AUCO Czech Economic Review 2 (2008)

Acta Universitatis Carolinae Oeconomica

Editorial

The AUCO Czech Economic Review, in its second year, enters the highly competitive international market of economics and social science journals. The pilot year of the journal is over, and hence it turns into a full-fledged publishing venture. To offer a competitive and attractive outlet virtually all aspects of its publishing have been modified, including the composition of the editorial board, instant online access, a professional website, indexing, and its layout. We have built on our experience with 2007's three issues, having explored the demand side and tested the capacity of the editors and staff.

The *raison d'etre*, or motivation, to launch a new journal is essentially twofold. Charles University, founded in 1348, showed an interest in reinvigorating its traditional outlet, the Acta Universitatis Carolinae Oeconomica (henceforth AUCO). Nevertheless, a modern format was a must. Secondly, it is an established fact that the referee process in many traditional journals is often prohibitively long. We aim to provide a viable, pro-active alternative, yet make no compromises on the classic double-blind peer review procedure.

These facts led us to re-launch the journal as a standard outlet in economics. With an editorial board comprised of 23 members from 12 countries, the Review is truly international, albeit with a Czech label. In terms of tracking current research, this issue sets a precedent: the average final decision was made eight weeks upon receiving the first draft and the maximum length for a decision was 11 weeks.

The AUCO Czech Economic Review is primarily focused on economics and political science papers with solid microeconomic grounds, addressing both theory and applied issues. Its coverage involves game theory, mathematical economics, public economics and political economics. It aims to serve as a common ground for economists and political scientists who explore political economy from a formal perspective. Another goal is to attract the contributions of gifted junior European economists.

This year's volume opens with papers from the Sixth Europaeum workshop of the Economics of European Integration Research Project, held at Charles University in Prague. The workshop brought together researchers from Austria, the Czech Republic, Finland, Italy, the Netherlands, and Russia, to discuss challenges and research issues facing the political economy of the European Union and closely related game theory issues. The workshop benefited from the support of the CEZ Group, the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic, and the Europaeum consortium of leading European universities. More details on the cooperation will follow in the information section of this issue.

A leading example of work on the research frontier that opens this issue is the paper by Tapio Palokangas (Helsinki) on migration. This is one of very few papers on the endogenous determination of migration quotas through lobbying, accounting for the general equilibrium effects of migration. Applying a menu-contributions approach, Palokangas shows that the government extracts rent from native workers by

threatening to legalise all immigration. An interesting corollary is that native workers and employers lose nothing if a limit for the immigration quota is increased externally by an international agreement. Palokangas thereby contributes both to literature on lobbying and the optimal design of contests.

Motivated by international environmental agreements, Lina Malozzi (Naples) and Stef Tijs (Tilburg) examine partial cooperation among treaty signatories. In response to a joint strategy of signatories, multiple equilibriums among non-signatories may arise with several selection criteria. Malozzi and Tijs prove that in supermodular games a max-selection criterion exists and is the best not only from the perspective of non-signatories,' but also from the signatories' point of view. An application to a public goods game is provided.

Fishing conflicts are inherently dynamic; competitors' decisions have an effect on the evolution of fish populations and on competitors' expected future profits. Elena Denisova and Andrey Garnaev (St. Petersburg) reflect these dynamics by considering a generalisation of the Levhari and Mirman Fish War Game for *n* participants. In a fish wars model, they derive the equilibrium and steady-state behaviour for different scenarios of countries' hierarchical and coalition structures. This allows analysing the impact that the hierarchical and coalition structures can have on fishery and ecology.

Mikuláš Luptáčik (Vienna) and his co-authors use six input-output-analysis criteria to assess the prospects of seven technologies in the European Union. With a multiplier analysis and key sector analysis, they focus on the interdependencies between sectors. Technology flow analysis and the subsystem minimal flow analysis allows them to take into account the R&D spent in one sector and the spillovers in other sectors of the economy. This genuinely empirical paper, moreover, carefully interprets the findings for each of the sectors.

Madeleine Hosli (Leiden) provides a political science perspective on the allocation of voting weights in the Council of the EU. Her paper compares the effects of the proposal tabled by the Convention on the Future of Europe with the Nice Treaty provisions and the Lisbon Treaty in terms of both the efficiency of decision making and the distribution of relative voting power within the EU-27. In addition, the paper shows how, with the current size of membership, the EU risks being unable to reach intergovernmental agreement.

We hope that the AUCO Czech Economic Review, complying with all current standards in economics publishing, will accompany you both as a reader and an author. We encourage you to enjoy open access to all of the articles on our website (auco.cuni.cz), sign up for the table of contents alert, and recommend interesting articles to your colleagues. Lastly, and most importantly, let us ask you to consider the AUCO Czech Economic Review as a submissions goal for your papers. On our part, we promise to do our best.

Editors