Think Global, Act Local or Think Local, Act Global?
Knowledge Production in the Global Agora

Paper Prepared for

**'Reshaping Globalization:
Multilateral Dialogues and New Policy Initiatives'
Central European University Conference
Budapest, Hungary
October 17th 2001**

Diane Stone
Principal Research Fellow
Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation
University of Warwick
United Kingdom

First Draft.

1. Introduction

This conference celebrates ten years of the Central European University. In keeping with the occasion for this conference, the paper focuses primarily on professional or scholarly knowledge and the manner in which research and analysis are deployed in global policy domains. That is, to address the way in which knowledge figures in policy oriented debates. It is a truism that the knowledge revolution is changing the global political economy and the international organisations, states, corporations, NGOs and networks active within it. Indeed, the discourse of knowledge is paramount with the emphasis on 'knowledge management' and 'knowledge sharing' within organisations; the desire for 'evidence-based policy' and 'cross-national lesson-drawing' to improve policy development; and broader public efforts to build the 'knowledge society' and 'knowledge economy'. Knowledge is one of the buzzwords of development.

In what sense is 'knowledge' to be understood in this discourse? It is a relatively instrumental understanding of knowledge where the emphasis is on how knowledge is a tool or technology in economic and social progress. Further, the type of knowledge addressed here is primarily codified knowledge in the form of research. Increasingly, 'knowledge management' and 'knowledge sharing' becomes technocratic and bureaucratic.

These developments return us to time-honoured questions regarding the relationship between knowledge and policy making. The qualitatively new consideration is how knowledge plays in global governance. In this regard, the paper directly addresses the conference theme as to what might be meant by 'the rigorous application of *best thinking* and *best practices* to the management of global systems'.[1] The idea of 'global best practice' is discussed with reservation and in recognition that knowledge represents one form of power. As will be argued, a critical component of the *relevance* of global thinking is the strength of national and local intellectual communities to re-interpret and adapt thinking to their cultural context and country conditions.

Without local input and re-fashioning of global knowledge, its application can be inappropriate, misconceived and perverse. Moreover, whilst there are positive and progressive aspects in aspiring to acquire global thinking and to ascribe to global best practice, the means and processes by which knowledge is reproduced, disseminated and applied, are not necessarily 'inclusive', 'legitimate' or 'progressive'. At face value, global public policy networks – one type of the new alliances and coalitions mentioned in the conference outline – do incorporate the major stakeholders. Yet, the production of global knowledge by 'coalitions around the common good' must be as focused on matters of process, transparency, representation, procedural justice and accountability as they are by end product or outcome. As will be concluded, this necessitates thinking and acting globally in knowledge production. However, before this matter can be addressed, some discussion is needed to outline how globalisation complicates our understanding of policy

---

[1] My emphasis. See the outline of conference themes.

making and governance and the decision-making structures within which knowledge is created and utilised.

2. Knowledge Production and the Widening Scope for Global Public Policy

Many studies have been undertaken on the many different types of organisation that create knowledge or undertake research in the pursue policy aims. 'Think tanks', for example, are a form of research organisation that directly seeks to influence policy (see *inter alia*, McGann & Weaver 2000; Stone 2000; Stone, Denham & Garnett 1998). There is also a relatively extensive literature on the activities of philanthropic foundations in both advancing knowledge and in its utilisation (Parmar 2002; Gemelli 1998). Universities, in contrast, have often been portrayed as being engaged in the disinterested pursuit of knowledge. However, there is clearly increasing pressures for them to demonstrate their social and economic relevance, while the 'internationalisation' of universities has been evident for decades with growing numbers of foreign students. Consultancy firms are increasingly involved with public policy (Saint-Martin, 2000). Many have been instrumental in the international spread and application of ideas concerning 'new public management' (Krause Hansen *et al*, 2002). Furthermore, there are many large and globally active non-governmental organisations (NGOs) such as Greenpeace and Transparency International which undertake research and attempt to use the findings to influence policy-making at national levels as well as in international policy communities. More select gatherings of experts sand policy practitioners such as the World Economic Forum and the Evian Group engineer policy dialogue between corporate, government and intellectual leaders. Also important is the role of government research bureaux, both those within departments, and autonomous non-departmental public bodies (quangos) in manufacturing knowledge.

These organisations, as well as the individuals within them, are active in more informal intellectual communities, professional associations and knowledge networks that cross borders and institutions and are sometimes referred to as the transnational 'invisible college'. For want of a better term these disparate organisations, networks and associations will be referred to under the umbrella term of 'knowledge agencies'. These organisations create 'codified knowledge'; that is, concrete intellectual and scholarly product that is found in publications, conferences and declarations of advisory groups. This kind of knowledge is most amenable to global production as it can be packaged for distribution. However, knowledge agencies also produce 'tacit knowledge' – shared understandings, on-the-ground knowledge and common identities – that cannot so easily be translated into global discourse. Many contribute to our understandings of the dimensions of policy problems and develop the conceptual tools to help manage issues in what will be referred to here as the global agora.[2] The global agora 'consists of a highly

---

[2] The term 'agora' is borrowed from Nowotony *et al* (2001) to refer to a social or public space in which science interacts and is constituted. The term is appropriated to the global domain to describe a new public space.

articulate, well-educated population, the product of enlightened educational systems … who face multiple publics and plural institutions' (Nowotony *et al*, 2001: 204, 205).

Traditionally, policy making has been deemed the preserve of national and sub-national (local, regional or canton) government. Relatedly, much 'policy knowledge' and thinking has been bundled at the nation-state level. Attempts by scholarly communities and policy researchers to inform policy are limited by time and funding, so activities have tended to focus on what is perceived as the crucial decision making level. In the past, and still so today, this is at the level of national government. Only when regional or local governments have significant powers (as in a federal system) will they attract the attention of researchers and policy entrepreneurs. Alternatively, local informal governance can be strong, especially when war, ethnic conflict, or a lack of central state capacity has undermined the influence of national governments. Such circumstances provide opportunity for local knowledge agencies such as universities and think tanks, as well as for foreign NGOs, consultants and development agencies, to shape policy developments. Yet, as noted by the Open Society Institute

> The policy process in many countries in the region remains fairly closed. Where 'outside' influence on the development of legislation, regulations and government programs is found, it is likely to come from government-endorsed foreign experts, the European Union and other international institutions. Not many local independent non-commercial organizations actively participate in this process (OSI, 2001: 7).

