

Cooperation for Knowledge
Demands
Know-how for Cooperation

Valedictory Address by

Louk de la Rive Box

Professor of international cooperation and
Rector of the
International Institute of Social Studies
(22 April 2010)

*'For students wishing to develop their talents in Europe,
we have created an international academic institution,
which includes an Institute of Social Studies,
providing courses in a variety of subjects
of special interest to international students'*

Juliana, Queen of the Netherlands, Washington (3 April 1952)¹

One world or none

Fifty eight years ago Juliana, Queen of the Netherlands spoke the above words at a special session of the US Congress. The speech became a notorious one, not because of the mention of ISS, but because of its supposed pacifist content. Rereading it with the eyes of today it is more visionary than plain pacifist. She concluded that she wished the world to be seen as one. If the US did not wish to stand alone in giving aid to others, it needed to count on the support of other free nations: support stemming from a general and profound sense of interdependence, brotherhood and co-existence of humanity as such. 'One world or none.'²

This was a provocation which the US Congress could not appreciate at a time of emerging virulent anti-communism. Neither could the Dutch officials who were responsible for all the Queen said. More astounding is that even half a century later some contemporary Dutch biographers still consider the speech to be off the mark.³ 'One world or none' may now sound like a cliché; it was of a daring astuteness in 1952.

Juliana was in contact with people who formed ISS: with Egbert de Vries, Jan Tinbergen or others who shared the ideals of another world being possible. These were generally liberal Protestants⁴ who formulated notions about a post-colonial world. De Vries⁵, who studied and worked in colonial Java, had been responsible for preparing the very first form of Dutch development cooperation in 1949. This was in the form of support for technical training through the newly formed United Nations. On 3 October 1949 the Netherlands Cabinet voted 1.5 million guilders for technical assistance to less-developed countries.⁶ De Vries was the pusher and builder: his working group wrote the first policy statement on development cooperation in 1950 and on 26 May he stimulated the very first academic conference on the topic⁷. A few years later he proposed that a fixed percentage of a rich country's wealth be set aside for development aid and the forerunner of the 0.7 per cent norm was born.⁸ Egbert de Vries was truly one of the founding fathers of Dutch development aid.

Knowledge for development

Why say all this? For one simple reason: Dutch development aid started with a clear conception – knowledge for the development of 'one world'. This was the view expressed by Egbert de Vries which led to the first form of multilateral aid in 1949: technical training. And it was the view that Juliana expressed in Washington in 1952 against all odds. The rest of this Valedictory argues that this origin needs to be

restored. Knowledge for development was and remains one of the most valid and efficient forms of international cooperation.

The question that I raise, however, is ‘Have we developed adequately the know-how for such cooperation?’ My answer will be: Yes, we did *then* – and No, we don’t *now*.

I agree with Peter van Lieshout and his WRR co-authors in their recent report that knowledge for development should be at the top of the international agenda. I also agree that we need to restore know-how for cooperation after the disastrous effects of years of neglect of professionalization in Dutch multilateral, bilateral and civilateral cooperation. The WRR authors lack, however, a good historical understanding of both the origins and the shaping factors of Dutch aid, which makes them vulnerable to misunderstanding societal embedding and the differences with other aid donors, like the British or the Americans to which Van Lieshout often refers.

In other work I have argued that the roots go deep into the nineteenth and even seventeenth centuries. I will not go so far, but let’s respect those who laid the foundations and try to build on those. I reject the facile optimism of the dreamers, then and now, just as I abhor the arrogant cynicism of those who ridicule international cooperation. Mine is a plea for a new focus on knowledge for development based on professionalization and know-how. I will do so by arguing that:

- we need to go even further back into intellectual history to understand where we stand now in the so-called aid-debate;
- international higher education was and remains an effective and efficient form of knowledge for development;
- know-how for cooperation is declining in the Netherlands;
- ISS is in a stronger position than ever to contribute to knowledge for development through its association with Erasmus University.

I will stress the very early and recent developments at ISS, but do so with due respect for the efforts that took place in between by all those who made the Institute what it is.

Standing on Polanyi’s shoulders

Allow me to take you back even further than 1952 or 1949, the founding of ISS and the establishment of Dutch international cooperation. Let’s go back to 1944 and the preparation of the post-war geo-political architecture and its institutions. 1944: the year of the conferences at Dumbarton Oaks creating the UN and in Bretton Woods proposing International Financial Institutions.

