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Abstract: 213 mot
For the last 20 years, the world economy has evolved at great speed. Every good, capital asset, knowledge is mobile and induces more competition. Innovate in commodities is a complex process which requires more cooperation. For innovating in the Knowledge Economy, firms must create nowadays “win win situations” among individuals in creating networks. The networks are thus useful nowadays for firms to imagine new innovative strategies. The building of networks authorizes the interactions between the agents, the environment and the institutions. Thinking the interdependences of the agents and institutions are not new for the evolutionary theory (Veblen, 1925 and Common, 1931) but nowadays, the institutions must be more flexible than before for helping agents to adapt to the Knowledge Economy. On the basis of the role of meso networks, we propose to the firms and the countries exporting industrial goods on the world markets, a new long run specialization and a new short run competitiveness which will promote a greater efficiency and equity around the world. Within the innovative networks, we analyze the role of two different actors: the “economic leader” who has a long run analysis and the “go-between leader” who knows how to diffuse the “useful information” to the actors in helping them to innovate in new products, services, or processes.
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Résumé: 337 mots
Depuis 20 ans, l’économie mondiale a évolué fortement. Les biens, les capitaux, les connaissances sont devenues mobiles et induisent une compétition accrue sur la scène internationale. Dans une économie de la connaissance, l’innovation s’appuie de plus en plus sur un processus complexe de division cognitive du travail qui nécessite des relations de coopération accrues. Pour réguler ces contractions, Veblen (1925) et Common (1931) ont montré dans la théorie évolutionniste le rôle clef que pouvaient jouer les instituions pour réguler les relations de coopération et de concurrence entre les agents. Aujourd’hui cependant, il semble que les institutions nationales doivent être repensées pour qu’elles puissent devenir suffisamment flexible pour que les agents puissent innover dans une économie de la connaissance mondialisée. Le papier montre que la construction d’une institution intermédiaire, régulant les relations entre les agents économiques et les institutions nationales, peut être construite par un réseau qui
La première partie présente les interactions qui se nouent au sein d’un réseau d’entreprise entre les différents acteurs, l’environnement et les différentes institutions nationales ou internationales. La seconde partie propose, sur la base d’une co-construction par les différents acteurs agissant dans les réseaux méso-économiques, une nouvelle forme de spécialisation à long terme et une nouvelle forme de compétitivité à court terme capables de générer une plus grande efficacité économique et une plus grande équité pour tous les acteurs. La dernière partie propose d’identifier à sein de ses réseaux deux nouveaux types de leaderships pour conduire efficacement ces nouvelles stratégies de long et de court terme. Le leader économique aurait la charge de conduire la stratégie d’innovation en créant les conditions d’une innovation win win pour tous les acteurs. Le leader go-between jouerait quant à lui un rôle déterminant puisque c’est à lui que reviendrait la tâche difficile de collecter et diffuser l’information utile à tous les membres de son réseau pour que l’entreprise puisse accroître concrètement ses parts de marchés sur les marchés mondiaux.

**Mots clés:** Méso institution, réseaux d’innovation, réseaux d’influence, avantages concurrentiels, compétitivité informationnelle.

