

## SCIENCE AND POLITICS: A DIFFICULT PARTNERSHIP

Transformations in political culture and academic policy, in the ways knowledge is accumulated and distributed, make relations between science and politics a highly complex system of mutual dependencies. Even though politics scientification and research politicisation are not new phenomena, this issue has been more thoroughly researched and critically reflected upon only under democracy and in the context of socio-political crises multiplying worldwide. It is the *contact* point of power and knowledge and a platform where philosophers joined by many researchers in social sciences and the humanities have met. The core question has been about the potential impact of scientific research and its findings on political decision-making processes in a State.

Today, nobody questions the need to support good governance with scientific advice. The end of the Cold War radically changed conditionalities of political practices, including foreign policies of Central and East European countries. In consequence, the interest in a potential transposition of Western patterns of bridging state administration and research and consultancy institutes has grown. In Poland, the reference point were publications of Anglo-Saxon authors as in their countries, such advising/consultancy has the longest tradition and its system is most developed.

The objective of this paper is modest. It is not to answer questions about the evolution and nature of political consultancy and its special form of think-tanks. The reason is that such institutions keep developing and changing and thus it is difficult to offer reliable and trustworthy answers. My objective is to defend the thesis that science and politics undergo a permanent dialectic process, and to sketch challenges that follow from it. Those challenges are what both decision-making politicians and equipped with theoretical knowledge experts have to face.

## THE AUTHORITY OF SCIENCE AND POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY

History of political thought abounds in reservations concerning any *proximity* of science to politics and *vice versa*. A philosopher on a throne and a politician in an academic gown have often evoked most negative associations. In a situation where science is fragmented and cannot see patterns in increasingly unpredictable political processes of long-lasting consequences, and where, in pluralistic societies, power is dispersed and the State has no monopoly for decision-making, there are many questions and doubts. The main question is whether and how a political decision can be rationalised and legitimised by its scientification.

A demand for scientific advice has grown only after WW2. Jürgen Habermas<sup>1</sup> viewed that stage of politics development as a new level of rationalisation attained by a new, bureaucratized State administration. He, like Max Weber, was concerned with how to rationally justify the choice of a final political decision amongst competing ideas, arguments and values. That issue comes boomeranging back and gains importance under mass democracy and ongoing transformations of social structures. The *risk society* notion introduced by Ulrich Beck in 1986, has already provoked much discussion on challenges that modern societies face under globalisation. At the same time expectations of those who believe in *the knowledge society* and *science-based civilisation* must collide with new strategies of steering a State and the need to search for ever new communication paths between expert knowledge and politics.

The complexity of modern life and the progress in its different spheres make an expert - who works in-between science and social practice of politics, insecure. The growth of experts' role in modern society also mirrors the growing ignorance of decision makers.<sup>2</sup> Knowledge deficits primarily result from the complexity of political phenomena, the long-term consequences of which escape the scientific competence too. Tensions between experts, their knowledge and capabilities on the one hand, and their agency and the rationale to use their knowledge while making decisions on the other hand, are inherent in relations between academic and political actors.

The point is that a participant in political life has two roles. Marc Bloch wrote:

Experience has taught us that it is impossible to decide in advance whether even the most abstract speculations may not eventually prove extraordinarily helpful in practice. It would inflict a strange mutilation upon humanity to deny it a right to appease its intellectual appetites apart from all consideration of its material welfare.<sup>3</sup>

The issue of science responsibility follows. Knowledge should be used. Nobody doubts that. However, philosophy of science asks questions about the ethos and responsibility of every individual who represents science.<sup>4</sup> Hans-Georg Gadamer wrote that "intermediation between modern scientific culture and its demonstrations in social practice has become a profession. [ ] An expert is in-between science, where they must be competent, and social practice of politics." <sup>5</sup> A politician wants to win whereas a theorist of political science wants to discover the objective truth. A politician and a political scientist both are experts in what is political. However, the two experts offer two different expertises and play two different roles, hence the debate on "two great dreams"<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Habermas, *Technik und Wissenschaft als Ideologie*, Frankfurt a. M. 1968, p. 120.

<sup>2</sup> H. G. Gadamer, *Das Erbe Europas*, Frankfurt a. M. 1995 [Polish translation: *Dziedzictwo Europy*, Warszawa 1992, p. 86].

<sup>3</sup> M. Bloch, *Apologie pour l'histoire ou Métier d'historien*, Chicoutimi (Canada) 1949 [Polish translation: *Pochwała historii czyli o zawodzie historyka*, Warszawa 1960, p. 33].

<sup>4</sup> H. G. Gadamer, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 85.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. J. Górkowski, *Traktat o inżynierii polityki. Studium historycznej socjologii wiedzy o technologii społecznej*, Puck 2009, p. 154.

Decisive are the scientist's individual ethics and sense of responsibility. It matters whom and how research results serve. A political scientist may and should have an impact on society's awareness and political culture. The question which emerges is why, despite the crowd of political scientists and other social scientists, citizens' political awareness is so appalling. Scientists try to deepen cognition respecting requirements of cognitive and practical objectives while the realisation of each of them requires a different ethos, another work organisation and, also, a different kind of self-knowledge<sup>7</sup>.

What are the determinants of cooperation between scientists and politicians? How to bridge and reconcile the world of knowledge and potential knowledge applications? There are no certainties and this reflection occupies researchers concerned about the condition of political culture. Since in political science propositional theories and theories of practice co-exist, what emerges is a peculiar situation: a politician cannot execute a scientific project. Politics will not be scienticised but it uses the results of scientific research.<sup>8</sup> Thus who is responsible for decisions shaped in the course of cooperation of scientists and politicians? Can the two responsibilities be balanced? How does an academic expert involved in co-shaping political decisions deal with the above? Will political consultancy grow to be the 'fifth power' next to mass media which are the 'fourth power'?

An evaluation of the impact of science on politics depends on the development of theoretical concepts not only in political science. It is obvious that the impact of science on a decision-making process cannot be measured.<sup>9</sup> New prospects for bridging science and politics stem from the discovery that history of diplomacy is part of the international history of culture. Theorists of international relations underline the need to approach a State, political concepts and practice as dynamic variables and the need to consider cultural conditionalities of State and society's operations. Consultancy in the area of foreign policy should, in particular, be closely connected with communication processes and cultural transfer issues including the role of economy and social relations.

Models in political science, considered to be heuristic tools, increasingly cover transformation dynamics in foreign policy. They emphasise the importance of legitimising the role of foreign diplomacy in public life. A deepened reflection on social actors' co-responsibility for the quality of State policies requires that external and internal conditions in which a State functions, geopolitical factors, security issues and the quality of international relations are recognised. Of high importance are also the roles various institutional, personal, military, economic, political and mental factors and social dispositions play in transferring ideas to a public debate platform.