In that same year a book was published that has been hallowed and hated, quoted or forgotten. I referred to it in my ISS inaugural address⁹ because it has shaped my thinking about the relations between the economic, political and cultural spheres of society. Hungarian born Karl Polanyi, the author, wrote *The Great Transformation* during the war in England and the US. Robert McIver hailed it as ‘a book that makes most books in its field seem obsolete or outworn’. He notes that Polanyi brings out ‘the social implications of a particular system, the market economy’ and its ‘reduction of man to labour and of nature to land’.¹⁰ McIver links the book to the creation of new global institutions and argues:

Of primary importance today [1957, LB] is the lesson it carries for the makers of the coming international organization. For one thing it shows that such liberal formulas as ‘world peace through world trade’ will not suffice. [...] Neither a national nor an international system can depend on the automatic regulants. Balanced budgets and free enterprise and world commerce and international clearinghouses and currencies maintained at par will not guarantee an international order. Society alone can guarantee it; international society must also be discovered. Here too the institutional fabric must maintain and control the economic scheme of things.¹¹

It is, therefore, a book ‘for every man who cares to know the society in which he lives, the crisis it has passed through, and the crises that are now upon us’. Conclusion: ‘it is only as we discover the primacy of society, the inclusive coherent unity of human interdependence, can we can hope to transcend the perplexities and the contradictions of our times.’

This is social science at the core; a statement of faith about the origins of the ‘crises we are in’ because only if we can discover the ‘inclusive coherent unity of human interdependence’ that we can tackle the contradictions of our times. This was not just a message for the 1940’s or ‘50s – this is a message for a time of crises facing the global economic system. The crisis of the 1930s inspired Polanyi – the crisis of the present decade returns us to many of the questions asked then. For just as then, Polanyi could argue now that the ‘root cause of the crisis [...] was the threatening collapse of the international economic system’.¹² ‘[T]he idea of a self-adjusting market implied a stark utopia. Such an institution could not exist for any length of time without annihilating the human and natural substance of society; it would have physically destroyed man and transformed his surrounding into a wilderness.’¹³

I argue that the principles of Polanyi’s model still stand strong yet need to be reframed for current circumstances. Take his notion of what he called the ‘double movement’ in the nineteenth century which lies at the heart of his analysis: economic liberalism versus social protection:

The one was the principle of economic liberalism, aiming at the establishment of a self-regulating market, relying on the support of the trading classes, and using largely *laissez faire* and free trade as its methods; the other was the principle of social protection aiming at the conservation of man and nature as well as productive organization, relying on the varying support of those most immediately affected by the deleterious action of the market [...] and using protective legislation, restrictive associations, and other instruments of intervention as its methods.

If ever our generation witnessed the utopia of economic liberalism, it was during the ‘glorious years’ of neo-liberal conservatism in the US, but just as much in the UK and the Netherlands. Economic policies were built on foundations laid by Polanyi’s principal antagonist Ludwig von Mises who ‘concluded that the only viable economic policy for the human race was a policy of unrestricted *laissez-faire*, of free markets and the unhampered exercise of the right of private property, with government strictly limited to the defence of person and property within its territorial area’.¹⁴

After a period of sheer adoration by politicians and academics of neo-liberal or neo-conservative economic theorists, time has come to take their original critics seriously. We must stand on the shoulders of those critical intellectual giants, as my teacher Robert Merton¹⁵ called them. We are in need of a theory which balances the notion of economic growth with one of social protection, including the conservation of nature as Polanyi stressed. As McIver noted in 1957, we must again adapt these principles in the design of global institutions and the associated form of international cooperation given the current crises; witness the failures of the Doha Round of global trade negotiations, of global financial control mechanisms, or of the Copenhagen Conference on global climate.

With a declining legitimacy of existing formal global institutions like the UN, as authors like Fukuyama¹⁶ and Daalder and Lindsey¹⁷ argue, the crisis in global institutions is very serious. The total system of institutions designed in 1944 is in fact at stake. Academics like Fukuyama, or extremists like Osama bin Laden or Geert Wilders have one thing in common: they question the very notion of ‘international society’ or ‘international community’ as it is presently structured around the UN family of organizations and the very notion of international cooperation.¹⁸

What is needed therefore is a theoretical re-foundation of the notion of international society on the one hand (as Polanyi argued) and drawing the practical consequences for global academic cooperation on the other (as he also did and as did people like ISS founding fathers De Vries and Tinbergen). Academic cooperation for one world. One world, or none?

Cooperation for knowledge

So far I have argued that academic and technical cooperation formed the very cradle of Dutch international cooperation. It has proven to be a remarkably effective and efficient form of international cooperation, which has produced over the past half century a body of graduates probably exceeding 50,000 alumni. In effect it developed into a third pillar of higher education, alongside universities and professional colleges.¹⁹ These are found in all walks of life, ranging from activists to academics and from heads of state to businessmen.

The good name of this so-called ‘Dutch model’ in many a country in the South, starkly contrasts with the ignorance about it in its home country. Even though evaluation after evaluation showed that the training provided was good or excellent in terms of Dutch criteria for higher learning, both the universities and the Ministry of Education did not attach great importance to it. This is surprising, given the fact that institutions like IHE Delft, IHS Rotterdam, ITC Enschede, MSM Maastricht or ISS were early innovators and forerunners of the present English-language Masters and Doctoral Programmes which emerged after the Bologna Declaration.