The trend toward multi-level governance complicates the national policy scenario. Multi-level governance is 'negotiated, non-hierarchical exchanges between institutions at the transnational, national, regional and local levels' as well as the 'relationships between governance processes at these different levels' (Peters and Pierre, 2001: 132). New sources of advice are emanating through regional arrangements such as the European Union. EU policy advice actors impinge upon not only member nation-states but also communities and countries beyond the EU. For example, the Forward Studies Unit of the European Commission has as its primary objective to generate ideas for internal Commission consumption but has gradually altered its focus over the last five years to engage with national policy communities in efforts to legitimise the European project. 'This has primarily developed informally, although *Carrefours* or symposiums are held, at which the Forward Studies Unit can exchange ideas with other research institutes, government and political parties, business and interest groups' (Sherrington, 2000). Other regional developments are creating new policy spaces into which knowledge agencies focus their attention. During the 1990s the ASEAN framework provided a venue for discussions in the immediate post-Soviet period for information sharing and collaborative research on security cooperation among the regional intellectual community in conjunction with the policy community (Nesadurai and Stone, 2000). The Blue Bird project on the 'reinvention of Southeastern Europe' is similarly based on 'the assumption that the invention of the region requires the construction of a common regional vision and the emergence of a regional public debate'.

Regional associations clearly present new policy forums for knowledge agencies and have become important producers of global knowledges. Less well understood is the manner in which global policy processes have emerged. As a result of governments, international organisations and a variety of non-state actors responding to transboundary policy problems such as is concerned with cross border movement (be it money, pollution or refugees) or common property problems concerning the oceans or the atmosphere, new governance structures are evolving. These problems have led to new forms of 'soft' authority recognised in 'global public policy networks' (Reinicke, Deng, *et al*, 2000) and private regimes which complement the 'hard' or formal authority of states and international organisations. Governance emerges from strategic interactions and partnerships of national and international bureaucracies with non-state actors in the market-place and civil society.

In many issue areas, governments and international organizations do not have the ability to design and/or implement effective public policies alone. 'Global public policy networks' – composed of NGOs, government agencies, business groups and international organisations – are helpful in some issue areas to come to terms with these challenges. Examples include the Consultative Group on International Agriculture Research (CGIAR), the Global Development Network (www.gdnet.org), the Global Water Partnership and the 'Roll Back Malaria Initiative' (Reinicke, Deng *et al*, 2000). The networks are involved in the involved in the delivery of public goods and services at the global level.[3]

Public policy, whilst still dependent on the state, is informed by a wider range of actors and structures such as 'transnational policy communities' and 'multi-level governance'. The transnational character of policy problems establishes rationales for research collaboration, sharing of information and co-operation on other activities that creates a dynamic for the international diffusion of ideas and policy transfer. The development of transnational networks has given rise to more complex and flexible modes of governance which complement (public sector) hierarchies and markets. A key feature of a network is a shared problem on which there is an exchange of information, debate, disagreement, persuasion and a search for solutions and appropriate policy responses. Global knowledge production is both constitutive of, and constituted by, these relatively fluid global policy networks.

Networks become a mode of governance whereby the patterns of linkages and interaction are the means through which joint policy is organised. In short, there is a functional interdependence between public and private actors whereby networks allow resources to be mobilised towards common policy objectives in domains outside the hierarchical control of governments (see Börzel, 1998). This tendency is particularly noticeable in global politics where governance structures and public institutions are more diffuse and lack the central coordination hierarchy and designation of authority that are characteristic of national polities.

---

[3] Greater detail on global public policy networks can be found at:
www.globalpublicpolicy.net.

Of late, a number of analyses have highlighted the progressive potential of networks. Research networks represent a potential counter to the dominant positions of the 'knowledge bank' (Gmelin, 2001). Due to their informal character, networks are often more effective at incorporating a wider range of stakeholders than public sector bureaucracies in policy development and delivery. Furthermore, networks are seen as an alternative mode of policy learning and transfer, encouraging dialogue and experimentation among similar or neighbouring 'recipient' countries with donors concerning 'best practice' (de la Porte and Deacon, 2001). Additionally, networks can effective at building trust, consensus and or what has been called 'global social capital' helping to ameliorate the 'democratic deficit' in the global agora (Reinicke, 2001: 45).

Yet, participation in such networks and private regimes can be dependent on resources and commitment. A question about 'inclusiveness' in these transnational policy communities is their club-like and elite character. Involvement is usually limited to recognised stakeholders and experts in the policy field. Participation is informally restricted and regulated by the network to exclude spiritual, peasant, or protest knowledges. 'Indeed, people who construct knowledge in secular, anthropocentric, techno-scientific, instrumental terms have generally exercised the greatest power in global spaces' (Scholte, 2000: 187). Moreover, participation can be costly. Access to global public policy networks requires time, commitment and resources. Many developing country knowledge agencies do not have sufficient resources to devote to national policy deliberations let alone global dialogues. Consequently, the dominance of OECD actors in regional and global policy debates is notable. These transnational policy communities and professional associations produce much of the knowledge about international standard setting and global best practice (Reinicke, 2001: 44).

An alternative definition is of 'embedded knowledge network' where greater store is place upon the power of ideas. These are: 'ostensibly private institutions that possess authority because of their publicly acknowledged track records for solving problems, often acting as disinterested 'technical' parties in high-value, high-risk transactions or in validating sets of norms and practices…' (Sinclair, 2000). Credit rating agencies such as Moody's or Standard and Poor are one example of private experts. In this neo-Gramscian definition, the stress is on firstly, how networks contribute to the construction of the legitimacy of policy judgements of individual experts and other sources of private authority; and secondly, how private knowledge actors and institutions are linked to the material interests and structures of globalizing capitalism.

In sum, the contention of this paper is that the production of global knowledge cannot be considered in isolation from the impact of globalisation upon governance and the emergence of new forums of policy deliberation. Increasing global political inter-connectedness runs in tandem with the evolving role of knowledge and expertise in social and political life. This is apparent in the dynamics behind the transfer of policy approaches from one country or region to another and the international spread of ideas that bolster these processes. However, the focus has been on horizontal transfers of best

practice and thinking between countries, to the neglect of analysis of the vertical transfers in the global agora.

