

# Editorial

With this issue *The Review of International Studies* passes from the Exeter team, who have edited it for the last few years, to the new team here at St Andrews. We would first of all like to thank those in the team at Exeter – David Armstrong, Maggie Armstrong, Theo Farrell and Bice Maiguascha – for their excellent custodianship of the *Review*, and especially (from our parochial perspective) for all their help with the inevitably complicated process of transition over the last few months. They have set an enviably high standard for contributions and intellectual content and are a hard act to follow. But we will do our best.

The *Review* enters the next five years with a wide readership and a justifiably high reputation amongst scholars of international studies both in the United Kingdom and Europe as well as further afield. We hope to build on and enhance that reputation still further and increase that readership as our term proceeds. The basic mission of the *Review* – to serve the members of the British International Studies Association and, indeed, the wider scholarly community by publishing the highest quality articles from all over the world and in all fields of international studies – will remain at the centre of our concerns. And, of course, we will continue the *Review's* policy of ensuring the highest standard of published work by rigorous, anonymous peer review of all submissions. There will be no compromise on these aims or standards. But, naturally, we also have our own ideas about how the *Review* should develop and over time, readers will see these make their appearance.

We shall, for instance, revert to the practice begun when the Aberystwyth team edited the *Review* of having one Special Issue a year, each December. The first Special Issue, in December 2006, will investigate the trajectory and fate of that now very variegated body of thought that goes under the name of ‘critical theory’ in IR. It is now 25 years since two of the articles that first introduced critical concerns into the field appeared, and so the Special Issue will pose the question ‘Critical Theory After Twenty-Five Years: What’s Left? What’s Next?’

We will also seek to encourage critical debate and discussion in all areas of IR and cognate fields. Of course, the *Review* has always done this, both generally by providing a home where substantive scholarly issues can be debated and through particular innovations, such as the forum sections that have been so much a feature of the *Review* in recent years. These will continue, but we will also try and stimulate very particular kinds of debate by inviting two scholars who take different views of a particular issue to debate that issue at length in the *Review* in a special section. The readership will then be invited to comment and discuss these interventions.

The field of International Relations, at least as understood by the *Review*, has always been characterised by its openness to insights and concerns from other areas of scholarly inquiry. This openness is something we believe to be of particular and growing importance. Thus from time to time we will also invite prominent figures from fields not often much considered in IR scholarship to offer a discussion either on some aspect of international relations in the world, or of the study of International Relations itself. Hopefully these essays may help to start dialogue both within IR and

between scholars in IR and scholars in other areas, where in the past such dialogue was scanty or non-existent.

Of course, these new initiatives will not all happen at once, and, we emphasise, will be developed alongside the longstanding and central purposes that a journal like the *Review* exists to serve. Taken as a whole we believe that they will enhance the mission and the reach of the *Review* as it approaches its fourth decade and thus help it to perform its central tasks with ever greater efficiency. We also hope that they will encourage the readership of the *Review* to continue to increase both the depth and the breadth of their analyses and interpretations and thus help all of us to understand better the complex and ever-changing world in which live. Finally, just as we hope that these developments will stimulate critical discussion of and within the field in general, so we hope and expect that if you have ideas that you think would be useful for the *Review* to consider, about ways of deepening our understanding and developing our mission, you will let us know. The *Review* fundamentally exists to serve the scholarly community interested in all aspects of international studies; let us know how we can do that even better.

*Nick Rengger (Editor); Rick Fawn, Oliver Richmond, Ian Taylor, Ben Thirkell-White, Ali Watson (Associate Editors)*