

# GLOBALIZATION STUDIES NETWORK INAUGURAL CONFERENCE

UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK  
18-21 AUGUST 2004

## REPORTS OF PANEL PROCEEDINGS

### Panel 1.1 Global Studies Journals

Bob Deacon, *Global Social Policy*

Barry Gills, *Globalizations*

John Groom, *Global Society*

Sirkku Hellsten, *Journal of Global Ethics*

Alisdair Rogers, *Global Networks*

Diane Stone, *Global Governance*

Three main issues were presented in the panel: (1) the aims of the journals and their main themes; (2) their contributions to advance knowledge and understanding of global issues and processes; and (3) editorial policies. The panelists agreed that their editorial policies should encourage three main goals: (1) multidisciplinary; (2) critical debate and policy-relevant knowledge on globalisation beyond theoretical contributions; and (3) space on editorial boards for Southern researchers.

Some presenters as well as members of the audience raised questions concerning submissions in different languages and the need to find criteria for publishing articles in other languages to break the 'monopoly of English and English-speaking contributors'.

Another important question was related to transparency and accountability in publishing policies and procedures, and the inherent tensions generated by the fact that editorial procedures respond to the demands of both scholars and markets, leaving the editor with the difficult task of being both scholar and salesperson.

In relation to the issue of 'language monopoly' and the problem of access for contributions from developing countries, there was consensus about the need to promote mixed editorial boards or collaboration with editors from other regions. Peer review in collaboration with scholars from different countries was also mentioned as an alternative to overcome the language problem.

## **Panel 1.2 General Globalization Studies Programmes**

Rita Giacalone, GRUDIR, Universidad de los Andes, Merida Venezuela  
Sergiu Miscoiu, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj, Romania  
Huang Ping, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Beijing  
Brian Winchester, Center for the Study of Global Change, Indiana University  
David Jacobson, School of Global Studies, Arizona State University

Participants in this panel addressed the past, present and future developments of four programmes in global studies. Three of the participants described the content of their academic programmes, the research projects and the established relationships with academic centers, business community, government and society in general. All the participants emphasized the importance of building up policy-oriented programmes and of developing joint research and publications. The discussion focused on the challenges that a transdisciplinary programme on global studies can face within its own University community.

In relation to the logistics involved when general programmes on globalization are set, participants mentioned that: (a) there is a crucial balance between University expectations and the sponsors' expectations; and (b) bureaucratic structures within Universities can prevent the implementation of new programmes on global studies. In relation to this point, participants mentioned how important it is to have strong support from senior authorities within Universities to conduct the necessary reforms and arrangements and to established joint research programmes. The ideological content of the concept of 'globalization' within national and regional contexts was also discussed.

## **Panel 1.3 Globalization and Security**

Lim Li Ching, Third World Network, Penang  
Paul van Seters, Globus Institute for Globalization and Sustainable Development,  
University of Tilburg  
Ram Rattan Sharma, School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Narhu Univeristy,  
New Delhi  
Pen Zhongyng, Institute of Global Issues, Nankai University, Tianjin

The main substantive issues discussed by this panel were: (a) globalization studies' avoidance, so far, of the question of security; and (b) 9/11 has brought the issue of security to the forefront. It was suggested that after 9/11 globalisation studies have entered a new era. New areas of research, for example bio-safety, must be taken into consideration. Other issues mentioned were the need to re-conceptualize security. The panel agreed that globalization cannot be taken as a totality; some entry points must be identified. It was thought that the subject of globalization and security is very wide and in need of (re)conceptualization.

### **Panel 1.4 Global Governance (1)**

Barry Carin, Centre for Global Studies, University of Victoria

Ann Florini, Brookings Institution, Washington DC

Adebayo Olukoshi, Council for Development of Social Science Research in Africa,  
Dakar

Jiro Yamaguchi and Ken Endo, Center for the Study of Globalization, Hokkaido  
University, Japan.

The main issues discussed in this panel were (a) new demands for global governance at a variety of levels and amongst a variety of actors; and (b) a range of substantive issues in global governance. The levels of governance considered included: the inter-governmental level, involving governments from the North and South, through to the potential creation of a G-20; the strengthening of individual state capacity in Africa; local governments in Japan and East Asia; the role of corporate social responsibility and private business actors in global governance; and the role of civil society in shaping the activities of all of the preceding levels of governance. The substantive governance issues discussed included: reform of the global financial system, the IMF and World Bank; the illicit economy and money-laundering; WTO issues such as the Doha Round and TRIPs; social welfare; the environment; agriculture; infectious diseases; the Chemical Warfare Convention; and terrorism.