## SCIENCE IN A DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

---

<sup>7</sup> B. Krauz-Moser, *Teorie polityki. Zastosowania metodologiczne*, Warszawa 2005, p. 145.

<sup>8</sup> B. Krauz-Moser, *Problem metodologicznego statusu politologii*, in: T. / o -Nowak (ed.), *Politologia w Polsce. Stan bada i perspektywy rozwojowe*, Toru 1999, pp. 13-26.

<sup>9</sup> More in: A. Landwehr, *Diskurs o Macht o Wissen. Perspektiven einer Kulturgeschichte des Politischen*, 'Archiv für Kulturgeschichte' 85, 2003, pp. 71-117 and F. Kießling, *Der 'Dialog der Taubstummen' ist vorbei. Neue Ansätze in der Geschichte der internationalen Beziehungen des 19. Und 20. Jahrhunderts*, 'Historische Zeitschrift' 275, 2002, pp. 651-680.

Modern political science describes political events as outcomes of carefully considered decisions. Social sciences have long strived to develop a model that would more accurately describe mechanisms of decision-making in the political sphere. Theoretical and empirical deficiencies follow from the impossibility to capture all rational and non-rational factors present in the decision-making process, to evaluate the degree of their co-dependencies and their conditionalities in the dynamically changing reality. The basic difficulty in theoretical analyses follows from the fact that decision-making in every political situation is a multilaterally determined, complex process without set boundaries. It is an ongoing process.

In sociology, a process is defined as "series of relatively homogeneous phenomena linked by casual or structural-functional dependencies"<sup>10</sup>. They always lead to political changes. Piotr Sztompka treats a process as "a sequence of consecutive and casually determined system changes called phases or stages"<sup>11</sup>. Functionalism assumes the superiority of the process sustaining the internal equilibrium of a system and its relations with its environment.<sup>12</sup> Mechanisms of the decision-making process have been widely described. The subject literature points for instance to universal models of decision-making procedures based on the normative theory of decision making processes. Patterns of rational decision-making assume that decision makers, while trying to optimise their activities, know the nature of the decision-making process and follow directions stemming from it. In practice, however, such a conduct is virtually impossible.<sup>13</sup>

How about a political advisor in such a decision-making situation? What makes experts' analyses effective? What does *influence* in politics mean? Those questions are repeatedly asked by social scientists.<sup>14</sup> Robert A. Dahl and Bruce Stinebrickner, American researchers who developed the pluralist theory of political elites, investigated the power of positive and negative influence a person or a group might have on actions or orientations of other persons. They define influence as "a relation among human actors such that the wants, desires, preferences, orientations of one or more actors affect the actions, or predispositions to act of one or more actors in a direction consistent with and not contrary to the wants, preferences, orientations of the influence wielder(s)".<sup>15</sup>

Politics and science create an area where they influence each other. Debates on whether the nature of a modern political analysis can be scientific, whether political phenomena or developments can be measured and which academic "services" have the

---

<sup>10</sup> J. Szczepański, *Elementarne pojęcia socjologii*, Warszawa 1970, p. 467. Cf. A. Antoszewski, *Proces i zmiana polityczna*, in: A. Jabłoński, L. Sobkowiak (eds), *Studia z teorii polityki*, Vol. I, pp. 193-194.

<sup>11</sup> P. Sztompka, *Socjologia zmian społecznych*, Kraków 2010, p. 452.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. for example A. Czajowski, *Decydowanie w polityce*, Wrocław 2013, pp. 84-85.

<sup>13</sup> Polish publications on that issue are numerous, for example: A. Bodnar, *Problemy teorii decyzji politycznych*, in: *Z zagadnień teorii polityki*, K. Opałek (ed.), Warszawa 1978; M. Zdyb, *Istota decyzji*, Lublin 1993; Z. J. Pietra, *Decyzje i niedecyzje polityczne*, in: *Prawo i polityka*, A. Bodnar, J. Wiatr, J. Wróblewski (eds), Warszawa 1988; S. J. Sokółowski, *Decyzja a działanie*, Warszawa 1975; H. Groszyk, A. Korybski, *Kultura polityczna a procesy decydowania politycznego (wybrane problemy)*, Warszawa 1980; G. Rydlewski (ed.), *Decydowanie publiczne. Polska na tle innych państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej*, Warszawa 2011.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. R. A. Dahl, B. Stinebrickner, *Modern Political Analysis*, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2003, 6<sup>th</sup> edition.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.* p. 17.

greatest impact on decision-making processes have not been conclusive. Charles Wright Mills believed that social sciences - equipped with its ideals of the value of truth, freedom and reason - should influence politics and political decisions. He argued for the informed imagination, respect for facts (accuracy) and creative research.<sup>16</sup>

He had no doubt that the quality of political life depends on intellectual qualifications of the participating *ömen of reasonö*. He had some reservations whether moral and intellectual dilemma of social scientists can be reconciled with being independent while doing their research, but among various social roles of the scientist, he underlined the value of reason which allows one to remain independent while choosing their own research problems and to direct their research at both those in power and public opinion.

Free men can make history with their rational endeavours. Mills's conception *öprompts us to imagine social science as a sort of public intelligence apparatus, concerned with public issues and private troubles and with the structural trends of our time underlying them both ó and to imagine individual social scientists as rational members of a self-controlled association, which we call the social sciences.ö*<sup>17</sup> The social scientist should be concerned with *öliberatingö education as öhis aim is to help build and to strengthen self-cultivating publics. Only then might society be reasonable and free.ö*<sup>18</sup> *öIt is the political task of the social scientist [í ] continually to translate personal troubles into public issues, and public issues into the terms of their human meaning for a variety of individuals.ö*<sup>19</sup>

Where science and politics meet, there is a permanent tension between different expectations, approaches and kinds of argumentation. Scientific criteria of truth often differ from political conducts. Philosophy of politics directs our search for the underlying cause for interactions between scientists and politicians back to ancient Greece. There, the critical discourse method, i.e. the dialectic, was developed in result of practical experience of the exercise of public authority.

Giandomenico Majone goes back to that ancient concept of dialectic and underlines the relevance of the social context of argumentation which is essential in the policy process.<sup>20</sup> In the course of public debate, the starting point of which are controversies and different points of view, what is underlined are persuasive (rhetoric) arguments and not formal proofs. Science is to concentrate on critical evaluation, advocacy and education to eventually offer suggestions relevant to the policy process.

