Editorial**(All *JIRD*) Editors' note**

Journal of International Relations and Development (2008) **11**, 215–221.
doi:10.1057/jird.2008.15

By the time this issue publishes, my function as Editor of *JIRD* will have come to an end. As in the fall of 2003, when I started taking over from the former Editor Zlatko Šabič and then effectively signing for the first issue in March 2004, Patrick Jackson and his team have been taking over step by step since the start of 2008 and are now in full control.

Many things have happened in the last 5 years with the CEEISA and *JIRD*, its official journal. The CEEISA got a new Charter, an Executive Committee and a solid institutional base; its membership has impressively risen. *JIRD* consolidated and further developed its status as a serious and independent voice in the landscape of IR, able to attract good authors, sometimes famous, sometimes less known (as of yet), and featuring special Symposia (e.g. on Human Nature in IR theory) and issues covering a wide field in IR, from foreign policy analysis and critical security studies to international political economy. In 2007, *JIRD* was finally accepted into the Social Science Citation Index. In this year alone, *JIRD* articles published since 2004 have been downloaded more than 18,000 times from the Palgrave Macmillan website.

Given these different special occasions, we have decided to make this note not from a single *JIRD* Editor, but from all past and present Editors. The former Editors will give a short appraisal of the history of the journal and the present Editor will introduce his team's vision for the term ahead. But before doing this, I will use the Editor's privilege one last time to thank all who worked with me during this editorial term. I wish to thank Petr Drulák, our Book Review Editor (and now Associate Editor) whose editorial advice I could always trust. Thanks go to my co-Editor Milan Brglez and his team in Ljubljana, which over the years included Ana Bojinović, Sabina Kajnc, Mateja Peter, Jernej Pikalo, Petra Roter, and Boštjan Udovič, and who managed the communication with authors and referees, as well as the proofing stage of the articles. I wish to thank Emma Jones for her unflinching support at Palgrave Macmillan. *JIRD* owes a debt to all the authors who decided to submit to us and especially to our dedicated referees, without whom we could not have reached the present quality.

This issue is dedicated to the memory of two members of our International Advisory Board, the late Hayward R. Alker (1937–2007), who also published in *JIRD*, and Ivan Tyulin (1947–2007). Their loss is deeply felt in our community.

Stefano Guzzini

Breaking the ground: the story of a Central and East European journal

The roots of the *JIRD* date back to 1984, when the journal *Development & International Cooperation* began to be published by the Centre of International Co-operation and Development (CICD), headquartered in Ljubljana. At that time, the CICD enjoyed considerable reputation among researchers from the developing world, and had a well-developed network with scholars and policy-makers. In part at least this was made possible due to Yugoslavia's active involvement in the Non-Aligned Movement. The journal focused mainly on economic issues in the developing world. As the disintegration of the bipolar global world order began to unfold, the journal was moved, in 1990, to its new home, the Centre of International Relations (CIR) at the University of Ljubljana. In 1994, the CIR started a new journal: *Journal of International Relations*, launched on the initiative of Bojko Bučar, one of the founding fathers of the Central and East European International Studies Association (CEEISA, see below). Research activities of the CIR pretty much reflected the topics, covered by the two journals, and it had made increasingly less sense to keep publishing them as separate journals. In 1997, it was finally decided that the two journals be merged into one — the *Journal of International Relations and Development (JIRD)*. The name reflected its origin, but the agenda of the journal was quite different, and has much to do with the development of the scholarly infrastructure in Central and Eastern Europe.

JIRD was to become the official journal of the CEEISA, which was founded in 1998. In the 1990s, the International Affairs Network (IAN), supported by the Pew Foundation, sought to create a network of institutions in Central and Eastern Europe with a focus on the study of international relations (IR). This effort had a strong impact on the institutionalization of contacts among scholars from the region. During IAN brainstorming sessions in 1996, an idea came up that the network should have its own professional association. Two years later, the CEEISA was inaugurated in St. Petersburg, Russia. Support to

the organization has been provided mainly by a connection between the Prague Faculty of Economics and the Chair of International Relations at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana. In the early days of the CEEISA, these two institutions provided all the administrative and organizational capacities. Now, the CEEISA has a far wider institutional base through its new Charter, voted by its members in 2007, and its elected Executive Committee with members from a variety of countries.¹

As the official journal of the CEEISA, all the features of a serious journal were introduced, including a strict double-blind peer review not common in CEE. An International Advisory Board was carefully selected, with a view to making sure that its members would not be there just for the name's sake, but would actually do the much needed review of incoming articles. A Book Review Editor was included in the team, whose work proved to be extremely beneficial for young aspirants from the region: not only did they receive their reviewed book free of charge, but under his editorship of their submissions, they could get a 'taste' what it was like to publish in an international journal. Last but not least, to mark the importance of starting afresh, and given the new name and approach of the journal's editorial team, *JIRD* started with Vol. 1, No. 1, rather than Vol. 14, No. 1.