The five panelists raised questions related to methodology and user groups. All of the programmes were intent to involve policy-makers either as research partners or end users of the research. Methodological questions revolved around how to conduct research on private sector activities and the urge for inter-disciplinary research.

### **Panel 1.5 Global Trade (1)**

Mustafizur Rahman, Centre for Policy Dialogue, Dhaka

Nicola Bullard, Focus on the Global South, Bangkok

Yao Graham, Third World Network-Africa, Accra

Meri Koivusalo, STAKES, Helsinki

The main substantive issues addressed in this panel were: (a) general approaches to conducting global trade; and (b) the regulatory arrangements that govern global trade. Most of the discussion focused on the WTO regime, though some mention was also made of regional and bilateral trade agreements, as well as the role (or more particularly the reinvigoration) of the state in regulating global trade. The presentations addressed a number of specific sectors, including agriculture, health and textiles. All four speakers were critical of existing arrangements to govern global trade, albeit in different ways and extents.

The main questions of organising and conducting research addressed in this panel concerned relations with practitioners. All four programmes were concerned to develop policy-relevant research and to act in advisory functions to governments (national trade ministries in particular), parliamentarians, social movements, and the

general public. In some cases the institutes were quite proactive in efforts to build political coalitions for alternative policies towards global trade.

No possibilities for collaborative research projects were discussed in this session. That subject was held over to the second panel on global trade.

### **Panel 1.6 Democratizing Globalization**

Moema Miranda, Instituto Brasileiro de Análises Socais e Econômicas, Rio de Janeiro

Robert O'Brien, Institute on Globalization and the Human Condition, McMaster

University, Hamilton, Canada

Geoff Stokes, Institute for Citizenship and Globalization, Deakin University

Discussion focused on both the constraints in capturing funding experienced by the different organisations represented by the panel, and on describing the research projects underway in these organisations. Practical obstacles included: the need to work with sometimes 'strange bedfellows' in order to strategically build momentum in accessing funding for multidisciplinary research; problems associated with assuring the participation of economists in a (well-funded) social science programme perceived as having little relevance to the day-to-day nitty-gritty of 'real-world' economics; and problems generally with competing for limited funds.

Regarding research content, emphases ranged from: the impacts on, and contributions to globalisation phenomena by the movements of asylum seekers and refugees, as well as of migration more generally, accompanied by a desire to in some way 'give voice to the voiceless'; the roles of national contexts in refracting transnational ideas and globalisation processes; the significance of Islamic NGOs as huge civil society organisations that are extremely politically engaged; the problems associated with a globalising dominance of international organisations that nevertheless retain a strong western, modernist bias (e.g. the influence of UNESCO in imposing global regulatory regimes reflecting western assumptions in the heritage industry was mentioned); and the importance of interrogating conceptual categories through the lens of globalisation – including, for example, notions of autonomy, citizenship, cultural difference, etc. All institutions were concerned with issues of disseminating research such that material is available in accessible, non-technical forms as well as in more conventional academic publications.

Moema Miranda of the Instituto Brasileiro de Análises Socais e Econômicas, an advocacy and research NGO engaged strongly in the World Social Forum process, provided a useful counterpoint to the orientations offered by the more narrowly oriented academic organisations. In being 'aligned with the losers of market forces', IBASE takes an activist and politically engaged approach in responding both to research needs and findings. Starting from the basic question of 'why is there so much poverty even with the contemporary spread of democratic governance regimes?', the institute seeks possibilities for research collaboration and network building in the interests of 'not just making capitalism more human and ethical but of thinking and doing new, different ways of organising and producing'. They emphasise perspectives and experiences from indigenous peoples and feminist analyses in their approach to

research, and to opening up different ways of thinking regarding contemporary globalisation processes. This theme of integrating advocacy and activism with good research when working with contemporary situations of extreme inequality constituted a significant domain of discussion in this session.

