

centre for the study of globalisation and regionalisation

newsletter

Issue 11
april 2004

Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation

Who we are...

CSGR at the University of Warwick is a research centre of the Economic and Social Research Council. It is the oldest and largest academic programme in Europe specifically devoted to the study of globalisation and regionalisation. We are a dozen core staff, two dozen associates and a number of visiting fellows.

What we do...

CSGR engages in high-quality, multi-disciplinary, inter-cultural, policy-relevant academic research. We run seminars, workshops, conferences and other special events. We publish working papers, articles, books and policy papers. We contribute to national and international networks in globalisation and regionalisation studies and also engage widely with official, civil society, business and media circles.

Contents

- Page 2 Introduction
- Page 3 Conferences and events
- Page 8 Research reports
- Page 20 Research fellows & associates
- Page 25 CSGR Seminar Series - Spring 2004
- Page 26 CSGR Seminar Series - Summer 2004
- Page 27 Latest CSGR Working Papers
- Page 28 CSGR staff and contact information

Introduction

Welcome to the eleventh biannual CSGR Newsletter. Seasoned readers will notice a revamped format, but as before the contents seek to inform our academic and practitioner audiences of the aims and activities of Europe's oldest and largest university research centre specifically devoted to questions of globalisation and regionalisation.

As is customary, this issue of the newsletter profiles several ongoing research projects that pursue CSGR's broad purpose of providing high-quality, multi-disciplinary, trans-national, policy-relevant analysis on globalisation and regionalisation. Gianluca Grimalda reports on his work concerning globalisation and income inequality. Marcus Miller discusses his research on debt renegotiation mechanisms in global finance. Sian Sullivan updates her investigations of social movement engagements with globalisation. Catherine Hoskyns and Shirin Rai describe their work on global gender issues. I review recent developments in my project on civil society and democracy in the global economy. In addition, the newsletter includes profiles of recently arrived CSGR research fellows Robin Cohen, Dwijen Rangnekar and Michela Redoano, CSGR associate Abdul

Paliwala, and Marie Curie Visiting Fellow Günter Metzges.

The newsletter also describes a busy calendar of events for CSGR. Since the preceding newsletter six months ago we have held nearly two dozen well-attended cross-disciplinary seminars at Warwick. In addition to the regular series, the coming months will bring a special weekly seminar on methodological issues in globalisation studies. In November CSGR co-sponsored a highly successful conference on the role of philanthropic foundations in globalisation. In July the CSGR Annual Conference, held in conjunction with the Global Studies Association, will address the theme of Southern Voices and Global Order. A month later CSGR will host representatives of some 50 academic research institutes and programmes in the inaugural

conference of the Globalisation Studies Network. CSGR workshops are considering the World Social Forum (March 2004), globalisation and violence (June 2004), gendering global governance (September 2004), and cosmopolitanism and humanitarian intervention (March 2005). In February we were pleased to welcome a visit by the Chief Executive Officer of the ESRC, Professor Ian Diamond.

CSGR is also making efforts further to improve the dissemination of research results. As well as redesigning the newsletter we have received a generous grant from the ESRC to upgrade our website, which already attracts over half a million visitors per year. Also check our working papers, which are downloaded some 15,000 times each week.

*Jan Aart Scholte
Acting Director*

STOP PRESS, Global Governance Comes to CSGR

As this newsletter goes to print we learn that an international selection committee has recommended that CSGR together with the Centre for Global Studies at the University of Victoria should form the next editorial team for the leading journal Global Governance in 2005-2010. CSGR will house the editorial office. More details to follow in Newsletter 12.



Conference and events

Globalisation studies network CSGR hosts inaugural conference *18-21 August 2004*

Arising out of discussions to establish a consortium of centres of globalisation studies (see Newsletter 10, p. 22), CSGR is very pleased and honoured to host the founding meeting of what has come to be called the Globalisation Studies Network (GSN).

The GSN groups together research, education and public policy programmes across the world that address questions of globalisation. The network will endeavour to promote innovative research and teaching collaborations and to bring the results of scholarly globalisation

studies into the public domain. The inaugural conference at Warwick will be a useful occasion to find out who is doing what and where in globalisation studies. There will be opportunities to develop research partnerships and to compare how different centres and programmes are run. In addition, prominent speakers will give plenary addresses on major intellectual and policy challenges facing globalisation studies today.

As this newsletter goes to press the conference has already attracted delegates from 50 research institutes

and programmes from all world regions. Representatives of civil society groups, foundations, governments and professional associations will also attend. Generous support for the meeting has come from CSGR, the Ford Foundation, and the International Development Research Centre.

Readers who are interested in attending this meeting should contact Denise Hewlett at CSGR: +44 (0)24 7657 2533 or d.hewlett@warwick.ac.uk.

Southern voices and global order CSGR/GSA annual conference *7-9 July 2004*

CSGR is pleased to announce its seventh annual conference, on the theme of 'Southern Voices and Global Order', to be held at the Scarman House facility at Warwick. The conference is sponsored jointly with the Global Studies Association (GSA).

The conference explores the possibilities of opening space and impact in contemporary globalization for marginalized states and peoples. Panels will consider themes such as capitalist globalization and the South, voting reform in international financial institutions, women and global ICTs and the South in Global Culture.

Paper and panel proposals should be sent by 31 May 2004 to Eleni Tsingou at CSGR: e.tsingou@warwick.ac.uk. Other readers interested in registering for this conference should contact Denise Hewlett at CSGR: +44 (0)24 7657 2533 or d.hewlett@warwick.ac.uk.

Conference and events

CSGR Hosts 8th Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) University 'The future of the international order: multilateralism or unilateralism?' Chris Hughes

CSGR and ASEF co-hosted the 8th ASEF University at the University of Warwick on 7-21 September 2003. ASEF was established in 1997 under the framework of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) process which brings together 25 states from Asia and the EU. ASEF's function is to enhance social and cultural understanding between Asia and Europe. The ASEF University is a flagship project designed to promote inter-cultural understanding among university students from universities in Asia and the EU.

The specific aims of the ASEF university are to provide a forum for students to engage in dialogue on a range of international issues that affect the ASEM partners and the forging of interpersonal networks that will foster cooperation in the future. The competition for places on the ASEF university is fierce, attracting students from leading universities in both regions.

The ASEF university is held twice yearly in an Asian and then a European institution. The 8th ASEF university came to the UK for the first time, and it was a major coup for the CSGR and Warwick to secure this prestigious event ahead of other rivals. In total, 38 students came to Warwick; half chosen from Asia and half from Europe. Financing for this major event was generously provided by ASEF. The co-

organisers at the CSGR end were Dr Chris Hughes and Professor Richard Higgott. CSGR-associated students Mike Keating, Tomo Taki, Alvin Goh and Pia Riggiozzi assisted as moderators.

The theme chosen for the ASEF university at Warwick was 'The Future of the International Order: Multilateralism or Unilateralism?'. This theme was selected after taking stock of recent events post-9/11 and crises in multilateralism in the global political economy. The students grappled with this theme through a series of intensive lectures given by leading experts from Asia and Europe and then through discussion in breakout groups. The list of speakers and topics included: Professor John Groom (Kent) [theories of multilateralism; the future of the UN]; Professor Heribert Dieter (German Institute for International and Security Affairs) [IMF and World Bank]; Dr Peter Newell (Sussex) [Kyoto Protocol]; Professor Kiichi Fujiwara (Tokyo) [multilateralism and security]; Professor Ellis Krauss (UCSD) [the US and multilateralism]; Dr Rizal Sukma [Centre for Strategic and International Studies, Jakarta] [the war on terror]; Professor Yu Yongding [Chinese Academy of Social Sciences] [the future of the WTO]; Mr Kam Young Sung (International Trade Institute, Singapore) [bilateral free trade agreements]; Professor Luk Van Langenhove (United Nations University)

[cultural unity and diversity]; Professor Morten Ougaard (Copenhagen Business School) [new forms of global governance]; and Professor Jan Aart Scholte (CSGR) [democratic deficits and multilateral institutions]. In addition to the lectures, the students took part in a scenario planning exercise in order to map out how they saw the future of the international order.