**JEL Classification Code:** F40, L14, L16

**Introduction**

For the last 20 years, the world economy has evolved at great speed. Every good, capital asset, knowledge is mobile and induces rising competition. Knowledge economy induces more cooperation with the “Division of Cognitive Labor process” (DLC) (1). The free exchange of goods and capital assets ought to authorize a better efficiency form individuals, firms and countries. The project of A Smith (1776) was to separate Economics Approach from Politics (Mercantilism) and Ethics (the “Fair Price” of Santos Thomas Aquino). He assumes that free exchanges, based on the labor value theory, would induce more economic growth and wealth than to follow the Mercantilist Approach which proposes to the countries to accumulate more and more trade surplus and gold. In the eighteen century as today, Economics still deeply remains linked to ethics and politic values. And thinking about the interdependences between the individuals and the institutions is an old question for the evolutionary theory (Veblen, 1925; Common, 1931). In this paper, we want to develop in a knowledge economy the “Heterodox Economics approach” of the “French School of Regulation” which already stressed on the continuous evolving world and the importance to take into account the key role of different historical periods (Aglietta, 1976; Boyer, Mistral, 1978) (2). Our analysis wants to develop more deeply this institution analysis on the interaction between agencies and institutions in the nowadays Knowledge economy. We want furthermore to stress on the sustainable
strategies for “small agencies” (small firms, small countries…) because, in the Knowledge Economy, all the agents may have a higher degree of liberty than during the preceding periods (1945-1973 then 1973-1990). Today, we assist to a “rebirth of the role of the “intermediary level” (as community of practice, cooperative, networks…) which helps both agencies and countries to reach a greater efficiency. An intermediary level (between the micro level of firms and the macro level of States) may have more power than the usual national institutions (as the Welfare State or the other ministries) and also more power than the European institutions (as the European Parliament). One of the main characteristics of this new intermediary level seems to be the day to day co-building of “collective institutions” which aim to develop quantitative (increase of employment and wealth) and qualitative approaches (increase of efficiency and well being). To define these intermediary institutions adapted to the world knowledge economy, we use the methodology of the “Social Provisioning Process” (3) developed by Eichner (1985), Lee (2013) or Jo (2015). The “Social Provisioning Process” stresses in effect on five main qualitative factors: the “Care, Share, Dare” Approach, the well-being of agencies, a global analysis (economic, political, and social processes), the ethical values and the large variety of agents involving in the production process. For analysing the intermediary level, we develop a systemic approach where “the whole is more or less than the sum of the parts” and the inclusive approach of the development and well-being. Our study thus mobilizes an interdisciplinary approach based on history, philosophy, psychology, sociology, economics and management (as Schumpeter, 1911; Polanyi, 1944; Hirschman, 1970). We want to analyze a key component of the Knowledge economy, which is called by M Porter (1990), “coopetition process” (4). In this process, the agents are at the same time in cooperation relationships (for innovating in new products) and in competition relationships (for selling products on the world markets). Our paper argues that both of these opposite behaviors must be mixed into dynamic networks, where the institutions are as important as the markets and where the demand policies are as useful as the supply policies to increase innovations and wealth in each country.

In the first section, we analyze why the world changes evolve more and more an evolutionary theory for thinking the inter-dependences between individuals, environment and institutions. In the second part, we will propose new long run and new short run strategies for “small” agents (firms as well as countries) which are efficient in a world Knowledge Economy. In the last section, we will show how these new strategies of innovation and competitiveness lead to develop new kinds of leadership within the firms and the countries.

1. The world changes induce a systemic organization

The globalization of all the countries and their entry into a knowledge economy induce a contradictory movement of “competition” and “cooperation” among individuals, firms and countries. Facing these two quantitative and qualitative changes of the world economy, both of the previous regulation mechanisms (the “invisible hand” of private markets and the “visible hand” of the national institutions of State-
Nations) fail to adapt firms to the new competition (Table 1). Our objective is to follow the dynamic interdependences between markets and institutions in the economic growth of each country studied for a long time by the evolutionary theory: Veblen, 1925; Polanyi (1944), and Hirschman (1970) in incorporating the systemic approach of Morin (1974) and Koestler (1988) for thinking dynamic interactions between the markets and the institutions. The complexity approaches points out the key role of the “intermediary institution” which could be more powerful than the old “macro institutions” of the State-Nations. The intermediary institutions are created by individuals within the firms and the countries but they stabilize the behaviors of the same individuals (in producing “regularities from disorder”) and also create innovation (in producing “complexity from disorder”) (Atlan, 1979). Brown and Duguid (1991) and Cohendet & al (2000) show how flexible the intermediary institutions (as the “communities of practice”) must be today for helping the agents to adapt their strategies to the World Knowledge Economy. In a world “inclusive economy” (5), it is thus important to conceptualize the contradictory relationships between markets and institutions, supply and demand, internal and external environment. In a systemic analysis, the firms and the countries must be “open” enough for innovating new products and constraint enough by the “path dependency” for producing and selling in the world markets. The traditional debate in economics proposes two opposite approaches to manage this complex evolution. On the one side, the “market approach”, focalized on the methodological individualism, assumes one automatic go-back to the equilibrium situation. On the other side, the “institutional approach”, taking into account a holistic approach, emphasizes on the “co-evolution” of markets and institutions inside the “path dependency” of each firm or each country. To analyze more profoundly the consequences of the world change on the firms’ behaviors, the intermediary institution is nowadays more efficient than the micro level of private firms or the macro institutions which suffered of the decreasing power of State-Nations in international relationships. In the Knowledge economy, innovation becomes a “collective” process and the relationships among individuals become as important as each inventive component (Muldoon, 2013, Guilhon & Levet, 2003). The actual “World Cognitive Labor Division” (W.C.L.D.) is thus far away from the “World Industrial Labor Division” (W.I.L.D.), where transnational firms chose to implant different activities (research, raw material, producing, selling) in different countries. The place of the New Industrialized Countries (N.I.C.) on the world markets have, during the 90’s and the 2000’s, increased quantitatively (they now belong to G20 and G8) and qualitatively (they also enter into the Knowledge Economy). The most important “emerging countries” are now competing against advanced countries in goods and services with high technology. In order to invent new sustainable “competitive advantages” (Porter, 1990; Aghion & al, 2005), all the firms must choose their specialization strategies “on the whole value chain” of the goods they produce. To build “competitive advantages”, firms must take into account five main factors which are present in the evolutionary theory: the role of the monetary profit, the role of the struggle for power, the role of historical relationships, the role of the representation of each agent, and the role of institutions. When a firm wants to
build the long run innovation strategy, the co-building of intermediary networks is useful to interlink the interdependences that exist between supply, demand, cooperation, and competition. In these intermediary networks, ‘the whole is more than the sum of its parts” (Foray, 2000; Muldoon, 2013). The networks are both open and close (Brown & Duguid, 1991, Cohendet & al, 2000) and they involve freedom and constraints (Rutherford, 2009). The intermediary institutions, which are co-built by agencies, create some useful rules which facilitate the exchange inside and outside the firm. The exchanges within the network are founded on knowledge sharing and trust relations-hips which tend to exclude egoistic instincts, corruption or privileges.