### **Panel 2.1 Global Studies Degrees**

Michael Conniff, Global Studies Initiative, San Jose State University  
Richard Longhorne, Center for Global Change and Governance, Rutgers University  
Dominick Sachsenmaier, Global and International Studies Programme, University of California at Santa Barbara

The main substantive issues discussed by the panel were: (a) growing student interest in globalisation studies; and (b) as a consequence, plans for expansion of teaching programmes on the subject. The panel described the evolution and content of degree programmes. Other issues discussed included the difficulty to arrange supervision for PhD students given the wide range of interests. The interdisciplinary nature of the programmes was also mentioned. The discussion was focused on a comparison of the programmes described. The panel agreed that this exchange of information on degree programmes had been very productive and could fruitfully be continued over the Internet.

### **Panel 2.2 Global Trade (2)**

Josephat Kweka, Economic and Social Research Foundation, Dar es Salaam  
Rogayah Hj Mat Zin, Institute of Malaysian and International Studies, Bangi  
Richard Kozul-Wright, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

This panel took a mainly economist's approach to global trade and was devoted largely to revisiting past events to redescribe reality. The panelists sought to develop alternative narratives and provide better foundations for policy. The sets of issues were: (a) general narratives about the role of and relationship between trade and national development; (b) foreign direct investment and capital flows; and (c) policy spaces for the state. Most of the discussion on trade focussed on regional analysis, e.g. trade issues in East Africa and East Asia. However, there was also discussion (particularly from the UNCTAD) about deeper and more general patterns of trade/development. The presentations also addressed specific issues concerning FDI and capital flows, drawing on recent and past experiences in particular regions (e.g. the Latin American debt crisis and the East Asia financial meltdown). All speakers were critical of the general received wisdom on the prognosis of the crisis; thus presenting new narratives of the events. These issues set the stage for the third theme of policy space and the role of the state. It was generally suggested that 'strong states' lie behind most of the 'success' stories and that current patterns of global governance are constricting the policy space for states. In this respect, all presentations adopted a comparative analysis across regions and time periods.

Regarding the organisation and conduct of research, the session considered engagement with policy and the funding of research. All programmes had explicit engagement with policy institutions at global, regional and/or local levels. However, all programmes expressed problems of research funding.

### **Panel 2.3. Global Governance (2)**

Simon Burrall, One World Trust, London

Richard Crook, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, London

George Thomas, School of Global Studies, Arizona State University

Yiwei Wang, Fudan Institute for International Studies, Fudan University, Shanghai

The participants in this panel focused on describing their research agendas and main methodological problems while doing research on global governance and non-state actors. Participants pointed to the relevance of identifying the best ways of impacting on policy processes as well as of engaging with local communities; and the need for transdisciplinary and flexible approaches to achieve this. The discussion focused on the prevailing accountability deficits in global governance processes, institutions and actors and the role that non-state actors can play in overcoming them.

In relation to the logistics of conducting research, participants noticed the methodological challenges that global governance processes posed when conducting empirical research. The importance of culture and power in global governance processes was also stressed.

### **Panel 2.4 Global Money and Finance**

Tony Addison, UNU-WIDER, Helsinki

Jorge Braga de Macedo, Institute for Tropical Scientific Research (IICT), Lisbon

Flemming Larsen, International Monetary Fund

Marek Wroblewski, Institute of International Studies, University of Wroclaw

This panel focussed on how international finance and monetary policy may help poor countries to develop. In particular, this theme was analysed from four different angles. First, attention was given to innovative sources of external finance, such as environmental taxes, the Tobin Tax, Great Britain's proposal of an International Financial Facility, ways to facilitate remittances. The evaluation of these proposals is the subject of a recent WIDER research project. Second, attention was given to how poor countries may benefit from the implementation of peer-reviewed systems of monitoring and surveillance, alike those that underpinned the constitution of the European Union. Areas in which such systems may be fruitfully implemented are innovative forms of finance and the development of cyclical indicators of economic activity. Third, an assessment was made of how different monetary policies/regimes, e.g. exchange rates regime and capital account liberalisation, bear on economic development and how they may relate with economic crashes. In particular, the need

of an empirical assessment of existing theories was stressed by Flemming Larsen of the IMF. He also pointed out that ‘real’ macroeconomic factors, e.g. domestic savings and domestic governance, should be considered in the analysis, as the success or failure of a country in catching-up overall seems to be independent from the monetary factors mentioned above. Fourth, the panel considered regional integration, with particular reference to EU enlargement.