ISS set up its MA Programme from the outset in 1952²⁰, long before the universities which created ISS were even dreaming of such outlandish diplomas. In addition, the programme was remarkably innovative in the sense that it would involve ‘*All Universities, all Faculties, all disciplines [...] and so is Government, if it wants to contribute to international understanding, cooperation and development*’.²¹ In other

words, De Vries saw ISS as an umbrella institute involving all universities; this has only been partially realized since such participation soon dwindled.

ISS was also destined from the beginning to be a real multidisciplinary institute involving all the social sciences.²² This also proved to be very hard. In a recent interview, former rector Chris van Nieuwenhuyze²³ pointed out the clashes between Tinbergen and De Vries on the matter. Tinbergen distrusted multi-disciplinarity and could only agree with straightforward economics; De Vries was an eclectic, who had worked in the multidisciplinary realities of agricultural research and teaching.²⁴ Already in 1948 he was described as one of the first contemporary scientists²⁵ for 'developing a responsibility towards nature and our fellow-men and by striving for an alternative economic structure [...] and to search for a balance between the interests of our generation and those of generations yet to be born'.²⁶ This certainly reminds one of the approach taken by Polanyi referred to before; in addition De Vries pleaded in favour of 'an interdisciplinary approach of processes of change in society' in line with the views of authors like Balandier and Hoselitz. De Vries would conclude in 1965 that 'it seems certain that this concept determined the life and growth of the Institute for the years to come'.²⁷

Was he right? To a large extent yes, since ISS has remained true to its multidisciplinary approach; yet there are limits. Some economists at ISS still follow Tinbergen's dictum that economics is for economists and they have their own staff group in the Institute – even though the vast majority of our economists are working in multidisciplinary teams. Certain social sciences have not played an important role in ISS, like social psychology; certain fields of study have not found a place, like business management. Certain adjacent disciplines like social history or the comparative study of cultures or religions have found it hard to flourish at ISS. De Vries' insistence on the role of government is indicative of his strong belief that ISS should give courses particularly to government officials in the newly independent countries. De Vries: 'The field was public administration, in line with the conviction that *execution* of development programs was at least as important as their design or the scientific research turning up development possibilities.'²⁸

With the final demise of the unique 'Dutch model of international education' in 2010 by a simple decision of the then Minister of Education a few years earlier, a few questions may be asked:

Was the decision by the then minister of education in 2000 'evidence based' and if so: what was the evidence?

What has been the contribution to the Dutch system of higher learning, given the half century of experience with Master, Diploma and to a limited extent Doctoral Programmes?

Why, in the end, has the attitude of the Dutch institutions of higher learning been so persistently negative towards the institutions they themselves created in the early 1950s?

Evidence based?

Little data is available on which the decision to terminate the Dutch model and force the International Higher Education Institutes to merge with universities is based. The overriding impression is that the argument was basically administrative or

bureaucratic: the Institutes had a special status, special funding, special diplomas and in one case (ISS) special legislation.²⁹ They were too small to be considered as independent entities of higher learning. In addition, they had created academic jealousies because they had been able to survive due to political support in the Legislature or in Cabinet.³⁰ In general, donor support for tertiary education ‘has largely been overlooked by the international community as an important component of a country’s development strategy’.³¹

In other words, the decision was based on arguments of secondary relevance, hardly dealing with their core tasks of teaching, research and capacity development.³² On the contrary, an evaluation in the early 1990s indicated that the model provided an interesting alternative for students from the global South, providing quality training with a practical bent.³³ When evaluated, the capacity development projects were found to be relevant and successful.³⁴

Conclusion: for all we know, the decision was not evidence based.

Contribution to Dutch higher learning?

No systematic review is available, to the best of my knowledge. So all that remains are impressions or anecdotal evidence. Two programmes were integrated into universities before the present round which finished with the independent institutes: the Wageningen Masters programme in Soil and Water and the Rotterdam programme in Housing Studies. Wageningen University was the first in the Netherlands to drastically aim for internationalization in the mid 1980s, i.e. well before Bologna.³⁵ It adopted an international Master and Doctoral Programme, set standards for each, chose English as the dominant language of instruction and went all-out to find funding. It learned the lessons of decades of capacity development and integrated it into its concept of internationalization.

Having been co-responsible for the process, my impression is that Wageningen learned a great deal from the International Education programme; my fellow coordinator (Boet Slager) was at the time the leader of the International Education Programme and his experience was well utilized. Teaching and research were linked to capacity development programmes, confirming the linkages with universities in the South.

The Rotterdam experience is somewhat different because the MA in Housing Studies was not taken as the starting point for internationalization. On the other hand, IHS allowed Erasmus University to expand its activities in the Global South in this specific field and it ultimately brought ISS to the University. I will come back to this later.

