

Let Rob van Dorland admit his breach of scientific integrity

Email exchange September 2009 – November 2015 by Thomas Colignatus (CPB 1982-1991, participant in CPB-studies 1990-2015) and Rob van Dorland (KNMI) on Climate Change and Economics

Thomas Colignatus
November 30 2015
<http://thomascool.eu>

Abstract

Professor Klaas van Egmond (Utrecht University) is no economist and gives confusing and misleading statements on economics to Dutch Parliament, the media, students at "Sustainable Finance Lab" (SFL at UU), readers of his 2013 book on "civilisation", and social action groups e.g. those that advocate changes w.r.t. money and banking. I filed a scientific protest against Van Egmond's texts and malconduct w.r.t. economics. This protest was denounced without argument as "spam" by another non-economist, Rob van Dorland (KNMI, senior advisor on climate change). The idea of spam is to delete it immediately without reading. Van Dorland thus advises to suppress criticism and erase it from the archive. He doesn't seem to be aware that this is another breach of scientific integrity. If he conforms with Van Egmond's statements on economics, then he is in similar malconduct as a non-economist. If he distances himself from Van Egmond then my warning to the same shouldn't be spam. Van Dorland should give a reasoned argument, as he already agreed to in 2009 but didn't do yet. These breaches of scientific integrity and blockages to multidisciplinary research on climate change and economics can be related to the CPB scenario study (1992) *Scanning the Future 1990-2015*. Some 25 years have been lost to effective policy making.

1. Introduction	2
2. What had happened in 2009 w.r.t. Copenhagen 2009	3
3. November 2015: an email on money and another one on Paris 2015	3
4. Van Dorland's scientific malconduct	4
5. Van Egmond slanders that I would have a campaign of slander	7
6. Sustainable Finance Lab (SFL at UU)	8
7. Mark Sanders at both SFL and the scientific bureau of D66	9
7.1. At the scientific bureau of D66	9
7.2. At Sustainable Finance Lab (SFL)	10
8. The order of responses, like "take me from the list", November 2015	10
8.1. Bilaterally proper	11
8.2. Non-bilaterally and such that it becomes malconduct too	11
9. Conclusions	12
References	13
Date: Wed, 02 Sep 2009 13:39:55 TC to RvD (** 1 **)	14
Date: Wed, 02 Sep 2009 17:18:29 TC to WWV & IPCC cc RvD (** 2 **)	14
Date: Sat, 09 Jan 2010 12:24:41 TC to RvD (** 3 **)	16
Date: Mon, 07 May 2012 09:34:43 TC to IDEE	18
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 2015 20:03:17 TC to PKM and RvD cc others & 2009 (** 4 **)	19
Date: Thu, 19 Nov 2015 11:31:50 TC to KvE and TK Com. on Finance cc others (* C *)	20
Date: Wed, 18 Nov 2015 21:01:19 KvE to TC cc SFL (* B *)	26
Sent: 18 November 2015 13:36 TC to TK Com. on Finance cc others (* A *)	27
Date: Wed, 02 Sep 2009 17:18:29 TC to WWV & IPCC cc RvD (** 2 **)	28
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 2015 19:19:05 MS to TC cc all	30
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 2015 19:28:49 PKM to TC only	30
Date: Tue, 24 Nov 2015 06:27:39 PL to TC cc all	31
Date: Tue, 24 Nov 2015 11:03:00 JR to TC cc all	31
Date: Tue, 24 Nov 2015 13:22:57 KvE to TC cc all (* D *)	31
Date: Thu, 26 Nov 2015 14:57:29 RvD to TC cc all (** 5 **)	32

PM 1. Emails between TC and RvD are (** # **) and TC and KvE are (* a *): there are no more. Email addresses have been adapted for netbots. All are scientists, journalists or other participants in the public domain. Weblinks of 2009 are now to <http://thomascool.eu>.

PM 2. Abbreviations in the email headings:

TC	Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus (science name), http://thomascool.eu
TK	Tweede Kamer = House of Parliament ¹
JR	Jan Rotmans, http://www.rsm.nl/people/jan-rotmans
KvE	Klaas van Egmond, no website at UU ? ²
MS	Mark Sanders, http://www.uu.nl/staff/MWJLSanders/0
PKM	Pieter Kuipers Munneke, http://www.staff.science.uu.nl/~kuipe117
PL	Paul Luttikhuis, https://www.linkedin.com/in/paul-luttikhuis-33176932
RvD	Rob van Dorland, http://www.knmi.nl/over-het-knmi/onze-mensen
SFL	Sustainable Finance Lab, http://sustainablefinancelab.nl
all	PKM & RvD & others of 2015 & others of 2009

PM 3. For the definition of "scientific integrity" see:

<https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/26/allea-defines-research-integrity-too-narrow>

PM 4. Key information about the context:

- The CPB long run study 1990-2015: <http://www.cpb.nl/en/publication/scanning-future-long-term-scenario-study-world-economy-1990-2015>
- My draft book (2009, 2015), "The Tinbergen & Hueting Approach in the Economics of Ecological Survival", <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/63904>
- My paper (2013), "Money as gold versus money as water", RWER 64, <https://rwer.wordpress.com/2013/07/02/issue-no-64-of-real-world-economics-review>
- M. Vonk, A. Bouwman, R. van Dorland, H. Eerens (2015), "Worldwide climate effects - Risks and opportunities for the Netherlands", <http://www.pbl.nl/en/publications/worldwide-climate-effects-risks-and-opportunities-for-the-netherlands>
- This discussion might seem nitty-gritty (and awkward w.r.t. Syria etc.) but see the cause of the 2007+ economic crisis and my 1990 advice to an enquiry by Parliament into unemployment and the role of policy making: <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/about>

PM 5. Normally I would consult someone on an argument on misconduct, but given the misunderstandings involved and that Van Dorland might be involved with the climate conference at Paris that starts today on November 30 2015, it is better to publish this.

1. Introduction

On November 21 2015, Paul Luttikhuis (journalist, NRC-Handelsblad) reported about the Climate Change conference in Paris 2015, quoting Pieter Kuipers Munneke (IMAU and weatherman NOS), Klaas van Egmond (formerly RIVM and MNP (later PBL)) and Michel Rentenaar (Dutch representative at Paris 2015). ³ (Because of Dutch, names are underlined.)

Klaas van Egmond (1946) is no economist but got his degree in food technology and then switched to the environment. He can be quite confused on economics. Luttikhuis quotes him from a testimony for Parliament in September 2015 on Climate Change:

"If economists would know as much about the economy as climatologists know about the climate, then we would never had an economic crisis." (likely referring to the 2007+ crisis). (Dutch: "Als economen net zoveel van de economie zouden weten als klimaatwetenschappers van het klimaat, hadden we nooit een economische crisis gehad.")

This statement is demagoguery and not science. For, how can a *non-economist* know what economists know about the economy ? (Disagreement need not mean lack of knowledge.)

¹ http://www.houseofrepresentatives.nl/members_of_parliament/committees/fin

² <http://www.uu.nl/en/organisation/governance-and-organisation/professors/professors-per-faculty/professors-faculty-of-geosciences> lists 2x Bert de Vries, of which once to HJMdeVries ?

³ <http://www.nrc.nl/handelsblad/2015/11/21/wachten-op-het-water-1557933>

- The 2007+ economic crisis was caused by politics, such as liberating markets or introducing the euro. See: <http://www.res.org.uk/view/art7Oct14Features.html>
- Pivotal is the censorship of economic science since 1990 by the directorate of the Dutch Central Planning Bureau (CPB). (Van Egmond doesn't protest against this censorship.)

Already on November 17 I had discussed Van Egmonds confused and misleading testimony for Parliament on money, see <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/17/dirk-bezemer-disinforms-dutch-parliament>. Reading NRC-Handelsblad just a few days later, it seemed logical to warn others also about this other confusion. Such a warning also makes sense given what happened in 2009 w.r.t. the Copenhagen summit.

2. What had happened in 2009 w.r.t. Copenhagen 2009

On September 1 2009 Rathenau Institute organized a discussion in Amsterdam with [Mark Lynas](#) ("Six degrees"), [Rob van Dorland](#) (KNMI), and [Paul Luttikhuis](#) (journalist, NRC-Handelsblad), as part of the World Wide Views on Global Warming, in relation to the Copenhagen summit in December 2009.

