

## EDITORIAL NOTE

The Editor occasionally receives letters from colleagues who take exception to opinions expressed in book reviews published in the *Journal*. Frequently such letters seek to controvert positions taken by a reviewer. These letters might be classed as reviews of reviews or as rejoinders to reviews. We are usually asked to publish these letters.

The policy of the Editors of the *Journal of Asian Studies* is not to print such rejoinders. This policy has been adopted for several reasons. We have limited space and do not feel we can afford to devote lineage to this category of communications. Moreover, we recognize that the academic book review, even if learned, is also a subjective art form in which opinion must play a role. We do not wish to inhibit reviewers, even at the risk of incurring the wrath, on occasion, of authors who feel that they have been done a disservice.

Moreover, the points at issue in rejoinders often seem to be of restricted and technical significance, relevant, perhaps, for a few specialists but not for the broad range of our membership.

The *Journal of Asian Studies* will continue to be interested in articles or communications whose *content* has independent scholarly merit for Asian studies. Such communications—after the usual evaluation by editors or by referees—will be accepted for publication. We cannot, however, print reviews of reviews, refutations of reviews, or rejoinders to reviews. We trust the readers of the *Journal* will find this note of explanation satisfactory.