3. The global diffusion of ideas and policy transfer

As is apparent from the previous section, knowledge production and utilization does not take place simply within the confines of a nation-state. Instead knowledge is diffused, ideas are spread, international lessons are drawn and policies are transferred beyond territorial boundaries and legal jurisdictions. This phenomenon is an important contributing factor to global convergence. Convergence describes a pattern of increasing similarity in economic, social and political organisation between countries that may be driven by industrialisation, globalisation or regionalisation. The tendency for states to become more alike can result from voluntary acts of cross-national lesson-drawing as well as from 'imposed' policy lessons such as might occur with loan conditionality. One of the key roles of knowledge agencies specifically as well as global public policy networks more generally is not only to produce ideas but to facilitate the spread of ideas. The international movement of ideas is not new but a centuries old phenomenon. However, advances in telecommunication entail that the movement and uptake of knowledge is occurring at a far greater pace.

Great interest has emerged in development agencies and international organisations about the spread of knowledge and providing information about international standards/bench-marks and best practice. An example is the information disseminated by the OECD's Public Management Programme (PUMA). It builds a number of mechanisms – publications, networks of senior officials, conferences, etc. – to spread information and provide 'forward thinking' on matters such as national accounting standards, human resources management and 'OECD Best Practices for Budget Transparency'.[4] Similarly, SIGMA – a joint initiative of the EU and OECD – advises transition countries on improving public governance at the central government level.[5]

Standards setting via national regulation, loan conditionality or the formation of international regimes promotes policy convergence. Approaches to convergence 'diverge on whether the driving force is economic or ideational, and whether states retain agency in the face of globalization or are dominated by structural determinants' (Drezner, 2001: 55). This paper does not engage with this debate,[6] suffice to say that the approach here is

---

[4] The PUMA web-site can be found at: http://www1.oecd.org/puma/

[5] SIGMA stands for Support for Improvement in Governance and Management in Central and Eastern Europe. The web-site is at: http://www1.oecd.org/puma/sigmaweb/

[6] Agent centred approaches do not dismiss structural forces but suggest that in varying degree, states and organisations can mediate, these dynamics. Structuralist approaches identify a process of institutional isomorhpism. Laggard states emulate the practices of global leaders. Their behaviour is led by the taken-for-granted aspects of political life where actors follow rules, shared interpretations, schema and meanings.

not structurally deterministic and greater emphasis is given to the force of knowledge and of agency.

Indeed, the term used here is 'policy transfer'. This is a process by which '*knowledge* about how policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in one political setting (past or present) is used in the development of policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in another political setting' (Dolowitz & Marsh, 2000: 5 my emphasis). The policy transfer approach assumes that transfer results from a rational process by decision-makers of a search for 'best practices' followed by imitation and modification. The emphasis is on the logic of choice in selection of policy ideas, the interpretation of circumstances or environment and (bounded) rationality in adaptation.

A further emphasis is on ideational actors and forces rather than economic factors.[7] The ideational approach argues that states alter institutions and regulatory policy as a consequence of an international consensus around a set of beliefs with sufficient normative power that political leaders fear they will appear as recalcitrants and poor international citizens. Convergence results from the power of abstract concepts, normative standards, policy paradigms and models of the rationalized bureaucratic nation-state. Once an idea or policy model become dominant – for example, privatisation, liberalisation and deregulation – other approaches lose their legitimacy. Rather than assuming that ideas simply percolate and diffuse gradually, a policy transfer perspective asks who or what is drawing policy lessons and emulating practice or even exporting knowledge and imposing policy ideas.

One important mode of policy transfer is through the elite networking of transnational policy communities or global public policy networks. These communities of experts and professionals share their expertise and information and form common patterns of understanding regarding policy through regular interaction such as through international conferences, government delegations, web-sites and sustained email communication (Bennett, 1991: 224-25). The ideas surrounding the 'new public management' is an example of a dominant discourse that has become institutionally embedded propelled by the professional interactions of OECD civil servants (Krause Hansen *et al*, 2002; James, 2000), consultants (Saint-Martin, 2000), professional associations, think tanks and others.

In addition to constructing dominant set of beliefs, experts and professionals potentially become a stronger causal factor in policy transfer when they go beyond knowledge production and dissemination to become 'policy entrepreneurs' – 'people who

---

[7] The 'race to the bottom' of regulatory standards is one economic argument that considers convergence occurs due to threat of capital flight that causes non-converging states to modify their regulatory policies in order not to lose their competitiveness in the global economy. A criticism is the erroneous assumption that states ignore other constituencies – electorates, bureaucracies and interest groups – and do not have market power vis-s-vis global capital Drezner, 2001: 58).

seek to initiate dynamic policy change' (Mintrom, 1997: 739). They help transfer the intellectual matter that underpins policies. They can provide the rhetoric, the language and scholarly discourse to give substance and legitimacy to certain preferred positions. These entrepreneurs engage in a variety of strategies to win support for ideas – 'identifying problems, networking in policy circles, shaping the terms of policy debates, and building coalitions' (Mintrom, 1997: 739). They operate alongside *official* actors such as bureaucrats, politicians and political appointees in transferring policy practices.

Of concern to a regional association, national polity or local community is the nature of the knowledge exchange. Technical cooperation, overseas training and the role of international consultants in institutional development can be in the manner of a 'one-way transaction' (Tilak, 2001: 256) or 'top-down knowledge sharing' (Stone in King, 2001: 31) from aid organisations or developed countries to developing countries. Consideration also needs to be given to whether the technical knowledge that is 'shared' can be effectively utilized. Simple advocacy of the benefits of 'best practice' does not confront deep-rooted asymmetries of power that exist in numerous developing and transition countries which may confound appropriate knowledge utilization. Furthermore, 'information dumping' can be 'either useless, or influential in promoting a given ideology or methodology' (Tilak, 2001: 261). The reviews and reports on past programmes necessarily reflect the evaluation requirements of donor agencies, government departments and other funders/authorizers of policy programs and are less focused on what has been learnt or experienced by the recipients or subjects of the program (King, 2001: 3). Moreover, understandings of 'best practice or thinking' are mediated by contractors and consultants who implement programs and who 'add to the complexity to any message' about best practice (de la Porte and Deacon, 2001).

Finally, 'lessons' and 'best practice' represent codified, formal and technical knowledge to be found in reports, reviews, web-sites and government and OECD documentation centres. A fetish for what is codified can squeeze out an appreciation of tacit and practical knowledge.

