

Editorial

NO journal can hope to satisfy all of its readers all of the time, and there have been occasions in the history of this one when criticisms have been expressed. These are invariably welcome, and are important aids in improving the *Journal's* quality. Some recent criticisms, however, bear on general policy and suggest to the Editors the value of restating the objectives and procedures which govern the *JAS* as they governed the *FEQ* from the time of its founding. The following remarks are published also on the recommendation of the Advisory Editorial Board.

The *Journal* welcomes for consideration *any* article-length manuscripts in the fields which it covers (the humanities and social sciences as applied to South, Southeast, and Central Asia, China, Japan, and Korea down to the present), without regard to discipline or point of view represented. Its Editors have no predetermined standards of orthodoxy or convention, and rely on the opinions of referees. Referees, including members of the Advisory Editorial Board, are selected according to the area and discipline of each manuscript. We particularly welcome manuscripts by younger or unpublished scholars. We are eager also to see articles which are interpretive, analytical, comparative, and even iconoclastic. We are more than willing to work with authors in the revision and re-submission of their manuscripts on the basis of referee comments or editorial suggestions. We endeavor to ensure that each manuscript submitted is carefully and objectively read not only by the Editors, but, more importantly by at least two referees with special knowledge in the manuscript's field. We attempt to base our decisions about manuscripts on a suitable blend of such specialist opinions and the more general judgments of the Editors.

The *Journal* is, we hope, one of the chief repositories of sound scholarship in the field of Asian studies. We feel that it is appropriate for us to be guided in our decisions by the standards which the profession, in its various disciplines, sets for itself, in the form of the opinions which we solicit on manuscripts from authorities in each field. But we believe that although such a policy seems the only acceptable one, it need not and it does not exclude from our consideration manuscripts which may challenge existing authorities or existing forms or may depart from established patterns of thought or presentation. We do not believe that sound scholarship or creative thought must be limited to or exclusively measured by what has gone before, and we select referees and use their opinions with the goal of discovering merit.

These guidelines represent no departure from long-established practice, and have been recorded in successive statements of editorial policy printed in the *FEQ* and the *JAS*. The statement printed in the *Quarterly*, vii (August 1948), 338 was reproduced with only minor changes in the *JAS*, xvi (August 1957), 687–688. It may now be appropriate to reproduce this document again, with two small changes relating to the *JAS Style Sheet* and to offprints, and the deletion of the earlier item 12 dealing with the News of the Profession section, much of whose material is now carried in the Association's *Newsletter*.