The lecture programme was further complemented by cultural events, including visits to London and Oxford, and to see Shakespeare at Stratford-upon-Avon.

The ASEF University was hailed as a great success by the participants. Two of the most striking outputs of the programme were the rapid intellectual progress of the students as they engaged in the 'crash course' in studying multilateralism, and the personal networks that were established among them; all suggestive that in the future these participants will go to make an important contribution to regional cooperation and the shaping of the global system.

The ASEF University also further put the CSGR on the map in both Asia and Europe as a centre for training students in globalisation and regionalisation studies, and for intercultural and interregional dialogue on globalisation.



Conference and events

Foundations of globalisation international conference: Manchester, 6-7 November 2003

An International Conference on the Foundations of Globalisation was held at the University of Manchester, 6-7 November 2003. Featuring 19 speakers covering a wide range of American philanthropic foundations' global activities - including the Green Revolution, public health, economic development or 'modernisation' strategies, foreign policy and the Cold War, management ideas and theories - the conference was attended by over 30 delegates from the United States, Canada, France, Italy, the Netherlands and, of course, Britain. The Conference papers mainly assessed the roles of the Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations, although a number of papers also examined, in part, Phelps-Stokes, Russell Sage, and other smaller philanthropies while one paper examined the relationship between 1990s philanthropies, such as Soros, with those of the early 1900s. In the final session of the Conference, delegates discussed how to take forward research in the area of foundations, the knowledge-networks which they have fostered, and their impacts on globalisation processes. It was decided that the papers/conference proceedings would be published, that the new academic network would be consolidated by future workshops and conferences, and that links

would be forged with other relevant research groups. The Conference organisers –Bill Cooke, Inderjeet Parmar and Jonathan Harwood - aim to continue their work in these areas and to keep participants informed of progress.

One of the main contributions that the Conference made was to successfully demonstrate the breadth of American philanthropy's activities and its global reach. Beginning from the early 1900s, the major foundations began an active global programme of health, disease control, food production, population control and other programmes. In addition, Rockefeller and Carnegie philanthropies built strong links with European and other institutions, principally with universities and research institutes, both in the social and natural sciences. In effect, the foundations began a process of building knowledge networks across the world, mainly to promote good causes but also to promote America's national interests. Established by some of the most successful industrial capitalists of the early twentieth century, and with boards of trustees who were heavily connected with Wall Street banks and international law firms and educated in east coast private schools and Ivy league universities,

the foundations were steeped in the east coast WASP establishment. Their domestic and international programmes reflected the concerns of US elites who wanted to use their financial power for the public good, to improve society and the world. Their approaches were always elitist, technocratic, "scientific", and utilitarian - "to put knowledge to work", as one RF officer said. They were well-connected with the State Department and other foreign policy agencies of the US state, as well as quasi-state research and propaganda organisations, such as the Council on Foreign Relations and the Foreign Policy Association. The foundations were, from their very beginnings, globalist in outlook. In their view, America should lead the world, exporting its values and institutions.

During the Cold War, the foundations promoted American hegemony in numerous ways, in alliance with official agencies of the American state. A paper by Ali Fisher (Birmingham) pointed out how the Rockefeller Foundation negotiated with both the State Department and British Americanists to set up the British Association for American Studies during the 1950s, while Wendy Toon (University College, Worcester) showed how influential

Conference and events

were the foundations in the planning and execution of official policies during the postwar occupation of Germany and Japan. Scott Lucas (Birmingham) noted the numerous ways in which the foundations were overtly and covertly connected with the CIA and its notorious attempts to manipulate European and other intellectuals. Inderjeet Parmar's (Manchester) paper showed the roles of Ford, Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations in Indonesian, Latin American and African higher education, specifically in building institutions favouring "modernisation" theories of economic development. Ann Vogel further examined the foundations' roles in promoting higher educational institutions abroad, and introduced sociological networking techniques to enhance our understanding of the interlocked nature of American philanthropy. And John Krige (Georgia Tech.) considered the Rockefeller Foundation's attempts after 1945 to 'Americanise' French science through its support for the CNRS.

Three papers also placed the foundations' support for 'Green Revolution' programmes in the context of the Cold War. Nick Cullather (Indiana) analysed the ways in which justifications of the Green Revolution repeatedly had to adapt during the 1950s and 1960s to shifting ideas about third world population growth generated by

demographers as well as to the critiques of high-tech agriculture developed by environmentalists. In addition to exploring a series of issues concerning the foundations' underlying assumptions, their relations to U.S. government agencies, and their potential gains from the Green Revolution, Robert Anderson (Simon Fraser) emphasised the need for more research on the all-important 'Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research' which has supported the Green Revolution since the 1970s. Placing the Green Revolution against the backdrop of the growth of high-tech agriculture in both Central Europe and the U.S. since the late 19th century, Jonathan Harwood (Manchester) sought to clarify the foundations' aims in championing the Green Revolution and concluded that despite frequent claims to the contrary, 'solving the problem of world hunger' was never seriously attempted.

Building on the question of Foundations' role in constituting the Cold War order, Guiliiana Gemelli (Bologna) presented a paper on the role of the Ford Foundation Ford in OEEC/OECD institutional development. Bill Cooke (UMIST) extended some of Gemelli's earlier work on management education by tracing ideas used by the World Bank in its management of contemporary globalization processes, particularly those

associated with change management, to foundation support of the Research Centre for Group Dynamics in the US and the Tavistock Institute in the UK. Thomas Cayet's (European University Institute) presentation was also on the development of management ideas, but this time in the context of the inter-war period, where he pointed to the little recognized ambitions of proponents of scientific management for its possibilities in engendering progressive social change, and particularly to the engagement of the Twentieth Century Fund with this aim. In an impressive and well received paper Nicolas Guilhot (LSE/CNRS) contrasted present and past foundation philosophy and practice, skillfully dissecting the nature, role and functions of the philanthropy of George Soros and comparing it with the philosophies of Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller and Henry Ford. From the foundations themselves, Courtenay Sprague (Carnegie Corporation) and Darwin Stapleton (Rockefeller University and Rockefeller Archive Center), provided case studies of Ford in reforming and challenging apartheid in South Africa, using organisations such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and their legalistic techniques and strategies, and of Rockefeller public health fellowships' role in globalisation. Both papers

Conference and events

argued that the foundations' activities constituted genuinely liberal programmes for political and social betterment. The Conference benefitted greatly from participation by foundation insiders and it is hoped that such intellectual exchanges will continue in the future.

The Conference was opened by three speakers who were, in effect, the pioneers of foundation studies - Robert Arnove (Indiana), Donald Fisher (British Columbia) and Martin Bulmer (Surrey). Their impact is still widely felt since they established many of the boundaries and modalities of the field and of the debate. In their Conference papers they reiterated their ideas, drawing upon subsequent bodies of theory and applying them to more recent developments, thus providing the Conference with a number of frameworks in which case studies could be situated.

The second major contribution of the Conference was to fill an important gap in the current literature and

thinking about the early phases and origins of "globalisation". If by this term is meant greater levels of integration between the knowledge/power networks of the world, with particular emphasis on those emanating from the metropolitan world centres such as the United States, then the foundations were shown by conference speakers to have made a vital contribution to its early history. The American foundations were linked with global power/knowledge strategies: building up existing research institutions, creating new ones, promoting particular kinds of knowledge and research (eg modernisation theories of economic development) and constructing powerful networks of individuals and institutions centred in the United States, both physically and in terms of American interests in global hegemony and Cold War competition. In the international knowledge economy, Rockefeller, Ford and Carnegie were the powerhouses that integrated national and international networks to

promote the intellectual components of America's global hegemonic strategy. In that regard, therefore, current-day global knowledge networks, such as those centred round the World Bank (the "Knowledge Bank"), were pre-figured by those built by the Big Three American foundations.