> Meaningful and useful knowledge is produced and reproduced … not by re-inventing locally what can be gathered from scanning a central global knowledge bank or by replicating best practices. Local problem perceptions and solutions have to be part of the local settings and processes (Gmelin, in King, 2001: 9).

Tacit knowledge is more ephemeral, recognisable in performance and usually deemed more subjective and procedural. Consequently, it is more fruitful to be enabled to learn, to cultivate critical awareness and develop knowledge capacity in order to enhance policy autonomy. In other words, traditional, 'grass-roots' and practitioner knowledge is frequently less amenable to such transfer rooted as it may be in communal understandings or local practices.

4. The Production of Global Knowledge

The knowledge base of organisations and countries is highly uneven. Additionally, the scope for interaction or interfaces between knowledge agencies and decision makers as well as the permeability and absorption capacity of a political system to global knowledge varies significantly from one country to another. Consequently, the awareness, uptake and adaptation of global knowledge, best practice or international standards is also highly uneven. More importantly, the idea of 'best practice' is challenged and contested. It is necessary to address whose knowledge becomes globalised knowledge and to recognise the asymmetrical power relationships among knowledge producers and consumers in shaping and channeling what is diffused.

Universities have expanded in the western world and new universities – public and private – have proliferated in developing countries. University internationalisation (as well as 'Europeanization') is apparent in the establishment of international offices, curriculum development, course credit recognition and transfer, discipline-based networks, collaborative links with foreign universities, multi-lingualism and/or adoption of English as language of instruction in some courses (Callan, 1998). The internationalisation of universities is manifest in the movement in foreign students. For example, almost half of Malaysia's tertiary students are currently studying abroad (Rizvi, 2000: 206). Academics have become more mobile, and finding more varied employment in think tanks, government advisory bodies and international organisations. Indeed, in number of countries, the 'brain drain' represents a significant development problem. Consequently, while not all universities are particularly 'international', all are subject to the dynamics of globalisation.

International organisations have consolidated over the past half century and with this institutional development has been the establishment of in-house research departments (Squire 2000). The 'development economics research group' of the World Bank is a strong hold of the economic examination of questions of development to the exclusion of other disciplines (Denning, 2001: 143). The United Nations agencies such as UNESCO and UNRISD have a direct interest in building the knowledge base of society. Moreover, these international organizations collaborate on, contract out or commission greater amounts of research with groups around the world. Their funding power has strong influence in structuring the supply of global knowledge and shaping research agendas.

Governments are also very important producers of knowledge. Needless to say, capacity for in-house research and policy analysis varies dramatically from one country to the next (see the essays in Stares and Weaver, 2001). Consequently, it can not be claimed that all policy analytic units can project their thinking into regional and global debates in the same way that the DfID report on globalisation might be discussed (DfID, 2000). The cultural role and high international profile of the British Council in promoting British education (and the more understated policy transfer role of the Centre for Policy and Management Studies attached to the British Cabinet) cannot be matched by the governments of Belarus or Mali. Similarly, other development agencies such as USAID, DSE (German Foundation for International Development) or CIDA have enviable

resources at their disposal for the dissemination of their version of 'best thinking' on development.

Increasingly non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and non-state actors are becoming influential knowledge providers. Authority is vested in their expert standing derived from professional status and experience as well as their scholarly credentials. The World Economic Forum and the Evian Group are private associations. Yet, the business and government leaders and high status intellectuals they are able to assemble bestow a patina of power and authority. Scholarly associations and professional bodies also fall into this category of third sector organisations for the advancement of knowledge.[8] However, most notable among third sector organisations are the independent foundations such as Ford, Nuffield, Carnegie, McArthur, Sasakawa and Gates. These international foundations increasingly incorporate a global focus in their programmes and funding of research.

The production of knowledge in the global agora is jointly constructed through the interactions of these agencies through international knowledge networks. An international knowledge network is 'a system of coordinated research, study (and often graduate-level teaching), results' dissemination and publication, intellectual exchange, and financing, across national boundaries' (Parmar, 2002). Governments, foundations and international organisations provide key financial resources for think tanks and universities to conduct research and investigate the viability of transmitting policies developed elsewhere. They are essential to the development of international knowledge networks that feed into and help sustain global public policy networks like GAVI the Global Alliance on Vaccines and Inoculation) or the CGIAR. In these global networks, the distinction between knowledge producers based in the official domain and (global) civil society has become very blurred.

In the past few years, there have been a plethora of reports, workshops and initiatives to enhance both knowledge production and utilisation. For example, European development agencies such as RAWOO (2001), Danida (2001) and KFPE (2000) have all produced reports on 'knowledge partnerships' or cooperation.[9] Why, at this point in time,

---

[8] These associations (such as for example, the International Institute for the Advancement of Science) are too numerous to recount. However, an excellent overview of both official and independent organisations dedicated to building research capacity in developing countries can be found in a recent report to DfID (see Young & Kannemeyer, 2001). Of the 49 organisations covered, there were: 4 foundations, 7 research institutes, 11 international NGOs and 9 regional NGOs. In other words, approximately two-thirds that could be categorised as 'third sector' or (global) civil society organisations.

[9] From June to December 2001 there will be numerous meetings deliberating on these issues. *June*: UK Economic and Social Research Council 'evidence based policy' conference. *July*: DfID sponsored workshop 'Bridging Research and Policy' at the University of Warwick, England. *September*: 'Knowledge, Values and Policy', Oxford International Conference on Education and Development In addition, the 'Knowledge Sharing for International Development: Asia workshop' sponsored by CIDA, DfID,

has knowledge come to play such a central role in the global political economy and more specifically with questions related to development and transition? Four propositions are put forward:

First, the trend over the past quarter decade has been the withdrawal of the state from the production, financing and delivery of public services. This has two consequences. One is that more emphasis has been placed on the private sector, civil society organisations and scholarly associations in the production of knowledge. Consequently, the 'knowledge agenda' has been magnified and amplified. The other, related consequence is that as funding towards development assistance has declined in OECD countries, financially strapped development agencies have needed to 'reinvent' themselves in a manner commensurate with fewer resources at their disposal. Partnerships to promote 'knowledge sharing', the discourse of 'knowledge for development' or the emphasis on 'knowledge management' and 'evidence-based policy' coincide with the declining amounts of overall aid to developing countries and a move towards development assistance that draws upon the resources, expertise and local knowledge of target communities.