This discussion in 2009 was monitored by [Peter van der Geer](#) (debat.nl). This moderator harrassed me but I still could ask Lynas whether he would be willing to look into the work by [Roefie Hueting](#) on environmentally sustainable national income. His reply was "no".

- After the forum session the bar opened and people could chat with one another. Rob van Dorland and I met, and we agreed that we would have a proper discussion in February 2010, after the busy period of Copenhagen 2009.
- I sent Van Dorland one confirmation email on September 2 2009 and a copy of my email to WWV and IPCC of that same date.
- I sent him an email in January 2010 with a reminder and some information.

Since Van Dorland never replied, we never had this proper discussion.

The 2009 event also caused me to regard Luttikhuis as a "limited" journalist (not necessarily because of his apparent education: musicology ?).

3. November 2015: an email on money and another one on Paris 2015

I directed my email w.r.t. the November 21 2015 newspaper article to scientist Pieter Kuipers Munneke (IMAU) and Rob van Dorland (KNMI, (now) senior advisor on climate change), also because I included the Copenhagen 2009 email as a reference. Part of the message is repetition.

The two climatologists were definitely served by a cc to others. There are many activists who are in denial of climate change and who might abuse the *demasqué* of Van Egmond (former head of the environmental planning bureau MNP, now PBL, advisory to KNMI). The cc to other scientists and some stakeholders like Parliament enables the climatologists to check:

- that the argument is in the public domain so that this isn't some kind of bilateral gossip
- that others have been and are being invited to give their arguments
- that Van Egmond emailed to me his defence, and that I was forced to point out again the difference between 'making an error' and 'being incompetent' in economics
- that journalist Paul Luttikhuis is rather "limited" in his reporting.

For the climatologists it is especially informative that there has been a cc to the "Sustainable Finance Lab" (SFL) at Utrecht University. This is the unit where Van Egmond produced his confusions and misleading statements, apparently with insufficient economic criticism. It is informative to others that this is not a personal issue between him and me, and that the whole SFL may either share the incompetence or show that I and economics 101 are wrong. Fellow economists are invited to check Van Egmond's testimony to Parliament in which he takes a velocity of money of 1 and neglects the costs of the payment system (or hushing up a

transaction tax so that Parliament can spend the seigniorage):
<https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/17/dirk-bezemer-disinforms-dutch-parliament>.

Please observe that SFL has been confusing the discussion since its inception in 2011.

- The notion of "sustainability" is abused. Its original meaning in 1987 was *environmental sustainability*. Given the abuse of "sustainability" for all kinds of issues that are even detrimental to environmental sustainability, Roefie Hueting has switched to systematic use of the term "environmental sustainability". It is a telling sign that SFL doesn't do this.
- This very 2015 email exchange indicates that Van Egmond⁴ as director of environment at RIVM 1989-2004 and director of MNP 2004-2008 with his deficient understanding of economics has maltreated Hueting's proposal for environmentally sustainable national income (eSNI), see <http://www.sni-hueting.info>.
- There is no economic reason why one should link money & finance to environmental sustainability. In other words: SFL is *inherently incompetent*. Such a link is a phantasy, that some say is inspired by the economic crisis since 2007, but whatever such inspiration it still is a confusion, like that correlation proves causation. A drive comes from the banking world (Herman Wijffels (RABO), Peter Blom (Triodos)), but we should allow also for this criticism: support by banks for an inherently incompetent SFL might be a cheap way for banks or bankers to claim that they support "sustainability". It shouldn't be too difficult for economists working at a bank to show that there is no economic reason why one should link money & finance to environmental sustainability.

4. Van Dorland's scientific malconduct

Van Dorland replies on November 26 2015 to my email of November 23 2015. My email was directed at him, cc others. He cc-s too, so that others can be informed about his reply. This is:

"Please remove me from the email list. I regard it as spam." (my translation)

Just to be sure:

- Van Dorland would agree that the message wasn't sent out at random (given our earlier contact and the other recipients), whence it isn't real spam. His statement "I regard it as spam" indicates that there is more than just spam-filtering, including filtering on superficial criteria like who is the sender. His use of "spam" thus is metaphorical.
- The metaphor that remains is: *neglect what it says, and just delete it (from the archive)*.
- I had not put Van Dorland on any list. I had directed the email to him and Kuipers Munneke.
- It appears that chronology is important. Before Van Dorland replied, others had responded with a statement like "take me from the list". It must have been those other responses who created the impression of a list. See the discussion in Section 8.
- The response by Van Dorland can be compared to the response by Kuipers Munneke. He also asked "to be taken from the list", but: (a) no cc, and just to me only, (b) no "spam", (c) there had been no earlier contact and agreement to have a discussion, (d) there still remains the option for a contact (without cc) and have such a discussion.

Dorland's reaction is scientific malconduct. A breach of integrity must have deliberate intent. The following will show this.

(PM. Observe that ALLEA / ESF have a code of conduct on research integrity, that lists five main misconducts: fabrication, manipulation, plagiarism, other, minor.⁵ This is a rather narrow interpretation: research versus science, five main breaches only, and mainly universities (and not KNMI). Currently, we adopt the wider notion of science itself.)

⁴ <http://www.klaasvanegmond.nl/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/CV-van-Egmond13.pdf>

⁵ <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/26/allea-defines-research-integrity-too-narrow>

The malconduct is, and requires some deductions to show this:

- (i) Van Dorland claims competence in economics to judge that my email is (like) spam
- (ii) He not only reports his own view but intends to advise and influence others, apparently with the objective to suppress my view and erase it from the archive.

(PM. The ALLEA / ESF code of conduct also mentions: "Misconduct also include *improper dealings* with infringements, such as attempts to cover up misconduct and reprisals on whistleblowers." The term "whistleblowing" is for non-scientists who should be silent but still speak up. In this case we are dealing with one branch of science (economics) that openly warns against abuse by scientists from another area (environmental studies, climatology). The processes of bullying, suppression and reprisal however can be similar.)

We can make the following deductions. I have not tried to make a mathematical model but the reasoning should be convincing for scientists to agree that there is malconduct.

(1) Given Van Dorland's agreement in 2009 to have a discussion with me, and his failure to specify any possible change of opinion (with reason that we could discuss, to prevent misunderstanding), he cannot denounce me for sending him relevant information w.r.t. Paris 2015 and the Van Egmond confusions w.r.t. economic science (for Parliament and in NRC-Handelsblad). (Looking now at Van Egmond's CV I see that he is also chairman of the scientific council of KNMI.)

(2) Van Dorland does not provide any argument.

(3) Van Dorland leaves unclear what his position is:

(3a) When *he conforms with Van Egmond's statement* that denounces economics then Van Dorland as a non-economist would also abuse economics.

(3b) When *he agrees with my protest* that Van Egmond is in error then my protest would not be spam, one might infer.

(3c) Perhaps Van Dorland disagrees with Van Egmond but for a different reason than I have given ? However, I am not aware of a reasoned warning by Van Dorland about Van Egmond's confusion.

(4) Perhaps Van Dorland merely wished to inform others about his own view about spam, but without the intention to try to influence them ? A proper reply would be, but is not given:

"I am a climatologist and I am not interested in economic aspects of the climate and such policies. For me any information on such issues is spam. But for other people, who are interested in economic aspects of the climate and such policies, this may be valuable information – though I cannot judge upon it." (Example proper reply)

(5) Instead, the situation is rather that Van Dorland would be interested in multidisciplinary approaches in which economics is relevant for climate change and its policies. This would fit the earlier agreement with me in 2009 to have a discussion. As mentioned in PM 4 (d) above, there is the paper by Vonk, Bouwman, Van Dorland & Eerens (2015) at the website of PBL. Its summary reads:

"On a global scale, the most important climate risks are related to disruptions to economic chains and the possibility of political tension. In Europe, the climate risks with the greatest impact are related to the international power grid and ICT networks. Giving adaptation to climate change a more prominent place in foreign policy will create international opportunities for the Netherlands; for example, in the fields of international stability, agriculture and urban planning and development. The activities of Dutch companies and academic institutions are held in high regard, worldwide. Added value will be created by incorporating climate adaptation as a specific element in projects."

He would rely on other economists than me. He would be aware that I may not know whom he relies on. Hence he could have forwarded the email to ask for an advice. This would be another kind of proper answer – *given neither*.

