From the editor

New beginnings

ith this issue I am pleased to announce that the journal has entered into a publishing arrangement with Cambridge University Press, the venerable consortia of letters with a long history (quite literally) of publishing some of the world's finest academic journals and scholarly manuscripts.

Beginning with issue 34(1), *Politics and the Life Sciences* will join Cambridge's roster of over 350 journal titles. *PLS* will continue to appear both online and in print through 2017, but beginning with 37(1) the journal will reside online as part of Cambridge Journals Online, while hard copies will remain available through a print-on-demand option. The journal's new home, where readers and contributors will soon be able to sign up for content alerts, access back issues, and submit articles, is *journals.cambridge.org/PLS*.

We would like to thank the good people at Allen Press who have delivered first-rate printing and production services for the journal for well over a decade now. We are especially appreciative of the able assistance provided by our account managers, including Kelly Calohan, Trisha Klosterman, and, mostly recently, Joe Barriger. Their commitment to quality has in no small way contributed to the journal's success.

The move to Cambridge, a nonprofit publisher representing "the future of publishing since 1584," offers long-term stability and a widely recognized commitment to academic excellence, free of market fashions and profit-driven decision making that now characterizes the commercial side of scientific publishing. For an association with a decades-old history (APLS), teaming up with a publisher with a centuries-old history (CUP) could not have come at a better time.

With the resources and support of Cambridge behind us, the journal will move towards publication as a quarterly over the next few years, with the eventual goal of achieving an ISI ranking and "impact factor," so valued by tenure and promotion committees. Our "alt metrics" (article downloads, article mentions, inclusion in databases, etc.) have always been good but we recognize the necessity and reputational benefit of joining the legions of ranked journals.

Moving forward, the journal's emphasis will remain on publishing the highest quality research articles with

doi: 10.2990/33_2_1

the broadest appeal, within our mission of exploring developments at the intersection of politics, evolution, and the life sciences.

When the next issue is published, *PLS* will appear in over 2,000 libraries worldwide as a new Cambridge title. The Association for Politics and the Life Sciences will retain ownership and editorial control of the journal, but now with the imprimatur of a premiere academic publisher. This is nothing new for our new partner, as Cambridge publishes on behalf of over 100 different learned and professional societies worldwide.

As this phase of the journal's independent status comes to a close, so will the appearance of this editor's note as a regular feature of each issue. Once upon a time, the journal was a benefit of association membership—and served as a primary communication channel of association activities. In the social media era, we have decoupled journal subscription from APLS membership, discontinued membership dues—anyone can now be an APLS associate free of charge—and our Facebook page (facebook.com/AssnPoliticsLifeSciences) and website (aplsnet.org) now serve as the primary means of association communications.

When called for, as in the case of special theme issues or forums, an editor's introduction will accompany sets of published articles. But association activities, such as the upcoming APLS meeting at the University of Wisconsin, Madison October 23-24, 2015, will primarily be announced through social and online media, including our webpage (aplsnet.org/conference.html) and Twitter account (follow us @AsnPLS, if you haven't already).

In this issue we devote the entire contents to a special forum on presidential disability and succession, stemming from a conference organized by Professor Robert Gilbert of Northeastern University last spring. The papers assembled here from renown experts in the field add in a consequential way to the historical record on presidential inability and highlight the remaining gaps that still exist in the line of succession. A longer, more expansive introduction to the issue appears next, so I will leave readers to explore that on their own, without further ado.

Erik. P. Bucy, Editor-in-Chief Lubbock, TX