An analyst, as a special member of the scientific milieu, should have skills needed to critically investigate political assumptions, evaluate proofs and use different sources. The analyst does not solve problems because conclusions drawn from policy analysis can hardly be rigorously proved. Instead, it is expected that experts would be more efficient in setting norms and standards in public policy. Scientific public services are effective as demonstrated by implemented theoretical programmes, their aims attained and verified.

---

<sup>16</sup> C. W. Mills, *The Sociological Imagination*, Oxford, 1959, 2000: 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary edition.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 181.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 186.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 187.

<sup>20</sup> G. Majone, *Evidence, Argument, and Persuasion in the Policy Process* [Polish translation: *Dowody, argumenty i perswazja w procesie politycznym*, Warszawa 2004, p. 20].

Researchers interested in the best possible transfer of science to policy-making underline that although much persuasion and many arguments can be well expressed in the language of science, it is not that conclusions of complicated process analyses can always be expressed in terms of scientific categories. The ongoing process of bettering political conceptions must be accompanied by advocating new ideas among society and thus of shaping public opinion. What actually happens is that expert solutions clash with both political and economic interests and administrative procedures. Thus the expert analyst must also assist advocacy and persuasion to achieve major policy innovations.

Under pluralist democracy and the free market of ideas, a confrontative process is in place. Where most important State security interests matter, the advisory/consultative body should follow the principle that the best method to shape policies is the competition of ideas and not dependence on decision-makers and interest groups. Consequently Majone postulates the institution of 'the honest broker' able to persuade all parties to carry a responsible debate. The postulate is workable provided that professional and ethical standards are respected.

A policy analysis may not provide decisive arguments validating a proposed thesis but suggest some more or less convincing arguments. Thus the objective is to make those arguments convincing. Hence debating is essential as it facilitates the ongoing learning process of everybody involved. Modern epistemologists argue that if scientific conclusions cannot be proved to be fully reliable, it must suffice that some rules of a scientific game are followed. Majone refers to Aristotle's analysis of craftsmen's work and compares a good craftsman to a good analyst to identify benefits of academic research.<sup>21</sup> In fact, what matters is the mastery of skills and materials, and a personal involvement of the craftsman in the undertaking. The work cannot be done mechanically and the serviceability of products largely depends on their artistic merit.

The conception of choice has played the most important and central role in political analyses. The choice depends on many factors but primarily on specialist knowledge. Codependencies in our world of today hardly permit a strict labour division between experts, analysts and policy makers. There is no universal solution because humans are objectively limited. When there is much consensus among experts, politicians become suspicious. When there is little consensus among experts, decision-makers choose the most convenient advice.<sup>22</sup> Undoubtedly, while looking for an ideal consultancy model, right are researchers who point to competencies, trustworthiness and lack of political involvement of an expert. Those characteristics are most desirable by political actors. 'Policy makers trust advisors who leave the politics to them, who yearn neither for influence nor for martyrdom.'<sup>23</sup>

The difficult relations between science, politics and power have some roots in objective deficits in social sciences, including political science, which lack research tools ensuring effective solutions to political issues. What is needed is an interdisciplinary effort. Safeguarding its integrity, political science is not going to reach any satisfying conclusions if it ignores research done in psychology, sociology, history, philosophy, cultural studies *et cetera*. That refers to history of international relations in particular. In foreign policy analyses,

---

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> J. G. March, J. P. Olsen, *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*, New York 1989, pp. 28-33. See also: M. Douglas, *How Institutions Think*, Syracuse 1986.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 32

there is a justified need to include not only the State and its institutions but also political parties, coalitions and social groupings.<sup>24</sup> Political science should pay more attention to internal policies including those covering scientific research and education. In short, the concept of politics must be extended to cover both the State and the non-institutional sphere, i.e. public behaviour, ideologies, symbolic order, political myths, mental representations, behaviour patterns, and values.<sup>25</sup>

Political anthropology, as a separate discipline, has already attained much in its analyses of social conditionings of policy processes *œnvisageant l'homme sous la forme de l'homo politicus et recherchant les propriétés communes à toutes les organisations politiques reconnues dans leur diversité historique et géographique*<sup>26</sup>. Academic authorities agree that it is time to depart from traditional concepts of politics and the State since what is political involves many actors, structures, activities and relations. Thus the core question is not who or what creates political products but how to identify and use those products.

Both analysts and those participating in political life value debates where public opinion is exposed. The discourse quality, truth and knowledge/competence have a decisive impact on the effectiveness of actions affecting political conducts and decisions. It is essential, however, that political culture is not narrowed to politicians, political parties, their programmes, and central administration.<sup>27</sup> Political debates aim to resolve which proposals of analysts are credible and most realistic.

The dissolubility of the science of power discourse will be valid as long as parties involved in the search for truth will respect discourse rules. Those rules need to be regularly updated. It is in the course of a debate where the truth and the object of competitions are defined.<sup>28</sup> How to distinguish between fake truth from real truth? How to distinguish knowledge from view points, judgements or beliefs? In its cultural context, truth may not be a perfect monolith resisting changes in time, space and society. It may well be a social product which serves the society as its reference point or signpost. For Achim Landwehr, who has explored most literature on science and power relations, important questions are: in what way and to what effect various actors and their discourses participate in political processes, and what the shape and expression of the power of knowledge relations are in that context.<sup>29</sup>

## THE QUEST FOR THE IDEAL

Before political consulting got institutionalised, absolute rulers used services of secret court or state counsellors. The counsellor rank was, in fact, a honorific title awarded by

---

<sup>24</sup> H.-U. Thamer, *Politische Geschichte, Geschichte der internationalen Beziehungen*, in: R. van Dülmen (ed.), *Fischer Lexikon Geschichte*, Frankfurt a. M. 1990, p. 53

<sup>25</sup> A. Landwehr, *Diskurs of Macht of Wissen. Perspektiven einer Kulturgeschichte des Politischen*, *œArchiv für Kulturgeschichte* 85 (2003), p. 71-117.

<sup>26</sup> G. Balandier, *Sens et puissance*, Paris, PUF 1971.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. T. Meyer, *Die Transformation des Politischen*, Frankfurt a. M. 1994; H. Bußhoff, *Komplementarität und Politik. Zu einer interdisziplinär orientierten Begründung des Politischen und der Politischen Wissenschaft*, Würzburg 1990.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. H. Bublitz (Hg.), *Das Wuchern der Diskurse. Perspektiven der Diskursanalyse Foucaults*, Frankfurt a. M., New York 1990.