(PM. I discover this PBL paper when writing this. In criticism to the PBL paper, a better economic advice is to boycott Holland till the censorship of economic science since 1990 by the directorate of CPB is lifted. This would be the best policy that the world could have w.r.t. climate change. We can proceed again once the censorship has been lifted. It is Van Dorland's role to inform his economist co-authors about this approach, and ask what they think about it, so that they can contact me for details.)

(6) It may be that Van Dorland didn't judge my message on content, but on superficial parameters. *What is spam might be in the eye of the beholder*. Real spam, e.g. on penis enlargement, is sent out at random, and might perhaps benefit some people (at least the senders). A scientist who receives such a random message, is not required to know about the theory and practice of penis enlargement, and may still regard it as spam. Criteria on this are put into spam filters. Passing such a filter (as apparently happened) may still leave spam. However, we already indicated that such a superficial test does not apply here: the use of the word "spam" in this case is a metaphor.

What about the chronology (Section 8) ? Before Van Dorland responded, there were four responses by others cc all (which he thus received too) "to be taken from the list". Van Dorland might say that he took these responses as a superficial parameter, like one can do for spam.

However, you cannot do so "like for spam": since it doesn't work like that for spam. For spam, you don't get rejection emails from others cc all, to guide you in your "superficial test" on how to regard it. Thus the chronology may be relevant, but doesn't provide an excuse for superficial reasoning.

Also, when we consider the four emails preceding Van Dorland's decision "to regard it as spam" it seems that these two are most important:

(6a) The first rejection was from Mark Sanders, economist at SFL. Van Dorland might have taken this as an indication that my economic view could be neglected. However, Sanders's text (Section 7.2) only states a lack of interest and doesn't give any reasoned argument. Van Dorland must claim knowledge of economics to judge about a difference of opinion, and then would need to forward the email to his economic advisors for an advice. (If Sanders happens to be one of his advisors, Van Dorland can see in the email that SFL is criticised for a display of incompetence, whence he can infer that he might have to revise his selection of advisors, whence the email would not be spam. He would also have to press Sanders to give a reply on content.) (See below for a discussion of Sanders's response.)

(6b) In the time-sequence of emails, Van Egmond on November 24 accused me of slandering. Perhaps Van Dorland in his reaction on November 26 merely wants to protect me from the accusation of slander, namely by reducing it to the innocence of an idiot procuring spam ? But he doesn't state this consideration. It would also be incorrect, for the proper point is that there is no slander but scientific protest. (See below for the discussion on Van Egmond's response.)

(7) I presume that Van Dorland really regarded the email of November 23 2015 as nonsense, and that he didn't have the objective to invite people to destroy *valuable* evidence. Perhaps Van Dorland doesn't like to see again my 2009 email to IPCC and WWV which had also been cc-ed to him, and which he apparently didn't do anything with. I presume that if he had considered this *valuable*, then we would have had a discussion in April 2010. Thus, we may well allow that a climatologist at KNMI regards some economic analysis as nonsense and doesn't want to discuss it.

Observe that he doesn't deny that I am an economist. His reaction might be like denouncing a fringe lunatic. But he doesn't challenge my background in econometrics. His email suggests that econometrics can result into what he wishes to regard as spam.

(8) But then this problem arises: he cannot claim competence on this. This is the same problem as with Van Egmond. Apparently he *does* claim it. He doesn't forward for advice, but he decides, and henceforth without hesitation and qualification informs others about it.

Thus, he has a very specific target. He not only expresses his view but also intends it as an advice to influence the views by others: spam: *neglect its arguments, just destroy the information, remove it from the archive.*

(9) In sum: it is an abuse of his authority as a climatologist to denounce a protest by an economist against the abuse of economics by an environmental scientist.

(10) There is a difference between intentionally wishing to suppress a view and erase it from the archive – which is the scientific malconduct that we have established – and the *awareness* that one is indeed abusing power and breaching the integrity of science. I suppose that the second doesn't apply and that Van Dorland would have taken a step back if he had grown aware of what he was doing. His lack of awareness on the second doesn't diminish the intention on the first.

Whatever his blindness, the fact of scientific malconduct thus remains. A person walking in the dark may step on a butterfly and not be aware of it, but he or she still decided to walk in the dark. When light comes, we can see a broken wing under his or her boots.

(A lesson: don't assume that you can just walk around in the dark. Take heed of a warning that light is available and that you shouldn't walk in the dark.)

(11) Of course, not least, Van Dorland neglects my protest against the censorship of economic science since 1990 by the directorate of the Dutch Central Planning Bureau. Climate Change may take centuries but for integrity of science the year 1990 is before the Big Bang. Obviously I am in an awkward position, speaking from a position of being censored. It is utterly unclear why Van Dorland doesn't protest against this situation.

(12) Above considerations do not clarify why Van Dorland reacted in this manner. He doesn't provide a reason and we can only guess: but that quickly becomes speculation. Perhaps anti-protesters have succeeded in creating a binary pro-versus-contra atmosphere, such that anything that isn't pro & supportive is labelled as contra and rejected? Let us not speculate. Above deductions have used hypotheses and counterfactuals, but no speculation.

5. Van Egmond slanders that I would have a campaign of slander

Professor Van Egmond replies on November 24 to my November 23 2015 protest, dropping "Dear" and "kind regards", with cc to all and including the full 12 page text. My translation:

"Thomas Cool,

I wish to be taken from your email list immediately, before I submit to the temptation again to respond seriously on your campaign of slander.

I point out to you finally for one last time that I have presented myself at all times, with emphasis, also in the hearing at the House of Parliament, as an environmental scientist, and not as an economist.

Klaas van Egmond
environmental scientist"

In reply to this:

- I have presented a scientific protest, backed up with arguments. This is not slander.
- It is slander that I would have a campaign of slander.
- Apparently it is inconceivable for professor Van Egmond that an economist challenges his confusions and abuse of economics: for him, it can only be slandering.
- He misrepresents my critique. My critique is not that he had *said* that he was an economist. I never disputed that he had said that he was an environmental scientist. My criticism was that he *hadn't* said: "I am no economist." If he had said so, the audience would be alerted to the question why his personal confusions and misleading statements on economics would be interesting (e.g. for Parliament or NRC-Handelsblad).

In my email to Kuipers Munneke and Van Dorland I attached the emails w.r.t. the session at Parliament w.r.t. money:

(* A *) My email to the Commission on Finance of the House of Parliament of November 18 2015, cc some people who have shown an interest in the topic, referring to my weblog text: <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/17/dirk-bezemer-disinforms-dutch-parliament>

(* B *) A reply by Van Egmond on the same day, cc only SFL.

(* C *) My reply to Van Egmond and Parliament cc others, on November 19 2015.

I have explained that the November 21 newspaper article on Climate Change came as a surprise to me, and that my response to it merely is logical. I cannot see how this short exchange would be a "campaign of slander".

Given this accusation of slander, it is useful to type out how Van Egmond introduces himself to Parliament at the session on money, October 14 2015. There is no need to translate it.

"Mijn naam is Klaas van Egmond. Ik ben in het dagelijks leven hoogleraar milieukunde en duurzaamheid aan de Universiteit Utrecht, kroonlid van de SER, en lid van het Sustainable Finance Lab. Maar net zoals mijn collega Dirk Bezemer praat ik ook voor eigen rekening en risico." (1:05:23 at <https://youtu.be/3TSb9gBdyVE>)

This reference "to be like Bezemer" requires us to step back, and type out his introduction:

"Mijn naam is Dirk Bezemer. Van de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen. Ik vertegenwoordig geen bank, commerciële bank, Nederlandsche Bank, AFM, geen activistengroep. Ik ben hier louter voor mijn eigen nieuwsgierigheid, kennis, en inzicht. En ook voor het uwe, hoop ik. Dat is waar academici voor zijn." (around 1:00:00)

Thus, Bezemer presents himself as an academic who speaks from his professional position. Subsequently this holds for Van Egmond too. His reference to his "own account and risk" doesn't refer to his private opinion and potential participation in an action group. He speaks as an academic, and he speaks about Bezemer as a colleague in this. This fits with this part of the session that is reserved for the experts. Thus, when Van Egmond testifies about something, then we expect to hear the professor in environmental science and sustainability. Indeed, he refers to the paper by Van Egmond & De Vries (2015) that claims to present a "system dynamics" (non-economic) model about the economy. My criticism as an economist is that using an economic model about the economy helps to avoid (systematic) errors.

Van Egmond's slander about a "campaign of slander" and the possibility that this affected Van Dorland's response of suppressing and erasing criticism, causes me to widen the scope, and test what might be construed as such a "campaign". When people are counting your sins then the victim might be criticised for *being incomplete* and be sent to the gallows for that.

