

Abstracts

Kathia Serrano-Velarde

The Bologna Process and the European Knowledge Society

The article addresses the question how the “knowledge society” became a political stake in the European reform discourse. By introducing the example of the Bologna process, I will explicit the political reinterpretation of the term “knowledge society”, retrace its operationalization into political action guidelines and critically discuss its actual implementations. What type of knowledge society is described in the policy documentation of the Bologna process and what are the limits to its realisation?

Jenny Ozga, Sotiria Grek and Martin Lawn

The New Production of Governing Knowledge. Education Research in England

This article draws on critical discourse analysis (CDA) to explore the extent to which there is an interdependence between new governing forms, often characterised as ‘post-bureaucratic’ and new knowledge forms, that are often described in terms of ‘mode 2’ knowledge – that is, knowledge that combines the academy, the state and the private sector in co-production. The discussion is based on the analysis of a large number of policy texts concerned with education research as well as scrutiny of academic literature on research policy in England from 1945 to the present. Much recent policy and academic discourse, we suggest, characterises new knowledge forms as socially-responsive, and as potentially democratising knowledge, because of their apparent interactive, iterative, problem-focused and trans-disciplinary character. We suggest that such an analysis is insufficiently attentive to the discourse of the knowledge economy, and the related (discursive) turn in new knowledge production towards *governing* knowledge.

Gábor Erőss

Ignorance Produces Knowledge. “Specified Ignorance” and Knowledge-Substitution Mechanisms in the Mirror of the Hungarian Health and Education Policies

In an era of post-bureaucratic regulation, transnationalisation and “evidence-based policies”, the appeal for change and reform in any policy domain is always a plea for research and expertise (both national and international). Knowledge and cognitive authority legitimize public policies. “Evidence” is often lacking, though. This text examines the ways in which formal, institutionalised scientific-bureaucratic evidence is replaced by other types of evidence, esp. transnational, social scientific, personal, stakeholders’ and local knowledge, as well as by – what we call – incarnated-charismatic knowledge. They (and others) can serve in given, sociologically observable circumstances as substitute-evidence, filling the legitimacy gap. They appear when the rational-legal form of political domination is challenged or a “feeling of ignorance” related to a given policy issue emerges. Therefore decision-makers need to mobilise alternative sources of evidence – to know and to govern. *Specified ignorance* in policy stands in focus of my *political agnatology* and *anthropology of knowledge*: its construction and mise-en-scène, i.e. the substitution of formal, scientific-bureaucratic State knowledge by alternative data processing methods and heteronomic (substitute) knowledge-forms in two contemporary Hungarian policy domains. These forms seem, in particular circumstances and for particular

Soziale Welt 60 (2009), S. 423 – 424

actors, more tangible or reliable, and, above all, more “authentic” and more legitimate. Political non-knowledge (specified ignorance) contributes to the emergence of postnational multilocal knowledge.

Alma von der Hagen-Demszky, Katharina Mayr and Elias Sanaa

Knowledge and Volition. The Production of Knowledge in Political Decision-Making

Political action simultaneously seems to be vital and defective. Without non-political input, political decisions can not be made and at the same time scientific facts appear nearly irrelevant concerning the results of decision processes. The implicit assumption of a lack of knowledge in political practice is inherent in most studies about consulting political decision-makers. In contrast we will argue that political actors must not be regarded as simple users of knowledge but as producers of knowledge of the political field. We emphasize that restrictions of what can be politically said or done is primarily regulated by *internal* forms of constructing political knowledge. Not following a usual reading, We suggest that interest and antagonistic positions shall not be treated as boundary conditions of political decisions, but as subjects of political knowledge emerging in political decisions. In our case study “*the imagined layperson*”, “*the existing legal and institutional state of affaires*” and “*the politics of the parliamentary groups*” of the Bavarian Landtag can be identified as constitutive elements of political knowledge about a governable world. Reluctant political decisions or the avoidance of “real” decisions usually provoke a criticism of the actor’s obligation to serve their interests. Empirically it shows how strong a differentiated audience limits what can be said or done politically.