<sup>29</sup> A. Landwehr, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

emperors and tsars. The person from whom the world learned about the art of counselling and accepting advice given to support wise governance was Niccolò Machiavelli. In his Dedication of *The Prince* to the Magnificent Lorenzo Di Piero De' Medici, he expressed his intention. He wished to offer the opportunity of understanding in the shortest time all what he learnt in so many years, and with so many troubles and dangers<sup>30</sup>. The author of *The Prince* paid much attention to his advice being objective. He did not embellish his text for he wished that the truth of the matter and the weightiness of the theme shall make it acceptable<sup>31</sup>.

Machiavelli explained what proper understanding of knowledge transmission is in Chapter XXIII 'How flatterers should be avoided'. A wise prince should do that by

choosing the wise men in his state, and giving to them only the liberty of speaking the truth to him, and then only of those things of which he inquires [í ]

A prince, therefore, ought always to take counsel, but only when he wishes and not when others wish; he ought rather to discourage every one from offering advice unless he asks it; but, however, he ought to be a constant inquirer, and afterwards a patient listener concerning the things of which he inquired; also, on learning that any one, on any consideration, has not told him the truth, he should let his anger be felt.

Machiavelli believed that a prince who is not wise himself will never take good advice and concluded that good counsels, whencesoever they come, are born of the wisdom of the prince, and not the wisdom of the prince from good counsels<sup>32</sup>.

Already in the 13<sup>th</sup> c. Frederick II, Holy Roman Emperor, appreciated the importance of state administration education. In Naples, he established the first 'public' university to attract many wise and prudent persons and to train graduates who would serve the kingdom.<sup>33</sup>

The progenitor of modern think-tanks was the court jester. Next to other entertainers who had to be aware of their limits while making jokes about their kings, there were jesters, often from noble families, who influenced decisions taken and could critically comment on their employers' actions. Some jesters let rulers use them; others used witty irony to improve governance.<sup>34</sup> The role of court jesters depended on the actual atmosphere at courts and the power structure. Under most despotic rulers, the function of the jester was both most important and threatened. The critical voice of a jester did not need to be taken seriously.

Only in the Enlightenment that situation changed significantly. As political thought deepened, the concept of an ideal advisor surfaced. In 1651, Thomas Hobbes characterised ideal consultancy as follows:

---

<sup>30</sup> N. Machiavelli, *The Prince*, [http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1232/1232-h/1232-h.htm#link2H\\_4\\_0006](http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1232/1232-h/1232-h.htm#link2H_4_0006).

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> Cf. C. Böhret, *Hofnarren, Denkfabriken, Politik-Coach: Chancen und Schwierigkeiten der Politikberatung damals und heute*, in: S. Fisch, W. Rudloff (eds), *Experten und Politik: Wissenschaftliche Politikberatung in geschichtlicher Perspektive*, Berlin 2004, p. 370.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. e.g. C. Ameluxen, *Zur Rechtsgeschichte des Hofnarren*, Berlin, New York 1991.



COUNSELL, is where a man saith, "Doe" or "Doe not this," and deduceth his own reasons from the benefit that arriveth by it to him to whom he saith it. And from this it is evident, that he that giveth Counsell, pretendeth onely (whatsoever he intendeth) the good of him, to whom he giveth it.<sup>35</sup>

[í ] a Counsellour, when an action comes into deliberation, is to make manifest the consequences of it, in such manner, as he that is Counsell'd may be truly and evidently informed; he ought to propound his advise, in such forme of speech, as may make the truth most evidently appear; that is to say, with as firme ratiocination, as significant and proper language, and as briefly, as the evidence will permit.<sup>36</sup>

The quest for truth and efforts to safeguard the freedom of reasoning are valid also today though the situation is different: power is divided, political life is party based, relations between science and power are depersonalised and intermediation between science and policy processes is institutionalised. In pluralist democracy, situations where science and power meet take the form of a complicated and highly ambiguous matrix of impact or inference. The history of science-power relations prompts a conclusion that both advisors and those who are advised need discuss complex issues and find best possible solutions together. Is such a pragmatic dialogue possible? Some research on modern think-tanks points to the necessity of accepting advice at an early stage of policy-making. The reasons is that both scientists and authorities need to experience and overcome the same difficulties and feel responsible for possible consequences of decisions taken. In that process, difficulties are both commonplace and unavoidable. Moreover, those in power are often lost and unable to choose from among the multitude of offers and advice of the growing number of various consultancy groups. Thus there is a need to appoint additional independent institutions to critically evaluate, segregate and select needed expert reports and analyses. Today, the role of former court jesters is played by people trusted by main political actors. In confidentiality, they critically debate particular decisions and their possible outcomes. This political coaching is common in all countries where the political system is based on pluralist democracy and free market.

In an idealised image of modern consultancy, there is an idyllic secluded location where a highly qualified team of scientists - who are experts in different fields - meets and is led by professional managers supervised by some special board. There a scientific debate takes place and ideas which will have an impact on the political decision process and help better the world are agreed upon. The reality, however, dictates its capricious rules which necessitate humility and ongoing adjustments to the changing conditionalities.

#### THINK-TANKS AS POLICY INSTITUTES

Political consultancy in democratic countries meets with a growing interest of public opinion. The objective of political consultancy is not controversial. However, there are many

---

<sup>35</sup> Th. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, CHAPTER XXV. OF COUNSELL, Differences Between Command And Counsell, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3207/3207-h/3207-h.htm>

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, Differences Of Fit And Unfit Counsellours.

answers to questions about where and how the dialogue between policy theoreticians and practitioners should be carried. Policy research needs to be long term if orientated at fostering a dialogue and research applicability. Since the transmission of scientific knowledge to the world of policy making is eventually orientated towards public opinion, it requires free exchange of thoughts and ideas. Both scientists and politicians are increasingly discontented as specialised academic science gets fragmented, i.e. increasingly narrowly specialised, and the State is increasingly helpless as socio-economic problems do grow. There are more worries and doubts if and to what degree a support of experts in an implementation of suggested solutions is the experts' task. How to remain neutral in the situation where political processes are targeted at privileged groups of electors?

History has proved that academic and political systems may use each other not necessarily for the benefit of all citizens. The World War I was but one experiment where science was exceptionally centralised and used in a paramilitary way as research on electrochemistry and physical chemistry became part of the war industry.<sup>37</sup> This historical phase of science that served nationalism and then communism should be treated as a warning and a call for self-control.

