

In the COMMONWEALTH

Donald G. Tannenbaum, Editor

As editor of this journal I have been faced with many decisions in the course of completing work on any issue: publish or not publish? call for additional reviews? edit extensively or leave most editing to the author? which reviewers' suggestions are central to the emergence of the best possible piece on a subject and which are more peripheral? and so on. However important such decisions are, they must necessarily emerge out of a careful consideration of the submitted articles themselves. If a manuscript is not ready for publication, editors and reviewers can do little more than suggest to an author possible routes for improvement; on the other hand, if it is clearly a fine work which advances knowledge of its subject in a scholarly way, then we need do little more than acknowledge and applaud the author's accomplishment. And if manuscripts are not submitted, then we are simply left to twiddle our thumbs until some appear. In sum, we are necessarily (and properly) subject to the call of our authors.

Since the first issue of *COMMONWEALTH* appeared, several people (including the experienced editors of some other state journals) have most amiably suggested that pressure will soon build a need for more frequent publication, perhaps to twice a year or even more often at some time in the not-too-distant future. This may indeed come to pass, although I think I have my hands sufficiently full with an annual at this point. At the same time, I am committed to the proposition that no worthwhile piece submitted to *COMMONWEALTH* ought to go unpublished. Should these two perspectives ever conflict, my sense of professional responsibility will doubtless lead me in the direction of expansion. The key factor to note at this juncture is that quality must precede quantity; in order to feel sufficient pressure to publish more frequently, an increasing number of solid, acceptable manuscripts must be submitted by those out there who are doing the research and writing, especially on Pennsylvania politics, an important staple of each issue. We are here and waiting.

Still, I have continued my efforts to gain greater visibility for *COMMONWEALTH* at state, regional and national political science meetings. In pursuit of this goal, I accepted an invitation from APSR Managing Editor Samuel C. Patterson to join a workshop for political science journal editors he organized at the 1990 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association in San Francisco. The workshop was composed of the editors of several of the top national and international political science journals, and as the only panelist from a state journal, I spoke on "The Role of

a State Journal Editor." I was also able to touch base with some authors and members of the Editorial Review Board and to tell prospective authors about COMMONWEALTH. In the past such activity has borne fruit in the form of new submissions, and I hope this trend continues.

Now, however, let me direct your attention to the fine collection of research pieces which constitute Volume 4. They range from the exploration of some unique participatory techniques that federal judges have devised to promote reform in complex bureaucratic institutions, through studies of the meaning and importance of Hegel's constitutionalism and the dynamics of Hobbes's concept of willing, to a sophisticated application of the bureaucratic politics/interest group approach to the behavior of key Soviet officials during the Polish crisis of the early 1980's. Volume 4 concludes with a study of Pennsylvania politics which addresses the question, why has this Commonwealth elected so few women to its state legislature? Like several of our past studies of Pennsylvania politics, the answer to this question has significance far beyond the borders of this one state, particularly as state legislatures have become such important arenas for the resolution of major issues that specially impact on women.

I cannot conclude without expressing my gratitude to the authors, members of the Editorial Review Board and other reviewers, colleagues in the Pennsylvania Political Science Association, editors of other journals, and numerous others who have contributed immeasurably to this enterprise. My thanks also to my editorial assistant, Jennifer Franchetti of Gettysburg College, for her second go-round in that job. And special appreciation is due our new Managing Editor, James Skok of Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg. Readers may remember him as the author of the article on Pennsylvania politics in Volume 3. Charged with the responsibility for turning approved manuscripts into a finished journal, his contribution is essential to the final product. Besides riding herd on all those involved in the production process, he has been, like our previous Managing Editors, a valued source of advice and assistance.