6. Sustainable Finance Lab (SFL at UU)

In the past, I have queried "Sustainable Finance Lab" (SFL) at Utrecht University what their approach was. From these occasional texts I cannot construct a "campaign" either.

- The following asks Rens van Tilburg (economist), now secretary of SFL, why he holds that economists are lost on the economic crisis (Van Egmond may hear economists who tell him this, but cannot judge this since he is no economist):
<http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Crisis-2007plus/2012-01-07-JongeTurken.html>
- The following explains that Dirk Bezemer disinforming Sweden (and the world):
<https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2012/12/23/dirk-bezemer-disinforms-sweden>
- And this message responded to statements by Charlotte van Dixhoorn:
- <http://www.thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Crisis-2007plus/2013-07-28-Email-Charlotte-van-Dixhoorn.html>

There is also professor Arnoud Boot, professor of Corporate Finance and Financial Markets at UvA, former chairman of the Royal Dutch Association for Political Economy ("Koninklijke Vereniging voor de Staathuishoudkunde" (KVS)) and member of the board of SFL. In my experience Boot is deficient in knowledge of political economy and environmental economics, while he might also be insufficiently aware of the different modeling traditions of system dynamics versus economics. While Roefie Hueting is an economist who includes information from environmental science, the system dynamics and thermodynamics approaches by environmentalists may infringe upon and denounce economic science and try to reinvent the wheel, see Colignatus (2009, 2015). If Boot had advised on the SFL model exercise that caused Van Egmond's position paper and presentation at Parliament, then Boot would be deficient in economics 101 too. However, this present discussion is not about the economics profession in Holland but about the malconduct by Van Dorland.

It may be remarked that Colignatus (2009, 2015) on ecological survival and Colignatus (2013) have not been discussed with me at SFL and may not appear in their references. The earlier contact with SFL explains the following. Van Egmond replied to me on November 18, with a cc only to SFL. Normally I would have replied only to him with similar cc. Potentially the cc to only SFL would have allowed fruitful discussion and resolution of the issue within the confines of SFL only. However, my earlier contacts with SFL indicated that this wasn't an option. Van Egmond had presented wrong evidence from SFL to Parliament. Hence my reply to Van Egmond on November 19 wasn't just cc SFL but also to Parliament cc others.

7. Mark Sanders at both SFL and the scientific bureau of D66

A member of "Sustainable Finance Lab" (SFL) of Utrecht University is Mark Sanders. He is also affiliated with the scientific bureau of the political party D66 (Democrats 1966).

7.1. At the scientific bureau of D66

In civil society Sanders is member of D66, a political party. They call themselves "sociaal-liberaal", while I call myself "sociaal liberaal" (without the dash). In civil society I also propose a "Sociaal Liberaal Forum" (SLF). Sanders also participates in the scientific bureau of D66, the Mr. Hans van Mierlo foundation.

The choice for a political party is personal, but one would suppose that the participation by a scientist in such a scientific bureau comes with the restrictions by science. Relevant links are:

- <https://vanmierlostichting.d66.nl/organisatie>
- <https://vanmierlostichting.d66.nl/mensen/mark-sanders>

D66 claims that democracy will be improved by direct elections of prime minister and mayors, by district voting instead of proportional representation (PR), and by referenda. These proposals are the "crown jewels" of D66.

I have informed Sanders as a fellow-economist that these D66 proposals (direct elections, districts, referenda) actually reduce democracy rather than improve it. Their selection in 1966 (the referenda a bit later) by party founder Hans van Mierlo was based upon his infatuation with the USA of John F. Kennedy, but not by serious study of the notion of democracy. The

D66 scientific bureau may be named after Van Mierlo but he was a journalist and politician, and as Dutch Foreign Secretary partly responsible for the Srebrenica massacre in 1995.

The scientific information about voting is here: <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/VTFD/Index.html>

Disinformation by D66 that affected the 2015 UK General Elections is reported here: <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/05/12/d66-con-on-the-2015-uk-general-elections>

I am supposing that Sanders and D66 parliamentarians Wouter Koolmees (economist, member of the Parliament Commission on Finance) and Paul van Meenen (mathematician, teacher of mathematics, member of the Parliament Commission on Education and Science) will be able to inform their party that these "crown jewels" do not generate more democracy but less. Of course, they might still prefer those proposals for political reasons of their own, but then should provide different arguments (like: less democracy, more chaos).

Unfortunately, Mark Sanders has declined to look into this, or find others who would.

In 2012 I published - not using the scientific name Colignatus - the political pamphlet "*Laat D66 zich opheffen*". This is a political pamphlet since the abolition of a hypocritical political party is again a political issue. For the rest the argumentation is scientific. <http://thomascool.eu/SvHG/LDZO/Index.html>

The journal of the scientific bureau of D66 is called *Idee*. Let me include an email to them. I don't know whether they indeed wrote a review of that pamphlet. Perhaps if Sanders had picked up the idea then he also might have taken a look at my wider economic analysis, and he could have informed SFL about their relevance. Perhaps Sanders gave negative feedback? Neglect can have a negative impact too.

A useful way to improve democracy is by strengthening science. This and other methods are discussed also in the booklet "*De ontketende kiezer*" (DOK) (2004) (before I started using the scientific name Colignatus): <http://thomascool.eu/SvHG/DOK/DOK-Aankondiging.html>

7.2. At Sustainable Finance Lab (SFL)

It so happened that Sanders was the first to respond with "take me from the list". Perhaps our earlier exchange on democracy played a role here. He doesn't give a reason why he cc-ed to others, and there is no apparent one. (Ten minutes later Kuipers Munneke also responded with "take me from the list" but did this bilaterally, dropping the option to inform others of his response to an email that had been directed to him.) With my translation:

Hello Thomas,

Can you take me from this mailinglist? Apparently you are very attached to (scientific) integrity and thus I presume that you will strictly adhere to the (moral) norms w.r.t. the use of email addresses? I do not appreciate this correspondence and trust that you remove my address from your mailing list immediately.

Kind regards,
Mark Sanders

Let me first discuss "take me from the list" in general before deconstructing this email.

8. The order of responses, like "take me from the list", November 2015

I don't maintain "a list" of recipients. I evaluate whether a cc would be relevant. Depending upon a subject I try to take account of whom has shown an interest in the subject. For a particular message this obviously results into a particular cc-list. For the Luttikhuis newspaper article on Climate Change, the members of the Sustainable Finance Lab (SFL) were relevant because Van Egmond is at SFL. Persons who listened to Van Egmond on money apparently

regard him as a serious spokesperson. The cc-format generates "a list". Recipients might experience this as if "there is a list". When they do not wish to hear inconvenient truths, they may respond by asking "to be taken from the list" rather than saying "I agree that I gave the impression to be interested in the subject but actually I am not really interested in it".

In the case of the email to Kuipers Munneke and Van Dorland, Parliament is included in the cc, with the commissions on Finance and Economics. When you respond to this email and do a cc to all, then by implication you are sending an email to Parliament. This might not indicate due respect for Parliament. It might not indicate respect for all either, but one would suppose that Parliament takes a different position, as it represents our democracy. What is Parliament to think when it receives emails "take me from the list" ?

8.1. Bilaterally proper

Proper is to ask bilaterally to be taken from a list, and not cc to all, bothering all. In this case the original email contained 12 pages of text (see below): inclusion of this can increase irritation.

(a) Pieter Kuipers Munneke asked to be taken from the list. He did so bilaterally, which is proper. Apparently he accepts that a newspaper article can result in email responses. His statement does not present a malconduct since I have not been in contact with him before while there still is the option to have a contact "without the list".

(b) Irene van Staveren (ISS) did so too, bilaterally.

(c) Rens van Tilburg (now secretary of SFL) asked to be taken from the list, copied to all, including the 12 pages of text, but mentioned that it would be better *not* to include all others: hence his email to all can be understood as a warning *not* to copy to all (but why did he copy the full text ?). (Dutch: "Wellicht handig als we dit enkel aan Thomas doorgeven! (maar ja, mij ook graag)")

(d) Ad van Oosten (journalist, Nieuwsuur), reacted bilaterally, suggesting to use Twitter. Well, I am not convinced yet that I should force other people to rely on Twitter to get adequate scientific information. (Dutch: "Is het een idee om mensen niet persoonlijk te mailen (mij ook liever niet) maar een website te bouwen waar je via twitter naar verwijst? Dan kan wie dat wil van je pennevruchten kennis nemen.")

