

Published or Rejected? African Intellectuals' Scripts and Foreign Journals, Publishers and Editors

ANTÓNIO CABRAL (*MIRAS, Moçambique*)

L. NJINYA-MUJINYA (*Uppsala University*)

P. HABOMUGISHA (*European Peace University, Austria*)

“The good editor or publisher is...part chameleon, part humming-bird, tasting every literary flower, and part warrior ant. I am a publisher - a hybrid creature: one part stargazer, one part gambler, one part businessman, one part midwife and three parts optimist.”

- *Cass Canfield*¹

INTRODUCTION

‘Rejected’, in the heading of this contribution — as you may guess — is when or where a writer’s script is turned down. ‘Published’ is reference for the contrary. We are grateful to Adams A Bodomo of the University of Hong Kong, China, who indirectly influenced our design of this paper’s title,² a paper seeking to understand and to portray the academic and power relationships among Africa’s authors and outside publishers and editors.

Almost at the turn of an imminent new millennium, this work attempts to make sense out of what sometimes seems a senseless struggle. This is the toil by many African authors to place their works with outside publishing institutions that many times evasively hesitate or refuse to accept them. For such writers, the now closing century, has been quite a tough haul in writing and publishing terms. Whether they are in for yet another such or more mentally, emotionally and physically debilitating haul is yet to be seen. Read this interesting landmark to get some view of that sequence of events.

This time two years ago, Abdallah F. Hayet of north Africa was at it again. He was cracking on a paper that was to be submitted to an ‘international’ journal in the South Pacific that had made an impression as an academic platform for African Studies. What he was writing on was a newsworthy topic, he thought. He thought too that he had a handle on the content and style of the journal. Unlike the preceding year when his paper bounced unpublished, from Europe, this time he was

¹ An American publisher, in *Esquire* 1969, quoted in Green (1996).

² A.B. Bodomo, PhD, teaches in the Department of Linguistics, University of Hong Kong.

confident he would make it. Intellectually and otherwise, he really felt connected and highly productive while assembling and interlinking the ideas in his unmistakably, but apparently justifiably, controversial essay. When it was ready, he asked a competent academic colleague to do some preliminary peer editing before posting it to the journal's editorial office. Within about three days, he received mail from the office's secretary that the article had arrived and was in the hands of the editorial board. A rejection or guidelines on how to revise and resubmit the paper would be sent to him, he was told. Everything sounded optimistic, and he felt he was on the right track this time! Days, weeks and months, however, came and passed but there was no response from the editors. When close to six months were gone, he got courage and wrote to ask about the fate of his article. For almost a week, there was silence. But he kept hopeful for the best, waiting for an envelope that might arrive with a copy of the journal's number containing his submitted paper. Day six came, but still there was no communication from the other end. Since 'silence' so-many-times unsettles many, Hayet was no exception. When the waiting was going into its seventh day, a message finally came. Eagerly he opened it, but it was a regret that said nearly nothing about why the paper had been declined. In a manner more tactical and friendlier than any such treatment he had previously received from other foreign publishing mandarins, Hayet was informed by the editor that they were sorry that they could not accept his paper. They were looking forward to Hayet's next article, the letter added. That was it. Just about two lines, followed by the editor's signature! Hayet, with every good intention, soon wrote back to request for the actual reasons why his paper was snubbed. The editor resent the original brief regret! Until this moment, Hayet has never got to know the reasons. Still he is waiting, and if he is lucky the answers will come in the post when the impending millennium is kicking off.

That small vista is dominated by a theme of anxiety, uncertainty and insecurity of a kind as are the writing and publishing efforts, apparently, of numerous other scholars in Africa. Let us take a broader and closer look at the matter.

An important aspect of African literature, yet to receive detailed study, therefore, is that of manuscripts by African authors that are rejected by many publishing interests of Asian, European, North American and other origins. Whether they are based abroad or have branches in Africa, hearsay and occasional written statements have it that these foreign publishers frequently turn down such manuscripts. Speaking generally, largely commercial non-African publishers as well as outside educational institutions — with a publishing slant — have apparently done that for a long time now. Under three subheads (Rejects Revisited, Weaving the Strands and a Conclusion), we examine the problem in a little more depth.

1. REJECTS REVISITED

Unhappily, the actual extent and seriousness of this problem, whose magnitude seems to increase every day that passes, remain rather ambiguous. No one to the best of our knowledge has produced a detailed country-specific or continent-wide document on it. Yet this is a handicap that seems to leave many younger and even many established African writers disheartened and with little energy to go on writing, for a while or for much of their active life.