2. New Thinking and Acting for agencies in the moving world

2.1 New Long Run innovative strategies for Small Firms in the Knowledge Economy

In this section, we study the role of networks for creating a long run competitive advantage for all the firms, including the small firms. With the globalization of the world economy, the optimal specialization strategy has fundamentally changed. Most of the firms specialize today in sectors which produce high value goods and the competition for producing such goods has sharply increased since 1990. However, the “non price specialization”, that Krugman and Helpman (1985) propose for firms in advanced countries, is no longer sufficient to explain their specialization choices. The exports of firms from the emerging countries represent a rising part of the actual world trade and they are fully competed the firms of the advanced countries. Since 2001, China’s firms have increased their patent deposits in the highly innovation intensive “industrial goods”, India’s firms have exported high technology “computer services” and Brazil’s firms have highly exported in biotechnological goods that are intensive in research & development (6).

For analyzing these actual innovative strategies of all the firms, we enlarge the “competitive advantage” concept of Mickael Porter (1990). We include in the innovation process the role of “market innovations”. In market innovation, firms recombine into new products some “radical innovations” which were invented previously. The Apple Inc. has thus succeeded in answering for example to the new “needs” of the consumers of the world. In the “competitive advantage diamond” of Porter (1985), we introduce the concept of “diversity” for analyzing the different strategies of firms when they combine supply and demand factors and competition, and cooperation relationships (Chart 1). With this concept of “diversity”, all the frims are involve and a small smart firm can participate with profit in “market innovations”. The aim of the “market innovations” is to take into account the “real needs” of consumers on each particular market. Within the networks, the firms thus build systemic interrelations between opposite factors to reach an output which will be more than the sum of its parts (Koestler, 1984). Most of the small firms develop their “competitive advantage” by inventing some “market innovations”. For example, as most of the Indian people still live with a very low income, the Indian firms practice more “frugal innovations” (Tata Nano, Ipad, Smartphone or 3D printer to build
houses…) more than “radical innovation” (aerospace or pharmaceutical products..) in order to build their “competitive advantages”. The small firms invent new “cooperation relationships” which are based on a “tacit knowing sharing” process. This kind of cooperation uses low-cost investments (for example just the purchase of a cell phone for communicating and selling products on their markets). At last, firms also invent new ways to practice “competition” in using, as we will study in the next section, different kinds of competitiveness for increasing their real market shares.