WIDER research activity is structured around a number of research projects; other themes of research in addition to that on finance and development include globalisation and poverty, and spatial inequalities. The research outcomes are presented in Conferences. The recently created programme on global development at IICT is actively engaged in disseminating the results of its research activity on peer-reviewed monitoring systems and public-private partnerships to members of the Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries (CPLP), especially in Africa and East Timor. There is no formal statement of research at the IMF, with an Evaluation Board assessing the projects. The Institute of International Studies, University of Wroclaw, is collaborating with different universities in Eastern Europe. Informal relationships with policy-makers are also in place.

No prospective collaboration was discussed in this panel. However, external collaboration to WIDER research programmes is possible, individual contributions being selected through calls for papers. The representative of the Institute of International Studies discussed with Caner Bakir, Center on Globalization and Democracy, Koc University, Istanbul possible future collaborations on the issue of the European enlargement.

## **Panel 2.5 Globalization Theory**

Masoud Alamuti, Globalization Studies Group, IMPS, Tehran

Mathias Albert, Institute for World Society Studies, University of Bielefeld

Jessica Byron, Department of Government, University of the West Indies, Kingston

Asuncion St. Clair, Global Dynamics Project, University of Bergen

This discussion revolved around the stated need for a ‘fundamentally new theoretical approach to globalisation studies’, one that moves on both from conventional international relations and realist approaches to state self-protection imperatives, *and* from liberal approaches that imply that state power will inexorably give way to market forces that inherently do not respect national boundaries. Mathias Albert began his presentation with the provocative comment that ‘this panel is the only one about something that does not exist, i.e. globalisation theory’, and emphasised that a Luhmanian approach that emphasised the changing constitution of community through communication might do the job. Such an approach would emphasise that there are no naturally given boundaries and that society is fluidly shifting according to communicative possibilities and actualities.

Jessica Byron focused not on globalisation theory but on the pragmatics of her own university situation. She emphasised in particular the constraints embodied by both the small size and the dispersed nature of the Caribbean island geography. In research

terms this is constraining in terms of maintaining collaborative networks beyond the Caribbean, whilst research opportunities are embodied by the contemporary local problems faced by small island societies attempting to maintain a different coherence amid the global wash of neoliberalism.

This point was taken up by Asuncion St. Clair who ‘upfronted’ the need for traversing the boundary between a liberal theoretical approach to globalisation when viewed ‘from above’, and the vehement contestations of globalisation processes emerging ‘from below’. Iterating the problems associated with methodological nationalism and territoriality, as well as identifying the hegemony asserted by transnational elites in generating transnational knowledges and global governance frameworks, she pointed out the need for a ‘sociology of science’ approach in deconstructing and contesting the knowledges produced and adhered to at global levels, particularly in policy domains. She also strongly advocated a desire to influence values, drawing on an ethical frame that is value-conscious, and that theorises value conflicts and struggles. In particular, this might theorise and expose the hidden values and norms that drive current global dynamics, as well as providing a theoretical context for deconstructing the universalising projects of rights, neoliberalism, global governance etc.

### **Panel 2.6 Globalization, Gender, Knowledge**

Helge Hveem, Centre on Technology, Innovation and Culture, University of Oslo  
Hideaki Shiroyama, University of Tokyo, and Ben Middleton, Ferris University  
Karin Siegmann, Sustainable Development Policy Institute, Islamabad

The principal issue addressed in this panel was the role of knowledge and technology in driving the globalisation process and the adaptation of these forces to different regional and cultural contexts. In particular, the impact of knowledge and technology was discussed with reference to: the role of multinationals in diffusing and shaping forms of capitalism in different regions; the reconfiguration of knowledge in East Asia; the influence of globalisation on the welfare states of the Nordic countries; and gender and industry in Pakistan.

All of the programmes were concerned with involving policy-makers in the conduct of research and in formulating responses to contemporary problems. Methodological problems were also discussed, including the need for multi-disciplinarity and the adjustment of methodologies to different regional contexts.

A number of potential areas for collaboration amongst the three programmes were identified. These included joint research on communicable diseases; the illicit economy and money laundering; and the role of cultural and regional standard setting in response to global standard setting as in the case of the WTO.

### **Panel 3.1 Globalization Centre Websites**

Nikolay Saveliev, Center for the History of Globalisation (CHG), Moscow



Nayan Chanda, Yale Center for the Study of Globalisation (CSG), Yale University

Four main issues were considered in the panel: (1) the reach and scope of the websites; (2) the types of information and analytical data they offer; (3) their intended audience (users of information); and (4) funding issues. The panelists also described the content of their websites and the relevance of their work for the targeted users.