Consider this. Nowadays, several foreign publishing avenues, when they turn down an African writer's manuscript, do not many times say what is wrong with it! In a friendly but clearly hypocritical manner, they thank you for your interest in their publishing house or periodical or whatever. Then abruptly and unceremoniously, they add that they are unable to, or do not think that they can, publish your text. Period, no more no less! Just like Hayet was treated! Further to the example of Hayet, we may note this from another African scholar. "Would you be interested in a publication in French that was rejected by two well-known publishing companies in New York?" writes S.'L. to Cabral on 13 June 1998. "I still have the entire manuscript, trying hard to get it published," he adds. Days later, on 7 July 1998, S.'L. again writes to Cabral, "Since these two companies did not furnish any cogent reason, and since your E-mail, I called them...and requested a reason for the rejection. I received a crispy or should I say telegraphic one sentence message: 'Your manuscript needs more work.' As to what kind of work, they would not say. You see my dilemma?" In a separate communication to Njinya-Mujinya, on 17 August 1998, S'L had this to say on the same manuscript:

"I have my manuscript. It is a 313-page...textbook.... There are...three broad chapters. I am so surprised that two well-known publishing houses — after examining the entire manuscript, after inviting me to New York and interviewing me over it, and after keeping my manuscript for an extended number of months, finally sent it back. Their reason was nothing but a short comment.... *I have since...lost interest in sending my manuscript back to them.* I have everything on a diskette, with a copy on my hard drive. I went back to the two professors of French, who did the original proofreading. For a fee, they have duly completed their work on my manuscript. I can now say that the manuscript is ready for any publisher who genuinely...wants us to make money. The book is the first of its kind, and I and other experts know and agree that it will sell. Do you think you can help me in getting it published? If so then please feel free to let us explore the European market. I am also exploring the Canadian market, but so far, I have found most of the publishers there are interested in manuscripts from Canadian authors. So there lies my dilemma: You have an African scholar who has produced a masterpiece, but whose fault is that he lacks networking and knows no one. I was beginning to think maybe...I could get someone who is already published, and perhaps who is a Ph.D. holder, who could co-author my manuscript. But then again, that might erode the spirit, the vitality and the

enthusiasm which pushed me into writing the book in the first place. I am consoled by the African proverb that 'anything worthy takes time,' so I am waiting for the right opportunity, and would appreciate any help from you." (Emphasis added)

S'L, to give the reader some additional information, lives and teaches in north America. Until 1992, when he moved camp to the Americas, he lived in his mother Africa where teaching was his work.

Granted that there are problems with a given rejected manuscript, how can the writer know and correct them if they are not pointed out to him or her? Also how can he or she grow intellectually and literarily without such useful feedback? If writing and being published are part of the continuous process of learning and sharing ideas in the human family, whether people agree or disagree, publishers ought to make accessible their evaluations of rejected manuscripts. That they dismiss them with masked faces suggests at least two things. Probably they fear confronting the writer with the bitter truth if his or her text is of poor quality, and this could be excused to some degree. But this cannot be the reason regarding persons who write so well, but controversially or no subjects that are evidently in the disinterest of a given publisher culturally, politically and so on. Since even such persons' manuscripts are 'trashed', that points to questionable motives on the part of the publishers, motives that need to be exhaustively examined. We need to critically review the kind of publishing power that is apparently so misused and abused by its holders by turning away writers without giving even the slightest reasonable explanation.

Several times, too, some foreign publishing institutions do not even have the courtesy to write to acknowledge receipt of a manuscript, especially once they have decided not to publish it! You may write once, twice or more times to ask them to do that, but they will keep dead silent! Only patience and persistent enquiry, in such cases, may sometimes get them to reply! *But such persistence could also easily wear out a writer's patience, mind and interest in trying to follow up on his or her manuscript or to have it placed with any publisher.* See this, from academic NK to Cabral on Sunday, 14 June 1998, to see this point better. "Below you find a response to another article I sent to the *Journal of Asian and African Studies*. The response below speaks for itself. *I did not re-submit the article as it was necessary to edit portions to take into account the lapse in time.*" In a letter of March 29, 1998 to the *Journal of African and Asian Studies*, a review run in a Western country, NK had previously written: "I sent last year an article on Norway's non-membership of the European Union. Until today, I have not received any response from the editor/s, as to whether they would publish or not. Please inform me as soon as possible about your decision." The required response referred to, to NK from the journal — also of the same date — says: Professor so and so "is in India at the moment so I cannot tell you the status of your paper. *It seems to me however that if you have not received any communication from us at this point* (the articles for 1998 are already in press) that either your paper was never received *or it was not*

accepted and a letter was never sent to you. If you are still interested, I suggest that you resubmit your paper.... I will see to it that it is put through the proper channels. I can let you know our decision by August.” For reasons already given, NK never turned in the paper again! By a Sunday 14 June 1998 correspondence, NK says to Cabral:

“...I have had a few articles rejected. Here find...correspondence...about a rejected piece of mine..., something I had been trying to say (publish) for a long time without success. /---/. Rejected written works occupy me a lot. I write uncomfortably worrisome things, I must grant, but facts are facts. They must be faced eventually.”

In a later letter, on Monday, 15 June 1998, he (NK) shares this with Cabral:

“I have only a solitary publication to my name...published in 1994 as proceedings of a conference./---/. I have presented workshop papers at a few international conferences here in Norway. Since graduation, I have tried to publish some things but have met the wall so far. They are mainly on agriculture and development. Also on the Great Lakes conflict in Africa.”

Looking for so-labeled international publishing avenues is, so it seems, no simple task for some scholars and writers of African background. They just have to wait and sweat it out! Is this perhaps part of the road to finding so-called high-profile international publishing powerhouses? The question though is: At what cost is that done? Are these people, honestly speaking, fairly or unfairly treated when their texts are rejected or disregarded entirely? Are these writers in part victims of an unfavorable global publishing system they have themselves helped to fashion, with or without their full consciousness? Is this a system in which they are at once willing and unwilling collaborators, a system that lots of times squeezes and discomforts them? These and connected questions are of interest to anyone whom this matter interests.

As we wrestle with the problem of this contribution, one of the many factors we should consider, according to Peace Habomugisha, is the author-publisher/editor relationship. Very briefly, as she sees it, editing and screening manuscripts written by Africans, is a venue — for many foreign editors and publishers — of exercising power and control, cultural intellectual power particularly, over Africa. These brokers of publishing outlets and opportunities sit in places from which they can accept or refuse a manuscript. Thus we could say that they have powers to 'appoint' or to 'dismiss' as they wish. Quite often the foreign publisher or editor feels that he or she is or can be the final authority on the topic of a specific manuscript, in a direct or indirect manner. Many times, however, the foreign literary publishing moguls that discount African writers' manuscripts are less fluent in the particular language(s) of publication (English, French, etc.) than a given African author. Often too they have less knowledge than the African author of the text regarding the text's topic. But these foreign publishing tsars have what is perhaps the most crucial component in publishing — the publishing means: typing and printing

equipment, necessary funds or accumulated fund-raising expertise, wide readership, established literature distribution networks, etc. This is the paraphernalia that empowers them to feel that they are the determining authorities over a manuscript's fate. The unequal paternalistic relationship among African authors and their foreign publishers and editors has been one of the sores of Africa's publishing in the twentieth century. There are no major signs yet that it is about to be balanced, as we stand at the turn of the twenty-first century CE — although a fall in the value attached to foreign editors and publishers is gradually growing. This is good, and is largely because Africans are increasingly and seriously taking their place in the publishing and communications industry, even if this still leaves much to be desired.

For the many African writers driven by an interplay of economic, political and social domestic insecurity, a background of miseducation and other factors, the controlling position of foreign publishers and editors — to whom the former are desperately or otherwise pulled — remains almost unchanged. Describing the former's plight some twenty years ago, a fix evidently still largely unfixed and perhaps more worrying than it was then, Altbach and Rathgeber (1980: 31) write:

“The relationship between expatriate editors and indigenous authors is sometimes fraught with special problems, especially when there is a basic difference in ideological perspective. Expatriate editors read and judge from a viewpoint that is in harmony with their own cultural background and experiences. Not surprisingly, this perspective is sometimes markedly different from that of the indigenous author. This problem has been examined in African contexts by Keith Smith and Eva-Maria Rathgeber among others. Smith focuses on the overall control exercised by expatriate publishers in the book market of English-speaking West Africa *and notes that expatriates and multinational publishers have a decisive voice in selection of material to be published.* Rathgeber, in...interviews with Nigerian scholarly writers, *found that there is a rising consciousness among Nigerian intellectuals of the ideological control exercised over their work by expatriate publishers who tend to accept for publication only those works that reflect a perspective which is in harmony with the viewpoint expressed by metropolitan scholars.* These ideological disagreements between indigenous authors and expatriate editors can have serious consequences. *If editors, on the basis of their power to refuse publication of an unsatisfactory work, are able to influence authors to change the style or alter the content of their writing, then it is this revised version that reaches the book-reading public.* Consequently, expatriates are often instrumental forces in the shaping of the written knowledge or culture that reaches the inhabitants of a country. Further, *they play a significant role in the determination of what knowledge will be transmitted abroad where it will be judged as representative of thought or opinion in the third world.*” (accent non-existent in the original)

The pair pay further attention to the predicament in a way that shows how badly an African author and his or her home country can be disadvantaged by the mainly one-sided unfair relationship (Altbach and Rathgeber 1980: 31-36). In a pithy statement on local manuscripts and their refusal by expatriate editors and publishers we learn that (Altbach and Rathgeber 1980: 31-32):

“Even before the question of editorial alterations can be considered, however, there is the issue of initial acceptance of a manuscript. Publishers, of course, *have the power to accept or reject* work offered to them for consideration, and if they have firm views on what constitutes legitimate work, then they may automatically reject any literary efforts that do not meet with the required criteria. It is perhaps out of a desire to avoid this issue that the multinational publishing corporations *tend to reject manuscripts that are highly controversial* or experimental in nature and prefer focusing on instead on the more predictable-and profitable-educational market. In this vein, it is interesting to note that the English translation of Ugandan writer Okot p’Bitick’s [sic] *Song of Lawino* was rejected by three British publishers before it was eventually accepted by the East African Publishing House in Nairobi.” (imported emphasis)

Notice the foreign publishers’ and editors’ general disinclination to experimentation and controversy (in the case of the so-termed Third World), which naturally and despite their disagreeable features, are the seeds of ‘progress’, of a great tomorrow, of continuity in discontinuity, of life in brief. The right spelling of the last part of Okot’s name, by the way, is p’Bitek, not Bitick as written above. Okot p’Bitek’s *Song of Lawino*, we probably should point out, went on to become a much-read and -consulted book, a modern classic in short! Indeed, it is one of p’Bitek’s books that have made him world-famous. But would the same expatriate editors and publishers be so inclined to stultification of controversy and experimentation in their indigenous homelands where they have their homes and bases?

That said, we may move to a related point. Listings, advertisements, popularization and distribution of foreign-published texts, authored by Africans, are fine. Yet rejected manuscripts are an equally significant (if not a more crucial) dimension of African authorship. By how much some of Africa’s aspiring authors fail to get published abroad and why, just as by their success to do so, can we adequately assess and rethink this external face — vis-à-vis the internal one — of the continent’s publishing activity. Thus the importance of placing side by side and comparing African writers’ gains and losses (read this as rejection), on the foreign publishing scene, cannot be more underscored. Just as it is important to have databases and bibliographic control on African writers’ works published outside, it is equally necessary, therefore, to keep track of the so-called ill luck of some of their manuscripts. This, it seems, must be done and done systematically and consistently for all time. The results of such methodical record-keeping, too, should be made available to the African public, particularly the reading, literary and publishing communities, for their personal and collective good.

The impression that one gets, however, is that things have on the whole been rather different. Right up to now, most of Africa's victims of the rejection have apparently tended to keep that experience only to themselves and a few other people within and without their circles of associates. Worst of all, that experience has all along existed in a fragmentary, unrecorded or not-so-well-recorded form. Why so, you may ask? Just for a variety of reasons, ranging from desire to protect one's image to perhaps a lack of a publicly accepted stage for sharing, assessing and capitalizing on such experiences. This general silence, however, conceals golden lessons for the African literary community, lessons that may, sometimes, be lost partially or entirely with the decease of the intellectual holding the information.

2. WEAVING THE STRANDS

What evidently needs to be done, to start with, is to map the history, the nature and character of the rejections and what negative and desirable impact they have openly or insidiously had on Africa's publishing potential.