On the whole, however, the contribution to the world of Dutch higher learning has been minimal. In a way, it might even be argued that Dutch universities were not forced to internationalize earlier due to the very fact that International Education institutes existed. In other words, Jan Romijn’s Law of the Dialectics of Progress (*Wet van de remmende voorsprong – the handicap of progress*) may well have been operative: Dutch universities did not have to open up to non-Dutch speakers, because there was an alternative English language MA and PhD programme.

Conclusion: the contribution has been very effective in one case (Wageningen) and negligible on the whole.

Why so negative?

Why then, has the Dutch model been so consistently disregarded by the very universities that created institutes like ISS? For all I know, the question has not been dealt with in serious academic literature. For someone who has worked in five Dutch universities and the last five years in ISS, it is evident in many respects. Let me give some examples:

- Dutch students could not register easily for courses at International Education institutes; transfer credits were not recognized; thesis supervision could not be shared;
- Dutch researchers with NWO (the Dutch national science foundation) funding were not allowed to re-apply for funding; their colleagues at International Education institutes were formally barred from competing;
- The introduction of the Bologna degree structure created formidable problems for the International Education institutes which had been providing internationally respected degrees (MA, MSc, PhD) for half a century. Some of the problems were created by the Dutch universities who wished to safeguard special degree programmes.

It would be too much to go deeply into the matter, so let me make just a few brief propositions:

- Part of the problem lies with the International Education (IE) institutes themselves; they have not invested in Dutch public relations, even though they did in relations with the political establishment from the very start;³⁶
- *Unknown, Unloved:* with fewer and fewer Dutch University-based professors among their staff, the Universities did not know what was happening with IE and mistrusted the quality of the training provided;
- *Funding:* the association of Dutch universities is a rather exclusive company, which may have looked critically at the funding of the institutes and especially the funding for fellowships. These were given for a long time to the IE institutes, thus creating a negative attitude among university administrators.

In conclusion, the negative relation between the universities and the International Education institutes led to distancing between them. This in turn led to fewer opportunities to learn from each other, essential at a time of global competition³⁷ for top students and staff.³⁸

All in all, De Vries' ideas about cooperation for knowledge were well ahead of the times. The very creation of ISS was unique and the same goes for Schermerhorn's³⁹ creation of ITC. Wageningen University proved in the mid '80s that valuable lessons could be drawn from the experiences with international education, provided it be taken seriously and linked to quality capacity development. The sudden termination of independent International Education institutes put this transfer of cooperative skills for capacity development in serious danger. Yet these institutes were the first to respond to the claim that the world is one and act upon it. One world – or none?

Know-how for cooperation

So much for the past. Where do we stand in 2010? Have we developed adequately the know-how for such cooperation? I repeat what I said before: Yes, we did then – and No, we don't now. Van Lieshout and his colleagues have made an incisive analysis in their book⁴⁰ and argue that the Netherlands may well have a high *commitment to development*, witness the top position it has had for years in the Center for Global Development's index⁴¹. Yet 'its commitment to knowledge is low and its institutional memory quite limited'. Van Lieshout continues: 'Once upon a time the Netherlands had a leading position in the area of developmental expertise. With India the INPAD-programme existed and investments were made in authoritative organizations like the Institute of Social Studies (ISS) and the Africa Study Centre (ASC).'⁴²

But the times changed with the appearance of the no-nonsense approach of the 1990's, especially under minister for development cooperation Herfkens (1998-2002). She considered multilateral expertise like the World Bank's to be more than adequate and Dutch expertise could be dispensed with. The great decline in professional know-how started, with the gradual demise of a professional network around the ministry of Foreign Affairs and Development Cooperation. What had been built by her predecessor Pronk, was undone in a matter of months. Van Lieshout quotes former Deputy Director General Rob de Vos stating: 'There was a feeling that Dutch universities were only interested in money, which was actually intended for the South. The policy theme departments paid hardly any attention to knowledge development, and the department concerned with research was completely isolated.'⁴³ Professionalization undone.

The drama of de-professionalization was made even worse by the Universities in the Netherlands. Most reduced their International Cooperation offices, or closed them altogether. By the beginning of the century only a few remained, including the ones at the Free University, Maastricht University and Wageningen University. External funding requirements primed and Van Lieshout concludes: 'the universities let their efforts in this area procrastinate.'⁴⁴

Add to this the decline in private sector involvement, especially through the consulting sector, and the trend among civil society organizations to hire local consultants in the South and the image becomes clear. The paradoxical phenomenon occurred that registrations for university courses in development and globalization issues remained high, even though employment chances in the Netherlands were rapidly declining. Whereas research and employment opportunities declined, student demand and public interest remained stable. The constituency at the base of society and in universities stayed firm – the political constituency in The Hague gave way and de-professionalization was the consequence. Even though minister Koenders has tried to reverse the trend, Van Lieshout concludes that the effect is likely to be small due to resource constraints.⁴⁵

In the early 1990s the Netherlands stood among the top three donors as far as funding for development research was concerned.⁴⁶ Twenty years hence the budget has dwindled to a meagre €40m. Van Lieshout cogently argues that it could easily be increased by a factor of 7.5 to €300m if it were to respond to international norms⁴⁷ for research and development. Again, a paradox: how could a country with an old

research for development tradition (remember that De Vries organized one of the very first academic conferences on the topic) allow itself to loose its professional research capacity?