In this context, the first presentation highlighted two main distinctive characteristics of the CHG website: (1) it gathers historical analysis of patterns of globalisation in general and the specific implications for changes in Russia; and (2) it offers focused work on financial issues. These two thematic categories are different projects with different target audiences. The first offers publicly available analysis on historical accounts to understand the process of social, political and economic change in Russia. It is directed to the general use of scholars and practitioners. The second follows a selective criterion, as the information is available only by subscription or fee for the use of negotiators, investors, companies, banks, and government representatives. This last issue resembles the work of think tanks or consultants.

The second presentation, on the Yale CSG website, highlighted its distinctive 'academic' character as it offers scholarly work, book reviews, and articles published in newspapers by academic columnists. The aim is to explore current affairs and to constitute a bridge between academia or policy circles and the general public. In this context, the targeted users are specialists, scholars, policy makers, and university classrooms.

Both panelists highlighted the importance of websites for: (1) the broader dissemination of research for the general audience, scholars and decision-makers; (2) the networking of actors; and (3) the promotion of critical debate

Three main concerns were raised in the open floor discussion: (1) the issue of funding; (2) the issue of copyrights; and (3) the problem of language.

### **Panel 3.2 Global Social Policy**

Bob Deacon, Globalism and Social Policy Programme, Helsinki/Sheffield

Huck-Ju Kwon, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development

Simon Rutabajuka, Centre for Basic Research, Kampala

Felipe Balmaceda, Center of Applied Economics, University of Chile, Santiago

The main substantive issues addressed by this panel were (a) conceptualisation of global social policy; and (b) how to build a global framework that allows sustainable effective social policies to be implemented. Global social policy was defined by one participant as 're-distribution at the global level involving international actors'. The panel agreed that globalisation sets a new agenda for research. It was mentioned that social policy is no longer only a domestic issue. The focus must also be on global/regional governance and civil society. The effects of measures such as

structural adjustment programmes and the role of multilateral organisations must be taken into consideration. The importance of comparative research was also mentioned. Signs for inter-institutional collaboration on the study of global social policy are very encouraging. A number of delegates at this conference expressed a firm interest in a joint project, and there is the possibility of collaborating with even more centres.

### **Panel 3.3 Global Civil society and Social Movements**

Jules Duchastel, Canada Research Chair in Globalisation, Citizenship and Democracy, University of Quebec at Montreal

Alla Glinchikova, Institute of Globalization Studies (IPROG), Moscow

Tosca Bruno, Daniel Patrick Moynihan Institute of Global Affairs, Syracuse University

Discussion highlighted different conceptual, theoretical and methodological challenges in the study of global civil society. Participants were concerned with the evolution of the idea of civil society and how it could be fit within broader questions about the reconstruction of (participatory) democracy in the face of globalization trends. Questions arose as to whether the concept ‘civil society’ could/should be extracted from its historical western origins to be employed as an impartial analytical tool. And practical issues of the efficient/effective operation of NGOs in the global policy domain were also addressed.

Reported research activities centered on (1) the discursive inclusion of civil society in the activities of international organizations; and (2) the practical problems and organizational possibilities that transnational NGOs encounter. On the former point, it was suggested that, while civil society is being included in global governance, the nature and quality of that involvement needs to be set within the context of evolving relations between economy, society, government and governance. On the latter point, an extensive project to compile interview data with heads of transnational NGOs about how they engage with global public policy making is being engaged at the Moynihan Institute of Global Affairs. This data will be a resource for activists and academics operating in these areas. Comments/suggestions were welcomed as to how to proceed with this project.

### **Panel 3.4 Globalization and Regionalization (1)**

Caner Bakir, Centre for Globalization and Democracy, Koc University, Istanbul

Honor Fagan, NIRSA, National University of Ireland, Maynooth [*Presented by Ronaldo Munck, University of Liverpool*]

Bjorn Hettne, School of Global Studies, University of Gothenburg

Victor Kovalidn, Gorbachev Foudation, Moscow

The main issues addressed in this panel were: (a) the relationship between globalisation and regionalisation; (b) the impacts of globalisation at regional and local

levels; and (c) the importance of comparative analysis on regionalism and governance. Participants addressed in three different ways the relationship between globalization and regionalization: as complementary, dialectical and conflictual processes.