All in all, the Conference was a very successful first step in building a network of foundation scholars and practitioners. For that reason we are especially grateful to our sponsors for enabling us to meet the financial costs of the Conference: the Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation at Warwick University, the Vice-Chancellors of UMIST and the University of Manchester, the Centre for International Politics in the Department of Government, the Centre for the History of Science, Technology and Medicine, the Manchester School of Management, and the BISA International Political Economy Group.

Research reports

On globalisation and income inequality *Gianluca Grimalda and Marco Vivarelli*

In the last two decades, within country income inequality (WCII) has shown an increasing trend both in developed and developing countries (DCs) (Sala-i-Martin (2002)). The fact that in many DCs –in particular Latin America, China and former Soviet Republics – this trend has been accompanied by a rapid process of increasing globalisation – at least according to its standard economic measures, i.e. trade and foreign direct investments (FDI) - has prompted many scholars to investigate whether there may be a relationship between these two processes.

The issue is controversial from both the theoretical and the empirical standpoint. As far as economic theory is concerned, the cornerstone of international economics, that is, the Heckscher-Ohlin-Samuelson (H-O-S) model tends to support the view that DCs should experience egalitarian trends as a consequence of globalisation. The reason is that a country that opens to trade will specialise in those sectors intensively using inputs in which the country is relatively abundant, which happen to be unskilled labour for DCs. The opposite should instead occur in developed countries, which are relatively abundant in skilled labour.

However, this view has been challenged by some recent contributions (e.g. Feenstra and Hanson (1996)), which stress that the concepts of "skilled" and "unskilled" labour are only meaningful in *relative* terms, i.e. in relation to the particular country that one examines. For instance, if a good is produced in the US and in Mexico with the same technology, it may be said to have been produced using "unskilled" US labour and "skilled" Mexican labour at the same time, given the different average level in workforce specialisation of the two countries. If such is the case, the prediction of the H-O-S model is in fact reversed, as relative demand for skilled labour will increase both in the North and the South, as do wage dispersion and income inequality.

On the empirical side, consensus is a long way away too, as some authors conclude that the opening process has nothing to do with increasing WCII (Edwards, 1997; Dollar and Kray, 2001), while others obtain opposite results (Lundberg and Squire, 2001; Cornia and Kiiski, 2001).

The International Policy Group - directed by Dr. Eddy Lee - of the International Labour Office (ILO- Geneva) has in recent years been

working on this topic under the aegis of the UK Department For International Development (DFID). A research project entitled "Understanding Globalisation, Employment and Poverty Reduction" has been co-ordinated by Professor Marco Vivarelli (Università Cattolica-Milano; ILO-IPG; IZA-Bonn). The main characteristic of this research project has been the focus on DCs, its general goal being the study of the impact of globalisation on employment, income inequality and poverty reduction on DCs.

The main findings obtained thus far (see Lee and Vivarelli (forthcoming)) may be summarised as follows. First, contrary to the prediction of the H-O-S model, the employment impact of globalisation in DCs is not clearcut and crucially depends on the technological absorptive capacities and the institutional context of the different developing countries. Second, the prediction of the H-O-S model that openness of DCs will reduce inequality within countries can be rejected on the basis of a theoretical and empirical analysis; yet, trade liberalisation and FDI do not appear to be the main culprits of the distributional deterioration which has occurred in most DCs. However, increasing trade seems to be associated with an

Research reports

increasing demand for skilled workers since "skill-biased technological change" (SBTC) trickles down from the developed to the developing countries; this may imply that the skilled/unskilled pay differentials tend to rise and result into (at least temporary) increase in income inequality in DCs. Third, the relationship between globalisation and poverty is very country-specific; however, there is some empirical evidence showing that in the majority of countries increasing trade has implied an increase in economic growth and an overall decrease in absolute poverty.

Gianluca Grimalda, a CSGR research fellow, has been involved in this project and is working with Professor Vivarelli on a theoretical investigation of the impact of globalisation on income inequality in DCs. More precisely, in a working paper forthcoming for the ILO series, they develop a theoretical exercise aiming to assess the impact of SBTC on a DC economy. The goal of the paper is to offer new insights into the observed rising trends in WCII.

The current wisdom on WCII hinges upon a relationship known as Kuznets's "curve". In his seminal analysis on income inequality, Kuznets suggested an inverted U-shaped curve relating economic development to WCII (Kuznets (1955: Table 1, p.13). According to this view, inequality should increase

during a country's earliest stages of development, reach a peak at some intermediate levels and then start decreasing as the country reaches higher levels of development. The reason for this pattern is due to the dynamics of labour supply and wage differentials that occur during the various phases of a country's industrialisation and urbanisation process. More precisely, the inverse U-shaped relation between inequality and per capita income – taken as a measure of economic development – results from the process of migration of the workforce from the agricultural sector (where both per capita income and within sector inequality are low) towards the industrial/urban sector (which starts small, with higher per capita income and a relatively higher degree of within-sector inequality).

Although this model – which we refer to as Kuznets I - would seem suitable to characterise DCs only, in fact recent contributions in economic growth theory, with considerable lack of imagination labelled "new" growth theories, still draw on the Kuznets hypothesis to account for the impact of a SBTC in developed countries as well. Their argument is remarkably similar to the original one by Kuznets, as structural dynamical change now takes place between skilled-intensive and unskilled-intensive sectors rather than between industrial and agricultural sectors. We shall label this account

Kuznets II. Hence, these theories explain the recent rise in WCII in terms of the upward bit of a Kuznets II curve, and predict an inequality-decreasing trend for the next years for developed countries (Aghion et al (1999: 1655).

But the revival of the Kuznets theory does not end here. In fact, given the process of technological spillovers taking place at the international level, the recent trend of increasing WCII in middle-income countries appears to be potentially accountable for in terms of a Kuznets relationship as well. The idea would be exactly the same as that set out above, with SBTC triggering a rise in skill differentials, later compensated by movements of the workforce to the relatively "advanced" sector. However, this latter conjecture deserves further analysis. In fact, the underlying idea behind both the Kuznets I and II stories is one of success in the development process, as massive migrations towards the fast-growing sectors must occur in both Kuznets I and II accounts in order to counteract the initial inequality-enhancing effect. However, real life is not always so "linear" as the equations of economists' models seem to imply. In fact, empirical growth "accounting" has emphasized many instances of *failures* in the convergence process for different countries in many different historical periods. The

Research reports

appallingly low growth rates of many African countries, which, according to the handbook economic theory should be the fastest-growing for the very reason that they start off the poorest, witness the underlying difficulties of the catching-up process.

In their joint work, Grimalda and Vivarelli address the question as to what happens in the cases of failures in the catching up process. Drawing on a theoretical framework that, eloquently enough, employs "non-linear" equations, they develop a theoretical exercise that looks at the evolution process of an economy hit by a SBTC. The relevant parameters of the model are "calibrated" to describe real DC economies, so that different scenarios as to how a "representative" DC economy responds to a SBTC may be spelled out.

The model allows for what are called "multiple steady states" – i.e. there are many development paths the economy may follow, not necessarily leading to the more efficient outcome possible. This makes it possible to incorporate both scenarios of success in the catching-up process, i.e. the more advanced technology diffuses throughout the economy, and scenarios of failures, when after an initial spurt of SBTC the technology fails to diffuse within the economy. However, the emphasis of the model

is not so much on the equilibrium features of the economy, but on the evolution of the economic system after the shock. This looks justified by the fact that even introducing some "mild" rigidity in the system, in the form of adjustment costs for workers or entrepreneurs who have to change their occupation, the simulations that have been conducted show that such a steady state would be reached no earlier than 80 years.

