

Editorial

This first number of the *Review of International Studies* is launched under the imprint of a new publisher, Butterworths of London. This, we hope, will begin a long and fruitful relationship between Butterworths and the British International Studies Association and we trust that our readers will find the new format attractive. The term 'British' has been dropped from the title – not because of any sudden loss of faith in the journal's country of origin, but rather because we wish to re-emphasize its international character in terms of subject matter, readership and general appeal. In all other respects editorial policy remains the same: we seek to attract scholarly contributions from social scientists, historians and lawyers with interests in the international aspects of their disciplines.

During the first six years of its existence, the British Journal of International Studies published a wide variety of articles on themes ranging from the origins of the First World War to mathematical analysis of the nuclear arms race. The Editor still retains his faith in the virtues of an eclectic approach, even if his enthusiasm, indeed his understanding of some of the more rarefied contributions is occasionally less than total. Nevertheless, the conviction remains that international studies is a 'broad church' embracing a variety of the conflicting perspectives and our new publisher's willingness to publish four rather than – as in the past – three numbers will mean an increase in both the amount and rate of publication.

This particular number is a 'special' one in the sense that all the articles are concerned with the theory of international relations and a careful reading reveals several areas of common interest and concern. In recent years, for example, there has been a revival in 'classical' international theory, partly stimulated by the editing and publication of the writings of the late Martin Wight and reflected in several essay collections, most notably the *Reason of States*, edited by Michael Donelan. Two of the contributors to this number of the *Review* examine the significance of Wight's approach to the study of international relations and some of those most influenced by him, will, no doubt, wish to take issue with Roy Jones' controversial – indeed subversive – analysis of Wight's work as well as Michael Nicholson's scepticism about its ultimate merits. Responses would be welcome.

Finally, the Editor would like to thank the editorial staff of Longmans for all their help during the last six years. Mrs. Elizabeth Stokes deserves particular gratitude for being a model of patience and understanding in her dealings with the Editor.

J. E. SPENCE