Second, development questions are increasingly questions of global concern that met with responses on a multilateral basis. In other words, development and transition are matters of global problem solving. However, collective action at the global level is frustrated by the lack of global institutions of global governance and regulation. Consequently, more informal partnerships, alliances, coalitions or regimes fill the institutional void for global public policies. One of the important binding agents, or glue, for these arrangements is the sharing of knowledge.

Third, transborder policy issues involving a high component of technical and scientific knowledge give individual experts and scholarly associations indirect entrée into policy making. Societal and policy/political understanding of matters such as genetically modified organisms, human cloning, nuclear energy, biological warfare, policy crises such as BSE and ecological destruction rest upon (social) scientific knowledge. Policy making increasingly relies upon the expert judgement and policy recommendations of scientists and advisors where elected representatives and so-called 'amateur' bureaucrats do not have the scientific knowledge/comprehension of a highly technical policy issue and are making policy decisions in circumstances of relative uncertainty. Policy demand for research and scientific expertise comes from national agencies but also from GPPNs, international organisations and MNCs.

Fourth, the trends towards improved accountability, monitoring and evaluation of policy-making at all levels of governance calls for knowledge skills. For example, 'evidence based policy' is one of the latest catch-cries of some western governments. Additionally, societal sources of knowledge outside government frequently do not operate alone – given their need for resources – but in partnership. Often these

partnerships are with government departments that contract-out research but increasingly think tanks, universities and professional institutes partner with foreign donors. As a consequence, organisational evaluation and professional reflection has emerged to meet the accountability requirements of western donors. In short, publicly funded researchers have been compelled by the conditions of the funding to lay claim to a policy orientation. This rhetoric or language of relevance has in turn helped drive the impetus behind the 'evaluation industry'. As a consequence, researchers are increasingly under pressure to 'demonstrate' their social, economic and policy relevance. This instrumentalisation of knowledge correlates strongly with the production of codified knowledge.

These four dynamics interact. Research and analysis is an important form of codified knowledge that is incorporated into policy deliberations. However, the manner in which it is incorporated and with what effect is never entirely clear. Nevertheless, there is strong demand from corporations and international organisations for highly qualified personnel with analytical skills and for advances in scientific and technological progress. This places pressure upon knowledge agencies to nourish the 'knowledge society'.

5. Knowledge Production and Global Public Policy

Where does knowledge – specifically scholarly and professional research and analysis – fit into global/regional policy processes? To a large extent, knowledge is incorporated into policy making where and when it is demanded by decision-makers. Experts and their organisations acquire political credibility by performing scientific services for states and international organisations. They respond to demand for knowledge that performs one or a combination of five functions:

- Instrumental use
- Cognitive explanation
- Ritualistic nourishment
- Legitimation
- No-use. (adapted from Tilak, 2001: 260)

i. Instrumental uses of knowledge

Experts can provide a range of services for official consumers such as informed judgements and analysis of existing programmes. Knowledge agencies are also useful acting as independent agents monitoring progress on adherence to international treaties and agreements. They also contribute to governance and institution building by facilitating exchange between official and other private actors via networks. Importantly, 'the technologies of globalization have also enlarged the amounts and types of empirical evidence' (Scholte, 2000: 191) available not only to scholars but also to policy makers. The welter of information produces a requirement for knowledge sifters or editors to distinguish between poor and rigorous research, to find policy relevant knowledge or to synthesise, distil and re-package knowledge into a manageable format.

The Public Policy Initiative of the OSI, for example, is a capacity building effort to promote policy centres across Central and Eastern Europe to 'inform the policy community' (OSI, 2001: 7). Often, however, analysis is provided in response to official invitation. Those who demand and fund research usually set the research agenda. Consequently, international organisations, foundations, aid agencies, governments and corporations shape the demand for knowledge and stamp a character on the supply of that knowledge. A consequence has been a shift in the research paradigm with increasing emphasis on the utilitarian value of knowledge. The current emphasis is on the value of research for 'user-groups', the production of graduates with skills that allow them to better understand the global political economy and the pragmatic concern for evidence-based policy.

ii. Conceptual frameworks and interpretation

Knowledge production provides the conceptual categories and interpretative frameworks within which to find explanations and policy options for global as well as local problems. This is captured in the agenda of the 'Blue Bird project' to establish a 'vision community of thinkers' to inspire regional policy debate (OSI, 2001: 51). In other words, think tanks, university institutes and researchers help develop the theories, discourse, methods and models that shape policy understandings and potentially become ruling ideas.

There is a common theme in the ideational literature that ideas matter more (or at least their impact more observable) in circumstances of uncertainty where interests are unformed or some kind of crisis (war, environmental catastrophe, election swings) disrupts established policy patterns and provokes paradigmatic revision. Epistemic communities are said to be able to capitalize on policy uncertainty (Haas, 1992). Ideational forces or knowledge actors are presented with a 'window of opportunity' to compete to redefine the policy context. The global agora is a domain of relative uncertainty where interests are unformed, institutions underdeveloped and political authority unclear. This is no more evident than in the wake of September 11th that has prompted a questioning and re-evaluation of old certainties in many quarters of the world.

iii. Rituals and symbols

Academic institutes and think tanks are routinely used by political leaders to announce policy initiatives or clarify positions. For example, most American Presidents and a host of distinguished international leaders have delivered presentations at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York as a prestigious platform from which to make policy announcements. Similarly, scientists are appointed to government committees to lend a scholarly veneer. Other experts in civil society bodies – think tanks, foundations, scientific charities, professional associations – perform similar roles organising seminars and closed discussions as well as hosting foreign delegations. Because of their professional image and scholarly aspirations, they are viewed as a more benign or cooperative alternative when compared to the relatively more critical stance, subjective knowledge and occasionally disruptive lobbying adopted by many NGOs. Accordingly,

quite a few knowledge producers have built stable relationships with official actors in governments and international organisations. Individuals get access to information and entry to official policy communities while state agencies can legitimise their policy position by arguing that they are interacting with and consulting independent civil society organisations. Yet, multi-lateral initiatives to commission research, establish policy taskforces of experts, and appoint experts to international committees may be less indicative of the power and influence of knowledge agencies and more symptomatic of circumstances where research and expertise is used to legitimate prior policy positions.

iv. Legitimacy and Authority

Experts exercise authority because of the scholarly legitimacy and scientific status they claim, or are perceived to, hold. They appropriate authority firstly, on the basis of their scholarly credentials and institutional location in quasi-academic organisations focused on the rigorous and professional analysis of policy issues; and secondly, their establishment as organisations independent from both the state and market that strengthens their reputation as civil society organisations. These endowments give experts some legitimacy in seeking to intervene with knowledge and advice into global and regional policy processes. Their scientific image is reinforced by their institutional affiliations with universities and think tanks as well as the media exposure they sometimes acquire. Moreover, the companies and official agencies that employ this expertise have an interest in bolstering this perception (and perhaps discrediting other varieties of expertise).