This is a bleak picture, but there is good news as well.

If ever the Dutch scientific establishment has pronounced itself in favour of demand-led research for development it is now. The Netherlands science foundation now praises its development oriented branch WOTRO for its work, which is set as an example to other branches. WOTRO's board has innovated radically and novel forms of partnerships are sponsored.⁴⁸ It has stimulated the Development Policy Research Network⁴⁹, which links practitioners from the public, private and civil society sectors. It funds the internationally oriented The Broker⁵⁰, which provides an interface between development researchers and practitioners all over the globe. It learns from SANPAD⁵¹, a remarkable successor to the India-Netherlands research partnership, which links African and Dutch researchers.

The Netherlands Royal Academy of Science maintained the status of Ceres, the research school intended for all sustainable development oriented researchers in the Netherlands and Flanders. It suffers under the consequences of the mentioned university policies but still stands strong.

A third development is the sudden interest among civil society and co-financing agencies for research. In the 1990s this interest was minimal. Just a few organizations, such as Save the Children, have a serious research branch. Critics showed that serious research was needed as a base to both incidental campaigns and structural partnership programmes.⁵² Over the past few years, major agencies like Cordaid, ICCO, Oxfam Novib and Plan have made major investments in research programmes, university chairs and are setting up research and development departments. I will return to this important development later.

Conclusion: Whereas the ministry has contributed to de-professionalization of the sector, NWO contributes to revamping expertise in the Netherlands and elsewhere. Whereas many universities procrastinated, the Royal Academy contributes to the Research School Ceres. Whereas private and public sponsors have withdrawn from supporting development oriented research in the Netherlands, major co-financing agencies have taken over and support ground-breaking partnerships among researchers and policymakers at the global level. The assignment is to see the world as one. 'One world, or none.' The present may have seemed bleak – but the future is bright.

Interlude

If I look at the general debate on development aid that the WRR authors have so eloquently analysed in their Report, and look at it through the theoretical lens Polanyi provided, I conclude that development aid has not generated the 'Great Transformation' from poverty that proponents increasingly called for. Neither has it prevented economic development as current critics, like Moyo, claim. Rather, we need to see it as a historically unique phenomenon in international relations that first needs to be understood (as indeed the WRR authors attempt), before it is idealized (by

people like Sachs) or rejected (as in many of the interventions by Dutch politician Boekestein). Egbert de Vries, in his cited 1965 report, wrote about the state of expertise and warned against such exaggerated claims:

But this does not (yet) lead to a general theory of development.[...] Analyzing strategies and policies for development and change [...] one must concede that the variety of circumstances so far is too great to allow for scientific extrapolations or even predictions.⁵³

International relations can be studied from at least two opposite angles. On the one hand, the competitive approach associated with national interest, exemplified in the work of the so-called realist school in the study of international affairs. On the other hand there is the cooperative approach towards a common interest, exemplified in the work of scholars who stress international order and development. These are two sides to the same coin of international order and change. All too often, international cooperation is studied and practiced as if it existed in a geo-political vacuum. This leads to exaggerations by people like Moyo, Sachs or Boekestein. In fact most cooperative activities form part of geo-political realities, and thus most cooperation programmes have multiple aims.

Development aid (as one form of international cooperation) is therefore inherently part of competitive international relations, yet aims at generating forms of equity and control that take the interests of the weak as a starting point. As is clear from the foregoing, my interest has all along been in forms of academic cooperation, or cooperation for knowledge. I see such activities in the long-term perspective that Polanyi outlined. With the dramatic demise of neo-conservative economic policies inspired by Polanyi's main adversary Von Mises, I see new opportunities for global cooperation. Such cooperation needs to be defined in terms of Global Public Goods and in line with the precepts set out by Polanyi. Policies and programmes therefore need to be embedded in the societies and cultures that will nurture them. Returning to the very question rhetorically asked in this address: One world, or what?

ISS – partner to a Global Issues knowledge network

And where does ISS stand in all this?