In relation to logistics, it was noticed that three of four centers have a strong policy orientation and a strong national focus as regards the impacts of globalization and regionalization. In contrast, one of the centers is seeking to develop interdisciplinary programmes on regionalization and globalization and to address both local and global arenas.

Two possible areas of research collaboration were identified: (a) information exchange in relation to labour mobility processes at intra-regional level; and (b) in relation to the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS).

### **Panel 3.5 Global Governance (3)**

Andrew Cooper, CIGI, University of Waterloo  
Sirkku Hellsten, Centre for the Study of Global Ethics, University of Birmingham  
Calum Miller, Global Economic Governance Programme, University of Oxford  
Ilari Rantakari and Timo Voipio, Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Pierre Vercauteren, REGIMEN, Catholic University of Mons

This panel testified to the recent emergence of globalization research centres since each programme had been launched in the last 2-3 years. Within the broad umbrella of global governance, these centres fell roughly into two categories: those working more at the conceptual level (e.g., establishing the meaning of global ethics, global governance, etc); and those with a more specific mandate and related programming. Bridging this divide, however, a normative agenda guides centres from both groups, whether to advocate the 'G20 idea' or to promote fairer international economic relations for the South. Panellists presented a range of interesting projects, such as comparing women's rights in Western and Eastern Europe and gathering ex-senior officials from developing countries for their reflections on crisis management.

At a project level, all of the centres feature publications and websites and several are also harnessing new tools, such as the media, elite champions (e.g., the Canadian Prime Minister in the case of the G20) and international commissions. The five centres are generally examples of well-funded institutions. Nonetheless, challenges were raised. These included: selecting representative interests and concerns of developing countries for research and advocacy; consulting with individuals from a cross-section of the political spectrum without losing the ability to reach conclusions; and accepting that building networks takes significant time and effort.

With five presentations, the session emphasized information sharing. Though no specific collaborations were discussed, the participants hinted at plans for future possible cooperation.

### **Panel 3.6 Globalization and Culture**

Petter Aaslestad, NTNU Globalization Programme, Trondheim  
Roland Robertson, Centre for the Study of Globalization, University of Aberdeen  
Thusitha Tennakoon, Bandarnayake Centre of International Studies, Colombo  
Saeid Zahed, Globalization and Iran Project, Tehran

The issues discussed in this panel were: (a) the relevance of culture in defining globalisation; (b) the notion of global culture, and its forms of expression; and (c) local forms of culture, and the impact that globalisation has on them.

With respect to (a), Roland Robertson emphasised how culture is the most important dimension in accounting for globalisation. Petter Aaslestad stressed the interdisciplinary character of the research project he is co-ordinating, whose goal is the exploration of how culture, society and technology interact in the context of globalization. How globalisation influences forms of artistic expressions is also analysed. As to (c) and (d), both Thusitha Tennakoon and Saeid Zahed emphasised the risk that local cultures can be wiped out by the homogenising forces of globalisation. They stressed the importance of finding ways to preserve local culture, expanding in particular on the cases of Sri Lanka and Iran.

The NTNU Globalization Programme is an interdisciplinary research project that involves more than a hundred researchers from various departments within NTNU. The programme sponsors international conferences, workshops, and various activities to disseminate its research, and is supported by the Research Council of Norway, the EU, and other institutions, some of them private.

Although no perspective collaboration was discussed in this session, both Roland Robertson and Barry Gills (University of Newcastle upon Tyne) already participate in the NTNU Globalization Programme. Moreover, Thusitha Tennakoon invited other research centres to create partnership with the Bandarnayake Centre of International Studies with the objective of studying and finding instruments to preserve local culture.

### **Panel 4.1 Global Studies Associations**

John Groom, World International Studies Conference  
Paul Kennedy, Global Studies Association

The panelists discussed four main issues: (a) the Associations as an expression of a 'globalised era' and the increasing concern on global issues; (b) effective ways of networking offered by the Associations; (c) membership; and (d) funding.

Organizational logistics, institutional support and resources were highlighted as the main challenges for these initiatives. Yet, there was a very positive note on the organisation of conferences and the promotion of participation and future

membership, as well as the prospects of collaboration with other institutions from developing countries. On this last point, there was an announcement and description of the forthcoming conference organised by WISC for August 2005 in Istanbul.