2.2 Using networks for increasing the short run competitiveness on the world markets

On the world market, the firms must nowadays manage three kinds of competitiveness: the “price competitiveness”, the “non price competitiveness” and the “information competitiveness” (7). This “information competitiveness” becomes more important because of the N.I.C.T. Revolution. In effect, a “false information” (8) can today destroy the reputation of a firm, even if their products are of good quality. In order to be “pro-active” on the world markets, all the firms thus practice “Competitive Intelligence” (9). The “Competitive Intelligence” methodologies want to increase the information competitiveness of firms in transforming “Information” into “Knowledge” and then in transforming “Knowledge” into “Useful Information”. This information cycle management is thus very different from the “price competitiveness” mechanisms (have low costs and low prices) and from the “non price competitiveness” approach (develop oligopolistic positions to avoid competition). For increasing their market shares on the world market, the firms use in the information competitiveness process three kinds of pro-active intermediary networks. In Chart 2, we present the case of small firms which can combine the power of three intermediary networks. On one side of the competitiveness triangle, the “Sharing Networks” are useful for firms to initiate short run “Learning by Sharing” Process between all the employee of the firms and all the firm’s partners. On the other side of the competitiveness triangle, the “Positive Lobbying Networks” could be used efficiency by firms to explain to their employees and their partners how the good they produce are “real better” (in quality, in environment, in labor conditions) compared to the same good of their competitors. Finally, on the summit of the triangle, the “Institutional Networks” are very useful to help small firms to protect their immaterial knowledge (by patents), to find crowd-founding institutions to finance their market innovations and to diffuse international norms and laws to small firms which don’t have a large law department to follow such strategic information. These intermediary institutional networks (regional patents organizations, non governmental organizations, regional councils…) really help small firms to patent industrial innovations. These intermediary organizations also inform small firms about the new change in international norms or laws. Even if the small firms are not powerful enough to change the international law, they can adapt their products to the new norm before the other competitors. As all the firms nowadays must “pro-act” on the world markets, these intermediary networks are particularly efficient to increase the power of the small firms.
3. The new long and short run strategies involve the new kind leadership of firms

The world changes have involved new long run and short run strategies both based on dynamic meso networks. The co-building of these networks involves both markets regulations and institutional regulations. The national institutions are thus not enough powerful today to regulate the New Economy because every good, capital or knowledge moves so quickly. The agencies must co-build meso institutions if they want to challenge competition and cooperation relationships. In a Knowledge Economy, the social institutions become, with the Division of Cognitive Labor Process (DCL), more and more “intermediary institutions”. These flexible institutions fully help the agents to adapt to new environments. The new institutional networks, as the communities of practice, the cooperatives or the “clusters”, are important to stabilize the behaviors of firms. They help firms to create some dynamic “Strengths Weaknesses Opportunity Threat” (S.W.O.T.) in transforming their threats into their opportunities.

3.1 The meso institutions are built on the concept of the “organized proximity” and the transformational leader

With the world economic changes, the organization of firms had moved from the “geographical proximity” organization (which authorizes regional and national cooperation) to the “thematic proximity” organization (based on the transnational firm logic) during the nineties and to the “organized proximity” organization (with the co-building of the organization rules) during the twenties. For building competitive advantages as well as for managing information competitiveness, all the firms must create their own “organized proximity”. The “organized proximity” was defined by Rallet and Torre in 2005 as “the capacity to encourage individuals to interact”. So the organized proximity, which is co-built in the intermediary network, “helps” the individuals to work together and, also, “constraints” them (Rutherford, 2010). To induce an efficient “organized proximity” within a meso network, the leadership within the firm must be rethinking. Different works in sociology and management (Avolio and Bass (1991), Drown & Duguid, 2000) explain how the recent world changes made the regulation transform from a “hierarchic leader” (with the “top down” logic) into a “transactional leader” who proposes rewards to individuals in order to increase their efficiency. Since 1990, the “transactional leader” had also changed into a “transformational leader” (Karaszewski & Lis, 2013). This “transformational leader” co-builds a common strategy where all the issues are discussed by all the partners of the network (Kotter (2007), Wisman, 2014). The psychologist, David McClelland (1996), had showed how the transformational leader must be able to think rational and reamed strategies and be able to practice too direct and indirect competition. In his analysis, the transformational leader takes into account the need of success of their employees, their wish to belong to specific communities and their need of power upon the others agencies. To managing his strategy, the transformational leader fix his own objectives, fix some challenge not to difficult for
him and privileges the short run challenge to the long run challenges. From his point of view, Daniel Goleman (1997) points out five main characteristics for being an efficient transformational leader: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skill.