The number of empirically justified answers to how consultancy can make policy processes more rational and effective, keeps growing. Political advisors and experts constitute the most influential elite in the West. Taxpayers are not indifferent to on what their money is spent. The number of international programmes investigating new trends in policy institutes and comparing them grows. Both, the dynamics of political changes under globalisation and the changed role of science require monitoring. Research standards do not change but the organisation and distribution of knowledge do. This was confirmed with *La condition postmoderne: rapport sur le savoir*, a 1979 book by Jean-François Lyotard, commissioned by the *Conseil des universités du Québec*. Its author, a philosopher, put forward a hypothesis that "that the status of knowledge is altered as societies enter what is known as the postindustrial age and cultures enter what is known as the postmodern age"<sup>38</sup>. Scientific policy has been dominated by information technology which leads to a situation where the "relationships of the suppliers and users of knowledge to the knowledge they supply and use [ ] assume the form already taken by the relationship of commodity producers and consumers to the commodities they produce and consume"<sup>39</sup>.

A manifestation of rationalisation and professionalization of the relationships between science and policy processes are attempts at clarifying the place of think-tanks, as a special form of consultancy, in the system of national and transnational institutions. Questions about think-tanks' quality and condition are an important reflection on political culture in democratic countries and their international relations. Think-tanks usually function as non-governmental organisations, which are not dependant on those in power, and take the form of expert research centres/institutes. They aim at supporting State administration, politicians, and the public with their evaluations, assessments and proposals. Thus they aim at influencing

---

<sup>37</sup> E.g. B. vom Brocke (Hg.), *Forschung im Spannungsfeld von Politik und Gesellschaft. Geschichte und Struktur der Kaiser-Wilhelm-/Max-Planck-Gesellschaft*, Stuttgart 1990.

<sup>38</sup> J.-F. Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* [English translation: Manchester 1984, p. 3].

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4

decision-making processes in the public sphere. In the subject literature, they are primarily defined by reference to their roles.

Martin Thunert offers a broad definition of think-tanks: „sind Think Tanks privat oder öffentlich finanzierte praxisorientierte Forschungsinstitute, die wissenschaftlich fundiert politikbezogene und praxisrelevante Fragestellungen behandeln und im Idealfall entscheidungsvorbereitende Ergebnisse und Empfehlungen liefern.“<sup>40</sup> A search for a homogenous definition of think-tanks is an effort both redundant and futile due to the ambiguity of their tasks, various organisation patterns, financing, range of services, expert competencies, research standards, influence spheres and their national characteristics. It needs to be underlined, however, that think-tanks treat policy consultancy as its priority and that differs them from institutions which focus on scientific research and knowledge popularisation while any consultancy plays a marginal role.

Think-tanks in countries where their cooperation with public administration is long, play many roles, starting with their basic role as analysts, through education, to their controlling function. Their reports and analyses go to interested recipients. Their tasks include shaping the elites, mobilising public opinion, and raising political culture standards. In western democracies, especially in the US, think-tanks function as personnel backup for public administration. As NGOs belonging to the „third sector“, they aspire to be the „fifth power“<sup>41</sup>.

## THINK-TANKS IN THE US AND GERMANY

The English concept of a think-tank has been recognised worldwide and rendered as *Denkfabrik* in German and *fabryka idei* in Polish. American definitions and interpretations have been the main reference in European comparative studies. Regular monitoring of various think-tanks in different countries is to facilitate comparisons of their growth dynamics and trends prevailing in their strategies. The American think-tank market is the oldest, largest and most diversified organisationally and functionally. No wonder, it is highly interesting to European social scientists. In German political science, comparative studies help to assess German think-tanks in an international context. In Germany, think-tanks are also referred to as *Ideenagenturen*. They are distinguished from universities and public research institutions „producing“ knowledge. Think-tanks are different because their objective is a close relation with policy makers, they professionally propagate their ideas on free market, are more or less openly ideology bound, usually give their employees little freedom in choosing study topics, and they serve defined customers supporting their strategic communication. They are institutes which pursue interest policy using scientific arguments.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> M. Thunert, *Think Tank in Deutschland ó Berater der Politik*, „Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte“, B. 51, 2003, pp. 30-31. See also his *The Development and Significance of Think Tanks in Germany*, <http://www.spaef.com/file.php?id=878> .

<sup>41</sup> S. Cassel, *Politikberatung und Politikerberatung. Eine institutionenökonomische Analyse der wissenschaftlichen Beratung der Wirtschaftspolitik*, Bern, Stuttgart, Wien 2001, pp. 84-85.

<sup>42</sup> E.g. W. Gellner, *Ideenagenturen für Politik und Öffentlichkeit. Think Tanks in den USA und in Deutschland*, Opladen 1995, p. 19, and his *Politikberatung und Parteienersatz: Politische „Denkfabriken“ in den USA*, „Zeitschrift für Parlamentsfragen“ H. 1, 1991, pp. 134-149.

Comparative studies on American and German think-tanks meet with growing interest in Germany and Poland. One may ask what their contribution to knowledge is. The German net of policy consultancy institutions has been growing fast since 1949 and is an important reference to young democracies in Central and Eastern Europe. The main reason is political culture. For Poland, it is also relevant that it neighbours with Germany and closer cooperation is possible. Political cultures and systems in the US and Germany differ much. For that reason findings and experience of social sciences and humanities need to be included in comparative studies. Unfortunately, in most Polish publications, comparisons are limited to presenting registers of consultancy institutions in a historical perspective, which are but a guide to expert institutions.

Actually, a cursory analysis of American and German think-tanks, their roles and functioning allows for some generalisations.

- Policy consultancy in the US and Germany is increasingly similar. This is due to globalisation and political life being progressively internationalised.
- Though the authority and respect for expert institutions and sources of new ideas are important, their soft power usually depends on non-scientific factors, in particular on their management, rhetoric and access to mass media. The 'product' label and marketing are also relevant as the product must sell well.
- Consultancy institutions profit from a trust deficit in politics and government legitimacy crises.
- Both those in power, public administration, interests groups, media, and experts form advocacy coalitions of broadcasters and recipients (demand and supply).<sup>43</sup> For they face the same problem of finding best possible answers to questions fundamental to society.

In 1963, Susanne Keller's book *Beyond the Ruling Class: Strategic Elites in Modern Society* was published and helped answer questions about conditions and performance effectiveness of consultancy institutions.<sup>44</sup> Strategic elites are responsible minorities working to face and overcome crises that occur and they are most visible in the public space when rapid social changes take place. Keller argued that in a transition phase between the industrial and postindustrial (information and services) society, elites differentiate functionally. Under pluralism, their relevance has changed and their role of bridging the worlds of science and politics cannot be underestimated. The challenge faced by strategic elites is to integrate and make coherent various conceptions, visions and interpretations of political groups. Are American strategic elites more advanced in influencing political decisions? If so, how do they do that? Conclusions of comparative studies are straightforward. In the US, which pioneered the system of policy consultancy, the environment for think-tanks is the most friendly. The American presidential system and the strength of American civil society have contributed to the development of different and more diversified forms and structures of policy consultancy in comparison to European parliamentary democracies. There are universities without students which carry research in many or few fields, institutions orientated towards specific

---

<sup>43</sup> E.g. P. Sabatier, *Advocacy-Koalitionen, Policy-Wandel und Policy-Lernen. Eine Alternative zur Phasenheuristik*, 'Politische Vierteljahresschrift' ó Sonderheft 24, 1993, pp. 116-148.