In the scenario of successful catching-up, the classic Kuznets account emerges as a secular trend in income inequality. In the scenario of unsuccessful catching-up, however, a pattern likening the U-shaped typical account of the Kuznets I and II stories emerges as well, though it has a much smaller magnitude as few cohorts of workers and entrepreneurs are involved, namely those pioneering the use of the skill-intensive innovation who later "retreat" to the traditional activities. Moreover, what also emerges from the study is that some short term Kuznets-like U-shaped relations emerge on a much shorter time scale than that implied by the longer term Kuznets. What proves to be the key variable here is unemployment, as the technological shock brings about, almost naturally, some fluctuations in skilled labour demand that, given the interdependencies of sectors within the economic system, spill over to

the unskilled labour market too. This originates what we could perhaps call a Kuznets III story, where income disparities are led by the pattern of unemployment rather than those concerning skill differentials and movements within labour supply. The observation that several DCs, such as Brazil, Egypt and Poland to name just a few, have in fact undergone long phases of high unemployment during the last two decades, may be seen as a preliminary piece of evidence confirming that the present line of research could offer some fresh insights into the factors of income inequality.

References:

- Aghion, P., Caroli, E., and C. GarcíaPeñalosa, (1999), Inequality and Economic Growth: The Perspective of the New Growth Theories, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 37, 1615-60.
- Cornia, Giovanni Andrea and Sampsa Kiiski (2001), Trends in Income Distribution in the Post-World War II Period, WIDER *Discussion Paper no. 2001/89*, World Institute for Development Economics Research, United Nations University, Helsinki.
- Dollar David and Aart Kraay (2001), Growth is Good for the Poor, *mimeo*, Development Research Group, The World Bank, Washington, March.
- Edwards, Sebastian (1997), Trade Policy, Growth and Income

Research reports

Distribution, *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, vol.87, pp. 205-10.

- Feenstra, Robert C. and Gordon H. Hanson (1996), Foreign Investment, Outsourcing, and Relative Wages, in R. C. Feenstra, G. M. Grossman and D. A. Irwin (eds.), *Political Economy of Trade Policy: Essays in Honor of Jagdish Bhagwati*, MIT Press, Cambridge (Mass.), pp. 89-127.-
- Kuznets, S. (1955), Economic Growth and Income Inequality,

American Economic Review, 45, 1-28.

- Lee, E. and M. Vivarelli, (eds.), (forthcoming). *Understanding Globalization, Employment and Poverty Reduction*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York
- Lundberg Mattias and Lyn Squire (2001), The Simultaneous Evolution of Growth and Inequality, *mimeo*, The World Bank, Washington.
- Sala-i-Martin, X. (2002), The Disturbing "Rise" of Global

Income Inequality, *NBER Working Paper no. 8904*, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge (Mass.).

- Vivarelli, M. (2004). Globalization, Skills and Within-Country Income Inequality in Developing Countries, in Lee, E. and M. Vivarelli, (eds.), *Understanding Globalization, Employment and Poverty Reduction*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, *forthcoming*.

Argentina in default: the renegotiation game

Marcus Miller

In his essay on "The Nightmare", the Argentine writer Jorge Luis Borges describes Fuseli's dramatic painting of a terrified sleeper surrounded by imaginary monsters. In December 2003, Argentina was living a nightmare - prostrate in deep recession and encircled not by figments of its imagination but by hordes of international creditors demanding repayment of their dollar loans. At that time, however, Judge Griesa of the claims Court in New York was holding the creditors at bay - restraining them to give Argentina time to negotiate "in good faith".

It was in this setting that Javier Garcia Fronti and I presented our paper "Argentina in default: the

renegotiation game" in the Centro Cultural Borges in Buenos Aires. What was the message? We argued that the Argentine proposal presented in Dubai, namely a recovery rate of 25 cents in the dollar was but the opening shot in a process of negotiation. The creditors response had been to demand 65 cents in the dollar; and on the basis of bargaining theory we estimated that the game could end with a settlement of about 35 cents. (Since the peso had fallen to one third of its previous value against the dollar, this was essentially a prediction that the dollar debt would be "pesified".) In addition, we warned that there would be increasing sanctions as creditors, both private and official,

attempted to enforce resumption of interest payments by Argentina, currently in suspense.

This evoked varied reactions from the audience. Some pooh-pooed the idea that New York judges - or any one else - could force Argentina to pay more. Others claimed that the economy rested on a knife-edge - and the nascent recovery would collapse into recession if creditors pushed too hard. Press reports in the two main newspapers (Clarín and La Nación) echoed our warning that the creditors would expect some improvement over the initial Argentine offer; and that sanctions would be mobilized to promote this by mid-2004.

Research reports

What has happened since then?

There has been no effective improvement in the Argentine offer; and, as yet, no settlement. But pressure from the courts, the World Bank, the IMF and G7 governments is mounting steadily; and President Kirchner is reluctant to fly in the presidential plane Tango One for fear that it may be seized by creditors!

In February 2004, Clarín carried a think-piece by Professor Fernando Navajas (UNLP). After discussing our paper he went on to consider how to improve the initial Argentine offer while, at the same time - for political reasons - preserving the rhetoric of the initial 25 cent offer in Dubai. The key idea is to use growth-related bonds, where payments will step-up

as economy recovers (and not to pay - or borrow - any more in the meantime). Creditors will ultimately get more than 25 cents in the dollar, but only when the Argentine economy can afford to pay it. With this innovative proposal, the nightmare could perhaps be ended.

Barcelona 22-25 January 2004: First international conference on social movements and activist research

Sian Sullivan

If a writer on a political subject manages to preserve a detached attitude, it is nearly always because [s]he does not know what [s]he is talking about. To understand a political movement, one has got to be involved in it...

George Orwell

In my last contribution to the CSGR Newsletter (issue 10, September 2003), I closed with reference to Henry David Thoreau's statement that '[t]he thoughtful [wo]man becomes a hermit in the thoroughfares of the marketplace'. The implication was that one dimension of a global radical politics that is contesting the moralities of capitalism, neoliberalism and militarism is that it is opening spaces for intellectual endeavours to

contribute to, and be part of, activist praxis.

The First International Conference on *Social Movements and Activist Research* was a key event in such a process. Its publicity leaflet states its objective as the establishment of an *adisciplinary* 'space of encounter, exchange, self-formation and debate' by those participating in 'social movements' as both activists and researchers. It declares three starting points or principles:

1. that activist research itself can be instrumental in 'a critical transformation of current reality';
2. that the institutional academic environment is a space where the power relations contested in global radical politics are reproduced; and

3. that the privatisation, commoditisation and corporatisation of knowledges - a process to which universities worldwide are bound - acts both as a form of social exclusion and as a constraint on learning trajectories.

Held in north-east Barcelona in the Ateneu Popular de Nou Barris - a socio-cultural facility or community centre run by several local associations - the meeting attracted some 200 participants from throughout Europe as well as from North, South and Central America. As an organisational process as well as an event, great attention was paid to attempts to 'do things differently'. An open organisational assembly had been held regularly in Barcelona

Research reports

during the year leading up to the meeting where anyone who wanted to participate in the event's organisation could volunteer thoughts, experience, time and skills. A website (in Catalan, English, French, Italian and Spanish) was established in the months leading up to the event (www.investigaccio.org), where those interested were invited to propose themes, workshops and roundtables that might feature as part of the conference. As such, the event itself was 'self-constituted' to a large extent. Papers were placed on the website prior to the meeting, enabling participants to share work and to establish links and collaborations before arriving in Barcelona. This was not to be a process of contributing abstracts that are selected by a few event organisers and then presented to a variously receptive audience. In order that costs could be kept to a minimum and participants to a maximum, accommodation was organised via a process of 'buddying up' with those living in Barcelona: I stayed with Nùria, one of the organisers of the meeting - a vivacious Catalan woman in the process of completing a masters degree, as well as involved in nationalist and gender-awareness initiatives. Several participants stayed in Can Masdeu: a self-sustaining social centre in a squatted premises in the beautiful aromatic dry woodland of the hills surrounding Barcelona - a place and community

that currently is under threat due to plans to build a road bypass through the valley in which it is located.