3.2 Different kinds of transformational leadership in the world Knowledge Economy:

From an economic point of view, we identify two kinds of leader. The “economic leader” has to conduct the long run strategy and the “go-between leader” has to diffuse the short term “useful information” to the right actors and at the right moment. In this last section we would like to analyze which are the “minimal” factors to define the efficiency of the “economic leader”. From our empirical studies on different “cluster organizations” (10) in different countries (Baulant, 2007, Amisse et al, 2008), we find that the “economic leader” must have two main characteristics. First of all, the “economic leader” must be “visionary” and be able to see into the 30 years’ horizon. The second characteristic of the “economic leader” deals with the problem of stabilizing the cooperation relationships. Thus the “economic leader” must be sure that all the participants of his network would really “obtain an advantage” by cooperating from his own motivation. In such a configuration, the people who are involved in networks are looking to cooperate for co-building a new strategy and therefore would not want to practice a “free rider behavior”. So the “economic leader” doesn’t have to monitor all the actions of his partners, because he trusts them. As the individuals feel both linked with other individuals and have much autonomy within the network, they are very motivated to co-built the collective strategy.

The role of the “go-between leader” (the “gate keeper” of Crosier, 1977) is also very important to build successfully the “meso” networks. This leader constructs a kind of “alchemy” with the interactions of the employees where “the whole would become greater than the sum of its parts of the network”. To get different people to work together within the network, the go-between leader’s role is thus complementary to the economic leader’s role (11). The go-between leader knows how to make use of the network’s “weak ties” (Granovoter, 1973). When some of the partners of his network disagree to cooperate, the go-between leader must find compromises. In practice, the go between leaders must understand how people, with different aims and culture, can cooperate. He has to formulate some “intermediary goals” which are useful in order to reach the final goal presented by the economic leader. The economic leader thusly builds organized proximity in the network by using the capability of the individuals to build together “new norms”. The go-between leader also builds organized proximity in the network in using the capability of the individuals to share of the “same frame of mind” (Rallet and Torre, 2005). To keep the network active, the go-between is pro-active for helping people communicate and cooperate (the “nudge” analysis of Thaler & Sunstein, 2010). This function within the network is paramount, even if the go-between leader seems less considered, than the economic leader, by society (12).
Conclusion

The globalization and the knowledge economy lead to an uncertainly world. In such a world, the firms must use pro-active networks to sustain their innovation strategies and their competitiveness practices. To manage these long run and short run strategies, inside the firms, two kinds of leaders have been studied. The “economic leader” conducts the innovation strategy and the “go-between leader” manages the producing and selling strategy. The networks organization of firms induces the apparition of new regulation policies which are far from the “top down hierarchy”. Effectively, networks must be flexible enough to be both open to new innovations (by monitoring for example) and closed to internal objectives and cultural habits for inducing learning effects. Managing innovative and selling networks are hard tasks. As the networks have powerful leverage effects in building “virtuous circle” in economic growth, the firms have to concentrate their efforts on controlling the “key points” of their network in giving some degree of liberty to each individual within the network. Our analysis stresses the key role of differentiated meso networks for innovating and competing. This study reconciles the two opposite approaches in economics: the strategic vision of the competition and the participative vision of the innovation. In further works, we will explore to a greater extent these new ways of “thinking the complexity” and “acting efficiently” in taking into account, not only economic and quantitative efficiency, but also social and qualitative efficiency. The main objective would be to define a New Regime of Economic Growth and a New Way of Consuming, based on the concept, proposed in the Stiglitz Report (2008), of the “Gross Product Happiness” index which seems more adapted to the world knowledge economy than the “Gross Domestic Product” index.
Table 1: Consequences of the two main world changes on external competition and internal organization of the firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Goods liberty</td>
<td>-Capital Assets liberty</td>
<td>-Knowledge liberty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Int. Division of Labor</td>
<td>-Int. Industrial Division</td>
<td>-Cognitive Labor Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abundant</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of information</td>
<td>Sur information</td>
<td>Lack of useful information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Invisible hand (Market)/Welfare States</td>
<td>Inclusive Internal Markets</td>
<td>Systemic: Learning Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard Power States-Nations</td>
<td>Soft Power Beliefs and values</td>
<td>Smart Power “Organized” Proximity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization nature in private firms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Price Competition</td>
<td>Monopolistic Competition</td>
<td>“Coopetition”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchic Leader</td>
<td>Transactional Leader</td>
<td>Transformational Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top Down supply Learning by Doing</td>
<td>Down Up demand Learning by Using</td>
<td>Co-building Corporate social responsibility Learning by Sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Consequence of the two world changes on the long run specialization and the short run competitiveness of the firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free Trade Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>Capital Assets</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Processes</td>
<td>World Labor Division (W.L.D.),</td>
<td>World Industrial Labor Division (W.I.L.D.)</td>
<td>World Cognitive Labor Division (W.C.L.D.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Run specialization Strategies</td>
<td>Comparative Advantage Theory</td>
<td>Non Price Advantage Theory</td>
<td>Competitive Advantage Theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ricardo, H.O.S.</td>
<td>Krugman and Helpman</td>
<td>Aghion, Howit, Porter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Run Competitiveness strategies</td>
<td>Price Competitiveness</td>
<td>Non price competitiveness</td>
<td>Informational competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization in firms and network</td>
<td>Hierarchic leader</td>
<td>Transactional leader</td>
<td>Economic leader Go-between leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 1: How using interactive Networks to co-build long run innovative strategies for Small Firms