Under its first Editor Zlatko Šabič, *JIRD* began being tracked in all major databases in the field of social science, except for the SSCI. The journal has become increasingly recognizable, and the number of manuscripts submitted has been growing. By 2003, at the common CEEISA-ISA meeting in Budapest, Palgrave Macmillan became the co-owner and distributor of *JIRD* and Stefano Guzzini became its Editor, in collaboration with co-Editor Milan Brglez from Ljubljana, who was responsible for overseeing the proofing stage. The Editor was from 'the West', but by that time, he had become acquainted with the region through his 6 years as a teacher at the Central European University in Budapest. Petr Drulák decided to accept the invitation to continue his work as Book Review Editor. Since then, *JIRD* has further consolidated this base by pursuing four main objectives. It aimed at a generally high-level and recognized academic quality, while nurturing the publication of authors from Central and Eastern Europe (but also from other European peripheries). It also wished to build up a wider scope in its audience and distribution and make the journal financially profitable while starting basically from zero, since *JIRD* used to be distributed for free before 2004. All this has been achieved. Indeed, by the end of this editorial term, Thomson ISI has accepted *JIRD* into the Social Science Citation Index.

Since *JIRD* is the official journal of a regional international studies association, it is open to all currents of research in international studies as represented in the region, as long as the submissions are of a scholarly type (and not policy studies), and connected to IR at large (and not, for instance,

domestically oriented transition studies). For this reason, and as the name also indicates, it explicitly includes both IR and international political economy, as well as purely theoretical and conceptual pieces. The latter had general reasons, but also took into account that theory can be 'the research of the poor'. In the research environment of the CEE, where research budgets and the choice of libraries are limited, theoretical work is more accessible, since one basically needs fewer books, no costly empirical research — only brains, which are more equally distributed in the discipline than money. Hence the format indicated on *JIRD*'s website says: '*JIRD* seeks original manuscripts that provide theoretically informed empirical analyses of issues in IR and international political economy, as well as original theoretical or conceptual analyses'.

In spite of being located in the Central and East European region, *JIRD* is not a regional journal in any narrow sense. Authors from all over the world can publish in it, on any international topic. Yet, at the same time, *JIRD* aims at encouraging and nurturing scholars from CEE to publish their findings in a journal that is not dominated by a purely West-oriented scholarship and research agenda. Moreover, the journal wants to help close a gap in IR research in Central and Eastern Europe between descriptive analyses and the standards of social science theory and method prevailing in the West. How successful has the journal been in pursuing these aims?

JIRD decided not to apply any quota system or positive discrimination for scholars from the region. It applies the very same referee procedure and has the same expectations in terms of scholarly quality. The development so far is encouraging. Scholars affiliated in Central and Eastern Europe have provided the third largest contingent of authors after the US and the UK and are on a par with Germany. Although this is certainly a number that would be good to see increased, it is already an achievement. No other journal in IR of comparable scholarly profile has reached a ratio of 10 per cent of its authors who are residing in CEE.

However, this good result cannot hide the special obstacles faced by regional scholars. At times, referees justifiably admonish that manuscripts lack the necessary bibliographic background, or do not refer to the latest twists in the debate. Instead, they seem to reinvent the wheel, or rely on common wisdom (often implicit), long-ago debunked or at least significantly questioned elsewhere. However, scholars in the region can not turn to the same bibliographic or empirical data sources as their colleagues in the 'West'. Regional libraries are in dire financial straits, most IR journals and books not available, and neither is there generous research funding for independent empirical data. Moreover, a regional voice has not just a special timbre; at times it might sing a different song. And here, applying international scholarly standards and relying on a referee network that necessarily compares to the

‘state-of-the-art’ in the field of IR is bound to import not just methods and standards, possibly more universal, but also expectations about content and research agendas. While it could be advantageous simply to skip some of the allegedly crucial debates that regularly haunt the discipline, a journal quickly becomes the gatekeeper for enforcing them; it is part of canonizing them. But there are other paths, other histories and traditions, other disciplinary matrices for approaching similar problems and conceiving different ones, which is a regional richness potentially lost, when such homogeneous expectations are applied.

Now, CEE is not a part of the world where disciplinary and academic traditions are far from the rest of Europe or the ‘West’; there is internal diversity all over, peripheries East and West, and also some unexpected intellectual affinities criss-crossing the continent, often with a long history. Perhaps, the special place of *JIRD* is precisely in developing for the first time a truly pan-European forum where such diversity and affinity can play out, and be played out on a level playing field. The challenge for any editorial team is to provide the conditions for such a forum, carefully listening to and gathering those voices, thus at least trying to meet this goal which may never be fully achieved.

Zlatko Šabič and Stefano Guzzini

Note

1 More information about the CEEISA, including its Charter, its Secretariat in Prague and the Executive Committee members is available at: <http://ian.vse.cz/ceeisa/>.