<sup>44</sup> S. Keller, *Beyond the Ruling Class: Strategic Elites in Modern Society*, New York 1963.

collective interests, conservative, leftist-liberal, and ordoliberal institutes, small agencies of different ideological orientations, and numerous foundations. There are institutions which collaborate with scientists who carry research and actively participate in political debates. Many institutions pay attention to scientific criteria and, at the same time, follow chosen ideologies. Often it is difficult to distinguish them from interest groups. Often they are a stepping stone for young politicians and ambitious civil servants. There, the revolving door meaning a movement of personnel of think-tanks and public administration is a common phenomenon. A majority of oldest American think-tanks still have a mission and resources to serve it.

Till the 1980s, among the US think-tanks, universities without students prevailed. Today, think-tanks are centres of renowned researchers who help developing plans and provide policy advice. Both their high number and demand for their services have contributed to their specialisation. Their organisational structure is less uniform than in Germany and other European countries. Most American think-tanks are privately funded. Some are small, consisting of several researchers, and some are large employing over 100 people and their annual budget exceeds USD 20 million.<sup>45</sup> Much attention is paid to reviewing policy analyses in scientific and popular journals. A think-tank is to aggressively sell its books, papers and ensure they widely marketed and referred to.

In 2001, Ted Halstead, founder and first president of the New America Foundation, advertised the Foundation as the most spectacular think-tank (with a USD 4 million budget) based in Washington, D.C.. The New American Foundation was to develop ideas which were to define the future of American society. Halstead presented himself as a social-political entrepreneur. The Foundation was not to climb up factory chimneys like Greenpeace but to change American society. The Foundation has been neither leftist or rightist. Its objective has been to offer unconventional ideas. Its members are published in most important journals. In fact, its mission has been to be better than its competitors, have a greater influence on American society and be more often and better heard.<sup>46</sup>

In Germany, most policy consultancy institutions emerged after WWII.<sup>47</sup> Despite their relatively late appearance on the public scene, German think-tanks offer professional services. In Germany, like in the US, competition forces think-tanks to be highly specialised. Their growth, areas of interest, roles and effectiveness are empirically studied. American and German think-tanks play similar roles but their organisation is different. Policy consultancy institutions supported by huge foundations and companies are in a better financial situation, especially more conservative ones. Questions whether policy consultancy is threatened with losing its ideology-free characteristic keep being asked.

---

<sup>45</sup> F. Bergsten, *Denken und verkaufen. Rezept für einen erfolgreichen Think Tank*, *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* Nr. 24, 30.-31. Januar 1999, p. 56.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. P. Pinzler, *Die Macht lässt denken. Think Tanks versorgene Amerika stetig mit neuen Ideen*, *Die Zeit* 12. Juli, Nr. 29, 2001, p. 6.

<sup>47</sup> E.g. P. Lundgreen, B. Horn, W. Krohn, G. Küppers, R. Paslack, *Staatliche Forschung in Deutschland 1870-1980*, Frankfurt a. M., New York 1986; M. Mols, *Politikberatung im außenpolitischen Entscheidungsprozeß*, in: von W.-D. Eberwein, K. Kaiser (eds), *Deutschlands neue Außenpolitik 1955-1972*, Vol. 4: *Institutionen und Ressourcen*, München 1998, pp. 253-264.

In the 1990s, German political scientists still gave much thought to how to make the German policy consultancy market more dynamic and attractive to politicians and comparisons to the American market of consultancy institutions were commonplace. President Roman Herzog in his lecture, given at the *Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik* in 1996, asked whether policy consultancy in Germany was a luxury.<sup>48</sup> In the Federal Republic of Germany, in contrast to the USA, consultancy is mostly financed with public funds.<sup>49</sup> Recently, new legislation has been introduced to make the private sector more active and involved in charitable activities. Specialists underline the need to strengthen cooperation of think-tanks and media and to professionalise public relations. Undoubtedly, a turn to private financing of think-tanks will mean politicisation of the expert sector and increase ideologisation of services like in the US.

In Germany, the think-tanks development has not reached its momentum yet. This situation is regularly criticised and compared to the US, which contributes to the growth of the catalogue of policy consultancy services offered by expert institutions. It has been underlined that to meet market expectations, institutionalised bodies need to carry systematic and on-going studies on political consultancy. In a discussion on policy consultancy and its new forms, openness and transparency do matter. The German market of policy consultancy is increasingly pragmatic. Both, analyses commissioned by politicians and activities of interest groups searching support from scientists are perceived as manifestations of advanced democracy.<sup>50</sup> The present supply of policy consultancy and advice is by large centred around universities. Big political parties have well structured consultancy systems. Each has its foundations which perform educational activities. German foundations have their offices in Poland and in many other countries. They are not only ambassadors of ideas of particular political parties. They effectively support civil societies and spread democratic political culture outside Germany.

It is extremely difficult to reliably assess activities and effectiveness of policy consultancy institutions. Even addressees of their work are not able to say which values, ideas and information are decisive to them. When members of the *Bundestag* ask how many competent bodies and advisors to the government can help MPs, the answer appears to be difficult. It has been estimated that in 1969, at the think-tanks development stage, there were 203 consultancy centres with over 300 experts (of whom only 1/3 were scientists). In 1977, the number of consultancy bodies was 358 with over 5,600 advisors.<sup>51</sup> It is impossible to paint

---

<sup>48</sup> R. Herzog setzt sich für Denkfabriken ein, *šFAZö* 15. März 1996, p. 4.

<sup>49</sup> J. Braml, *Voraussetzungen für das Wirken deutscher und amerikanischer Think Tank*, <http://www.wissenschaft-und-frieden.de/seite.php?artikelID=0337>.

<sup>50</sup> W. H. Reinicke, *Die politische Beratung in Deutschland. Zunehmende Öffnung unter dem Druck der Sachprobleme*, *öNeue Zürcher Zeitungö* Nr. 24, 30/31 Januar, 1999, p. 56.