My conclusion will be that ISS stands stronger than ever through a set of partnerships which make it a strong knowledge-centre on global issues. Van Lieshout *cs.* laments the weak position the Netherlands finds itself in with regard to global issues research and capacity development.⁵⁴ The WRR authors easily bypass the universities and research institutions like ISS in their report, only paying attention to actors like entrepreneurs⁵⁵ (relevant but with limited expertise in global issue management), citizens (as consumers or migrants)⁵⁶ and NGOs (of which they are rather critical)⁵⁷, but forget the significant role that universities have played and could play again. They therefore recommend the creation of a Global Issues Centre to gather, analyse and promote knowledge about Global Public Goods. The authors wish to replace the 'nineteenth century' notion of 'international cooperation' with policies for 'global cooperation'⁵⁸ and see this centre as an essential prerequisite.

ISS has good news for them: it is part of a network that already functions in this way, involving many of the organizations mentioned before. Let's see where we stand at ISS in terms of research and capacity development for such Global Cooperation.

We do not need a new Global Issues Centre, but need to strengthen what exists. The weaknesses, I argue, are not primarily due to an inherent weakness in Dutch research, training or capacity development activities. They are mainly the result of wrong priorities set by the Dutch government, which saw development researchers as rich beggars and, to a certain extent, by university administrators who saw greener pastures in countries like China.

ISS adopted a strategy in 2005 that would guide its development towards a European top institution for the study of global equity and development issues. Some of the changes experienced were foreseen in the strategy – others were not. Let me start with the latter. We did not foresee the sheer implosion of the financial system in the US and Europe, even though most of our students and staff had serious misgivings about the utopia that Von Mises' followers in Washington were preaching.

We did not foresee Web 2.0 and its consequences, especially in the realm of social networks. We adapted rapidly so all participants and staff can access all information services through WiFi in their rooms or from home. Our library staff foresaw the end of bound periodicals in the Library – leading to fierce debate with senior researchers. Our library is visited quite well, even without the bound volumes.

We did not foresee Utrecht University's request for a friendly divorce, leading to a rapid search for a new host. In the end, Utrecht couldn't have done us a greater favour, for it led to a remarkably productive partnership with Erasmus University. Before long we will have a joint Tinbergen Chair for the study of global economic change and equity. Our researchers have jointly acquired substantial funding in global health issues, corporate social responsibility and are working on proposals on human rights, migration and value chains. Capacity development is now on Erasmus University's agenda, through both its Institute for Housing Studies and ISS.

Some of the changes that we did foresee are as follows:

- *Become research led:* ISS research is rated highly as part of the re-accreditation of the Ceres Research School. In 2009 and 2010 our researchers obtained funding for research partnerships from such varied sources as NWO, Ministry of Economic Affairs, European Commission and the World Bank. Research productivity is acknowledged by providing significantly more research time for researchers with a high output according to Ceres standards. Our doctoral programme has been restructured to provide more quality guarantees to participants.
A remarkable programme on *Civic Driven Change* exists, under a global partnership, co-sponsored by the main Dutch co-financing agencies. In addition, HIVOS and ISS both invest in research for development through a long-term partnership which prepares NGOs for their research function.
- *Be teaching based:* quality teaching remains the main task, with acknowledgement of exceptional teaching performance as evaluated by students. Promotions (all the way up to professorships) are now teaching-performance based. The application-admission ratio is now well over 10 to 1. Student intake has increased, albeit not as much as we had hoped due to fellowship restrictions. Partnerships with institutions in Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Surinam, Tanzania, Uganda, Vietnam and through Erasmus Mundus are operative.

- *Strengthen Capacity development*: ISS supports a number of long term projects in Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Mozambique and Vietnam. New partnerships for a type of Star Alliance are in the making with Brazil, China, India, Japan, Korea, South Africa and with the UN University of Peace in Costa Rica.
- *Stimulate public debate*: regular series were organized with Oxfam Novib and SID on critical views regarding the present crises and on global population issues. ISS has joined the *Winternachten* cultural festival year after year. Incidental debates brought scores of people to discuss the already-mentioned WRR report. ISS' contribution to public debate is now firmly entrenched.
- *Revamp personnel policy*: we increased staff mobility, checked regularly on staff satisfaction through surveys, clarified procedures.
- *Reduce organizational complexity*: we halved the number of committee-memberships, thus freeing time for core tasks.

We are an Institute of 400 people strong: 200 master students, 50 doctoral researchers and 150 staff. We have a 58 year history in effective and efficient international cooperation for knowledge – in my view the first and the very best form of international cooperation. We represent 50-odd nationalities and we count on a network of about 11,000 alumni, some 2000 of which are actively involved and contribute to the world's Know-How for Cooperation. We are a very proud member of the Erasmus family of faculties and partner with 40 institutions all over the globe which deal with global issues. We stand on the shoulders of giants like Karl Polanyi, Egbert de Vries and Jan Tinbergen and build on their work.

We work for one world, because we know there is no other one.
It has been a wonderful honour for me to serve this Institute.

