Editorial

Comparative European Politics (2004) 2, 1–2. doi:10.1057/palgrave.cep.6110029

A year ago, we launched the first issue of this new transatlantic journal, *Comparative European Politics*. Our aim was neither to map out a new approach to comparative analysis, nor to defend any partisan theoretical or empirical preferences we may have as editors, but to establish a journal for specialists in comparative politics whose interests are primarily European. *Comparative European Politics* was created as a peer-reviewed journal of European political science, which we interpreted broadly to include international and comparative political economy, public policy and administration, electoral politics, political sociology and international relations. In our first editorial, we called for articles that would focus on ‘...contemporary Europe within and beyond the European Union, the processes of European integration and enlargement, and the place of Europe and European states within international/global political and economic dynamics.’ We included a list of substantive areas in which we hoped to attract the very best scholarship from both sides of the Atlantic, but were clear that we did not intend to impose any common theoretical, methodological or empirical standards. Nevertheless, we were equally clear that we expected all submissions to be explicitly comparative in their own terms. To support this enterprise, 24 noted scholars from Europe and the United States agreed to serve on the editorial board. As we now move into our second year and our second volume of publication, we would like to reaffirm these commitments, and to evaluate the success of our collective enterprise.

In our first volume, we published 17 articles, all of which were peer reviewed. More than 60 manuscripts were submitted for this volume, each of which was sent to three referees. Thus, almost 200 anonymous referees participated in this collective enterprise. Of course, we owe each of them a debt of thanks (you know who you are). Indeed, many of the reviewers read re-submissions twice before their job was done. We take special pride in the fact that the turn-around time for reviews was unusually fast, and that the time from submission to publication was exceptionally rapid. Each of us has tried to work closely with the authors with whom we have had contact, as well as with the referees, to ensure rapid publication.

A total of 22 scholars published individual or joint articles in our first volume. Although the majority were based in Europe (14), a substantial

number were based in the United States (seven), and one in Australia. We are pleased by the quality of the scholarship that we were able to publish, and we are reassured that the quality of the journal has been reinforced by our review process. Our articles include several new departures, and a healthy mix of theoretically and empirically oriented articles. We have also included a critical review symposium of the Hall and Soskice volume on *Varieties of Capitalism* (Oxford, 2001), an unusually rich dialogue, with a response by the authors. This symposium has now been made available on the Palgrave website.

We are grateful to our anonymous reviewers, as well as to our editorial board, many of whose members have encouraged and supported this journal before the first issue was completed. Of course, we must also thank the authors whose articles we were able to publish, as well as those whose submission we did not. It takes a leap of intellectual faith to agree to have your best efforts published in a journal that has not yet appeared. David Bull and Steven Kennedy at Palgrave also demonstrated their support for this project from the beginning. We owe a debt of thanks to Leah Ramirez in our office in New York, and Diane Martin in our office in Birmingham for their hard work this past year in launching what we now feel is a major new journal in comparative politics. Finally, to you, our subscribers and fellow scholars, thank you for joining with us.

Martin A. Schain, Colin Hay and Ben Rosamond