<sup>51</sup> W. Rudloff, *Einleitung: Politikberatung als Gegenstand historischer Betrachtung. Forschungsstand, neue Befunde, übergreifende Fragestellungen*, in: von S. Fisch, W. Rudloff (eds), *Experten und Politik: Wissenschaftliche Politikberatung in geschichtlicher Perspektive*, Berlin 2004, p. 15. In 1992, Axel Murswieck identified 294 advisory bodies with around 2875 experts; cf. A. Murswieck, *Wissenschaftliche Beratung im Regierungsprozeß*, in: A. Murswieck (ed.), *Regieren und Politikberatung*, Opladen 1994, p. 112. In 1999, Ortwin Renn spoke about over 1000 scientific bodies advising on German policies; cf. O. Renn, *Sozialwissenschaftliche Politikberatung. Gesellschaftliche Anforderungen und gelebte Praxis*, *öBerliner Journal für Soziologieö* 9, 1999, p. 542.

a picture of sources providing scientific and analytical advice to German politicians and administration. The situation is in flux. Organisational forms of public and private research institutes keep changing. There are many *ad hoc* committees. Many focused expert studies are commissioned by individual lands and big cities. Despite difficulties in identifying mechanisms of effective influence of science on political practice and other practices as well, this process keeps attracting the attention of specialised bodies. American science utilisation and German *Verwendungsforschung* concepts are manifestations of the above. That research focuses on topics analysed, choice of scientific fields, patterns of applying scientific methods, decision-making processes, advocacy and its rhetoric, and last but not least on the pluralism of ideas and interests.<sup>52</sup>

## POLISH THINK-TANKS ON THE MARKET OF IDEAS

Polish think-tanks and Polish democracy are of the same age. The modest number of publications on Polish think-tanks reflects their short history. Some publications are trivial and anecdotal, and their relevance is short lived. That is due to the lack of the needed perspective on rapid changes in the consultancy scene. Some are useful guides to Polish think-tank institutions. Encouragingly, some thorough empirical research has been done recently providing clear recommendations for advisors and their customers. Polish researchers are not reinventing the wheel. They use models, theories, and observations made by their American colleagues and refer to them while evaluating Polish think-tanks.

Social scientists do criticise institutions which offer expertise, especially in the context of research done abroad.<sup>53</sup> The experience of Polish institutions interested in foreign policy and international relations has not been long, i.e. only 20 years, and they still experiment. Despite their limited experience, however, some offer services meeting highest international standards.

The list of shortcomings and difficulties which Polish think-tanks encounter has not changed. Researchers and columnists concerned with Polish political culture standards underline *ösinsö* characteristic of science and policy-makers relations. These include: the lack of a long-term strategy; underfunding of the consultancy sector which must rely on grants; its dependency on sponsors which makes its scientific credibility doubtful; notorious mass media coverage of politics for mass consumption which makes public policies vague, and makes politicians focused on winning support of the public for themselves; the lack of skills among politicians and central administration, ignorant about the importance of relevant expert knowledge, to carry a dialogue with experts.

State institutions often view think-tanks as their potential competitors on the path to power.<sup>54</sup> Wawrzyniec Smoczyński of the *Polityka* weekly writes:

---

<sup>52</sup> E.g. H. Heinrichs, *Politikberatung in der Wissensgesellschaft. Eine Analyse umweltpolitischer Beratungssysteme*, Wiesbaden 2002.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. P. Zbieranek, *Polski model organizacji typu think tank*, Warszawa 2011 and his *Struktura polskiego sektora organizacji typu think tank w wietle bada empirycznych. Przyczynek do opisu polskiego modelu think tanku*, in: T. B. kowski J. H. Szlachetko, *op. cit.*, pp. 86-106.

<sup>54</sup> P. Zbieranek, *Polski model...*, pp. 204-205.





qualitative analyses of their self-presentations published on their websites, a questionnaire carried among Polish think-tanks and interviews with the management of 11 of them.<sup>58</sup>

Their self-presentations allow to confront subjective reflections with objective valuation. Repeatedly, analysts critically assess their potential customers. In Poland, the interest in expert services is little. "This formula of influencing policies has not been recognised yet." "Politicians do not see a value added nor a commonality of interests." "Politicians are not interested in using those resources. [ ] They know better." In short, they do not appreciate the value of consultancy. Some experts point to poor analytical skills as some analyses are based "on selective literature reviews", and note that there is "no consultancy free market". Foundations and other expert organisations are "painfully underfunded and the modest means available go to chosen ones."<sup>59</sup> Finding a way to influence "those who have an influence and not to be influenced by them" appears to require a mastery of acrobatics.

The first issue is that expert institutions idealise their operations and their objectives are but wishful thinking. They perceive themselves as independent, objective and reliable. A possible political orientation, ideology, or held political views are concealed because they are embarrassing. Very few institutions do not hide their political identity. Most would rather underline their "neutrality" and being "apolitical". Scientific standards are valued but some admit that although standards need to be advertised, occasionally, "it is worthwhile to not underline them excessively". The desire to influence policy making and supply ideas, which is the priority of think-tanks worldwide, is a secondary objective in Poland. At present, it is difficult to learn whether Polish think-tanks primarily "have ambitions but no illusions" (a questionnaire answer) or whether they are institutions which "are not driven by the ambition to exert influence but by an intellectual passion" (self-evaluation of an interviewee).

A more complete picture of the condition and effectiveness of policy consultancy requires empirical research, especially on political customers. That research has only begun. Newest reports on the lack of a balanced dialogue between science and politics are relevant but far from being a thorough analysis. An important development has been a research project on the participation of experts in improving the analytical potential of central administration. The project was carried out by the Civil Service Department at the Chancellery of the Prime Minister and financed by the ESF as part of the Human Capital Investment Operational Programme 2007-2013. It aimed at improving decision-making mechanisms in the administration and "the participation of experts in the process of enhancement of analytical potential of governmental administration"<sup>60</sup>.

Having collected Polish and foreign experiences, the authors of the project Report (2011) managed to prepare recommendations and a model for implementing defined standards in central administration. The analysis focused on a decision-making process in public policy

---

<sup>58</sup> D. Stasiak, *ŹPomi dzy, czyli gdzie? Polskie think tanki w poszukiwaniu recepty na siebie*, in: T. B. Kowski, J. H. Szlachetko, *op. cit.*, s. 107-133. Stasiak addressed her Internet questionnaire containing 23 questions to over 80 expert institutions. Twenty seven responded and only 20 agreed that calling them think-tanks was justified.

<sup>59</sup> D. Stasiak, *op. cit.*, s. 120-121.

<sup>60</sup> "Improvement of the Quality of Decision-Taking Processes in Government Administration by Use of the Potential of the Scientific and Experts' Communities" Report 2011.

areas and development and assessment of legal solutions. It was concluded that public administration institutions and external think-tanks had the necessary potential and that the weakest link is communication. Thus popular observations were confirmed.