Both panelists highlighted the importance of professional conferences and associations for: (1) the promotion of multidisciplinary and multidimensional research — Paul Kennedy highlighted the importance of ‘topic-driven’ conferences as a motor to achieve these goals; (2) the (global) networking of actors; and (3) the promotion of critical debate on current issues.

Three main concerns were raised in the open floor discussion: (1) the issue of funding; (2) the issue of membership, and (3) the risk of overlapping activities.

Some lines of collaboration were discussed in this session, in particular the case of the GSA with its counterpart in the USA and other collaborative plans with some developing countries such as Teheran. This can eventually bring more members and open funding opportunities, although the issue of membership was also presented as a problem of competition amongst associations. In the case of WISC some collaborative initiatives with partners in South America (e.g. FLACSO/Argentina) were highlighted.

Paul Kennedy also pointed out that some collaboration could be fostered with other associations to be more influential, and also highlighted the importance of journals reinforcing this type of networking activity.

#### **Panel 4.2 Global Social Policy (2)**

Ronaldo Munck, GSEU, University of Liverpool

Saied Ameli, Centre of Globalization Studies, Tehran University

Ali Saeidi, Centre of Globalization Studies, Tehran University

The unifying theme across these three very different presentations was the impact of global pressures on social relations in specific territorial areas, especially Liverpool and Iran. The research focus of these centres is not on ‘global’ social policy per se, but rather on how social policy is constructed in states and cities in a changing global context. The third panelist, moreover, would reject the possibility of a progressive ‘global’ social policy since he conceived globalization as Westernization and Americanization. The Iranian project is at the preliminary stage of posing central research questions, namely: should Iran design a welfare state? If so, how? Does Iran’s lack of integration in the international economy provide autonomy for social policy reform? Having carried out numerous projects in Liverpool and several overseas as well, the Liverpool project is more advanced. The Liverpool centre takes the concept of ‘social exclusion’ used by many international bodies and critically applies it to research in different local areas.

One of the central challenges in research design for the centre at Tehran University has been to determine how applicable Western approaches and literatures are to the Iranian case. Without a central budget, the Liverpool programme operates on a

project-to-project basis. It has succeeded for several reasons, including that it is a flexible network where researchers freely move among projects and that it has carried out rigorous participant observation, after gaining the confidence of the local communities in questions.

The research interests of the two centres were too different to enable direct cooperation. That said, many comparisons between Iran and Liverpool were raised, and there was a high level of audience interest in Iranian practices.

### **Panel 4.3 Global Civil Society and Social Movements (2)**

Shana Hofstetter, Initiative for Policy Dialogue, Columbia University

Robert Holton, Institute for International Integration Studies, Trinity College Dublin

Peter Mandaville, Center for Global Studies, George Mason University

Heikki Patomaki, NIGD, Helsinki

Andrés Serbin, Centro de Estudios Globales y Regionales, Buenos Aires

Discussion centered on the conceptual and ethical issues involved with the operation of 'networks' within civil society and how they affect policy structures and output. Critical points were raised as to the transformative capacity of networks in light of the power relations that pervade them. The prominence of elites and the global distribution of mobilizing capacity were held as significant constraints on the democratic possibilities of global networks – including the GSN itself. A debate arose between those who felt that power structures retarded the democratic credentials of networks and those who believed that, since all social relations are conducted within matrices of power, we should work from within the problematic social situation rather than apply democratic standards that might not be met.

Reported research activities centered on the operation and study of networks in the formulation of global public policy. The Initiative for Policy Dialogue draws together leading economists along with representatives from local and global NGOs to formulate consultative technical policy positions for the aid of developing world governments and institutions of global governance. Robert Holton discussed an extensive and multi-disciplinary research project on the nature and operation of different global networks. Peter Mandavile presented details of a new project to provide informed policy-relevant reports to a Washington audience, based on studies with the global justice movement, representatives from the global south, as well as more specific ethnographic studies in Iraq.

Heikki Patomakki outlined the policy reform activities of the Network Institute for Global Democratization (NIGD). The network engages in a North-South dialogue on the possibility of bottom-up activities that might lead to policy and/or institutional innovation within the context of a realistic study of power within the global political economy. Finally, Andres Serbin highlighted some of the particular problems faced in the Latin American context for fostering civic involvement in policy formulation and governance, e.g. clientalism, parochialism and corruption. His centre has developed participatory research on the role of civil society in conflict prevention, peace building and the 'costs of non-integration' in a Latin American context.