Of course, given its history, Barcelona was a provocative and pertinent setting for such an event. Here, the 19th century saw an expanding number of workers living in desperate conditions riot repeatedly against a bourgeoisie reaping the benefits of industrialisation. This created a fertile context for the growth of a militant anarcho-syndicalism, based on desires to establish decentralised and autonomously run productive ventures and services. In the early 20th century, Catalunyan socialists and anarchists began to resist Spain's militarised imperial pretensions, marking a period of unrest in a context of repression by the Castilian dictator, Primo de Rivera. In 1936 a federated, election-winning alliance of anarchists, radicals, socialists and republicans faced a full-blown civil war with Franco's militarised fascism. The toll for Catalunya's anarcho-syndicalists was disastrous. In recent years, people have been arrested in Barcelona for anarchist activism, and to judge from the anarchist symbols graffitied around the city, an undercurrent of contemporary anarchisms bubbles away not so far from the city's surface. This accompanies widespread concern that repression and censorship was increasing under the dictate of

formal Spanish Prime Minister Aznar, himself a member of the fascist party during General Franco's leadership. As elsewhere, these trends are targetting cross-cutting precarious 'groups' such as immigrants, anarchists, squatters, separatists, and activists.

As such, the meeting's proactive focus interacted substantially with the local contexts in which it took place, highlighting the 'real world' complexities influencing activist practice and research. Important issues that came up included: the relationships between Catalan separatist politics and a radical activist politics that focuses on transnational issues; the integral significance of maintaining physical spaces for the existence and enhancing of alternative communities and organising practices; and current processes and events in Barcelona that are demolishing existing inner-city communities in the process of gentrifying and cleansing the city, particularly in relation to the city's 2004 business and tourism-oriented Cultural Forum.

A key thread weaving through the intent and assumptions of the meeting was a validation of the knowledges that can be generated via subjective experience of, and participation in, multiple contexts. For many, this has arisen from a frustration with the methodological

Research reports

assumption of objective distance pursued in the burgeoning field of 'social movement studies'. As Colin Barker and Lawrence Cox argue in a paper submitted as a contribution to the meeting¹, such an approach contains within it its own limit: that in pursuing the observation, description and explanation of social movements as a distant object of research, the processual and recursively 'agentic' participation of the active subject is denied.

For myself as an anthropologist (+ecologist/dancer/woman/activist), this emphasis was particularly relevant. Perhaps because social and cultural anthropologists have tended to work in cultures outside their own which, in the context of post-colonialism and 'development' has meant experiencing stark political and economic inequalities, they/we have long been grappling with the ethical circumstances of their/our work. For many, this has carried an attendant desire to effect some sort of 'public service': to speak out – to *do* something – about observed injustices. We become part of the contexts we work within, we are taken up as political currency within these contexts and we would be naïve to imagine that by being part of a 'northern' academic tradition our research is thereby, or should be, apolitical. But we face enormous institutional and other obstacles to our ability to contribute: ranging from a lack of support from

formal academic institutions to publish work in local contexts, to threats of litigation of we publish analyses that expose local resistance to powerful international NGOs, donors and corporations.

Having been at the receiving end of such threats for published research during the neoliberal nineties in Namibia², I personally am rather bored with a conventional dichotomising of positions: between academia and activism, theory and practice, objectivity and subjectivity, and the traditional and organic intellectual (cf. Gramsci). These are categories which themselves maintain a hegemonic status quo in intellectual and pragmatic arenas. Objectivity, for example, is a constructed (and experientially impossible) analytical position that arguably is not ethically desirable, even if it remains a cornerstone for many in the social sciences. I – in fact, the multiple and shifting 'Is' that constitute 'I' (cf. Deleuze and Guattari) – am more interested, intellectually and organically, in ways of excavating and subverting these categories and their correspondences. If I validate, empower and reflect on my experiences, it becomes clear that theory has been critical in helping me to make sense of my 'real world' engagements; which at the same time have also informed my readings of theory; which has influenced my 'real world' practices; which have

informed my intellectual endeavours; and so on... These are not separate domains, and if 'we' continue to think of them as separable then we simply maintain the universalist fragmentation on which modernity thrives, and on which exploitative political and economic practices feed. Instead, and echoing Julia Kristeva, I favour a theoretical opening of the field of active subjectivity that makes possible a corresponding opening of the hermeneutic tautology that 'theory harbours its object within its own [enclosed] logic'. This position eliminates the distance between theory and action via the '*willful*' possibilities created by the phenomenon of *interpretation*.

As such it posits 'an ethics of the open subject': an embracing of contingency, ambiguity and agency, a discarding of an assumption that anything should be taken as given, and a strong theoretical support for our always active and *constitutive* engagement with the world³.

I greatly appreciated the supportive space of this meeting to share such thoughts with other activist-academics and academic-activists, and particularly with the other anthropologists present. Other workshops and roundtables in which I participated with interest included one on the organisational implications of networks, in terms of both theory and practice, and an

Research reports

afternoon spent reflecting on the socio-political implications of particular activist tactics, from direct action to mass marches. As with most conferences, however, the scheduled meetings were greatly enhanced by *sharings* in the spaces outside these meetings: sitting on the steps outside the conference one evening discussing the analytical relevance for social movements of conceptual metaphors drawn from physics and the life sciences; building links over tapas in a cheap restaurant with academic-activists from Greece, Israel, France, and the UK; and talking with fellow anthropologists about the problems, both personal and professional, engendered by an ethnographic and participatory orientation to research. It seems to me that this meeting was indicative of a current zeitgeist and effervescence of the theory: practice: praxis nexus. It is part of a number

of new and emerging initiatives – some of which have bubbled up in isolation but which are overlapping, coalescing and re-constituting in novel ways. CSGR is linked in several ways to this activity. For example, I was part of a group of six people who registered a Radical Theory Workshop at the November 2003 European Social Forum in Paris - a workshop which attracted an unexpectedly high number of participants. This effort is continuing via an e-list and plans to organise a one-day Radical Theory Forum to coincide with the next European Social Forum, as well as to register possibly more Workshops within the Forum process itself. Independently of this an 'anarchist:academics' e-list emerged from a meeting at the Anarchist Bookfair in London, October 2003. Currently there is some cross-over of participants occurring between the two lists and

the beginnings of discussion regarding shared interests and intent. The theoretical and pragmatic interests of these events and discussions, groups and individuals, are reflected in a process of 'talkshops' supported by CSGR due to take during 2004, under the title of academia, activism and postanarchism: theory and practice in (anti-)globalisation politics. All these initiatives build and magnify existing theory:practice initiatives such as the UK-based Signs of the Times (www.signsofthetimes.org.uk) and Shifting Ground Collective (www.shiftingground.org). It is tempting to see in them some renewed vigour in the recursive relationship between theory and practice, as well as between the ivory tower of academia and the real world 'out there'.

Attending the World Social Forum *James Brassett*

The recent meeting of the World Social Forum (WSF) in Mumbai attracted around 80,000 people from across the globe. Participating groups ranged from development, environmental and human rights NGOs to radical resistance networks advocating violent confrontation with

the structures of economic and social power. There were also numerous mobilisations of poor, lower caste and displaced peoples from India able to publicise their situation via an ever-present news media. At first the energy and diversity in the WSF can be

overwhelming. 'Another world is possible', I read on every leaflet, but chaos and confusion seemed to be the operational paradigm.

