

Tips and Observations

1. Pick your journal carefully. Check its editorial board. Read reviews on humanities wiki, etc. Check its website for backlog.
2. Consider what databases you would want your article to appear in, e.g., Project Muse and JSTOR.
3. Polish your writing as much as you can. But bear in mind that “style” should not be used to cover up argumentative flaws. Rather, it’s a formal device that can be used to improve or give more nuance to your critical argument.
4. Respond to reviews politely and asap. Be humble. Do not directly argue back. You are not obliged to address every issue.



Like 30

CRITICISM A Quarterly for Literature and the Arts

Edited by Jaime Goodrich

Subjects: Art, Cultural Studies, Gender, Language and Literature, Literary Criticism and Theory, Music, Popular Culture, Women's Studies

Published four times per year
ISSN 0011-1589
E-ISSN 1536-0342

H-Index: 14

[Submit to Criticism](#)
[Purchase Individual Articles](#)



[Overview](#) [Current Issue](#) [Forthcoming](#) [Subscriptions](#) [Back Issues](#) [Awards](#)

Criticism Volume 59, Number 1, Winter 2017

"Every Day You Are a New Person": Narration and Cosmopolitan Universalism in Jean Rhys's *After Leaving Mr. Mackenzie*
Jason R. Marley

Photography from the Inside Out: Robert Frank's Memorial Images
Benjamin Pollak

Charles Reznikoff's 1934 *Testimony* and the Idiom of American Violence
Justin Parks

Psychoanalytic Thinking and the Sexual Politics of Style
Scott St. Pierre

IN THIS SECTION

[Subscriptions](#)
[Acquisitions](#)
[Publication Schedule](#)
[Advertising Rates](#)
[Publishing Ethics](#)

CONTACT US

Journals Manager

Tara Reeser
(313) 577-4607
tara.reeser@wayne.edu

Journals Marketing & Sales

Coordinator
Julie Warheit
(313) 577-4603
julie.warheit@wayne.edu



Examine the journal's editorial board

- <https://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/discourse/editorialboard.html>

Go to humanities wiki and read reviews

- http://humanitiesjournals.wikia.com/wiki/Comparative_Literature,_Cultural_Studies_and_Theory_Journals
- **College Literature**
- Submitted Oct 17, accepted Jan 18 with extensive comments and recommendations. Amazing.
- Has now slightly leavened their pedagogical focus. A really excellent place to publish that has a wide scope and is not clubby or elitist.
- Historically as much concerned with pedagogy as critical and theoretical approaches, now looking for more work on the latter.
- **Critical Inquiry**
- Don't bother with this journal! I submitted twice there over the past five years and in both cases the same result: over 5 months of waiting for exactly the same response (with no reviews and nothing specific said about the texts): Dear XXXXXX, Although we found much of interest in "XXXXXX," we finally concluded that your essay does not meet our present needs. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to see your work. We appreciate your interest in Critical Inquiry. Sincerely, W. J. T. Mitchell Editor. In both cases, I immediately resubmitted the manuscripts elsewhere and they were accepted (one with minor revisions and the other with no revisions). I agree with what has been said here: because this is an incredibly unprofessional behavior, not only I am never going to submit there, I will also never review for them, read the journal, or put of any of their texts on the syllabi of my courses.
- Also had a long wait (around 5-6 months) for a brief rejection with no feedback and no evidence the article had even been read.
- After 11-12 months a rejection, and no reports - although I was told 3 people had read it. Since then, I have published several books with good presses, articles in PMLA, MLQ, MFS, and elsewhere, but I would never submit to (even by invitation) or referee for Critical Inquiry. I won't read the journal either, knowing that the peer review process is uneven, and that they do not share reports with aspiring scholars, who could really use the feedback.



PROJECT MUSE®

Theresa Hak Kyung Cha's "Phantomnation": Cinematic Specters and Spectral Collectivity in *Dictée* and Apparatus

Mayumo Inoue

Criticism, Volume 56, Number 1, Winter 2014, pp. 63-87 (Article)

Published by Wayne State University Press
DOI: 10.1353/crt.2014.0009



➔ For additional information about this article
<http://muse.jhu.edu/article/543704>