However, their scholarly legitimacy and rationalism is finely tuned and can be called into question by ideological advocacy and politicisation which undermines their reputation as providers of independent analysis or neutral expertise. Too close an affinity with government, political parties or NGOs can seriously undermine their authority and legitimacy as objective (or at least balanced) knowledge providers. Moreover, an extensive body of social theory contests the scientific status of 'experts' and knowledge agencies as simply one kind of narrative that is no more legitimate than the knowledges of indigenous groups, practitioners, or religious revival movements. Postmodernist explanations regard knowledge as not only bound to time and place but the person or agency that created it. Cultural and historical context determine the character of truth. Rationalist understandings of scientific objectivity are not regarded as 'truth' but as contingent and contestable knowledge claims. 'It is the social power relations – rather than any fundamental truth – that have elevated rationalism over other modes of knowledge in modern contexts' (Scholte, 2000: 191).

v. Irrelevant knowledge

Whilst research and educational institutions, as well as private consultants and think tanks, may aspire to influence global thinking and shape policy agendas on global policy problems, the more frequent reality for those in policy making milieux is not to use research rationally and comprehensively. Knowledge agencies may be ignored or patronised at will by governments, corporations and international organisations.

Furthermore, some developing countries do not absorb effectively either global or local knowledge in the absence of governmental capacity in the form of in-house policy units or well-trained bureaucracy. Nevertheless, policy irrelevance does not mean social or cultural irrelevance.

The nature of influence exerted by knowledge agencies in the global agora reflects the knowledge function they perform. The instrumental value of knowledge agencies is to be found in the day-to-day deliberations of development agencies, international organizations and global public policy networks. The conceptual influence of knowledge on policy is much more diffuse, incremental and 'atmospheric' (James, 2000). Acting as 'legitimisers' is perhaps a reflection of the lack of influence of knowledge agencies. However, there are many intermediary variables between knowledge production and subsequent policy design and implementation. Researchers and experts are one small and relatively unimportant group compared to vested interests of MNCs, governments and other political actors seeking to shape policy. Consequently, rather than the agency of individual experts, think tanks or university institutes, it is their collective impact that institutionally embeds certain technical discourses as hegemonic within international organizations and global public policy networks.

In general, knowledge production in the global system tends to based on a complex interweaving of network interactions. Sometimes, these are loose, *ad ho*c relationships with like-minded policy institutes, NGOs, university centres and government agencies, in a given issue area to exchange information, ideas and keep abreast of developments. At other times, advisors and their institutes act as policy entrepreneurs within tighter networks such as an epistemic community. Networks are important both in embedding knowledge agencies in a relationship with more powerful actors, and in increasing their audience or constituency, thereby potentially amplifying their impact. The emergence of global knowledge elites consolidating in global policy networks raises new questions about inclusion and global access.

As outlined in the 'conference rationale', one objective is to consider the conviction 'that new alliances and coalitions can be formed among the governments, the corporate sector and civil society in new and increasingly democratic and inclusive ways'. Yet, the growth in the supply and international spread of knowledge and expertise has impact not only on the character of knowledge but also on channels into and participation in global policy developments. Knowledge based authority is one foundation behind the 'enforceable societal relations' and sets of hegemonic ideas within what some identify as the emerging global polity (Ougaard & Higgott, 2002). Recognised standards and modes of verification are often generated under the canons of academic research and intellectual collaboration. This does not allow an even playing field for many NGOs and community organisations that do not have the expertise or resources to conduct the intellectually coherent and technically proficient studies that match the research capabilities of development agencies. Subjective perceptions, practitioner insights, grass-roots knowledge and communal voices do not have the same credence or value as 'expert' deliberations. Moreover, such knowledge cannot be up-rooted from its

context and packaged in format to be transmitted upwards into global domains. Indeed, it may not make sense out of context. The character of global knowledge – technical, codified, elite and homogenised language – produces new inequities.[10] Those with elite knowledge skills and attributes – graduate degrees, professional experience in international organisations – are more likely to be able participate in global policy dialogues.

6. The Local Domain of Global Knowledge Production.

Improving access to global knowledge and disseminating ideas regarding best practice is vitally important to many developing countries without a strong university sectors or research capacity within government or civil society. This paper disputes neither the need nor the value of global sources of knowledges. For many developing countries the opportunity to study abroad, to participate in OECD training programmes and networks, or to access the databases of organizations like the World Bank represents the best available knowledge. Instead, the issue is more about participation in knowledge production – what knowledge is (re)produced and where it is disseminated. As noted in a report on the role of consultants in EU social policy transfers to Central and Eastern Europe: 'It is principally the (international) experts who are on the ground in the recipient country that have the possibility to shape policy issues through the projects they participate in' (de la Porte and Deacon, 2001, my inclusion).

Universities, foundations and think tanks play an important role as both regional/global knowledge interlocutors and as local/national knowledge repositories. Strong national and local capacity in knowledge creation is crucial not only in enhancing national policy learning and development of policy solutions but as a necessary foundation from which to engage in global policy debates and became effective interpreters and adapters of global knowledge. Strong local capacity not only provides a bulwark against the standard models and 'one-size-fits-all' application of global knowledge, it is the source of new data, fresh insights, innovative synthesis and local intelligence.

This is contested terrain. It is in the local application of knowledge and the implementation of policy where global standards are most keenly felt by local communities. Tensions and competition often result between international experts with the national policy communities that are critical of the lack of knowledge of local conditions and cultures. Structural adjustment loans are often supplemented by technical assistance, frequently in the form of consultants (Larmour 2001). The preference for

---

[10] Ravi Kanbur for example, unintentionally draws attention to this dilemma when he identifies a gap in understanding between Group A (analysts in the international financial institutions) and Group B. (civil society, analysts in NGOs and some UN agencies, non-economists, protest groups) despite their common aim to combat poverty. The groups operate with incommensurate discourses. He highlights the different valuations given to codified, technical abstract and seemingly objective knowledge and the subjective and clearly normative evaluations and perceptions of NGOs.

foreign consultants, especially by donor agencies that tie technical assistance to the hire of donor-country experts is often regarded as a constraint on the development of in-country research capacity and policy expertise.