The conference itself – that is, the programme content as opposed to the colour and (continuous) drum

Research reports

beating of the parades – operated in three ways. Firstly, there were the WSF-organised panels. These boasted the ‘big names’ of the alter-globalisation movement and discussed the broader significance and impact of the WSF. Here I had the privilege of hearing, amongst others, Martin Khor, Mary Robinson, Joseph Stiglitz, Vandana Shiva and George Monbiot. Interestingly, Stiglitz was welcomed with a five minute standing ovation. Secondly, there were numerous self-organised panels that addressed various subjects from radical agendas for local autonomy to broad critiques of alleged American imperialism. And

finally, there was a range of issue-focused workshops aimed at constructing agendas for future activity. For instance, I attended a meeting of the Tax Justice Network that sought to build North-South linkages to confront the incidence of tax evasion by large multinationals.

To be sure the WSF can draw academic and political criticism. There is no single, easily digested proposal for policy makers to consider. Despite prominent internal supporters, it appears that democratic self-selection will not be operational soon. And without strong governmental backing the ideals of

many activists may remain simply that. But the WSF achieves other goals. A diversity of agendas illustrates well that numerous problems exist. The pooling of multiple stories of oppression, resistance and overcoming can go a long way to fostering solidarity. And reformers like Mary Robinson and Joseph Stiglitz do valuable work to push the critical voices of Mumbai into the policy frames of global governance. In such light the oft-repeated slogan ‘another world is possible’ may be more a reflection on the present than the future.



Workshop on World Social Forum, March 2004

Research reports

Gendering International Political Economy (GIPE) *Shirin Rai and Catherine Hoskyns*

During the past year we have been developing a programme of work on the above topic. This forms one strand in the application which the Centre has made for a Network of Excellence under the EU's Framework 6 funding programme. The programme is being carried forward in cooperation with Professor Brigitte Young of Muenster University (one of the Centre's Advisory Board members).

The problem we are addressing is the marginalisation in both mainstream and critical IPE of feminist and gender research and perspectives. At present there may be one gender chapter in an IPE book or one volume in a series but these contributions are rarely engaged with or incorporated. Where gestures are made they are towards outcomes (the effects on women) rather than on process (how these effects come about). This is despite the fact that feminist gender research is increasingly producing rich and relevant material, which has

both analytical and empirical significance. Examples of this would be: feminist work on production chain analysis and Thanh-Dam Truong's analyses linking the sex economy and the Asian financial crisis.

What we are after therefore in gendering IPE is to see how gender is embedded in the processes and discourse of IPE (and of neo-liberalism, its main object of study) and to estimate what the effects would be if these hidden characteristics were revealed.

As a first step in developing a programme of work, a meeting was held in Muenster on 5/6 December 2003 of those involved and interested in this strand of the application. At this meeting, those present reported on the current research they were engaged in (in our case, gender and global governance and gender mainstreaming in the EU's macro economic policy) and what kind of a

conceptual and empirical base this laid for the project. Heidi Schelhowe and Brigitte Young also described projects underway in northern Germany to create gender sensitive virtual networks for students and others and to promote non-hierarchical access to information and technology training. Such a 'virtual network' also forms part of the Framework 6 application.

As a result of this meeting a tentative programme of work has been established. This would comprise work in four areas: feminist redefinitions of key economic concepts; circuits of capital and their effects on human security and insecurity; governance and regulation/deregulation (especially concerning the EU and the WTO) and feminist critiques of and alternatives to new and old forms of resistance. The CSGR seminar which we gave on GIPE on 9 February was an attempt to open discussion on the first of these areas.

Research reports

Civil Society and Democracy in the Global Economy

As described in earlier newsletters (no. 7, p. 25 and no. 9, pp. 20-21), the CSDGE Project has been administered through CSGR since October 2001 to explore the implications of civil society activities for democracy in the governance of global production, exchange and consumption. The project, funded by the Ford Foundation and under the general coordination of Jan Aart Scholte at CSGR, has now involved inputs from more than 250 business forums, community groups, faith-based associations, labour organisations, NGOs, and research institutes across seven focal countries (Brazil, Canada, Egypt, France, Russia, Thailand and Uganda).

The hundred-page project report (pictured below) is now available from CSGR in the English original as well as in Arabic, French, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish and Thai translations. The four main parts of the report in turn: (a) identify the various democratic deficits in contemporary economic globalisation; (b) review multiple actions that civil society associations have taken to date to address these problems; (c) analyse environmental circumstances that can help or hinder civil society groups in their democratising initiatives; and (d) assess the democratic credentials of civil society practices themselves. The full report can be downloaded from the CSGR website. Hard copies in any of the seven translations can

be obtained by contacting Denise Hewlett in the CSGR office (denise.hewlett@warwick.ac.uk).

The completed report is being discussed in follow-up meetings with civil society groups in the seven focal countries. Thus far follow-up activities have been held in Russia, Thailand, Uganda, Egypt and France (see photographs on next page). The dissemination events have included public meetings, individual and small-group discussions, and media interviews. Similar activities will follow in Brazil and Canada during 2004.

Professor Scholte has also been disseminating the project findings in discussions with academic, business and policymaker audiences.



Research reports



Research fellows & associates



Robin Cohen

Robin Cohen has returned to Warwick after nearly three years at the University of Cape Town. There he was Dean of Humanities, a new Faculty that incorporated five prior faculties – including 19 departments in the performing arts, the traditionally defined arts, the social sciences and education. ‘Managing so many diverse activities enormously opened my horizons and I had a great time; the only problem was I had little opportunity to write and reflect’, he says. He welcomes his re-appointment at Warwick – half in his old department, Sociology, and the remaining half in CSGR, where he hopes to make up for lost research time. He will be engaged in four diverse projects though, he confesses, the timelines are a little vague.

1. **Global Sociology, 2nd Edition**

Though written in an introductory style, this account, written with Paul Kennedy, goes somewhat beyond the ambitions of a textbook. Robin and Paul try to set out a systematic statement of what a post-national sociology

might look like. The book has been well received worldwide, with a two-volume translation in Japanese and a pending Chinese edition. However, the publishers are already pressing for a new edition with many more pages and an account of the world after 9/11. Among other things this involves writing a chapter on global religions, which the publishers now insist on, despite having expunged such a chapter from the 1st edition on the grounds of the general irrelevance of religion. Thus the wheel turns.

2. **Direct Action in Global Civil Society**

This project, which will fit into the CSGR’s general interest in global civil society, will have to be discussed in detail with colleagues, particularly Jan Aart Scholte and Sian Sullivan (and CSGR Associate Shirin Rai), who are working on cognate and complementary themes. Robin hopes to develop an analysis of those direct action groups that practice forms of innovative politics falling short of illegality but transcending traditional lobbying practices. He is particularly interested in democratic deficits in state *and* non-state organizations.

3. **Visualising Diasporic Space: Blacks, Jews and Irish**

With his colleague, Lesley Marx (University of Cape Town), Robin is developing an article juxtaposing recent conceptual re-evaluations of the concept of diaspora with the cinematic representation of three diasporic experiences: Black, Jewish and Irish. The three films selected are made by independent filmmakers whose work does not easily fit into received narratives of the conventional Hollywood studio product and who are trying to depict the complexity of binational or transnational identities.

4. **The World of Creolization**

Ever since the French Caribbean writer, Eduard Glissant, announced ‘the creolization of the world’ a steady stream of new theorising (for example by the Swedish anthropologist, Ulf Hannerz) and empirical studies of diverse societies, have ‘liberated’ the term ‘creole’ from its linguistic use. Now the term is often used to capture ‘hybridity’, ‘cultural complexity’, ‘syncretism’ and ‘mixture’, arguably the predominant (or at least a prominent) condition of global society. In this project Robin will use historical, comparative and empirical data to test the theoretical and social scientific limits and possibilities of ‘creolisation’.

