



Why Publish, and Why Publish in *Leviathan:* *Interdisciplinary* *Journal in English?*

Jens Kjeldgaard-Christiansen

ABSTRACT

In this editorial, I discuss the reasons why students would want to publish their academic work, as well as the benefits of publishing in *Leviathan: Interdisciplinary journal in English* specifically. I then introduce the articles in the first issue.

Keywords: Leviathan, English journal, publication

Corresponding author: Jens Kjeldgaard-Christiansen (jkc@cc.au.dk)

Department of English, Aarhus University

Publish or perish. For those comfortable in the academy, there's at least one unmistakable incentive for getting your ideas published: You don't get to stay if you don't do it. For students, who may not want any part of academia after graduation, the reasons why you should publish are perhaps less clear. In this short editorial for the first issue of *Leviathan: Interdisciplinary Journal in English*, I will try to make at least some of them clear. I will then say something about what it means to publish in *Leviathan* specifically. Finally, I will introduce the articles of the issue.

First the lofty argument. Good ideas matter; bad ideas clutter. When you show your ideas to the world, the world can push back against them, revealing their applications and exposing their cracks. Academic publication is about making private ideas public, and that can certainly be a worthwhile goal in itself. Ideas made public through *Leviathan* specifically will get a prominent and stable platform. DOI identification, to be implemented following the release of this first issue, means that articles won't be made hidden or unavailable by changes at the level of the hosting platform, and that all published materials will be indexed through Crossref's extensive databases.

Another good reason to publish your work, and let's be frank, is personal recognition. If you wrote a cogent and innovative paper within your field of study, you deserve credit. A good grade is nice, but a publication means that you will have something more substantive to show for your efforts. Publication in *Leviathan* is a testimony to precocious academic proficiency. It shows that the author is ahead of the curve within his or her area of specialization. That is not a bad thing to be able to demonstrate in a *videnssamfund*. For example, publication in the journal can be one way of making yourself visible to a PhD selection committee.

Finally, you may simply want to get your paper published to help your fellow student out. If a student's paper is recommended for publication by a member of faculty, then that member of faculty considers the paper an instructive example for other students. It will be used as such. Philosophers and psychologists tell us that the thesis of psychological egoism, the idea that we are ultimately only motivated toward benefitting ourselves, is false. We apparently really do care about the fortune of other people. Perhaps that is true—my heart, hardened by the villains I study, is not so sure. But yes, there's altruism in it.

Leviathan is meant to be a journal that will help students test their ideas, get recognition for their hard work, and help other students by providing them with exemplars of academic writing. The journal is modeled on the format of the refereed academic journal: It incorporates a review procedure—the faculty of the Department of English, Aarhus University decide what's recommended for the journal—and it publishes academically specialized papers that aim to produce new knowledge. I hope you will like it.

Articles

The first issue of *Leviathan* opens with the article “WSPU Rhetoric: Justifying Militancy” by Emilie Boutrup Högarð (recommended by Assistant Professor [Mark Eaton](#)). The article was originally submitted as an exam paper for the course History, Society, and Culture 2. Högarð argues that, “While the WSPU [the Canadian Women’s Social and Political Union, active 1903-17] sought to promote the cause of women’s suffrage, their rhetoric, as a result of adopting [a] militant method, increasingly served the purpose of justifying the method rather than the cause.” After having failed to secure women’s suffrage through measured and empathic appeals, the WSPU began to frame their struggle in terms of good and evil—righteous victims and power-crazed oppressors. Högarð examines the way in which this transition shows in the writings of three contemporary feminists.

Kristina Sommerlund contributed the article “Critical Overview: Gender and Tentative Language” (recommended by Assistant Professor [Michaela Hejná](#)). The article was originally submitted as an exam paper for the course English Linguistics 3: English in Its Social Contexts. Sommerlund draws on the work of American linguist Robin Lakoff on women’s linguistic assertiveness, or the lack thereof. In particular, she presents a critical review of the literature concerning women’s use of hedges and other forms of tentative language. Sommerlund’s review challenges Lakoff’s stronger claims about women’s use of tentative language, emphasizing that many forms of putatively tentative language serve other functions than hedging and self-effacement.

Amalie Due Svendsen contributed the article “*Pride and Prejudice*: A Bildungsroman” (recommended by Part-time Lecturer [Sophia Kier-Byfield](#)). The article was originally submitted as an exam paper for the course Literature in English 1. Svendsen argues that the standard designation of *Pride and Prejudice* as a romance novel is problematic. The personal development of Elizabeth, the novel’s protagonist, is more consistent with the label of *Bildungsroman*. On this view, the novel shows itself to be at least as much about women’s social place in society as about the romantic union of Elizabeth and Mr. Darcy.

Joachim Jelle contributed the article “A Study in *Scarlett*: Creaky Voice and Romantic Intention in Spike Jonze’s *Her*” (recommended by Assistant Professor [Michaela Hejná](#)). The article was originally submitted as an exam paper for the course English Linguistics 3: English in Its Social Contexts. With his contribution, Jelle seeks to extend findings on women’s use of creaky voice to enhance their own romantic desirability. He examines Scarlett Johansson’s character’s use of creaky voice in the film *Her*, showing that the character preferentially employs creaky voice when extending romantic invitations to the male protagonist of the film.

Laura Bjerre Schwalbe contributed the article “‘Mother! Where Are You?’: Attachment, Hazard-Precaution and Loss Simulation in *Bambi* and *Finding Nemo*” (recommended by Associate Professor [Mathias Clasen](#)). The article was originally submitted as a BA project for the course Human

Nature and Pop Culture: Evolutionary Approaches in the Humanities. Schwalbe argues that *Bambi* and *Finding Nemo* target evolved human attachment and hazard-precaution mechanisms by featuring young, cute, and identifiable protagonists forced to cope with the loss of one or both parents. Both films give viewers vicarious experience with threatening and emotionally devastating events. Schwalbe concludes the article by arguing that the kind of evolutionary analysis she undertakes can be fruitfully integrated with a feminist perspective.

Finally, the first issue of *Leviathan* features the master's thesis "Framing Secular Women's Rights in Contemporary Britain and Beyond: Challenges and Implications" by former student Martin Rosendal Ehlers (recommended by Associate Professor [Sara Dybris McQuaid](#)). Ehlers examines a number of challenges to multiculturalism in Britain, focusing on enduring frictions between women's secular human rights and religious accommodation. He concludes that recent feminist campaigns against Sharia law challenge the broader discourse of multiculturalism that surrounds questions of religious toleration and human rights.