> International cooperation in research, … which largely takes the form of research by consultants … tends to displace public funding of research. It also sets new research agendas. The short term needs and compulsions of international research also contribute to negating the value of long-term research on the one hand, and building of sustainable capacities of the universities and research institutions; and as a corollary to the research conducted or sponsored by international organisations, domestic research generally gets devalued (Tilak, 2001: 259).

In Sri Lanka, "This causes resentment among locals and discourages them from active participation" (Stanley Samarasinghe, 2nd November 1999). Another cause for complaint has been the imposition of 'one-size-fits-all' development models and inappropriate application of 'world standards'. In Bulgaria "… it is quite difficult to argue with some foreign consultants in developing projects, especially with foreign donors, that not all research instruments that work in some part of the world also work in the others" (Lilia Dimova, 17th November, 1999). These local experts raise valid questions about both the quality and utility of practical and policy knowledge marketed by the consultancy industry and the interests of donors in demanding such knowledge.[11]

Foreign consultants and international experts are important in promoting the international exchange of knowledge. However, local universities, foundations and think tanks are helpful in mediating between the local needs and experiences and the general knowledge available. They open up spaces for pluralistic dialogues across national and cultural boundaries and challenge mainstream thinking. In particular, local knowledge agencies can improve understanding of policy transfer processes. Specifically, they can identify the conditions under which policy transfer occurs, when policy transfer is either appropriate and will enhance 'best practice' or when it will lead to policy failures, and finally, they can aid decision-makers in the processes of policy transfer. In doing so, knowledge agencies are not simply studying policy transfer but are constitutive of the process and become propellers of transfer. This is apparent when academics, consultants or think tank staff are seconded to the World Bank or IMF; undertake consultancy work for state aid agencies such as Finnida, when they write position papers for think tanks and engage in advocacy work for NGOs or consultancy that draws attention to overseas experience.

Also not to be neglected is the manner in which education and skills acquisition are major elements of the policy transmission process. For example, poorly understood is the manner in which the movement of foreign students contributes to policy diffusion. A significant proportion of graduate students are sponsored by their home governments, usually a specific ministry to undertake policy or economically relevant degrees in Europe and North America (Barber *et al*, 1984). Long-standing schemes of international

---

[11] These comments were taken from an electronic dialogue initiated by the World Bank Institute. Full statements are archived at: (http://www2.worldbank.org/hm/hmgdn/html).

student exchange such as the Columbo scheme, Rhodes scholarships and Fulbright fellowships, and the more recent example of Soros scholarship scheme as well as Erasmus and Socrates in the EU, represent significant channel for the international movement of ideas, policy and practice. In the case of the USA,

> Its ability to spread ideas is further enhanced by the wealth and prestige of US universities which attract a growing number of foreign students. In addition to being immersed in US culture, foreigners studying business, economics, law and public policy in the United States also receive an education that stresses the virtues of free markets, democratic institutions, and the rule of law… When it comes to US cultural hegemony, American universities may be as powerful a weapon as the American military (Walt 2000: 40).

With the internationalisation of universities, the traditional activity of intellectual exchange and cross-national engagement via the 'invisible college' has become routine. However, relatively few universities have global reputations and most of these are located in Europe and North America.

A small transnational liberal college type of institution like CEU may become an important cog in the discourse on globalized knowledge. Furthermore, policy centers like the Centre for Policy Studies (CPS) based at CEU and others in the OSI network are other smaller cogs. In particular, CPS is a center that can potentially assist the internal audience of the CEU in better understanding the wider relevance and applications of research and cultivating a facility for policy entrepreneurship. It also can play a role to project the best of CEU thinking to an outside world in its aspiration to 'to improve the policy environment in the region by diversifying the sources of public policy input'. As the CEU grows, it can also be a mediator, editor and interpreter of global knowledge. That is, to take global lessons and best practice assumptions and evaluate for inapplicable ideas or inappropriate transfer. There is much to learn from other countries and organisations, but strong local knowledge agencies are also needed to modify 'best thinking and practice' to suit local arrangements and cultural expectations. This may well lead to divergence and difference recognised as a positive attribute and as a source for future innovations. In sum, the most relevant knowledge is that which is tailored to a national and local context. To be of social value in this context, universities and other knowledge institutions need to carve out space to evaluate global thinking and engage in learning.

Conclusion: Think Local, Act Global?

Policy transfer and global knowledge sharing has at least two dimensions, but one dimension has received greater attention. It is easier to adopt the discourse of 'think global, act local' and develop 'knowledge sharing' and capacity building programmes around this mantra. That is, to provide desperately needed support for local universities and policy institutes as well as to make global knowledge more accessible to developing countries for local interpretation and application. However, there are clear asymmetries of power and capability inherent in 'knowledge for development'. It is a far more

difficult enterprise to 'think local and enact it globally'. For example, the seventeen policy centres supported by the OSI have 'obtained a significant degree of credibility and influence in their respective areas of practice'. However, awareness of their activities and expertise is not 'reflected outside national boundaries' (OSI, 2001: 7). The capacity to participate in global policy dialogues and networks is not as well developed. Greater focus on this side of equation would not only require recognition of the disparities in knowledge capacity and therefore the inability of many countries to participate in global knowledge production, but also recognition of the great diversity of knowledges. Top down knowledge sharing or the development of global databases that can be easily accessed are not so well structured to allow the reverse flow of knowledge from local knowledge producers into global knowledge production. In sum, university institutes and independent policy centres need not only to be policy entrepreneurs among their local communities and within national polities but to develop some capacity as policy entrepreneurs in the global agora.

Word Count: 8126

References

Bennett, Colin. J. (1991) 'Review Article: What is Policy Convergence and What Causes It?' *British Journal of Political Science*, 21: 215-233.

Börzel, Tanja. (1998) 'Organizing Babylon -- on the different conceptions of policy networks', *Public Administration*, 76 (summer): 253-73.

Callan, Hilary. (1998) 'Internationalization in Europe', in Peter Scott (ed.) *The Globalization of Higher Education*, Buckingham, UK, The Society for Research Into Higher Education and the Open University Press.

Danida (2001) *Partnership at the Leading Edge: A Danish Vision for Knowledge, Research and Development*, Copenhagen, Danida.