Research fellows & associates



Dwijen Rangnekar

Dwijen Rangnekar joined the Centre in September 2003 as a Senior Research Fellow in International Economic Law with a joint appointment in the School of Law. As an evolutionary economist, Dwijen's research focuses on the relationship between the innovation process and appropriation strategies and the economics and politics of knowledge production. Of special interest are developments in and the role of intellectual property rights with respect to the innovation process. In terms of industrial sectors, his research mainly concentrates on the seed industry, agro-food industries, biotechnology and pharmaceuticals. His current research focuses on the following areas:

- (a) writing a book on the transformation of plant breeding and the seed industry, tentatively titled *Seed Capital: The Economics and Politics of Plant Variety Protection*;
- (b) studying the implications of geographical indications on agro-food supply chains;
- (c) using bibliometric tools to analyse the

impact of the global harmonisation and strengthening of intellectual property rights on knowledge networks; (d) implementation of the TRIPs Agreement of the World Trade Organisation by developing and least developed countries. At the School of Law, he teaches international intellectual property law in the LLM programme.

Prior to joining CSGR, he held the post of Senior Research Fellow at the School of Public Policy, University College London, where he led a three-year project on policy innovation in the pharmaceutical industry, which examined the role and influence of patient groups. He has worked as a tutor and/or lecturer in Economics at Kingston University, UK, University of Greenwich, UK and the University of Utah, USA. Previous research posts include tenures as Research Affiliate at the Centre for Economic Studies and Planning, Jawaharlal Nehru University and Consultant to ActionAid. He has been educated in India, the US and the UK, having completed a PhD in Economics from Kingston University, UK. His research has been published in a variety of mediums that include journals (*Prometheus, Industrial and Corporate Change, Science as Culture and Social Action*), book chapters, newspapers (*The Economic Times*) and magazines (*Ecologist, Frontline*), and policy papers and

reports for funding bodies.

With an active interest in bridging the theory-policy divide, he has conducted policy-related research for, inter alia, the UK government's Commission on Intellectual Property Rights, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, ActionAid, OXFAM, UK Food Group, Panos and the World-Wide Fund for Nature. He has made submissions to and/or been informally consulted by working groups involved in framing intellectual property law in India. He is a member of the Advisory Committee of the International Plant Genetic Resources Institute's project on 'Rights and Responsibilities over Genetic Resources: The Role of the Public Domain in Producing International Public Goods', a member of the expert peer group for the World Trade Institute's (Bern, Switzerland) Research Project on Legal Rights to Plant Genetic Resources and Related Traditional Knowledge, and a member of the consultative group for UNCTAD/ICTSD's policy paper on 'intellectual property rights and sustainable development'. In addition, he is a member of the Board of Trustees of 'Find Your Feet' – a UK-based rural development organisation working in Southern Africa and India.

Research fellows & associates



Michela Redoano

Michela joined the CSGR in September 2003 as a research fellow. Her main research interests are in the areas of Political Economy, International Tax Competition, Fiscal Federalism and Lobbying. At the CSGR she is currently working on three projects. The first one concerns the construction of a "Globalisation Index" for a wide group of countries (more than 200) and for several years (from 1970 to

now); this index takes into account several dimensions of globalisation (i.e. economic, political and social). The second one focuses on inter-jurisdictional relations, such as the relationship between lobby formation and political centralisation, and the nature of fiscal policy interdependencies between European countries. Finally, the third project analyses to what extent multinationals' investments are related to the characteristics of the tax systems.

Before joining the Centre, she worked for the ESRC-Centre for Public Economics at the University of Warwick, where she was engaged on a project on international tax competition. Her research focused

on empirical and theoretical aspects of capital tax competition (race to the bottom of corporate taxes and tax reaction to capital controls) and the distinction between tax and yardstick competition.

Before coming to England, Michela worked as a consultant for the Italian Public Sector on issues concerning fiscal decentralisation and local public finance and lectured Mathematics for Social Sciences at the Faculty of Political Science at the University of Genoa.

Michela holds a PhD and a MSc in Economics from the University of Warwick and a Laurea in Economics and a Doctorate in Public Finance from the University of Genoa (Italy).

CSGR ASSOCIATE



Abdul Paliwala

Abdul Paliwala is Professor of Law at the University of Warwick and Director of the Law Courseware Consortium, the UK Centre for Legal Education (ICT) and Electronic Law Journals which publishes the *Journal of Information, Law and Technology*

and *Law, Social Justice and Global Development*. He leads the Secretariat of the British and Irish Law, Education and Technology Association. Abdul has a long association with the Law and Development Programme at Warwick. He has LLB and PhD degrees from the University of London and is a Barrister. He has previously taught at the University of Papua New Guinea, University of Dar es Salaam and Queen's University of Belfast and carried out various consultancies in development and information technology. His two main areas of publication are

Information and Communications Technology Law and Law, Globalisation and Development. Relevant books include *Law and Social Change in Papua New Guinea* (Butterworths 1981), *Law and Development in Crisis* (Zell, 1993) and *Effective Learning and Teaching in Law* (Kogan Page 2002).

His work on Legal Regulation of the Global Digital Divide is part of a wider research project on law and economic globalisation. The key area of study is the interconnection between global, regional and national information and

Research fellows & associates

communications regulation in the era of convergence of information and communications. This involves, in particular, the formal legal and policy

role of the WTO and other international organisations in promoting harmonisation in the development of information and

communications technology regulation, as well as the impact of recent convergence regulations in the North on developing countries.



Günter Metzges

*University of Bremen
Marie Curie Fellow, CSGR
October 2003 – March 2004*

As a Marie Curie Visiting Fellow here at the CSGR I am completing the final draft of my doctoral thesis for submission in Germany. This work primarily focuses on the impact of non-governmental organisations on international decision making.

The thesis begins from the observation that the level of political decision-making has changed as a result of the increase in societal denationalisation (Zürn 1998). More and more decision-making processes take place at the international level. With this transition the strategies of non-state actors have changed too.

Since the early 1990's in particular we can observe a proliferating

involvement of non-state actors in international negotiation processes. Nongovernmental organizations, groups and individuals form transnational networks initiate, shape, contribute to or prevent regime-building processes across the world. This development calls for a new approach to regime-building processes. Reference to asymmetries of power in the interstate system alone or the purely economic interests of states are no longer satisfactory explanations.

My argument begins from the assumption that the 'Political Opportunity Structure' (Tarrow 1998) of NGO's has changed with the increase of post-national systems of governance. Because of these changes – I hypothesise - we can expect a larger impact of oppositional in comparison to cooperative NGOs.

The inter-nationalisation of policy processes leads to a multiplication of contest arenas and consequently a multiplication of veto-player positions. Civil society actors that oppose transnational regime-building processes need only win over or convince one of these veto players

in order to endanger the success of international negotiation processes. The well known problems of decision making in multilevel systems (Putnam 1988) enhance the strength of groups that attempt to hinder decision making. Processes of International regulation have therefore become more difficult.

From 1989 to 1998 two negotiation processes took place at the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in Paris. One was a successful negotiation process: the OECD Bribery Convention. The second concerned the 'Multilateral Agreement on Investment', that failed in 1997. Both were initiated and pushed forward by the United States and both were intended to intervene heavily in domestic legislative competences (taxation, public order, and criminal law). In both processes NGO networks entered stage after negotiation had begun.

By comparing different stages of each negotiation I aim to establish whether civil society networks have had an impact on international regime-building processes.

Research fellows & associates

Furthermore my comparison draws out the differential impact of co-operative and oppositional NGO networks on the success or failure talks.

The findings of the empirical work confirm the theoretical assumption. It can be shown that a transnational campaign of NGOs had a strong impact on the failure of 'MAI' negotiations. But it can't be shown

that the NGO campaign in favour of OECD Bribery negotiations was crucial for the success of the talks. Rather it seems plausible that the lack of a coherent opposition against these negotiations counted as an important factor for their eventual success.