(e) George van Houts (playwright on banking scandal) decently asked this bilaterally too.

8.2. Non-bilaterally and such that it becomes malconduct too

Some other recipients asked "to be taken from the list" too, but did a cc to all others, and included the full 12 pages of text: thus knowingly that this would increase irritation. Irritation rises when one receives cc's from more people.

- This isn't nettiquette.
- At best it is negligent.
- *But these are experienced users of the internet.* It might also be *intended* to cause that other recipients grow more and more irritated at the original sender of the email.
- Later responders *know* what has been happening earlier.

The responses can be listed in the order of occurrence:

(a) Mark Sanders (economist, Utrecht University, SFL): there is no need for a cc to all.

(b) Paul Luttikhuis (NRC-Handelsblad): he may reply to criticism cc all, but has no argument.

(c) Jan Rotmans (PhD mathematics, ⁶ Erasmus University): there is no need for a cc to all.

(d) Klaas van Egmond (Utrecht University, SFL): he may reply to criticism cc all: but slanders.

(e) Rob van Dorland (KNMI): he may respond to an email to him, cc all: but see above.

We have already discussed the inappropriate responses by Van Dorland and Van Egmond. It is fair when they cc to all, but it isn't fair how they abuse this. Let we subsequently discuss the other cases.

⁶ <http://www.janrotmans.nl/media/1014/jan-rotmans-cv-2012-nl.pdf>

(ad a) While one might say that I threw a rock in the pond, Sanders threw a first rock, a first because it was directed at me. See the text of his email above.

(a-i) There is really no reason to copy to all. If he feels that Kuipers Munneke and Van Dorland need a reply from SFL, then the secretary of SFL can collect comments internally, make a report, put it on the website, and sent out the appropriate email cc all.

(a-ii) He knows about netiquette. His choice to cc to all thus is deliberately directed at inflicting crowd irritation at the original sender.

(a-iii) Sanders recognises the appeal to integrity, but gives this a shallow interpretation w.r.t. the use of email addresses, and does not make the full inference w.r.t. the censorship of economic science since 1990 by the directorate of the CPB. This is morally unbalanced. By analogy a rape victim should shut up when bystanders are annoyed by the noise.

(a-iv) He implicitly suggests that I would not be aware of netiquette and need to be reminded of this.

(a-v) His argument that he does not appreciate the correspondence is shallow and self-centered. He does not recognise the reason *why* the email has been cc-ed to him. It wasn't sent to him merely to inform him about an inconvenient truth, as he suggests. It was sent because these others in the cc are either involved e.g. at SFL or witnesses overall. See the discussion in Section 3. (His complaint is like: "I was just standing there on the side of the street, only interested in going for a walk, and suddenly there is this car crash, and now they want me to give my testimony and all of that. This is a waste of my time. There is even a lady who says that she was distracted since I didn't have my clothes on.")

(ad b) Lutikhuis wrote the NRC-Handelsblad article that I referred to. I stated that Van Egmond disinform him. The email was not directed to him and there was no immediate need for Lutikhuis to respond cc others. There is an implication indeed that Lutikhuis himself should have been able to deconstruct Van Egmond's statement about economics, and in that respect Lutikhuis might have a basis for a response cc all. However, in that case he should have responded on content.

(ad c) Rotmans has no apparent or stated reason.

9. Conclusions

(1) Van Dorland's email on "spam" is an abuse of his authority as a climatologist to denounce a protest by an economist against the abuse of economics by an environmental scientist.

(2) This conclusion is based not merely on the word "spam" but upon considering earlier contacts, the nature of this new contact, the context, the sequence of responses.

(3) The evidence also shows intent, which turns this into a clear case of scientific malconduct. The intent is not such that Van Dorland was also aware of actually breaching integrity of science, but it is still such that there is the malconduct of a deliberate effort of suppressing a view of a fellow scientist and erasing it from the archives.

(4) The discussion has shown a context that also causes dismay. Van Dorland might argue that it is difficult for him to maintain integrity in an environment of confusing information. This would be a difficult argument, since my email to him was to alert him to the existence of this environment of confusing information, and to specify where the problems were. Thus we see confirmation of this dismal environment but it cannot be a justification for breaches.

(5) Van Dorland should give a reasoned argument, as he already agreed to in 2009 but didn't do yet. My suggestion is to let him admit his breach of integrity. Anyone who wishes that Van Dorland and I have a discussion on climate change and economics might understand that it is very difficult to have such a discussion when Van Dorland qualifies my protest as "spam".

(6) These breaches of scientific integrity and blockages to multidisciplinary research on climate change and economics can be related to the CPB scenario study (1992) *Scanning the Future 1990-2015*. Some 25 years have been lost to effective policy making. The system of policy making generates multiple responsibilities. Politicians would be responsible at the ballot box. Scientists are responsible for maintaining the integrity of science.

References

PM 1. Only major publications are given for the body of the text. See the text and email messages for more internet links.

PM 2. Since 2004, Colignatus is the name in science for Thomas Cool.

Central Planning Bureau (1992), "Scanning the Future. A long-term scenario study of the world economy 1990-2015", Sdu publishers,
<http://www.cpb.nl/en/publication/scanning-future-long-term-scenario-study-world-economy-1990-2015>

Colignatus, Th. (2001, 2014), "Voting theory for democracy", 4th edition, Thomas Cool Consultancy & Econometrics, <http://www.thomascool.eu/Papers/VTFD/Index.html>

Colignatus, Th. (2007), "Klimaatbeleid is een kwestie van beschaving", ESB, 1 juni, p317,
<http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/Wetenschap/Artikelen/Milieu/2007-06-01-KlimaatbeleidIsEenKwestieVanBeschaving.pdf>

Colignatus, Th. (2009, 2015), "The Tinbergen & Hueting Approach in the Economics of Ecological Survival", draft, <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/63904>

Colignatus, Th. (2013), "Money as gold versus money as water", RWER 64, July, p90-101,
<https://rwer.wordpress.com/2013/07/02/issue-no-64-of-real-world-economics-review>

Colignatus, Th. (2014), "An Economic Supreme Court", RES Newsletter, October,
<http://www.res.org.uk/view/art7Oct14Features.html>

Colignatus, Th. (2015a), "D66 con on the 2015 UK General Elections", May 12,
<https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/05/12/d66-con-on-the-2015-uk-general-elections>

Colignatus, Th. (2015b), "Dirk Bezemer disinform Dutch Parliament", November 17,
<https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/17/dirk-bezemer-disinforms-dutch-parliament>

Colignatus, Th. (2015c), "ALLEA defines 'research integrity' too narrow", November 26,
<https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/26/allea-defines-research-integrity-too-narrow>

Cool, Th., H.H. Hulst (2004), "De ontketende kiezer", Rozenberg publishers,
<http://thomascool.eu/SvHG/DOK/DOK-Aankondiging.html>

Cool, Th. (2012), "Laat D66 zich opheffen", mijnbestseller.nl,
<http://thomascool.eu/SvHG/LDZO/Index.html>

Van Egmond (2013), "Een vorm van beschaving", 3e druk, Christofoor

Egmond, K. van (2015), testimony on money given at Dutch Parliament,
<https://youtu.be/3TSb9gBdyVE>, hour 1:05:23

Egmond, K. van, B. de Vries (2015), "Dynamics of a sustainable financial-economic system", working paper, Sustainable Finance Lab, October,

<http://sustainablefinancelab.nl/files/2015/04/SFM-paper-Egmond-de-Vries-okt-2015.pdf>

Luttikhuis, P. (2015), "Klimaatverandering: onze apocalyps in slow motion", NRC-Handelsblad, November 21, <http://www.nrc.nl/handelsblad/2015/11/21/wachten-op-het-water-1557933>

Lynas, M. (2007), "Six degrees: Our future on a Hotter Planet", Fourth Estate, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Six_Degrees:_Our_Future_on_a_Hotter_Planet

Vonk, M., A. Bouwman, R. van Dorland, H. Eerens (2015), "Worldwide climate effects - Risks and opportunities for the Netherlands", <http://www.pbl.nl/en/publications/worldwide-climate-effects-risks-and-opportunities-for-the-netherlands>

Date: Wed, 02 Sep 2009 13:39:55 TC to RvD (1 **)**

To: dorlandv / ~ / knmi.nl
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
Subject: N.a.v. "Six degrees"

