European Journal of Political Research **25**: 387–388, 1994.
© 1994 *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands.*

Editor's introduction

MICHAEL MORAN
University of Manchester, United Kingdom

This is the third volume of the *Review*, and the last to be edited by me. The commissioning and publication policies remain unaltered for this volume because our fundamental aim also remains unchanged: to review in English bodies of work originally published in another European language, in order both to communicate a flavour of different national political science communities and to convey something of the content of their different intellectual agendas.

That fundamental aim means that eclecticism remains the order of the day. Despite the continuing spread of the European Consortium for Political Research, and the institutionalisation of political science in specialised departments, the identity of European political science remains disparate. The intellectual styles, the substantive concerns, and the levels of methodological sophistication vary greatly, not merely between individuals and adherents of different intellectual traditions, but between different national political science communities. That is the most enduring impression left by three years as editor of an enterprise of this kind. Contextual influences remain extraordinarily powerful, despite the gradual emergence of the kind of cosmopolitan European political science associated with the ECPR. The tension identified in the editorial introduction to the very first issue of the *Review* – a tension between the cosmopolitan and the national – continues to characterise political science scholarship in Europe.[1]

Both the tensions and the eclecticism are well illustrated by the contributions to this volume. The ambitious survey by Balme and his colleagues of studies of territorial policies in four leading European states is a particularly striking case. Twin themes weave themselves through that paper: the particular forces created by national political structures; and the common problems and themes created by scholars examining territorial policies in the different national environments. The particular and the general are also mixed in Bendix's paper, but perhaps its most striking feature is the extent to which the themes identified there echo those revealed in a survey of a very different national literature on women and politics, Outshoorn's study of the Dutch literature which appeared two years ago.[2] In the reviews by Faist and by Roberts, which are in important respects complementary, we see also the mixture of cosmopolitan themes and national contextual considerations. Ziemer, by contrast, introduces us to a world where the concerns of mainstream cosmopolitan political science barely intrude, and where the

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.1994.tb00427.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

emergent discipline is largely consumed by issues generated by the national political system. The stories told by Spourdalakis, by Beukel and Klausen, and in the concluding survey of Spanish literatures, are by contrast all versions of the story of the rise of cosmopolitanism: a story of the way research agendas generated by national political concerns are increasingly tackled using the universalist language of scientific political enquiry.

Notes

1. Moran, M. (1992). Editor's introduction, *European Journal of Political Science* 21: 333–5.
2. Outshoorn, J. (1992). Women and politics in the Netherlands: A review of the literature, *European Journal of Political Research* 21: 453–67.

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.1475-6765.1994.tb00427.x Published online by Cambridge University Press