Editor's Foreword

We are pleased to present Volume IX, Number 1 (Spring 2016) of the New England Journal of Political Science. Matthew MacWilliams of the University of Massachusetts Amherst leads this issue with an insightful examination of the Judiciary Act of 1925, a piece of legislation that continues to shape the Supreme Court today. Christopher Galdieri of Saint Anselm College and Kevin Parseneau of Minnesota State University, Mankato, follow with a timely study of the role that party elites play in the presidential nominating process. Our final article in this issue returns us to the Supreme Court where Paul Foote of Murray State University looks at the ideology of Chief Justice John Roberts in the work of the Court.


Once again I have benefitted from the hard work of talented others in bringing this issue to publication. Copy editor extraordinaire Tess Marchant-Shapiro of Southern Connecticut State University did an excellent job whipping these pieces into shape. Book Review Editor Peter Lindsay of Georgia State University continues to work hard to grow this exciting new feature of the journal. Please keep us in mind as a review outlet as your book projects come to fruition. You can ask your publisher to send books for review directly to Peter. Technical Advisor Odeh Halaseh of Kent State University put everything together with his usual speed and skill. Our anonymous reviewers were crucial to making this issue possible, and their efforts are much appreciated.

I'll close with three exhortations, two old and one that is new. As always I ask you to consider us as an outlet for your work, and to encourage your colleagues and graduate students to do so as well. We are still trying hard to attract more submissions. We are also still looking for state report assistance, so anyone interested in perhaps contributing to our State (and hopefully Province) Reports section should contact Paul Petterson at Central Connecticut State University (petterson@ccsu.edu). Finally, you will (if you have not already) undoubtedly notice that this issue is dated Spring 2016 when 2017 is already upon us. The lower than desired number of submissions is one reason for this delay, but perhaps a bigger cause is a difficulty in securing participation in the peer review process. I recognize that the task of reviewing is immensely time consuming, and also that we are all subject to ever-increasing demands on our time. However, I ask (beg?) of you that if you are asked to review for us that you seriously consider doing so. A number of submissions to the Journal have spent far too long in the review process. With all of this being said, we hope you enjoy this latest issue.