The collected interview data revealed that expectations of experts and central administration have been diverse. What makes their relations difficult is also the lack of formalised mechanisms coordinating the commissioning and using services of external consultancy. Conclusions reached and recommendations presented cover issues fundamental to that cooperation. That concerns knowledge management in the administration and coordination of commissioning research and expert opinions. The cooperation could improve if conclusions drawn from thorough analyses of policy processes, legal solutions on using expert knowledge, main actors involved, their potential, and an evaluation of risks and advantages of the cooperation of central administration with third parties were duly taken into consideration and implemented. Authors of the Report recommend that a special unit is created and acting as an intermediary between the world of science and the world of politics. Is that a good solution? New institutions are fruitless if mutual trust - the essential binding glue, is not there.

In 2011, Michał Mierzwa investigated the issue of transparency criteria in academic and expert milieus. It is not a minor issue since most analytical advisory institutions emphasise scientific standards, research objectivism and reliability. Mierzwa's study was more modest but his conclusions were similar to those drawn in the Report. Some respondents implied that the adjective 'scientific' adds prestige while the think-tank label makes an institution seem less serious and suggests its politicisation.

Edward Said, a Palestinian American intellectual, in his book *Humanism and Democratic Criticism* wrote:

The task of the humanist is not just to occupy a position or place, nor simply to belong somewhere, but rather to be both insider and outsider to the circulating ideas and values that are at issue in our society or someone else's society or the society of the other.<sup>61</sup>

It is the researcher's inquisitive spirit and obligation to keep asking questions that are values in their own right. Glenn Tinder wrote about 'humane uncertainty' which contains an intuition of freedom.<sup>62</sup> A humanist may be useful to policy makers but only if they wish to embrace humane questions and doubts. For the humanist, the priority is to creatively search answers. What policy makers want, however, are quick and ready recipes. That does not exclude cooperation but both 'worlds' have to face different expectations.

A specialised expert institution employs specialists in various areas and they must have special competencies or skills needed to carry analyses. The authority of science is not questioned if knowledge is used in political practice. However, it is unnecessary to underline consultancy being scientific. Institutions which are *stricte* scientific face very different tasks. Their employees are obliged to earn academic degrees and their teaching load makes them deal with other difficulties. Their research projects take years. The form of their publication is

---

<sup>61</sup> E. Said, *Humanism and Democratic Criticism*, Columbia 2004, p.76.

<sup>62</sup> G. Tinder, *Political Thinking: The Perennial Questions*, New York 2004, 6th Ed., p.199.

of secondary importance. They value their contributions to science and analytical creativity. What is needed is an intellectual distance to objects or phenomena investigated and financial security of projects undertaken.

Expert institutions need marketing and promotion. What is valued is an aggressive sale of ideas. Typically, they need to build relations with their customers, seek for clients, have quick access to information and respond to emerging needs. What differs them most from academic institutions is think-tank's capacity to reach decision-makers and to influence their decisions and, last but not least, to present their ideas, analyses and reports in mass media.

## EUROPEANISATION OF THINK-TANKS

Democratisation of Poland was accompanied by transferring some of its sovereign rights to regional and supranational levels. Similarly, the emergence of Polish think-tanks has been accompanied by think-tank's internationalisation and Europeanisation. The personnel of exquisitely well prepared and usually young people builds its international networks in search to better the services. Interest in European and global issues has grown along Poland's membership in the EU and other international organisations. Think-tanks increasingly compete but also cooperate.

Some Polish institutions, which fit the think-tank formula, participate in international projects. The *demosEuropa*, for example, participates in the *Think Global ó Act European* project which, since 2008, has brought together 16 think-tanks to prepare policy recommendations for now each Trio of the Presidency of the Council of the European Union. The Polish Institute of Public Affairs is involved in the PASOS association of CEE and Central Asian think-tanks. The Centre for Eastern Studies (OSW) has its permanent representative in Brussels since 2011. An exchange of experts advances. On the 21<sup>st</sup> of February 2011, the Polish office of the European Council on Foreign Relations was launched at the Warsaw University. Created in 2007, ECFR is the first pan-European think-tank that now has its offices in Berlin, London, Madrid, Paris, Rome, Sofia, and in Warsaw.

The growing data base of think-tanks worldwide facilitates better exchange of experiences gathered. Polish institutions have an opportunity to participate in regional and global networks of think-tanks, contributing their own knowledge and experience of relations with East European countries. It is necessary to carry research on dependencies between ideas, interests and institutions, and social, economic and political factors in European countries. It goes without question that the quality of European integration largely depends on consulting and involving citizens in debates on stronger democratic legitimisation of the European Union.<sup>63</sup>

The quality and effectiveness of policy consultancy depends on many factors. The very involvement of experts in policy issues is an indicator of civil society progress. An

---

<sup>63</sup> W. Walters, J. H. Haahr, *Governing Europe: Discourse, governmentality and European integration*. London 2005; T. T. Kaczmarek, *Kto kieruje globalizacj ą? Think tanki ó ku nie nowych idei*, Warszawa 2011; W. Przybylski, *Think tanki Starej i Nowej Europy*, *öMi dzynarodowy Przegl d Politycznyö* No. 1, 2005; S. Mrozowska, *Think tanki w Unii Europejskiej*, in: T. B kowski, J. H. Szlachetko, *op. cit.*, pp. 175-199.

important task of independent analytic institutions is to advance political education of citizens. In addition to present think-tanks' advisory function, they support society's political participation by communicating ordered information, inspiring debates and enriching public opinion views. Their contribution to shaping democratic political culture cannot be underestimated in any breakthrough periods, especially in CEE.

The quality of foreign policy is not conditioned by the number of think-tanks but by advisors and their customers' will to cooperate where mutual respect and trust are essential. Polish policy consultancy centres are searching for their own identity. Effectiveness of their undertakings depends on many factors which should be carefully monitored by researchers. Rationalisation of policy-making and governance improvement depend primarily on making decision-makers convinced that the future of Poland and its place in Europe largely depends on knowledge. Underestimating the role of institutions which assist the transfer of knowledge will equal ignoring the society.

Translated by Hanna Mausch

**Professor Anna Wolff-Pow ska, University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Pozna branch**  
(annapoweska@gmail.com)

**Keywords:** science, politics, think tank, consulting, persuasion

#### ABSTRACT

*Relations between science and politics have long been an object of interest of humanities and social sciences. This paper is an attempt at outlining challenges faced by today's political science. The author seeks to answer the question how Polish think tank centres address the issue of effectively impacting policy-making. Other questions asked concern the condition of research Europeanisation and organisation of Polish consultancy institutions.*