Geachte dr. Van Dorland,

We zouden een datum prikken in Februari, maar gezien het weer heb ik eigenlijk liever April. Ergens in de week van 5 - 9 April ? Vooralsnog heb ik geen voorkeur. Wat mij betreft gaat het om een gesprek tussen twee wetenschappers, een econoom (ik) en een climatoloog (u), over het geven van adequate informatie aan collegae en derden. Het liefst had ik met u gesproken voor Copenhagen, omdat het wel mooi zou zijn wanneer daar zou worden besloten om de Hueting eSNI indicator wereldwijd in te voeren (per land), maar gezien uw drukte is het allang mooi wanneer het ueberhaupt zou lukken elkaar eens rustiger te spreken.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

Verwijzingen:
Mijn definitie van "risico":
<http://thomascool.eu/Risk/index.html>

U vroeg naar een kort opstel. In Economisch Statistische Berichten verschenen:
<http://www.sni-hueting.info/NL/Anderen/2001-08-24-ESB-Cool-over-Hueting.pdf>

Maar de klassieker is natuurlijk Tinbergen & Hueting:
<http://www.sni-hueting.info/EN/Publications/1991-Tinbergen-Hueting-GNP-and-market-prices.pdf>

Misschien dat uw economische dochters alvast kunnen kijken naar <http://www.sni-hueting.info>. Misschien dat ze hun papa kunnen uitleggen wat de essentie is ...

De oudste heeft misschien veel aan "The Old Man and the SNI" (misschien moet u wel verwijzen naar Hemingway) <http://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/9152>

En hier natuurlijk Hueting's protest dat de "Monitor Duurzaam Nederland" van de Planbureaus een verkeerde voorstelling van zaken geven <http://www.sni-hueting.info/NL/index.html>

Date: Wed, 02 Sep 2009 17:18:29 TC to WWV & IPCC cc RvD (2 **)**

To: info / ~ / wwviews.org, IPCC-sec / ~ / wmo.int
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

Subject: Copenhagen (after Mark Lynas's talk in Amsterdam, September 1)
Cc: secretariat / ~ / unfccc.int, executiveoffice / ~ / unep.org, lene / ~ / peoplesclimateaction.dk, C.vandermeij / ~ / Rathenau.nl, j.staman / ~ / rathenau.nl, i-books / ~ / antenna.nl, jhansen / ~ / giss.nasa.gov, info / ~ / debat.nl, dorlandv / ~ / knmi.nl, luttikhuis / ~ / nrc.nl, secretaris / ~ / wetenschapsjournalisten.nl, peter.howells / ~ / uwe.ac.uk

Dear Sir, Madam,

Yesterday, Rathenau Institute organized a discussion in Amsterdam with Mark Lynas ("Six degrees"), Rob van Dorland (KNMI), and Paul Luttikhuis (NRC-Handelsblad), as part of the World Wide Views on Global Warming, in relation to the Copenhagen summit in December. The discussion was monitored by Peter van der Geer (debat.nl).

You are likely to think that Holland is a liberal and freedom loving country. You are likely to think that Rathenau Institute will collect all useful information and transmit this to you. I am sorry to inform you that this is not the case. Dutch culture does not respect freedom of thought and Rathenau Institute will surely not provide you with an adequate report.

I am writing to you as an economic scientist. This present email to you is the accurate report that you need, warranted by economic science.

As an economic scientist I protest against the censorship of science and the abuse of power by the Dutch Central Planning Bureau (CPB) since 1989/90. The CPB was founded in 1945 by Jan Tinbergen (1903), the first recipient in 1969 of the Nobel Prize in economics (with Ragnar Frisch). When I told Tinbergen about the censorship he reacted that a younger generation that he himself would have to resolve this. These younger generations till now neglect Tinbergen's advice, and the matter has not been resolved yet.

I also protest against Dutch indifference to this situation. In fact, since 2004 I advise to boycott of Holland till the censorship is resolved.

Links are provided below.

At the Amsterdam discussion, when I stated my protest against the censorship of science by the CPB directorate, discussion leader Van der Geer interrupted me, talked down to me, suggested that I had delusions of a conspiracy, and then ignored me for a long while. By consequence, my serious scientific contribution was suppressed and ridiculed. It is telling of Dutch culture that no one in the audience (at least to my knowledge) protested against this treatment. Eventually Van der Geer allowed me to make some final remark, while admitting that he had indeed been ignoring me deliberately. I must admit that I felt quite intimidated and irritated by then. Thus, as I did not experience an open atmosphere, my last remark may not have been the most effective. (Which is part of the reason why Rathenau Institute will not provide an adequate report.)

I have been protesting against the censorship and abuse of power for some 20 years now (i.e. since I participated in the CPB long term projection "Scanning the future 1990-2015" and my comments were blocked by the directorate). Dutch society is apparently incapable of resolving this. When science is neglected then indeed a journalist like Lynas may write a book like "Six degrees" but such a book does not resolve the basic scientific questions on economic management, and it may actually distract from the relevant questions (since the question is not really whether there will be six degrees, while economic policy is more fuelled by fear for unemployment).

Hence, I again protest against all this disrespect for science, and see reason to inform you about this.

Subsequently, I want to draw your attention to the Tinbergen & Hueting Approach in the Economics of Ecological Survival. This approach dates back from at least 30 years. Economists neglected it since they were not interested in the environment. Ecologists neglected it since they disliked economics. What we see now is a disaster in scientific advice

to society. This is not a purely Dutch phenomenon but an international phenomenon. However, there is a strong Dutch component, as you can read in the provided links.

Dr Roefie Hueting is a United Nations Global 500 Award winner. The UN statistical procedures on the environment are very much based upon his work. In my judgement Roefie Hueting is a serious candidate for the Nobel Prize in economics, if only his work was decently studied by my fellow economists. The way his work is being treated by economists and policy makers is an intellectual disgrace for both science and policy making. Remarkable is the failure of the grassroots environmental movement, in their dislike of anything economic, to investigate the Tinbergen & Hueting approach.

Thus, another practical suggestion - next to boycotting Holland - is that the Copenhagen summit adopts the Hueting indicator of "environmentally Sustainable National Income" (eSNI), alongside the traditional measure of national income. It will be relatively easy to implement the eSNI measure since it uses base material that UNStat already has adopted from Hueting's work. The measure is wider than only the climate, but it will be essential to monitor economic development while indicators as CO2 or temperature are inadequate just by themselves.

Another suggestion is that you put this report prominently on your website. A final suggestion is that you dispatch a team of investigators to Holland to check the points that I have reported on, and put their report on your website. An effective policy on climate change starts by boycotting Holland till the censorship of science is resolved.

As said, links are provided below.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
<http://thomascool.eu>

PS. I copy to dr. Peter Howells of the RES Newsletter with the suggestion of publication.

Perhaps a good introduction to my person might be this discussion by prof. dr. Richard Gill (mathematical statistics Leiden and Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences):
<http://www.math.leidenuniv.nl/~naw/serie5/deel09/sep2008/reviewssep08.pdf>

My protest against censorship of science and abuse of power by the CPB directorate:
<http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/English/TPnCPB/Case.html>
<http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Institute/After35YearsOfMassUnemployment.html>

The Tinbergen & Hueting Approach in the Economics of Ecological Survival:
<http://mpa.ub.uni-muenchen.de/13899>

Hueting's page
<http://www.sni-hueting.info>

Date: Sat, 09 Jan 2010 12:24:41 TC to RvD (3 **)**

To: dorlandv / ~ / knmi.nl
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
Subject: T.a.v. Schneider's SAACS

Geachte dr. Van Dorland,

We hebben een afspraak staan om komend voorjaar eens te spreken. Wellicht kan ik in de tussentijd wel reageren t.a.v. Schneider's Science as a Contact Sport. Ik zond Martijn van Calmthout onderstaand email. Als u ook alvast gaan lezen dan hoeven we misschien minder te praten.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

Date: Sat, 09 Jan 2010 12:21:03
To: "Calmthout van, Martijn" <m.vancalmthout / ~ / volkskrant.nl>
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
Subject: Met dank

Geachte heer Van Calmthout,

Ik dank u hartelijk voor uw berichtje over SAACS van professor Schneider. Het is een grote opsteker uw berichtje te lezen hoewel ik aarzel of ik de hele odyssee moet gaan lezen.