#### **Panel 4.4. Globalization and Regionalization (2)**

Philippe de Lombaerde, United Nations University-Comparative Regional Integration Studies, Bruges

Isidro Morales, School of Social Sciences, Universidad de las Americas, Puebla

Robbie Robertson, Centre for Development Studies, University of the South Pacific

The panel focused on the relevance of macro-regionalism in policy-making and governance. Participants addressed the policy relevance of comparative regional studies on macro-regionalism and of monitoring its impacts and developments. It was noted that small states and territories have turned to regional strategies as a strategy to face global challenges. More comparative empirical research on regionalism on the basis of a thematic division instead of a particular region was suggested as one of the possible ways to conduct research on this area.

Participants identified as possible areas of collaboration: (a) comparative analyses of inter-regionalism and its relationship with globalisation; (b) politics of monetary and currency unions in comparative perspective; (c) the social dimension of regionalism, regional social policy and regional public goods; and (d) regional migration regimes. Participants agreed to meet again to discuss these possibilities further.

#### **Panel 4.5 Global Cities**

Martin Bosman, Globalization Research Center, University of South Florida

Deane Neubauer, Globalization Research Network, University of Hawaii at Manoa

The speakers reported on both substantive and methodological issues in their current research projects on Global Cities. As for the former, the speakers stressed the relentless pace that characterised the urbanisation processes, such that the 21<sup>st</sup> century appears to be the urban century. The relationship between globalisation and urbanisation is multi-faceted. First, urbanisation and the creation of mega-cities appears to be a truly global phenomenon. Second, although the process of expansion of cities is somehow a natural phenomenon linked with demographic trends, there is a specific globalisation trigger in urbanisation, which the speakers aim to capture through their research. Third, cities are the environment where spaces of global interconnectedness (technological, financial, etc.) are most evident. Between the various angles that this theme can be taken up, the speakers emphasised as key variables: (a) migration, both as a cause for making cities global and as an effect of globalisation; (b) the process that leads a city to become, and to remain “global”.

As for the methodological issues, the speakers conduct their research mainly by comparative investigation of different cities scattered around the world. They plan case studies in Tampa (Martin Bosman) and possibly Karachi (Deane Neubauer). Bosman emphasised the difficulty in using statistics for his work, as these typically take the country as the unit of analysis, and the provision of data is increasingly becoming a market in itself.

The Globalizing Cities Project is carried out by members of University of South Florida's Globalization Research Center. It is now entering its second phase, which will carry out an in-depth study of Tampa Bay, with the objective of capturing the processes that make a city "global". This is done through the collection of qualitative and quantitative data.

The Globalisation Research Network, established in 2001, is a collaboration of four US-based universities, and aims to complement the individual centre-based projects. In 2004-05, supported in part by a grant of the US Department of State, the GRN will hold six small "dialogic" conferences in relation to the globalisation and urbanisation research project.

The two research centres represented by the speakers of this panel have already put in place forms of collaboration. The Globalization Research Center invites partnership with other research centres within GSN interested in conducting comparative studies on global cities.

#### **Panel 4.6 General Globalization Studies Programmes**

Omano Edigheji, Centre for Policy Studies, Johannesburg  
Alfred Nehma, Organisation for Social Science Research in Eastern  
Southern South Africa, Addis Ababa  
Raul Pertierra, Asian Center, University of the Philippines, Quezon City

The main substantive issues addressed by this panel were: (a) the need to create and maintain a dialogue between academics and policy makers; (b) further development of research methodologies, in particular, regarding their relevance to regions; (c) areas of research were identified by themes; (d) participants agreed on the importance of expanding research to global/regional levels. Among the areas for research mentioned were: social movements and civil society, women migrant workers, information and communications technology, with particular reference to mobile telephones, the topics of tradition, identity and globalisation, and reconceptualizing terrorism. The discussion focused on the importance of making the results of research available to policy makers. It was mentioned that a step that one of the centres has taken in this direction is the distribution of published work directly to every government official. The panel discussed the importance of using as many channels of distribution as possible, including, perhaps, mobile telephones to disseminate results. The panel recognized many possibilities for collaborative work among GSN members, including in regional and sub-regional groupings.