De la Porte, Caroline. and Deacon, Bob. (2001) 'International Consulting Companies and Easter European Accession to Europe', summary of report, http://www.stakes.fi/gaspp/consultingcompanies.html

Denning, Stephen. (2000) 'Knowledge Sharing in the North and South', in Wolfgang Gmelin, Kenneth King & Simon McGrath (eds.) *Development Knowledge, National Research and International Cooperation*, Edinburgh, Bonn & Geneva, CAS-DSE-NORRAG.

DfID (2000) *Eliminating World Poverty: Making Globalisation Work for the Poor*, White Paper on International Development, UK, HMSO.

Dolowitz, David. & Marsh, David. (1996) 'Who Learns from Whom: A Review of the Policy Transfer Literature', *Political Studies*, 44(2): 343-57.

Dolowitz, David. and Marsh, David. (2000) 'Learning From Abroad: The Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy Making', *Governance* 13 (1) 2000.

Drezner, Daniel. W. (2001) 'Globalization and Policy Convergence', *International Studies Review*,

Gemelli, Guiliana. ed. (1998) *The Ford Foundation and Europe (1950s-1970s): Cross Fertilization of Learning in Social Science and Management*, Brussels, European University Press.

Gmelin, Wolfgang. (2001) 'Managing Which and Whose Knowledge for Development' in Wolfgang Gmelin, Kenneth King & Simon McGrath (eds.) *Development Knowledge, National Research and International Cooperation*, Edinburgh, Bonn & Geneva, CAS-DSE-NORRAG.

Haas, Peter. (1992) 'Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination', *International Organization*, 46(1): 1-35.

Kanbur, Ravi. (2000) 'Economic Poliyc, Distribution and Poverty: The Nature of the Disagreements', unpublished paper.

King, Kenneth. Ed. (2001) 'Knowledge, Research and International Cooperation', *Northern Policy Research Review and Advisory Network on Education and Training – NORRAG News*, 29 (July), Edinburgh, Centre of African Studies, University of Edinburgh.

Krause Hansen, Hans., Dorte Salskov-Iversen and Sven Bislev (2002) 'Transnational Discourse Communities: Globalizing Public Management' in R. Higgott & M Ougaard (eds) *Understanding the Global Polity*, London, Routledge.

Larmour, Peter (2001) 'Coercive Transfer? Conditionality and Policy Reform in PNG and the South Pacific', unpuplished paper. Australian National University.

McGann, J. & Weaver, R. K. eds. (2000) *Think Tanks and Civil Societies: Catalysts for Ideas and Action,* Sommerset N.J.: Transaction Press.

Nesadurai, Helen E.S. and Diane Stone (2000) 'Southeast Asian Research Institutes and Regional Cooperation' in Stone, D. (ed.) *Banking on Knowledge: The Genesis of the Global Development Network*, London: Routledge.

Nowotny, Helga., Scott, Peter and Gibbons, Michael. (2001) *Re-Thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*, Oxford, Polity Press.

Open society Institute (2001) *Open Society Institute Related Public Policy Centers*, Activity Report – June, Budapest, OSI.

Parmar, Inderjeet. (2002) 'American Foundations and the Development of International Knowledge Networks', *Global Networks*, forthcoming.

Peters, B. Guy, and Pierre, Jon. (2000) 'Developments in intergovernmental relations: towards multi-level governance', *Policy and Politics*, 29(2): 131-35.

RAWOO – Netherlands Development Assistance Research Council (2001) 'Utilization of Research for Development Cooperation: Linking Knowledge Production to Development Policy and Practice, the Hague, RAWOO.

Radaelli, Claudio. (2000) 'Policy Transfer in the European Union: Institutional Isomorphism as a Source of Legitimacy, *Governance*, 13(1): 25-43.

Reinicke, Wolfgang. H. (2001) 'Walking the Talk: Global Public Policy in Action', in *Global Public Policies and Programs: Implications for Financing and*

Evaluation, proceedings from a World Bank Workshop, Washington DC., the World Bank.

Reinicke, Wolfgang., Deng, Francis. et al (2000) *Critical Choices: The United Nations, Networks and the Future of Global Governance*, Ottowa, International Development Research Center.

Rizvi, Fazal. (2000) 'International Education and the Production of Global Imgaination' in Nicholas C. Burbales and Carlos Albero Torres (eds.) *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*, New York, Routledge.

Saint-Martin. Denis (2000) 'The Formation of the New Entrepreneurial State and the Growth of Modern management Consultancy', in Dietmar Braun & Andreas Busch (eds.) *Public Policy and Political Ideas*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.

Samhoff, J. and Stromquist, N. (2001) 'Managing Knowledge and Storing wisdom? New Forms of Foreign Aid?' *Development and Change*, 3(2):

Scott, Peter. (1998) 'Massification, Internationalization and Globalization', in Peter Scott (ed.) *The Globalization of Higher Education*, Buckingham, UK, The Society for Research Into Higher Education and the Open University Press.

Scholte, Jan Aart. (2000) *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, London, Macmillan.

Sherrington, Philippa. (2000) 'Shaping the Policy Agenda: Think Tank Activity in the European Union', *Global Society*, 14(2).

Sinclair, Timothy. J. (2000) 'Reinventing Authority; Embedded Knowledge Networks and the New Global Finance', *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 18: 487—502.

Squire, Lyn. (2000) 'Why the World Bank Should Be Involved in Development Research', in G. L. Gilbert & D. Vines (eds.) *The World Bank: Structure and Policies,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Stares, Paul and Weaver, R. Kent. (2001) *Guidance for Governance*, Tokyo and Washington DC., Japan Center for International Exchange and Brookings Institution.

Struyk, Raymond. J (1999) *Reconstructive Critics: Think Tanks in Post-Soviet Bloc Democracies*, Washington DC., Urban Institute Press.

Stone, Diane. (2000) *Banking on Knowledge: The Genesis of the Global Development Network*, London, Routledge.

Stone, Diane., Denham, Andrew. & Garnett, Mark. (1998) Think Tanks Across Nations, Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Tilak, Jandhyala. (2001) 'Knowledge Development and International Aid', in Wolfgang Gmelin, Kenneth King & Simon McGrath (eds.) *Development Knowledge, National Research and International Cooperation*, Edinburgh, Bonn & Geneva, CAS-DSE-NORRAG.

The World Bank (1999) *Knowledge for Development: World Development Report 1998/99*, New York, Oxford University Press.