeed on popularity (This new form of measurement as compared to the old would be not wholly dissimilar to Wikipedia vs. the Encyclopædia Britannica in their differing approaches to establishing authoritative knowledge: see Giles, 2005). It may be that the Anglo-American center will still win at this game for a while, but it will eventually give way, not least because the Anglo-American center may come increasingly to have a diminishing percentage of worldwide anthropologists, world anthropologists of whom more and more may be able and willing to convey their research in English. I myself see this potential development as a very good thing indeed for the eventual development of a truly worldwide anthropology, an anthropology that is no longer locked in narrow Anglo-American academic norms. But before this can happen, it will take multitudes of individuals embarking on their own particular strategies for both embracing and resisting the lure of the Anglo-American center as purveyed through their own universities, as we have just discussed.

## CONCLUSION

I began this article by discussing “the audit culture” in contemporary universities, from its emergence in the United Kingdom to its global spread today, making universities ever more commercial in their focus, and increasingly turning professors into employees. I then examined the differences in knowledge between the hard sciences and the soft social sciences and humanities: while for the former there is apparently a universal advance in knowledge, for the latter there is not: thus, global measures of scholarship are in these disciplines less matters of knowledge’s advance than of institutionalized cultural imperialism. I then discussed this situation particularly as it applies to anthropology today; and I discussed three paths that anthropologists may take to at least partially escape it. One path is to play the neoliberal academic game in one’s English-language academic writings but to write in one’s own language to break free of that game. A second path is to write books rather than articles, a strategy that, even in English, allows a degree of freedom from the stranglehold of Anglo-American anthropological norms that articles tend not to allow. A third path is to use the Internet to transcend those norms, by publishing one’s works online. Sites such as academia.edu and researchgate.edu have the potential to radically subvert today’s norms of neoliberal academia, although they are far from doing so yet.

All these strategies have their problems; but they do represent attempts, on an individual basis, to level the global anthropological playing field. These strategies are all only very partial at present. Nonetheless, I am cautiously optimistic, because of the technology of the Internet, as well as the ongoing development of a globalization that is not just from the top down but from the bottom up. Within 50 years, we may indeed see the emergence of a truly global anthropology.

Meanwhile, though, it is clear that for anthropology and for other disciplines in the soft social sciences and the humanities, we are at a low point. The academic world is becoming institutionally globalized, as the spread of audit culture attests, but it is an earlier form of globalization, one based on cultural imperialism (albeit of an institutional rather than an intellectual sort). This will give way—this new institutional cultural imperialism is temporary, I argue, and will be swept away by the Internet as it evolves. But this has not yet happened, and this low point is the working world in which most contemporary academics must now live.

## REFERENCES

- Bošković, A., & Eriksen, T. R. 2008. Introduction: Other people’s anthropologies. In A. Bošković (Ed.), *Other people’s anthropologies: Ethnographic practice on the margins*: 1–19. New York, Berghahn.
- Canagarajah, A. S. 2002. *A geopolitics of academic writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Crystal, D. 2003. *English as a global language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Diaz, S. I. A. 2010. The accountologist: An emerging form of anthropological life in Mexican universities. In B. de Bary (Ed.), *Universities in translation: The mental labor of globalization*: 89–103. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Dubiel, H. 2010. Academic capitalism: Toward a global free trade zone in university services. In B. de Bary (Ed.), *Universities in translation: The mental labor of globalization*: 61–72. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Gen, B., & Bada, E. 2010. English as a world language in academic writing. *Reading Matrix*, 10: 142–151.
- Giles, J. 2005. Internet encyclopaedias go head to head. *Nature*, December 15.
- Global Higher Ed. 2011. Visualizing the uneven geographies of knowledge production and circulation. September 14. Retrieved from <http://globalhighered.wordpress.com/2011/09/14/visualizing-the-uneven-geographies-of-knowledge-production-and-c/>, December 15.
- Goh, B.-G. 2010. A presentiment of the death of intellectuals in Korean society. In B. de Bary (Ed.), *Universities in translation: The mental labor of globalization*: 27–48. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Hannerz, U. 2010. *Anthropology's world: Life in a twenty-first-century discipline*. London: Pluto Press.
- Head, S. 2011. The grim threat to British universities. *New York Review of Books*, Jan. 13.
- Iwasaki, M. 2010. The oxymoron of higher education: Neoliberal restructuring and the incorporation of Japanese national universities. In B. de Bary (Ed.), *Universities in translation: The mental labor of globalization*: 73–88. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kang, N. 2010. Neoliberal university reform and the international exchange of intellectuals. In B. de Bary (Ed.), *Universities in translation: The mental labor of globalization*: 20–225. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Khosravi, S. 2011. *"Illegal" traveller: An auto-ethnography of borders*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kuhn, T. 1962. *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kuwayama, T. 2004. *Native anthropology*. Melbourne, Australia: Trans Pacific Press.
- Li, C. 2010. Redefining "liberal education" in the Chinese university. In B. de Bary (Ed.), *Universities in translation: The mental labor of globalization*: 153–163. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Lin, A. 2009. The narrowing of intellectual space by Western management discourses: Higher education in Hong Kong. In G. S. Poole & Y. Chen (Eds.), *Higher education in East Asia: Neoliberalism and the professoriate*: 107–121. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Lindsay, B., & Blanchett, W. J. 2011. *Universities and global diversity: Preparing educators for tomorrow*. London: Routledge.
- MacLellan, P. 2009. Retooling Japan for the 21st century: Higher education reform and the production of "international" scholars. In G. S. Poole & Y. Chen (Eds.), *Higher education in East Asia: Neoliberalism and the professoriate*: 73–95. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Margolis, M. 2004. The withering of the professoriate: Corporate universities and the professoriate. In J. K. Odin & P. T. Manicas (Eds.), *Globalization and Higher Education*: 24–41. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

- Mathews, G. 2010. On the referee system as a barrier to global anthropology. *The Asia-Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, 11: 52–63.
- Nelson, A. R., & Wei, I. P. 2012. *The global university: Past, present, and future perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Odin, J. K., & Manicas, P. R. T. 2004. *Globalization and higher education*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- SCImago Journal and Country Rank. 2012. Journal rankings on anthropology. Retrieved from <http://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php?category=3314>, September 2012.
- Shore, C. 2008. Audit culture and neoliberal governance: Universities and the politics of accountability. *Anthropological Theory*, 8: 279–298.
- Shore, C. 2010. Beyond the multiversity: Neoliberalism and the rise of the schizophrenic university. *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale*, 18: 15–29.
- Shore, C., & Wright, S. 2000. Coercive accountability: The rise of audit culture in higher education. In M. Strathern (Ed.), *Audit cultures: Anthropological studies in accountability, ethics and the academy*: 57–89. London: Routledge.
- Sidhu, R. K. 2006. *Universities and globalization: To market, to market*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wade, N. 2010. Anthropology a science? Statement deepens a rift. *New York Times*, December 9.
- World Council of Anthropological Associations. 2012. Publications. Retrieved from <http://www.wcaanet.org/publications.shtml>, September 2012.
- Xiao, X. 2010. Is anthropology a science? Retrieved from <http://anthronow.com/press-watch/is-anthropology-a-science>, September 2012.

Direct reprint requests to:

Gordon Mathews  
 Department of Anthropology  
 The Chinese University of Hong Kong  
 Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong  
 e-mail: cmgordon@cuhk.edu.hk