Endnotes

¹ Translated back from the Dutch as published in Margreet Fogteloo, *I have a dream': belangrijke en bijzondere redevoeringen uit de wereldgeschiedenis* samenst. en red. Margreet Fogteloo 3e herz. dr Utrecht: Bruna, 2003: p 357

² M.G.Schenk, *Juliana Vorstin naast de rode loper* Amsterdam (De Boekerij) 1980: 191-192

³ C.Fasseur *Juliana en Bernhard: het verhaal van een huwelijk 1936-1956* Balans, 2008

⁴ For De Vries' Protestant background and relevance for his development views see the review of his *Man in rapid social change* in the *Annals of the American Academy* (1962) see http://ann.sagepub.com/cgi/pdf_extract/342/1/200

⁵ For De Vries' colonial background see P van der Eng, 'An Observer of 65 Years of Socio-Economic Change in Indonesia: Egbert De Vries' *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 1991 (27) :39 – 55

⁶ J J P de Jong, 'Onder ethisch insigne: De origine van de Nederlandse Ontwikkelingssamenwerking' in J A Nekkens & P A M Content *De geschiedenis van vijftig jaar Nederlandse ontwikkelingssamenwerking 1949-1999* Den Haag (SDU) : 67

⁷ *Idem*: 69

⁸ See M A Clemens & T J Moss 'Ghost of 0.7%: Origins and Relevance of the International Aid Target' *Working Paper 68* Washington (Cntr Global Dev't) 2006: 4. For a current review of the debate see P Hoebink '0,7% aan ontwikkelingshulp: een norm die niet heilig is, wel een afspraak' Nijmegen (Radboud Universiteit – CIDIN) 2010.

- ⁹ L Box ‘The Great Transformation in Higher Education Into something rich and strange?’ Inaugural Address, The Hague (ISS) 2005
- ¹⁰ K Polanyi, *The Great Transformation* New York (Rinehart) 1944 ; [the paperback edition of 1957 edition was used]: ix
- ¹¹ *Idem*: xi
- ¹² *Idem*: 23
- ¹³ *Idem*: 3
- ¹⁴ See <http://mises.org/about/3248>
- ¹⁵ See http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Robert_K._Merton
- ¹⁶ F Fukuyama *America at the crossroads. Democracy, power, and the neoconservative legacy*. New Haven, Conn. (Yale University Press) 2006
- ¹⁷ I Daalder & J Lindsay ‘Democracies, of the world unite’ *Public Policy Research* 14 (1): 47 – 58
- ¹⁸ For an analysis of the notion of international society see L Box , ‘Wither ‘International Community’? Grotius, Fukuyama and The Hague’ in D.Vriesendorp et al. *The Hague legal capital?, Liber in honorem W.J.Deetman* The Hague (Hague Academic Press) 2008.
- ¹⁹ See the 2007 letter of State Secretary for Education B Bruins <http://www.sail-international-education.nl/documents/government%20declaration%20status%20SAIL%20master%20programs.pdf>
- ²⁰ For the early history of ISS see E de Vries ‘Developing a development institute’ *Ann. Meeting of Directors of Development Research and Training Institutes* Naples, 1965: 1
- ²¹ *Ibid.* Underlining in original
- ²² See also on human development J B Opschoor ‘Knowledge sharing in support of human development’ in M Spoor et al. *Globalisation, Poverty and Conflict: A Critical ‘Development’ Reader* Springer 2005: Ch.16
- ²³ Personal Interview with C A O van Nieuwenhuyze, The Hague, 25 3 2010
- ²⁴ De Vries had done broad agro-socio-economic research including a village study in Java for his doctoral dissertation in Wageningen – see E de Vries *Landbouw en welvaart in het Regentschap Pasoeroean : bijdrage tot de kennis van de sociale economie van Java* Wageningen (Diss. Veenman) 1931
- ²⁵ See the reference in J A Du Pisani ‘Sustainable development - historical roots of the concept’ *Jrnl of Integrative Env’l Sc’s*, 2006 (3)2 :83-96 [see also <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a755279221&fulltext=713240928>]
- ²⁶ In L de Haan & P Ton, *Dutch research on environment and development in sub-Saharan Africa*, Leiden (Neth. African Stds Ass’n) 1994: 9.
- ²⁷ *Id.*:2 Underlining in original
- ²⁸ *Ibid.* Underlining in original
- ²⁹ See letter of the Ministry of Education <http://www.sail-international-education.nl/news.htm#integration>
- ³⁰ See the relevant Netherlands Government statements in *HOOP2000 en Kabinetsstandpunt IBO-IO (dd 31 mei 1999)*
- ³¹ See D Kapur & M Crowley ‘Beyond the ABC’s: Higher Education and Developing Countries’ Washington (Cntr Glob. Dev’t Working Paper 139) 2008: 81 [see <http://www.cgdev.org/content/publications/detail/15310.lewis>]
- ³² On the relation between the core tasks in a time of rapid globalisation see J B Opschoor ‘Tertiary capacity development and societal development’ The Hague (NUFFIC Seminar) 2006: esp. p. 9 [see http://www.nuffic.nl/pdf/os/Cross_border_2006/JBO_draft.pdf]
- ³³ Evaluation done for DGIS in 1991-’92; see also the results of the 2006 re-accreditation exercise under <http://www.sail-international-education.nl/news.htm#finalreportqanu>
- ³⁴ See Nuffic evaluation of the so-called SAIL programme <http://www.sail-international-education.nl/news.htm#22032005>
- ³⁵ K G Eveleens & R Rabbinge ‘Current trends in post-graduate education at the Wageningen Agricultural University: innovation, organization and internationalization’. *Eur. J. Agric. Educ. Extens.* 1 (1994) 91-102.
- ³⁶ When discussed with former rector C van Nieuwenhuyze he said ‘Indeed, may be I should have spent more time on contacts with Dutch colleagues; I just had a full job keeping the place together...’ See interview referred to above.
- ³⁷ For an empirical review see V Naidoo, *Transnational Higher Education: A Stock Take of Current Activity Jrnl Studies in Int’l Education*, 2009 (13) 3: 310-330; on academic competition and