Laudable as their efforts are in foregrounding the centrality of Korea's colonial history and the ensuing experience of migration and diaspora in *Dictée*, the critics' assumption that such history can be best told from the perspective of its "native" offspring who is either of Korean or Korean diasporic origin invites the problems of the native's commodification in the mainstream culture and its utilitarianist exemplification as the holder of political "truth" in the pedagogical culture. This occurs when the critics ultimately interpret Cha's experimental formalism as constituting a merely sophisticated variant of realist historiography and privilege the "diasporic" subject as one who engages in such a more or less unproblematic mimesis of empirical "history" out there that has been only partially lost or damaged due to time's passage. Moreover, these critics' hypostatization of the single "native" subject in *Dictée* as one who now approximates such irreparable history willfully sidelines the presence of multiple speaking women ("diseuses") who differently and differentially narrate *plural* histories of oppression and displacement, including ones that took place in Korea.¹⁰

This tendency is pronounced in Wong's "Unnaming the Same: Theresa Hak Kyung Cha's *Dictée*", where the critic's valorization of *Dictée*'s critique of the notion of national history that privileges "identity over difference" is predicated upon what Wong sees as Cha's putative positionality as "the Korean American immigrant woman writer." As Wong continues, it is such "privileging that the Korean American immigrant woman writer, marked by differences of race, nationality and gender,

Review example

- **1. Scope and Purpose:** Does the author state clearly the purposes, main arguments, and conclusions of the article?
 - Yes, the purposes, arguments, and conclusions are stated clearly.
- **2. Contribution:** Does the manuscript present new concepts, data, interpretations, etc., that make it a significant contribution to the field?
 - Yes, the manuscript presents new and original interpretations of Cha's work that make it a significant contribution to the field. These interpretations are quite sensitive to the subtleties of Cha's interest in film criticism and in video production. Readers will appreciate these thoughtful engagements with Cha's creative and critical work.
- **3. Scholarship:** Please comment on the author's scholarship and knowledge of recent literature. Does the author seem aware of current scholarship in the field?
 - The author explicitly engages with two of the best-known and well-respected essays on Theresa Hak Kyung Cha's *Dictee* in Asian American literary studies. She implicitly and explicitly critiques these essays persuasively. The author also cites and engages with other important (relatively) recent works of critical theory and postcolonial studies.
- **4. Organization/coverage:** Is the organization clear and consistent? Are all the important topics covered? Is the coverage well-balanced?
 - In general, the organization is clear and the subheadings are helpful. I have some minor suggestions regarding organization below. Coverage of topics is generally well balanced.
 -
- **5. Writing style:** Please comment on the author's writing style and its importance to the success of the manuscript. Is the style appropriate for the intended readership?
 - The writing style is appropriate to the subject matter and for the intended readership: versed in theory but readable and understandable. I appreciated how the diction was both precise and suggestive, as befitting a complex topic; and also varied enough to keep the reader's interest.
- **6. Recommendations:** What specific suggestions for revision do you have for the author? Do you recommend that we accept this manuscript for publication?
 - This is a strong article that will be of interest to many readers, both because Cha is a significant avant-garde artist and writer, and because the article itself is highly insightful, and absorbing to read. I highly recommend that *Criticism* accepts this manuscript for publication. I have a few minor suggestions for revision, mainly regarding organization and secondarily regarding development of argument.
 - Some of the main arguments are articulated in pp. 14-16, regarding "images that remain irreducible to discursive forms" and that exceed "the narrative contents of films" as well as "narrative structures that speak for and suture us to ideologies." These arguments are well-articulated, well-supported, and highly significant. I would suggest that the author find a way to more explicitly preview these interpretations and arguments, as well as how they intervene in the "hypostatization of the single 'native' subject" presumed by some Asian Americanist critics, earlier in the paper. The current introduction is nicely suggestive regarding the transformative, "alchemical" properties of art, but could do more to prepare the reader for the arguments to come.
 - The discussion of gender and postcoloniality in the last few pages (pp. 26-27) has great potential but right now it feels like it arises abruptly for the reader, like it is tacked on at the end. For revision, consider previewing this argument for the reader earlier in the essay and/or developing this argument in greater depth. On p. 27, if the native man desires to be in the place of the colonizer, what explains the lack of desire on the part of the native woman? Is it simply a lack of opportunity, or something else? If *Dictee's* "phantomnation" is "primarily opened by women," why is this so? Etc.
 - The discussion of antiphonies (pp. 29-30) is important but also feels abrupt. Consider how to prepare the reader for this idea earlier in the article.
 - As I have stated, my overall assessment is that this is a strong, original, and insightful article.