Interactive Cooperation Diversities:
- Tacit Networks (Communities of Practice)
- Local Networks (Regional cooperatives, “Clusters”)

Interactive Supply diversities:
- “Frugal Innovation”
- Tacit Knowledge

Interactive Demand Diversities:
- Useful goods
- “Mixed Goods” with several uses for consumers

Interactive Competition Diversities:
- Price Competitiveness
- Non Price Competitiveness
- Information Competitiveness

Chart 2: How using Interactive Networks to increase short run Competitiveness of Small Firms

Interactive Institutional Networks diversities:
- Protecting immaterial knowing
- Crowdfunding institutions
- Diffusing international norms or laws

Interactive Sharing Networks diversities:
- Learning by doing
- Learning by using
- Learning by sharing

Interactive Lobbying Networks diversities:
- Pro-action
- “Positive influence”
- Learning by confronting
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Notes

(1) In the “Division of Cognitive Labor process” (DLC) (see Muldoon, 2013) the relationship between the agents are as much important of the piece of knowledge that the agents know. So we can invent new process with the same knowledge with just changer the relationship between these pieces of knowledge. The knowledge and the innovation are a collective process, not an individual one.

(2) In the French School of regulation, the authors stressed on the unequal relationships between agencies and the reject of equilibrium markets. But they use a quantitative approach because there was a “mass production” and a “mass consumption” in the advanced countries. They showed that each period have regular pattern and specific institutions: Welfare State, Money, Labour Markets, International hegemony of advanced countries.

(3) The “Social Provisioning Process” analysed by A Eichner (1985) ; F. Lee (2013) and Tae-Hee Jo (2015) is a qualitative approach of economic development which takes into account the well-being of the agents, a global analysis of economic, political, and social processes, the taking into account the ethical values and the high variety of agents. This approach is well adapted to the analysis of the world knowledge economy based on the “Care”, “Share”, and “Dare” Processes.

(4) The “coopetition” was an old idea developed first by Japanese firms and popularized by Porter (1990) where agents are simultaneity in cooperation for innovating and in competition for selling.

(5) The “inclusive economy”, developed by the World Bank, is a concept which wants to link together in a qualitative approach of the sustainable development of the different countries: their economic growth, their social development and the management of the environment.

(6) Brazil exports “intelligent textile goods” which combine “cotton” with “spider’s genes” to make textile elastic and resistant.

(7) The “information competitiveness”, described by C. Baulant (2007), is a new form of competitiveness which involves the network working, the positive lobbying by Internet and the protection of the immaterial patrimony.

(8) The team of researchers conducted by the professor Ronald Hites (2004), published research in the review “Nature” which concludes that the Norwegian salmons were more cancerous than the salmons from North America. This information, largely diffused by the media, had induced a 40% decrease of the sales of the Norwegian salmons on the French Markets, even after that this information was corrected by some other scientific analyzes.

(9) Even if Business Intelligence is not new (Wilensky 1967, Ansoff, 1975), the Business Intelligence practices had sharply increased since 1990, with the end of the “cold war”.

(10) A “cluster” organization is a group of small companies, universities, capital risk agencies producing a similar products or services on a same territory. The main objective of the...
interrelations of these different kinds of actors is to increase innovation and efficiency on this territory. The most famous cluster is the Cluster of the Silicon Valley.

(11) In the knowledge economy, the leaders are “hill-climbers on an unknown landscape”. The “Maverick leaders” (the economic leader) “discover new land” and the “Follower leader” (go between leader) explore in detail this new land (Muldoon, 2013).

(12) On the concept of “bounded rationality” created by Herbert Simon, Dominique Foray (2000) shows how Michel Crozier played a “go-between leader” role to diffuse this concept in France.