Ik heb professor Schneider onderstaand email gestuurd om hem attent te maken op het soortgelijke gedoe in de economische wetenschap, met name de censuur van mijn werk en de onwaarheden rondom het milieu-duurzame nationaal inkomen bij Hueting.

Mijn hoop is dat u Schneider's opmerking over de media ter harte neemt. Een mooie toets is te vragen aan Frank Kalshoven wat hij nu inhoudelijk van mijn analyse vindt, ik heb daar nooit iets van gezien.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

Date: Sat, 09 Jan 2010 12:11:59
To: shswesite / ~ / lists.stanford.edu
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
Subject: Compliments. A similar struggle in economics

Dear professor Schneider,

My newspaper reported about your SAACS. My compliments.

There is a similar mishap in the last twenty years in economics.

My suggestion is that you ask some of your economic advisors to look into the internet pages that I list below, and that they formulate questions that I might try to answer.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

Relevant links:

(1) My DRGTPE <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Index.html>

(2) My protest against censorship of science and advice to boycott Holland till this is resolved:
<http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/English/TPnCPB/Case.html>

(3) Roefie Hueting (UN Global 500 winner) on environmental economics:

<http://www.sni-hueting.info>

(4) My paper on Hueting: "The Old Man and the SNI":
<http://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/9152>

Date: Mon, 07 May 2012 09:34:43 TC to IDEE

To: idee / ~ / d66.nl
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
Subject: Fwd: Pamflet "Laat D66 zich opheffen"

Geachte redactie,

Ik zond daarnet onderstaand bericht dat ook voor u relevant lijkt.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

Date: Mon, 07 May 2012 09:33:31
To: vanmierlostichting / ~ / d66.nl
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
Subject: Pamflet "Laat D66 zich opheffen"

Geachte mensen van D66,

Als wetenschapper en econometrist kom ik tot de conclusie dat de 'kroonjuwelen' van D66 juist anti-democratisch zijn.

Als mens adviseer ik derhalve al bijna twee decennia tot opheffing van D66.

De wetenschappelijke onderbouwing is te vinden in mijn boek "Voting Theory for Democracy".

Als mens heb ik nu het pamflet laten verschijnen "Laat D66 zich opheffen".

Hopelijk bent u zo ruimdenkend dat u er aandacht aan wilt besteden in uw "Digitale Nieuwsbrief" en hopelijk ook uw website. Hopelijk wilt u ook een exemplaar van het pamflet aanschaffen om te recenseren. Ik ben niet bij machte om exemplaren toe te sturen in de hoop dat er wat mee gebeurt.

Hopelijk kunt u zien dat ik zeer begaan ben met het geestelijk welzijn van leden van D66 en de kiezers van D66.

PM. Wellicht wilt u dit bericht doorsturen aan Alexander Rinnooy Kan, tenslotte een mede-econometrist.

Hieronder de relevante weblinks.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
Voorzitter Sociaal Liberaal Forum
Secretaris Samuel van Houten Genootschap, wetenschappelijk bureau van het SLF

Weblinks:

Pamflet:
<http://thomascool.eu/SvHG/LDZO/Index.html>

VTFD
<http://thomascool.eu/Papers/VTFD/Index.html>

Discussies op internet:
http://www.joop.nl/opinies/detail/artikel/laat_d66_zich_opheffen

<http://www.frontaalnaakt.nl/archives/00000747.html>

Date: Mon, 23 Nov 2015 20:03:17 TC to PKM and RvD cc others & 2009 (4 **)**

To: p.kuipersmunneke / ~ / uu.nl, rob.van.dorland / ~ / knmi.nl
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
Subject: W.r.t."Apocalyps in slowmotion" NRC November 21 2015
Cc: <cie.fin / ~ / tweedekamer.nl>, "Egmond, N.D. van \\\(Klaas\\)" <N.D.vanEgmond / ~ / uu.nl>, wetenschap / ~ / nrc.nl, luttikhuis / ~ / nrc.nl, info / ~ / wwviews.org, IPCC-sec / ~ / wmo.int, secretariat / ~ / unfccc.int, executiveoffice / ~ / unep.org, lene / ~ / peoplesclimateaction.dk, i-books / ~ / antenna.nl, jhansen / ~ / giss.nasa.gov, perscontact / ~ / climategate.nl, "Tilburg, R. van \\\(Rens\\)" <R.vanTilburg / ~ / uu.nl>, "Vries, B.J.M. de \\\(Bert\\)" <B.J.M.deVries / ~ / uu.nl>, "Wijffels, H.H.F. \\\(Herman\\)" <H.H.F.Wijffels / ~ / uu.nl>, <e.m.sent / ~ / fm.ru.nl>, <klamer / ~ / eshcc.eur.nl>, "Sanders, M.W.J.L. \\\(Mark\\)" <M.W.J.L.Sanders / ~ / uu.nl>, "Schenk, E.J.J. \\\(Hans\\)" <E.J.J.Schenk / ~ / uu.nl>, "Kool, C.J.M. \\\(Clemens\\)" <C.J.M.Kool / ~ / uu.nl>, <staveren / ~ / iss.nl>, "Boot, A.W.A." <A.W.A.Boot / ~ / uva.nl>, <h.a.benink / ~ / uvt.nl>, "Luuk de Waal Malefijt" <l.dwm / ~ / onsgeld.nu>, d.j.bezemer / ~ / rug.nl, marc / ~ / decorrespondent.nl, nrc / ~ / nrc.nl, G.J.vanderZwaan / ~ / uu.nl, H.M.Amman / ~ / uu.nl, tegenlicht / ~ / vpro.nl, Ad.van.Oosten / ~ / Nieuwsuur.nl, Monique.Wijnans / ~ / Nieuwsuur.nl, marjan.minnesma / ~ / urgenda.nl, rotmans / ~ / drift.eur.nl, HOEVEN / ~ / ISS.NL, studentenraad.dsz / ~ / vu.nl, bestuur / ~ / asva.nl, naitsoezn / ~ / groningenstudentenbond.nl, kritischstudentenutrecht / ~ / gmail.com, M.M.C.G.Peters / ~ / uu.nl, M.M.Leezenberg / ~ / uva.nl, info / ~ / janbor.nl, <beekman / ~ / filosofie-oostwest.nl>, a.vander.braak / ~ / vu.nl, "L.J.R.Scholtens" <l.j.r.scholtens / ~ / rug.nl>, "Waard, Peter de" <p.dewaard / ~ / volkskrant.nl>, t.meeus / ~ / nrc.nl, dejongsteven / ~ / gmail.com, jesse / ~ / ftm.nl, M.Sommer / ~ / Volkskrant.nl, economie / ~ / trouw.nl, parlement / ~ / trouw.nl, ombudsman / ~ / volkskrant.nl, ombudsman / ~ / nrc.nl, cie.ez / ~ / tweedekamer.nl, cvandixhoorn / ~ / gmail.com, "George van Houts" <georgevanhouts / ~ / gmail.com>

Dear dr. Kuipers Munneke and dr. Van Dorland,

(a) Earlier, I warned about Dirk Bezemer and Klaas van Egmond who disinform Dutch Parliament:

<https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/17/dirk-bezemer-disinforms-dutch-parliament>

(b) Now, NRC newspaper features an article "Apocalyps in slowmotion" by Paul Luttikhuis, November 21 2015.

<http://www.nrc.nl/handelsblad/2015/11/21/wachten-op-het-water-1557933>

(c) Journalist Luttikhuis spoke with Peter Kuipers Munneke, Klaas van Egmond and Michel Rentenaar. Below there are copies (1) and (2) that show that Klaas van Egmond doesn't know much about economics, and that he apparently has been misleading his readership about his presumed knowledge of economics also during his period as director of the Dutch Planning Bureau for Nature and Environment.

(d) Luttikhuis and Van Dorland were present in the event w.r.t. Copenhagen 2009 mentioned in the email under (3). Apparently Dutch society has not been able to produce a sensible scientific response to the information in that email. I repeat my advice to boycott Holland till the censorship of science at CPB since 1990 is lifted.

(e) There is this memo of mine in the Newsletter of the UK Royal Economic Society on the failure of the Trias Politica model of democracy:

<http://www.res.org.uk/view/art7Oct14Features.html>

Klaas van Egmond doesn't know much of economics, but he bashes economics anyway. In the interview he suggests that the science of climate change is better developed than economics on the economic crisis. This is a wrong comparison. My suggestion of improving democracy is to create a constitutional Economic Supreme Court per nation, see the constitutional amendment in my book DRGTPE. One reason to look into this option seriously is the recognition that economic science has been handling the economy very decently. Also the economics of climate change. It are political forces in a failing Trias Politica, censorship of science and deluded climate scientists like Klaas van Egmond who create the confusion.

