European Journal of Political Research **21**: 333–335, 1992.

Editor's introduction

MICHAEL MORAN
University of Manchester, United Kingdom

The post war institutionalization of political science, whose history has recently been summarized by Rose (1990), left the discipline with two very different legacies. On the one hand, political science within individual nations has been immeasurably strengthened in recent decades. Different political science communities have developed their own distinctive organizations, career networks and intellectual agendas. The institutionalization of political science thus produced growing national (and linguistic) diversity. On the other hand, the last twenty years have also seen a rapid internationalization of political science. Internationalization has been given an organized form in bodies like the ECPR, and has been helped by the emergence of English as the main language of international scientific communication. This cosmopolitan world of international political science has developed to some degree independently of national scholarly communities. It is dominated by a distinctive group of internationally mobile scholars, and has been substantially preoccupied with a distinctive intellectual agenda – notably, as Rose himself remarks, with Rokkan inspired 'huge comparisons'.

These different legacies – the national and the cosmopolitan – mean that the discipline flourishes at two levels. Most political scientists spend their careers within one nation, address themselves to debates within their own national political science community, and communicate in the national language. The world of the national political science community occasionally intersects with, but is substantially separate from, the international networks created in the last couple of decades.

The purpose of the *Annual Review*, which will appear each year as a special issue of the EJPR, is to provide a forum where the two worlds of political science communicate. Our brief is simple: to review significant bodies of literature produced by national political science communities; to emphasize in those reviews literature which has been published in a language other than English; and thus, by using English as a medium of communication, to diffuse internationally what would otherwise only be available to those with access to sources in the original languages. No systematic evidence is available about the linguistic abilities of professional political scientists, but there is overwhelming impressionistic evidence that, whatever the first language, and whatever the range of linguistic attainments, English is by a long way the 'first foreign language' of the political science community. In short, it is the perfect medium for linking the two worlds of political science, the national and the cosmopolitan.

The need for this link has become more pressing in recent years, because of

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.1992.tb00903.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

a quite unexpected development. Imagine a far sighted observer attempting a couple of decades ago the task of predicting the future shape of political science. Our observer would surely have seen a world where the cosmopolitan was replacing the national: where electronic communication across borders was increasingly easy; where English, already the leading international scientific language, was becoming ever more dominant; where the international conference and workshop, growing ease of travel, and the development of an international labour market in political scientists, were all encouraging international integration. Our observer could hardly have avoided predicting the decline of distinctive national political science communities and their integration into an international profession of political science.

Yet our far sighted observer would have been wrong. It is true that cosmopolitan political science has become more important in recent years; but it is equally true that the same period has seen growth in the size and diversity of national political science communities. The most obvious measure of change at the national level is provided by the evolving membership of the ECPR itself. The rise in the number of affiliated institutions, and the expanded range of nations represented, is not only a measure of growing internationalization; it is also a sign of the growing health of national political science communities. In 1970 six nations were represented in ECPR membership; by 1989 the figure was fifteen (Rose 1990: 593). The growth in membership from the United Kingdom – from three in 1970 to forty in 1989 – happened during a period when political science was increasingly professionalized in Britain; and the entry of institutions from Greece and Spain in the 1980s signalled the emergence in those countries of national political science communities after the end of autocratic rule. We can expect more members, and more national diversity, with the collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe. As the range of national political science communities widens, the depth and richness of their individual literatures will grow. The economics of publishing and the logistics of translation mean that a declining proportion of good work will find its way into the international language. The need for a medium like this *Annual Review* will become greater.

In short, political science is far from turning into a cosmopolitan discipline. This cosmopolitan world certainly exists, but alongside it stand the growing national political science communities working to their own agendas and reporting findings in their national languages. In this volume it is, for instance, fascinating to see how one of the most cosmopolitan and 'culture free' parts of the discipline – rational choice theory – is in the Spanish and Dutch literatures adapted to national concerns.

The selection of subjects covered in this volume is guided by two principles – which are, it so happens, in tension with each other. One principle is eclecticism. The diversity of political science, and the different interests of readers, both demand a wide range of topics and a wide sample of national literatures. But a second principle has been to search for thematic connections: hence the first two papers offer a comprehensive survey of studies of

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.1992.tb00903.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

the 'new' political forces in Germany; and the papers by Colomer and Schram present parallel accounts of rational choice studies in two very different national settings. The tension between these two principles will undoubtedly mark future volumes, and we hope that it will be a fruitful tension. But the content of future volumes will not only be the result of the editor's commissioning activities; it will also depend on what readers demand and potential contributors offer. The editor of a publication like this is particularly reliant on advice, since his knowledge of what is rich in the literature of any particular national political science community is inevitably limited. The *Review* is thus distinctive not only in its mission of surveying the political science literature beyond English; it is also distinctive in the extent to which it relies on its readers and contributors for guidance.

Acknowledgement

The editor wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Alison Enticknap in the preparation of this issue.

Reference

Rose, R. (1990). Institutionalizing professional political science in Europe: A dynamic model, *European Journal of Political Research* 18: 581–603.

Address for correspondence: Michael Moran, Editor *Annual Review* of *European Journal of Political Research*, European Policy Research Unit, Department of Government, University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom.
Phone: (61) 275 4889: Fax (61) 275 4751

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.1992.tb00903.x Published online by Cambridge University Press