cooperation in W Europe see A. Luijten-Lub et al. 'On Cooperation and Competition: A Comparative Analysis of National Policies for Internationalisation of Higher Education in Seven Western European Countries' *Jrnl Studies Int'l Education*, 2005 (9) 2: 147-163

³⁸ L Cremonini, Leon & D Antonowicz 'In the Eye of the Beholder? Conceptualizing Academic Attraction in the Global Higher Education Market' *European Education*, 2009 (41) 2: 52-74

³⁹ On ITC and Schermerhorn see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ITC_Enschede

⁴⁰ WRR *op.cit.*: 207-210

⁴¹ See Center for Global Development, *Commitment to Development Index 2009* Washington [see <http://www.cgdev.org/section/initiatives/active/cdi/>]

⁴² WRR *Op.cit.*: 207 [translation LB]

⁴³ *Ibid.*; see for the original M Heres & F Bieckmann 'Oiling the wheels of change' *The Broker* 2007 (3) [<http://www.thebrokeronline.eu/index.php/en/layout/set/print/articles/Oiling-the-wheels-of-change>]

⁴⁴ *Op. cit.*: 207 [translation LB]

⁴⁵ *Id.*: 208

⁴⁶ L Boer & L Box The tenuous interface: Policymakers, researchers and user-publics the case of the Netherlands' development cooperation *Knowledge, Technology & Policy* 1993(6): 3-4

⁴⁷ The WRR uses a private sector standard of minimally 6% outlays for R&D in knowledge intensive sectors like international cooperation.

⁴⁸ See WOTRO *Strategy 2007-2010* The Hague 2006: esp. p 15 [see

[http://www.nwo.nl/files.nsf/pages/NWOA_6SVE2W/\\$file/Wotro-Strategy%20Plan%20DEF%20met%20opmaak.pdf](http://www.nwo.nl/files.nsf/pages/NWOA_6SVE2W/$file/Wotro-Strategy%20Plan%20DEF%20met%20opmaak.pdf)]. The strategy for after 2010 is being discussed at the time of writing, and offers again promising perspectives for development oriented research and its valorisation.

⁴⁹ See <http://www.dprn.nl/background>

⁵⁰ See <http://www.thebrokeronline.eu/en/About-the-Broker>

⁵¹ See for the origins of SANPAD Hoebink et al (2003)

<http://www.sanpad.org.za/portal/docs/publications/sanpad%20-%20paper%20ieasa%20conference.pdf>; for recent results see http://www.sanpad.org.za/phase3/index.php?option=com_phocadownload&view=category&id=6:phase-2-outputs&Itemid=57

⁵² L Box & I Norlund, 'Linking up: Partnership in development research between donor agencies and ngo's: the case of the Nordics and The Netherlands' in: I Norlund (Ed), *Development Research and Development Aid* Copenhagen (Nordic Proceedings in Asian Studies – FAU/NIAS 4) 1992: 7-18 [see [http://books.google.nl/books?hl=nl&lr=&id=sZM-znIp6voC&oi=fnd&pg=PA7&dq="+irene+norlund"+louw+box"+ngo&ots=ok3NiEohtD&sig=pLhUu0Y_3v22KNBt1Sr3emKdjPQ#v=onepage&q=&f=false](http://books.google.nl/books?hl=nl&lr=&id=sZM-znIp6voC&oi=fnd&pg=PA7&dq=)]

⁵³ De Vries (1965): 6

⁵⁴ *Op.cit.*: 236

⁵⁵ *Op.cit.*: 249-257

⁵⁶ *Op.cit.*: 257-263

⁵⁷ *Op.cit.*: 264-274

⁵⁸ *Op.cit.*: 245