eps 2.2

editorial comment

The ECPR is playing an important role in 'Europeanising' the profession, and this is a difficult task, albeit one that is carried out with enthusiasm and dedication by those involved - witness the discussion by Fabio Armao *et al*. in this issue on organising the 2002 Joint Sessions in Turin. Pan-European research projects, standing groups, workshops and publishing have become the norm - and at that level one can say that the profession has truly Europeanised. But the dead weight of a profession traditionally divided by nation is a heavy one, and one is frequently astonished at how border-bound and parochial the university system remains.

We are all aware, especially those of us who try to cross those borders or who work in supranational institutions such as the EUI in Florence, what the consequences of that parochialism can be, especially when it comes to finding jobs in a country that is not one's own, or in returning to a system once one has left it (there remains very little mobility in the profession in Europe, except for inward migration to the Dutch and British labour markets).

But it is still surprising to learn, as we do from the Umbach and Scholl article on 'A Core Curriculum in EU Studies', of the shortage of updated texts on EU politics in languages other than English; or that many political science (as opposed to law) departments in a number of countries tend not to teach the subject (though this is changing). This is reflected in the fact that we frequently search in vain for European experts from certain countries able and willing to participate in pan-European research projects on EU politics, as opposed to comparative politics, where they are stronger (again, this is changing amongst a younger generation of scholars). Unlike in law, it has often been simpler - and the European profession should be ashamed of this - to import high quality expertise from the United States (where many of us also flock - this year, rather oddly, except perhaps for Dolly Parton fans, to Nashville - to engage in discussion and debate on Europe in the framework of the European Union Studies Association's biennial conference).

We have a whole symposium in this issue about globalisation; the authors assembled by John Callaghan set out to tell us how we can better understand this complex phenomenon and how they think it should be studied. But in EU studies it seems as if the European profession more easily 'globalises' by going off-shore, than it 'Europeanises' at home.

One step in the right direction must be the development of a core curriculum and the creation not just of a professional *esprit de corps* in this critical area of study across Europe, but also of an educated, well-informed, public. Political scientists who worry about a European 'demos' should not be surprised by its absence if even significant parts of the European academy are incapable of

https://doi.org/10.1057/eps.2003.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

embracing, studying and communicating the reality of an EU sphere of politics. Umbach and Scholl and their colleagues make a valuable contribution in suggesting how this could and should be done by starting with a core curriculum in EU studies (if the subject is taught so poorly in universities, one can only wonder at how it is approached in the school systems). Colleagues reading this issue might note the gap in the market in their countries for an EU politics textbook and get to work; if they are quick they could make a killing.

The Nice referendum in Ireland provides an excellent example of the need for the creation of an educated public that is fully aware of what Europeanisation is and means. John O'Brennan, in his analysis of the event, argues that one of the reasons for the failure of the first referendum and the success of the second was the poor level of understanding among Irish voters as to what enlargement meant, both for themselves and for the new accession countries. The bombardment of the population with information via the media and pro-European organisations during the second campaign had the desired effect. One wonders, however, what a similar survey to that conducted before the Irish poll - indicating that only eight per cent understood the Nice Treaty - would have revealed elsewhere, whether among the general population …or in certain university politics departments.

Jim Newell and *Martin Rhodes*

'...the European profession more easily 'globalises' by going off-shore, than it 'Europeanises' at home.'

https://doi.org/10.1057/eps.2003.1 Published online by Cambridge University Press