As a matter of urgency, therefore, affected writers, or persons who were in the confidence of such writers — who are now long departed — should come out and break their quiet. More than ever, they should 'publish' those experiences — both by the spoken and written word. Single public talks or entire local, national, regional and international seminars could be devoted to verbal 'publication' and constructive review of experiences stemming from declined African writers' manuscripts. Proceedings of such seminars could indeed be printed and circulated. Whole articles, monographs, books and master's or doctoral dissertations and theses could be written on the subject of the rejects. Offices and archives to register and preserve written or taped, but unpublished, stories of rejection could also be set up in suitable locations across Africa. A whole view of publishing showing that no individual foreign publisher has the final word on the worth of an African writer's text could, and perhaps should, conspicuously be installed throughout the continent. That a manuscript refused by such a publisher can turn around and become so important and notable, locally and globally, should apparently also get no less emphasis across Africa.

Until now, arguably — and we have attempted to do something of the kind above already, though on a small scale — very little or nothing has been done to weave the story together. That is not so hard to appreciate. In Africa, as elsewhere in the world, refusal of a manuscript is for the most part bound to be interpreted as rejection of the writer herself or himself. The author's worth is perceived to be underrated. For some time, for many people, it may not be possible to avoid being demoralized — emotionally and mentally. This is natural and quite understandable, but such feelings — where they cannot be initially overcome — must be seen as ultimately no more than the fleeting experiences we know them to be. Sooner or

later, therefore, the person affected could and should make the time to get on with the business of documenting and evaluating the refusal of his or her work.

The reader will perhaps be happy to hear that the present paper is one of the few first steps in what is intended to be a much wider exploration and mapping of the problem under discussion. Although certainly not already well under way, some vital gains have been made such as some indications from the African scholarly society that the problem is important and worth investigating. With so little achieved so far, every relevant help to make the exploration a great success will therefore be needed from those that can give it. Especially important will be people that readily wish to publicly share the experiences of their manuscripts that were rejected by non-African publishing interests in the latter half of the twentieth century CE.

If you, the reader of this information, have ever had your book or other type of manuscript refused by a foreign publishing institution, we would be very pleased if you could share with us the full contents of the letter and other information rejecting your manuscript. Kindly type out the letter(s) and so on and send the material to us. Names and addresses of the publisher, editor, journal, dates, etc. should be given. Do please append your own reasons why you think your manuscript was refused publication, contrary to the editor's or publisher's formal explanation or none. Also if you know of a colleague with such experience, please share this message with them. Or if you know of an already documented story of such rejection, please inform us where we can find it. We would be happy to hear of any story about works, by Africans, that were rejected by foreign publishers initially, but whose so-termed misfortune went into reverse and became famous upon publication by another publisher(s).

Readers' imagination and action will perhaps be fired up by the following. Among other experiences, the larger study in progress will document and assess rejection — several times — of Prof. António Cabral's own manuscripts by non-African publishers.

3. CONCLUSION

Imagine there was a well-written and evaluated record of the fate of rejected manuscripts and whatever theoretical and pragmatic lessons Africa could draw from that. Perhaps Africa as a whole would not be suffering great lack of academic and non-scholarly information today. The rejects, as we see it, need to be given a high-profile pedestal, to which Africa can turn for inspiration, because rejection — justified or not — can be the seed(s) of great prospects. For in what may seem to be short or long term failure one may learn and gain something. Foreign publishing institutions, which many of Africa's established and younger authors seem to prefer rather than local publishers, would perhaps then be seen in their true colors. Most Africans would thus probably discover whether it is the foreign or local publisher

that really needs more of their support, admiration and respect — a discovery evidently only made by very few to date!

Very briefly, therefore, there is urgent need to record and analyze all accessible stories on reject manuscripts from as far back as possible to the present and beyond. Every vital detail, every word or comment from the mouth or pen or whatever of a foreign publisher or his or her editor(s) etc., must be carefully noted and weighed. So too should a reject's subsequent fortunes or so-named misfortunes. We need to establish what manuscripts have been refused, when, why, by what kind of person or institution, and the implications of such rejections for Africa's writers and publishing industry.