- Putnam, Robert. 1988. Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two Level-Games. *International Organization* 42:427-460.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement : Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. 2 ed, *Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Zürn, Michael. 1998. *Regieren jenseits des Nationalstaates., Edition Zweite Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Who's Visiting CSGR

Dr Martin Besfamille, University Torcuato Di Tella, January-February 2004

Professor Verity Burgmann, University of Melbourne, June 2004

Dr Graeme Cheeseman, University of New South Wales, January-December 2004

Stefanie Hiss, Marie Curie Fellow, University of Bamberg, March-September 2004

Günter Metzges, Marie Curie Fellow, University of Bremen, October 2003-April 2004

Dunja Speiser, Marie Curie Fellow, Institute of International and Security Affairs Berlin, February-August 2004

Dr Torsten Strulik, University of Bielefeld, May-July 2004

Professor Grahame Thompson, Open University, April-September 2004

Dr Nicola Yeates, Queen's University Belfast, February-July 2004

Professor Seyed Saaid Zahed Zahedani, Shiraz University, July-September 2004

CSGR Seminar Series

Spring 2004

Date: 5th January

Speaker: David Barlow
University of Newcastle-
Upon-Tyne

Title: The Political Economy of
Reform in the Transition
Economies

Date: 12th January

Speaker: Professor
Mansoob Murshed
Institute of Social Studies,
The Hague

Title: Civil Wars in the Age of
Globalisation

Date: 14th January

Speaker: Ann Florini
The Brookings Institution,
Washington DC

Title: The Coming Democracy:
New Rules for Running a
New World

Date: 19th January

Speaker: Eleni Tsingou
University of Warwick

Title: A Global Approach to the
Fight Against Money
Laundering? Public
Institutions, Private Banks
and the Gap between
Policy and Practice

Date: 26th January

Speaker: Dr Nicola Pratt
University of Birmingham

Title: Bringing Politics Back In:
Examining the Link
between Democratisation
and Globalisation in Egypt

Date: 29th January

Speaker: Professor John Whalley
University of Warwick

Title: Globalization and Values

Date: 2nd February

Speaker: Dr Martin Besfamilie
Univerisdad Torcuato Di
Tella, Buenos Aires

Title: International Capital
Markets and Sub-National
Borrowing

Date: 9th February

Speaker: Professor
Catherine Hoskyns &
Professor Shirin Rai
University of Warwick

Title: Gendering International
Political Economy

Date: 16th February

Speaker: Professor Abdul Paliwala
University of Warwick

Title: Regulation and Global
Digital Diffusion

Date: 23rd February

Speaker: Günter Metzges
University of Bremen

Title: Non-Governmental
Networks: Their Influence
on International
Negotiations

Date: 1st March

Speaker: Dr Graeme Cheeseman
University of New South
Wales, Sydney

Title: Military Force and Forces
in a Globalising World

Date: 1st March

Speaker: Dr Daniel Drache
York University, Canada

Title: The Political Economy of
Dissent: Poverty
Eradication and Its Global
Public After Cancun

Date: 8th March

Speaker: Professor Peter Burnham
University of Warwick

Title: Bretton Woods and the
Politicisation of Central
Bank Policy in Britain

CSGR Seminar Series Summer 2004

*Unless otherwise stated seminars are held on Mondays at 1.00pm in the CSGR Seminar room S1.50
(1st Floor Social Studies Building)*

Date: 29th March

Speaker: Devinder Sharma
Chair of the Forum for
Biotechnology and Food
Security (India)

Title: Trade, Biotechnical and
Hunger

Date: 19th April

Speaker: Dr Nicola Yeates
Queens University Belfast

Title: Conceptualising the
Relationship between
'Globalisation', Migration
and Care: A Global Care
Chain Approach

Date: 26th April

Speaker: Dennis Leech
University of Warwick

Title: Weighted Voting, Power
and Accountability in the
World Bank and IMF

Date: 4th May

Speaker: Shiv Visvanatham
Centre for the Study of
Developing Societies,
New Delhi

Title: Grammer of catastrophes:
local and global response

Date: 10th May

Speaker: Professor Robin Cohen
University of Warwick

Title: Globalization and the
Creolising World:
Ethnicity Revisited

Date: 17th May

Speaker: Professor
Stephen Broadberry
University of Warwick

Title: Cotton Textiles and the
Great Divergence:
Lancashire, India and
Shifting Comparative
Advantage, 1600-1850

Date: 24th May

Speaker: Professor Carlo Perroni
University of Warwick

Title: The Economic Rationale
for Special and Differential
Treatment of Developing
Countries under the WTO

Date: 7th June

Speaker: Professor
Grahame Thompson
Open University

Title: The Fate of Territorial
Engineering: Blood, Soil
and Post-liberal Forms of
International Governance?

Date: 10th June

Speaker: Professor Verity Burgmann
University of Melbourne

Title: Striking Back Against
Empire: International
Working-Class Resistance
to Corporate Globalisation.

Date: 14th June

Speaker: Dunja Speiser
Title: State Failure and External
Intervention: A Special
Focus on Africa

Date: 15th June, 4pm

Speaker: Dr Matthew Lockwood
ActionAid

Title: Civil Society and the WTO:
A Report from Cancun

Date: 21st June

Speaker: Stefanie Hiss
Title: Social Standards,
Multinational Firms and
Developing Countries

Latest CSGR Working Papers

121/03, August

S Sullivan

Distributed networks and the politics of possibility: Interpretations of what's new about the form and content of global anti/post-capitalism

122/03, August

K Homewood & S Sullivan

On non-equilibrium and nomadism: knowledge, diversity and global modernity in drylands (and beyond ...)

123/03, August

S Sullivan

'We are heartbroken and furious!' Engaging with Violence in the (Anti-)Globalisation Movement(s)

124/03, September

R Higgott

American Unilateralism, Foreign Economic Policy and the 'Securitisation' of Globalisation

125/03, September

B Lockwood & M Makris

Tax Competition and Politics: Double-Edged Incentives

126/03, November

T H Edwards

Quality Standards Under Classical Oligopoly and Trade: Regulatory Protection or Just Over-Regulation

127/04, January

C W Hughes

Japan, the Post-9/11 Security Agenda, Globalisation and the Political Economy of Inequality and Insecurity

128/04, January

T H Edwards

An Economic Assessment of the Accession of the Central and Eastern European Countries to the EU Single Market

129/04, January

T Taki

Globalisation, Labour Migration and State Transformation in Contemporary Japan

130/04, February

J A Scholte

Globalization and Governance: From Statism to Polycentrism

131/04, March

E Tsingou

Policy Preferences in Financial Governance: Public – Private Dynamics and the Prevalence of Market-Based Arrangements in the Banking Industry

132/04, March

D K Das

Financial Flows and Global Integration

CSGR staff and contact information



Robin Cohen
Senior Research Fellow
E r.cohen@warwick.ac.uk



Toby Dodge
Senior Research Fellow
E b.t.dodge@warwick.ac.uk



Huw Edwards
Research Fellow
E t.h.edwards@warwick.ac.uk



Gianluca Grimalda
Research Fellow
E g.f.grimalda@warwick.ac.uk



Denise Hewlett
Secretary
E denise.hewlett@warwick.ac.uk



Richard Higgott (On Leave)
Director
E richard.higgott@warwick.ac.uk
E rhiggott@colbud.hu



Chris Hughes
Deputy Director
E c.w.hughes@warwick.ac.uk



Marcus Miller
Associate Director
E marcus.miller@warwick.ac.uk



Dwijen Rangnekar
Senior Research Fellow
E d.rangnekar@warwick.ac.uk



Michela Redoano
Research Fellow
E michela.redoano@warwick.ac.uk



Jan Aart Scholte
Acting Director
E scholte@warwick.ac.uk



Domenica Scinaldi
Administrator
E d.scinaldi@warwick.ac.uk



Sian Sullivan
Research Fellow
E s.sullivan@warwick.ac.uk



Eleni Tsingou
Research Fellow
E e.tsingou@warwick.ac.uk

Contact Information

Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation The University of Warwick Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

T +44 (0)24 7657 2533 F +44 (0)24 7657 2548 E csg@warwick.ac.uk W <http://www.csg.org>