



SUBMISSION SLOG

William E. Foster

In response to Professor Foster's letter on this page, we accepted the letters on the following pages. Now what do you think of our editorial judgment?

– *The Editors*

Dear editors,

As you know, the process of submitting articles to law reviews and awaiting their response (if any) is rather agonizing for untenured profs. At first, you look for any sign of positivity from the top-ranked journals, which are pretty quick to drop the hammer (Did they call my piece “scholarship”?). But by the end of the process, you're pretty jaded as all of the rejection letters look the same (in large part because they are indeed, all the same). Attached please find my outlet during the angsty period for the last few cycles. The first is a submission cover letter that (perhaps transparently) attempts to put a positive spin on previous rejection. The other is a copy of an e-mail I received from one law journal toward the end of the cycle a few years ago that I've marked up to reflect what I imagine (am pretty sure) is what the editors were really thinking.

If The Green Bag would be interested in publishing either or both of these letters, I'm sure many untenured folks would get a good laugh.

Thanks,
Will

Will Foster is an untenured associate professor of law at Washburn University School of Law.

William E. Foster



[Fancy Law School Letterhead]

February 26, 2013

Re: *Tax Slog*

Dear Editor:

Law review editors across the nation are abuzz with excitement over my latest article, *Tax Slog*. *Tax Slog* is sure to be controversial and provoke widespread academic debate over the normative justifications for current tax structure in a modern, technology-driven economy. The article suggests that the present regime is untenable and undertheorized, and calls into question the current system's equitable distinctions. Clearly, *Tax Slog* has wide-sweeping implications for modern legal philosophy, economic theory, and our understanding of the origins of life.

Now is your chance to join in the wave of praise for this tantalizing work of scholarship. Here is a brief sample of what some of the country's top law journals are saying:

Utah's process editor acknowledged that the article is **"in the review pipeline."**

Michigan's editorial board indicated that it would "give [my] article . . . **careful consideration for publication**["]

Boston University's editors said they would **"look forward** to reviewing" *Tax Slog*.

The University of Chicago Law Review's articles editors **"appreciate[d] the opportunity to** read and consider [my] work."

Vanderbilt's Law Review editor implied that *Tax Slog* was **"scholarship."**

Cornell Law Review's articles editor was **"thank[ful] for [my] interest in"** their publication and said he would "look forward to [my] next submission."

Georgetown Law Journal's senior articles editor was like-

Submission Slog

wise thankful for my interest, and “**hope[d] [I] would consider [GLJ]** again in the future.”

Pepperdine’s board found it “**regrettable**” that they were unable to extend an offer of publication.

With this dramatic acclaim from premier law review editors, there is no question that *Tax Slog* will become an important and groundbreaking addition to the legal canon. Should you have any questions or wish to extend an offer of publication, please contact me at untenuredprof@school.edu.

Very truly yours,
Untenured Professor



Dear _____¹,

Thank you for your above-titled submission to the New Amsterdam University Law Review.² We have now completed our final review of your manuscript³ and unfortunately⁴ are unable to extend

¹ Note that we didn’t bother to go back through your materials to see if you’re a professor, practitioner, prison inmate, or anything else.

² As you’re probably aware, we have this thing called the “Tax Law Review” where “Tax” articles go. The consensus was that we’d rather light ourselves on fire than read a tax piece, much less edit and publish such a thing. Seriously, our professor for the basic income tax class was so socially awkward that he made the homeless chess players in Washington Square Park uncomfortable. We shudder to think what one might be like in a Red State.

³ By “manuscript,” we mean cover letter, CV, and title and first footnote of your article. The bulk of this review time was spent debating whether anyone on the editorial board could locate Arkansas on an unlabeled map. Only our research editor was successful, and she’s from Kyrgyzstan and it was probably required knowledge on her citizenship exam.

⁴ We received this form letter from the materials at the law journal conference. Our executive editor was tasked with editing and customizing the letter for our purposes. She spent 7 hours and ultimately only changed “we regret that” to “unfortunately.” We were all very impressed with this.

William E. Foster

an offer⁵ of publication. The Review receives a large number of submissions and we are constrained by the limited number of pages we are able⁶ to publish. Frequently we must make the difficult⁷ decision to turn down an excellent piece of scholarship.⁸

We wish you the best of luck⁹ and look forward to your next submission.¹⁰

Sincerely,

[Name Omitted]

Editor

New Amsterdam University¹¹ Law Review



⁵ We enjoy conveying this phrase more than we can express in words. We've kowtowed to obnoxious professors for 2 years now and it's our turn. Let me say it again "we are unable to extend an offer!" Actually, we're perfectly "able" to, but don't want to! Ha!

⁶ Read: "willing."

⁷ We're probably reaching at this point.

⁸ Please note that we are very obviously not designating your piece as such.

⁹ Despite a nearly overwhelming inclination to the contrary, we left this in from the form letter at the urging of our overly polite articles editor.

¹⁰ . . . going to the Tax Law Review. See Note 2.

¹¹ We are aware that you are an alumnus of this school, as you referenced your LL.M. from NAU in your cover letter, CV and first footnote. We are also aware that the LL.M. program admits anyone with a pulse and credit score over 680. In the future, we [NAU students for realzies] would appreciate your efforts to tone down your affiliation with our institution.