The full account of the problem is yet to be written, and you and us can help a lot to achieve that. Now in its beginnings, our exploration is one significant dimension of the problem that you could support with much-wanted data. Any interesting comments, criticisms, suggestions and things of the kind would be welcome and helpful. This is our task, as it is your own. Your own little or ample experience with the problem can make a great difference as can anyone else's that you know of. You can be a partner with us, in a real or virtual manner, as we seek to record and find lasting advantageous answers to the problem. Finally, a word to promising African writers of the future. Those who have their submitted manuscripts turned down by foreign publishers and editors, several of whom are many times self-created and self-appointed experts on African publishing, should know — if they do not — that rejection does not always mean that one's text is of substandard. Quite often, such pieces are good; only a conspiracy of factors — which may or may not be fair — condemns them to be rejects. Is this not what Professor Arunachalam (1998) is saying in his recent work?:

“Immediately following the Prague conference of biomedical editors in September 1997, *New Scientist* commented in an editorial that when it came to choosing manuscripts for publication, editors of reputed international journals would more likely select the one from Harvard in preference to the one from Hyderabad, even though both manuscripts may be of comparable quality. Harvard any day is a safer bet than Hyderabad! Technology tends to exacerbate this inequality and further marginalize scientists on the periphery. The Internet, or for that matter any technology, does not come without its attendant problems. History has repeatedly shown that technology inevitably enhances existing inequalities. /---/. I would not be surprised if very soon the gulf between the scientifically advanced nations and the others widens even further, leading to further reducing the role of the developing countries in the enterprise of knowledge production, dissemination and utilization. Do I sound pessimistic?”

All that is nothing new, it is a restatement, a reminder of what is already known to many in Africa. This knowledge should however be spread all over. Now is time indeed to heed and ponder the following from Peace Habomugisha (1997):

“An editor's or publisher's rejection of a manuscript should never ever be accepted as the final word on the worth of that text. Oftentimes such a publisher

underestimates its quality and potential value for reasons that may not be above board — reasons that may be partly or wholly in his or her narrow selfish interests. Any one editor's or publisher's knowledge of things, after all, is limited like that of every human being.”

Meanwhile we would like to encourage every outside publishing interest that receives and vets manuscripts by African researchers and writers to emulate the great example of Africa (UK), Nordic Journal of African Studies (Finland), Journal of Religion in Africa (UK and Holland), and many such interests that make effort to point out what is wrong with a submitted manuscript — showing and suggesting what can be done to better it. When unable to publish a text for inevitable reasons, some of them even at times recommend where it can be placed for consideration.

When addressing the rejects issue, we will have to seriously look at both sides of the pancake: that of the foreign publishing interest, and that of African writers. Not all the blame, deserved or not, can go to such interests. The African side seems also to have its own share. At this time nobody probably beats Bodomo in putting the point better:³

“My paper⁴ did not address the issue of people's testimonies about paper rejection. As you know, this is a very embarrassing aspect of the trade. Letters of rejection can be embarrassing, and sometimes are nasty. I was just discussing my paper with one man on the phone (here in Hong Kong) who said that sometimes manuscript reviewers make certain comments which, in effect, question how the author got his...degree. /---/. Another funny thing that I discovered during my recent trip to Ghana is this: some academics are rather more interested in excuses. They make very little effort or none at all to publish but are quick to say that...those who are outside (for now) publish quite a lot because it is...easier?... I had to tell one such person that it is not all African academics outside who have published quite a lot and it thus cannot be that easy.... It was at that point that I noticed this lame excuse. So in pursuing that project about reasons why Africans on the continent get rejected one should be careful not to encourage such lame excuses. One should encourage them to know that with hard work they can successfully compete with anyone anywhere in the world....”

Because of the embarrassment element we anticipate as one constraint, among many others, that it will not be easy to get access to some accounts of rejected scripts, particularly those bordering on personalia and privacy — accounts that may, if revealed, be damaging to the intellectual involved. One such person, now resident in Sweden, hinted at that quite recently. He would not like the public to know the details of the rejection aspect of his until now unsuccessful efforts to be

³ AB Bodomo in a communication to an academic colleague, Hong Kong, 11 September 1998.

⁴ *Pushing onto Publishville: Frustrations and Fruits — Managing The Publish Or Perish Maxim at The University of Ghana, W-Africa* (yet to be published).

published in American (US) journals. If however the rejected script was later published with success, we expect the earlier personally damaging rejection to be easily made available.

REFERENCES

Altbach, P. G. and E.-M. Rathgeber 1980.

Publishing in The Third World: Trend Report and Bibliography. USA: Praeger.

Arunachalam, S. 1998 (unpublished).

Africa in The Global and So-Called Developing-World Perspectives: A Bird's-eye View of Information Technology, Publishing and Science Communication.

Green, J. 1996. (First Pub 1982).

The Macmillan Dictionary of Contemporary Quotations. London: Macmillan

Habomugisha, P. (unpublished 1997).

Travelling and Seeing the World.