Monika Eigmüller, Klarissa Lueg and Vincent Gengnagel*

Editorial

After publishing CPE independently for six years, we are happy to announce that the journal will be published by the German scientific publisher Nomos, one of the leading German publishers in the social sciences and humanities, starting with this issue. Thus, CPE has not only found a very suitable home in terms of subject matter, but also an overall professional and competent environment to continue to present current contributions to social science and humanities research on Europe. With Nomos, we remain open access, that is, we continue to make knowledge accessible to the broader public, and free to the journal's readers: Both our archive and all upcoming issues are available at the Nomos e-library. We look forward to this cooperation, and to continuing to work with our dedicated editorial board, and with our esteemed authors and reviewers, who made this step possible. Over the last six years, CPE has developed into an international forum for scholars interested in processes, practices and cultural observations related to a European dimension. Nomos will aid us in professionally facilitating the increased interest in our journal, whilst allowing us to remain an autonomous editorial unit. In parallel to this change, CPE is also strengthening its multi-disciplinary focus: while the journal was mainly suspended in a strong network of sociologists and political scientists, more disciplines and research streams now add valuable insights and perspectives to our scholarly focus. This is reflected both in the composition of our editorial board and advisory board, in our permanent open call for papers, and in the article submissions we receive. With Nomos, we will now publish at least biannually. We continue to publish open themed issues, but also continue to encourage guest editors to publish themed issues with us which has become a successful tradition over the last six years.

On this issue

The present issue presents both a thematic focus on the topic of crisis as well as contributions with different topics. Four contributions deal with the topic of crisis in general, and COVID-19 and its socio-political effects in particular. The remainder of this issue is open themed and gathers one contribution on student attitudes towards the EU, as well as two research notes on organizational history communication and on the role of borders in the green transition.

* *Monika Eigmüller* (monika.eigmueller@uni-flensburg.de) Europa-Universität Flensburg, Germany
Klarissa Lueg (klueg@sdu.dk) University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
Vincent Gengnagel (vincent.gengnagel@uni-flensburg.de) Europa-Universität Flensburg, Germany

 DOI: 10.5771/2566-7742-2022-1-1

In his article "How do state authorities act under existential uncertainty?", Klaus Kraemer develops eight hypotheses on the social logic of political decision-making processes during the Coronavirus pandemic. Distinguishing between the role of political and scientific expertise, the paper observes German and Austrian state response patterns in different phases of the pandemic. Using the concept of a "whiteout" – the result of a violent snowstorm, in which visual navigation becomes impossible – as a metaphor for the stage of "not-knowing" (Habermas), Kraemer develops eight hypotheses as to why governments chose their crisis-response strategies. Kraemer dismisses rational model of politics for explaining governmental crisis responses during "whiteout" situations, and instead proposes isomorphic state reactions and legitimacy-seeking as driving state measurements. Governmental performance, he argues, hinges on evoking and upholding a hardly sustainable "collective morality". In consequence, a perceived end of the crisis might depend on emotional rather than scientific parameters.

Verbalyte and Eigmüller's paper addresses the question of how public approval of and trust in politics developed over the course of the COVID-19 pandemic in different EU member states. They focus specifically on the influence of digital and social media, and ask how COVID-19 related social media use and trust in information provided by them was associated with the people's attitudes toward governmental and European Corona measures across European member states. By presenting known factors affecting support for anti-Corona measures, they theoretically explain why the use of and getting information from social media during the pandemic has a negative effect on the assessment of governmental Corona measures. Using data from the Eurobarometer, they examine how social media use affects the evaluation of Corona measures. The authors are able to powerfully demonstrate that there is a link between social media use and distrust in governments and their policies.

Focussing on a similar arena, Alexander Bogner asks "What can science do in the face of pandemics?". The essay reflects on what science can and cannot provide in aiding governmental responses to COVID-19. Bogner argues that science has to educate and inform about the new virus and its societal consequences, but that public communication of scientific findings also has to give insights into the limits of scientific knowledge production. Drawing as clear as possible a line between politics and science is all the more necessary in times of crisis, when scientific advice all to easily is performed as legitimating decisions that are by nature political. After all, the "high degree of scientisation" of the pandemic brought different phenomena to the fore: On the one hand, a kind of anti-science sentiment similar to climate denialism emerged. On the other hand, the public was, in its vast majority, sympathetic to scientific information and took part in a public reflection of scientific responsibilities regarding the "power of knowledge".

In his essay on "Mobility policy as pandemic policy", Georg Vobruba discusses how the Schengen regime became an important means of COVID-19 response. The essay starts with the question of how the Schengen system coped with pandemic policies, which led to tensions between interests to restrict mobility on the one hand and the EU's general built-in agenda of mobility within Schengen. The current outcome seems to point towards selective restrictions and an asymmetrical dynamic, as he argues that "the vaccination backlog outside the Northern Hemisphere becomes a cynical but effective legitimization for EU border closures to the outside world". Elaborating on this, the paper explores important changes the EU-borders are likely to undergo due to the pandemic.

Directing attention to a different crisis, that is, the Brexit politics, Jens Maesse and Thierry Rossier trace how structural dissolution is articulated in the Brexit discourse. They analyse two public letters by economic experts supporting the "remain" and "leave" campaign and the social positions and backgrounds of the signees. They also interview economists from both camps, revealing a deep-seated feeling of disorderliness. While remainers are generally unsettled by both the Brexit campaign and its outcome, which they experience as a threat to their identities as economic experts, the leave-camp experts are unable to offer a new post-Brexit order.

In their article "Integrationists, Critical Europeanists and Pessimist Europeanists: EU attitudes among students in a German university", Céline Teney, Juan Deininger and Josefine Zurheide alert to the importance of mixed methods approaches when investigating attitudes towards the EU. They survey student attitudes towards the European integration project and subject answers to both standardized and open questions to a latent class analysis to identify qualitatively different response patterns. They argue that this approach aids in gaining a more nuanced understanding of students', in general favorable, attitudes towards the EU.

In addition to the above-mentioned articles and essays, we present research notes that elaborate on ongoing research activities and agendas. In their note "The corporate making of history: History communication of organizations as research subject" Klarissa Lueg and Trine Susanne Johansen develop organizational history communication as a multi-disciplinary, empirical research subject. They motivate their interest in how companies construct history by pointing to the impact a potential commodification of historical work could have on how history is perceived by the public. European case examples are touched upon to illustrate the rising corporate and public interest in organizational history communication.

Søren Tinning and Dorte Jagetic Andersen, in their research note, "Are European borders green? Notes on the need for research approaches and policy measures to deal with the reality of borders when implementing green transitions", address an overlooked need for problematising the role of borders in the green transition. As it stands, research into and policymaking on green transitions are influenced by

the dichotomic bind of a borderless world vs. closed borders ontologies, failing to capture the much more complex and often also conflictual reality of borders when implementing green transitions. Facing this challenge, the authors argue for an approach to borders recognising their practical constitution and able to transcend restricted ontological presuppositions.

We thank our contributors, reviewers, all members of our editorial and international advisory board and the large supportive network of CPE, especially Hauke Brunkhorst, Maurizio Bach and Georg Vobruba, as well as our new partner Nomos, especially Martin Reichinger and Sandra Frey, for making this issue possible.