The editorial vision of the third regime

Whenever we try to think of the future, we always draw on resources and capacities given to us out of the past, by those who have come before us. In this way, present action stems from the tradition of the past even as it reaches out into a yet-unknown world to come. Zlatko Šabič and Stefano Guzzini, the previous two Editors of this Journal — along with the numerous people who have cooperated and collaborated with them over the years — have produced a rich and vibrant editorial tradition that I and the other members of the new editorial team are honored to inherit. Since the Journal’s founding in 1997, there have been two editorial regimes; as the third regime, we are both indebted to that tradition and determined to meet or exceed the high standards that the previous regimes have set.

As regime changes go, this one has been extremely smooth. Do not expect any radical or revolutionary alterations in the Journal's basic mandate from us: *JIRD* remains, as it always was before, a social-scientific journal of International Relations (IR) scholarship broadly understood. Rooted in the region of Central and Eastern Europe, the Journal is nevertheless not a 'regional journal' as that term is commonly understood. To the contrary, the Journal aims to publish high-quality social-scientific scholarship on world politics regardless of the empirical focus of a particular article or the national origin of its author. That said, the Journal does have a special interest in promoting the growth of IR as a field of study throughout Central and Eastern Europe, and as such particularly encourages submissions that bring regional debates and theories into dialogue with other parts of the scholarly landscape. But it should be emphasized that we — like the previous editorial regimes — are interested in wide-ranging *dialogue*, rather than either the provincialism of a narrow focus on purely regional debates or the provincialism of a slavish adherence to the fads and fashions of 'Western' IR.

In other words, *JIRD* should be a site of translation and encounter, and not the place for the establishment of any particular orthodoxy. We take no official editorial position on the substantive and theoretical debates in the field, and we have no intention of engaging in 'gate-keeping' editorial practices designed to shape the discipline by excluding particular kinds of work from consideration. This is particularly important when it comes to methodological questions; there has been no *JIRD* 'line' about what constitutes an appropriate social-scientific methodology for the study of world politics, and there will continue to be no such line. Similarly, the Journal will continue to refrain from the practice of 'courtesy reviewing' in which a submitted manuscript critical of some scholar's work is sent to the critiqued scholar for the kind of commentary that often amounts to a veto on the manuscript's publication. We are as uninterested in upholding the disciplinary *status quo* through the review process as we are in upholding it through methodological policing.

That said, the Journal has been and will continue to be a journal devoted to the publication of social-scientific scholarship, rather than policy commentary or statements of raw political activism. By 'social science' we mean not the adherence to some narrow doctrine, but the broader sensibility so well articulated by Max Weber in *his* classic editorial vision statement of 1905:

The social science that we want to concern ourselves with is a *science of actuality*. We want to understand *in its particularity* the encompassing actuality of the life in which we are placed — on one hand, the coherence and cultural *significance* of individual occurrences in their contemporary configuration, and on the other hand, the reasons for those occurrences being historically so and not otherwise. (Weber 1999: 170–1)

Although there is nothing in Weber's statement about precisely *how* that 'science of actuality' is to be carried out, his observation does establish an important criterion for good social science: it should be related to the empirical world. Even theoretical and conceptual scholarship, which we have published and will continue to publish, should be oriented in the last instance towards helping us improve our explanations and understanding of the actual, empirical world within which we live. Elsewhere in the same essay, Weber defines social-scientific knowing as involving the 'analytical ordering of empirical actuality' (*ibid.*, 160), a definition that highlights the *systematic* character of social-scientific work: the consistency of premises and conclusions is vital for a sound piece of social science. But beyond these two broad strictures — be systematically consistent, and relate what you are doing to the study of the empirical world — we, like Weber, place no restrictions on what 'counts' as social science.

For assistance in determining whether a manuscript is publishable, of course, the editorial team turns to other scholars and requests anonymous peer reviews. Anonymous peer reviewing is not a perfect system, but it does make possible two important things: the veil of anonymity permits a reviewer to give honest, constructively critical feedback, and the input of reviewers gives the editorial team a chance to see how an argument is received by other scholars in the field. We will continue the Journal's established practice of 'developmental' reviews, which means both that the editorial team will endeavour to give precise and directed feedback to authors so that they can improve their manuscripts, and that we will encourage reviewers to provide such feedback as well. This applies equally to manuscripts that are ultimately accepted and to those that are ultimately rejected. The peer reviewing process should be an educational and edifying experience regardless of its outcome in a particular case; in this, we will strive to continue the precedent established by previous editors.

We are grateful for the opportunity to continue and expand the proud tradition of the *Journal of International Relations and Development*. Having inherited the resources of that tradition from previous editorial regimes, we confidently hope to one day pass it on to our successors, both intact and improved by the addition of our own distinctive style. Building on its past, the Journal's future is a bright one indeed.

Patrick Thaddeus Jackson

Reference

- Weber, Max (1999) 'Die 'Objektivität' Sozialwissenschaftlicher und Sozialpolitischer Erkenntnis', in Elizabeth Flitner, ed., *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*, 146–214, Potsdam: Internet-Ausgabe: <http://www.uni-potsdam.de/u/paed/Flitner/Flitner/Weber/>.