

Editorial

This issue of the *Review* is the first to be published under the direction of a new editorial team. The new team is based at LSE but international in scope: Kimberly Hutchings (LSE) is the lead editor; Mathias Albert (Bielefeld), George Lawson (LSE) and Jennifer Sterling-Folker (Connecticut) are co-editors; Roberto Rocca (LSE) is the Editorial Assistant. Although the new team is, from this issue until the end of 2015, in overall charge of the journal, the content of the *Review* over the next year or so will be made up of articles accepted by Nick Rengger at St Andrews. It is a mark of the popularity and success of the journal that so many people want to publish in it. As such, we are delighted to be taking it over, and would like to thank Nick and the outgoing team for their hard work over the past five years, as well as BISA for awarding us the editorship. We are particularly grateful to Paola Raunio at St Andrews and Patrick McCartan at CUP for their help during the transition period. We also want to take this opportunity to thank the outgoing editorial committee and advisory board for their service to the journal. And we offer a warm welcome to members of the new Editorial Board, who we know will uphold the distinguished tradition of their predecessors. As readers can see from the list of names printed on the inside cover, the new Editorial Board is a heterodox group which, we think, speaks well to the range and diversity of the *Review*. We look forward to working with them.

As noted above, the content of the *Review* during 2011 and early 2012 will continue to be drawn from articles submitted and accepted while the journal was based at St Andrews. Because of the extent of the backlog of accepted articles, the new editorial team has decided, in consultation with BISA and CUP, to call a temporary halt to the acceptance of new submissions until 1st April 2011. This will enable accepted articles already undergoing review to be processed more quickly, and will mean that articles submitted after April 1st will have a shorter turnaround time. In the meantime, we will be using the first six months of our editorial tenure to strengthen our reviewing procedures and, in consultation with the editorial board, to consolidate plans to raise the profile and reputation of the journal. We will report further on our plans in early 2012.

Our main goal as editors is a simple one: to make the *Review* the *premier general journal in the discipline*. In our view, the *Review* stands alone as a site where *all* parts of the discipline can be put into conversation with each other. The *Review* has no specific theoretical orientation, methodological sensibility or substantive issue focus – the first aim of our editorship is to maintain and, where possible, extend the journal's intellectual range. We are, therefore, cognisant of the openness of the journal towards new voices and approaches. However, we are equally cognisant that this openness can lead both to a 'ghettoisation' which reinforces mainstream-periphery divides and a Tower of Babel feel in which scholarship is increasingly fractured and isolated. Our aim is to make the *Review* a site where

these disparate debates can come together in a common conversation, one based on highlighting creative tensions rather than seeking bland synthesis.

We see the *Review*, therefore, as a site where IR's many voices can come together. But openness is not enough on its own. Equally important is a concern for quality. For us, the *Review* is a focal point not for its own sake, but as a means of providing space for the range of outstanding work which can be found across the discipline. In short, we want to engage with the variety of scholarship which characterises contemporary IR and publish the best pieces within it. Although all five issues of the journal this year will be weighty as we work through the backlog of accepted pieces, from 2012 the *Review* is likely to have a more slimmed down feel as we seek to publish only the very best IR scholarship. This will be possible only with the help of our colleagues. We are committed to rigorous peer reviewing of all material submitted to the journal and understand that efficient handling of the submission and review process is essential to raising the quality of the journal. A key goal in the short term is to cut down the time between submission and decisions. The administrative systems are in place to accomplish this; we hope that the reviewers we call upon share our desire for the *Review* to be associated with outstanding professional practices as well as outstanding articles. We want both submission and publication in the *Review* to be standard-leading in the field.

This year, therefore, will be one of continuity as well as change. However, we will innovate in at least one way – the introduction of a competitive process for the selection and production of Special Issues. Over recent years, the *Review* has published regular Special Issues, something which has allowed the journal to set the disciplinary agenda. The new editorial team will continue this tradition, albeit with a twist. In future, Special Issues will be co-edited by a member of the editorial team and a Guest Editor. Readers interested in putting together a Special Issue and acting as a Guest Editor should submit proposals by 1st April 2011 to r.roccu@lse.ac.uk. The proposal should comprise the following:

1. Name, affiliation and contact details of proposed Guest Editor;
2. Names of contributors;
3. Proposed Title and theme of the Special Issue;
4. Background and Rationale for the proposal;
5. Detailed abstracts of all of the papers.

Please note that articles submitted to Special Issues will be peer reviewed as closely as those under regular submission to the journal. The process of selecting successful bids will involve both independent referees and the editorial team. We strongly encourage readers to submit proposals to us. And we strongly encourage readers to keep reading the journal as we work at maintaining and enhancing the *Review's* traditions of openness and excellence during the period of our editorial tenure.

Kimberly Hutchings
Mathias Albert
George Lawson
Jennifer Sterling-Folker