(f) My apologies to readers who see a copy of an exchange that they saw already. I cannot help it, but Klaas van Egmond not only disinform Dutch Parliament but also Paul Luttikhuis and readers of NRC Handelsblad. There is no particular reason to single out Klaas van Egmond as the evil genius of economic nonsense and anti-scientific arrogance. But the situation shows the importance of maintaining scientific integrity.

Kind regards,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
Econometrician (Groningen 1982) and teacher of mathematics (Leiden 2008)
Scheveningen

=====
(1)
=====

Date: Thu, 19 Nov 2015 11:31:50 TC to KvE and TK Com. on Finance cc others (* C *)

To: "Egmond, N.D. van \\\(Klaas\\)" <N.D.vanEgmond / ~ / uu.nl>, <cie.fin / ~ / tweedekamer.nl>

From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

Subject: RE: Wetenschappelijk protest tegen de misleidende informatie door Dirk Bezemer in het Rondetafelgesprek Geldstelsel d.d. 14 oktober 2015

Cc: "Tilburg, R. van \\\(Rens\\)" <R.vanTilburg / ~ / uu.nl>, "Vries, B.J.M. de \\\(Bert\\)" <B.J.M.deVries / ~ / uu.nl>, "Wijffels, H.H.F. \\\(Herman\\)" <H.H.F.Wijffels / ~ / uu.nl>, <e.m.sent / ~ / fm.ru.nl>, <klamer / ~ / eshcc.eur.nl>, "Sanders, M.W.J.L. \\\(Mark\\)" <M.W.J.L.Sanders / ~ / uu.nl>, "Schenk, E.J.J. \\\(Hans\\)" <E.J.J.Schenk / ~ / uu.nl>, "Kool, C.J.M. \\\(Clemens\\)" <C.J.M.Kool / ~ / uu.nl>, <staveren / ~ / iss.nl>, "Boot, A.W.A." <A.W.A.Boot / ~ / uva.nl>, <h.a.benink / ~ / uvt.nl>, "Luuk de Waal Malefijt" <l.dwm / ~ / onsgeld.nu>, d.j.bezemer / ~ / rug.nl, marc / ~ / decorrespondent.nl, nrc / ~ / nrc.nl, G.J.vanderZwaan / ~ / uu.nl, H.M.Amman / ~ / uu.nl, tegenlicht / ~ / vpro.nl, Ad.van.Oosten / ~ / Nieuwsuur.nl, Monique.Wijnans / ~ / Nieuwsuur.nl, marjan.minnesma / ~ / urgenda.nl, rotmans / ~ / drift.eur.nl, HOEVEN / ~ / ISS.NL, studentenraad.dsz / ~ / vu.nl, bestuur / ~ / asva.nl, naitsoezn / ~ / groningenstudentenbond.nl, kritischstudentenutrecht / ~ / gmail.com, M.M.C.G.Peters / ~ / uu.nl, M.M.Leezenberg / ~ / uva.nl, info / ~ / janbor.nl, <beekman / ~ / filosofie-oostwest.nl>, a.vander.braak / ~ / vu.nl, "L.J.R.Scholtens"

<l.j.r.scholten / ~ / rug.nl>, "Waard, Peter de" <p.dewaard / ~ / volkskrant.nl>, t.meeus / ~ / nrc.nl, dejongstevan / ~ / gmail.com, jesse / ~ / ftm.nl, M.Sommer / ~ / Volkskrant.nl, economie / ~ / trouw.nl, parlement / ~ / trouw.nl, ombudsman / ~ / volkskrant.nl, ombudsman / ~ / nrc.nl, cie.ez / ~ / tweedekamer.nl, cvandixhoorn / ~ / gmail.com, "George van Houts" <georgevanhouts / ~ / gmail.com>

Geachte professor Van Egmond,

Dank voor uw reactie t.a.v.

<https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/17/dirk-bezemer-disinforms-dutch-parliament>

Het is prettig dat u akkoord gaat met een realistische omloopsnelheid van geld, anders dan $V = 1$ zoals klaarblijkelijk gebruikt in de presentatie voor de Tweede Kamer. Wel geldt:

- (a) U gaat niet in op het punt dat seigniorage eigenlijk al opgaat aan de kosten van het transactie-deel van het geldstelsel, zodat u niet aan de Kamer kunt zeggen dat het ook gebruikt kan worden voor andere uitgaven.
- (b) U verhoogt de inflatie van 2 naar 3% om de term "tientalle miljarden" te blijven rechtvaardigen, maar dat laatste is geen doel op zichzelf, en ook bij 3% en $V = 2$ en re-ele groei van 1,5% en GDP van EUR 600 mrd kom je nog steeds slechts op een seigniorage van EUR 13,5 mrd, nodig om het transactiesysteem te financieren (want bij meer inflatie wordt het systeem ook weer duurder).
- (c) Accepteren dat je $V = 1$ moet aanpassen naar $V = 2$ is toch zoets als bij hersenchirurgie zeggen dat je niet nu niet bij de voet begint maar bij de buik, zodat je meer in de buurt zit en mensen moeten ophouden met klagen. Want een deskundige had geen $V = 1$ gebruikt. Ik neem aan dat de analyse toch flink is doorgesproken in het "Sustainable Finance Lab" voordat u naar de Kamer ging: en niemand zag het ?

Het heeft eigenlijk geen zin meer. De presentatie staat op video. U staat daar plechtig uit te leggen hoe het zit en hoe de overheid miljarden euro's kan uitgeven. Terwijl dat onhoudbaar is. U bent door de mand gevallen als iemand die buiten zijn opleiding treedt en die niet beseft dat economie een eigen discipline is. Dit is niet iets recentelijks, het speelt al decennia: wat ook kan verklaren dat u er nu mee doorgaat op het terrein van het geldstelsel. Het beste wat u kunt doen is uw professoraat aan de UU opzeggen voordat het u ontnomen wordt, u inschrijven voor cursussen economie om te leren inzien waar u in het verleden fouten heeft gemaakt, en de mensen die daar last van hebben gekregen uw excuses te schrijven.

Voor journalisten die meelesen: de krantenkop mag dus luiden: Oud-directeur van het Milieu- en Natuurplanbureau (MNP) (2004-2008) blijkt weinig van economie te begrijpen maar deed jaren alsof. Hij blijkt een exponent in milieukringen waarin dit probleem endemisch is.

Een ander hoofdpunt is natuurlijk dat u niets zegt over mijn kritiek t.a.v. Dirk Bezemer. U had kunnen onderschrijven dat diens artikel "No one saw this coming" geen aandacht geeft aan mijn onderbouwde waarschuwing ruim voor de crisis van 2007+. U voegt zich bij Bezemer in het bewust weglaten van relevante informatie. Ook dat is een wetenschapper onwaardig.

Hieronder geef ik nog enig detail-commentaar voor de Vaste Commissie voor de Financiën, en cc anderen.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
Econometrist (Groningen 1982) en leraar wiskunde (Leiden 2008)
Scheveningen

At 2015-11-18 22:01, you wrote:

Bij deze een korte reactie op je 'wetenschappelijk protest'.

Bij een langere reactie zouden bovenstaande fundamentele kwesties niet hersteld zijn.

- 1 Je grootste ergernis lijkt te zijn dat veel van de SFL-betrokkenen geen economen zijn.

Dit is niet de grootste ergernis. Zoiets zou de man spelen, en niet de bal. Hopelijk wilt u mijn kritiek niet verkeerd voorstellen.

Wel meen ik dat de economische wetenschap geweld wordt aangedaan. Samenwerking met niet-economen en niet-wetenschappers is te waarderen, maar het onderwerp van het Geldstelsel heeft betrekking op staathuishoudkunde, en dan dient staathuishoudkunde centraal te staan. Waarom willen niet-economen het wiel opnieuw uitvinden? Waarom doen sommigen t.o.v. de Tweede Kamer alsof zij economen zijn? Klaas van Egmond en Bert de Vries (klaarblijkelijk chemicus, "systeemdynamicus") hadden moeten zeggen: wij zijn geen economen.

Zoals je weet zijn de beste ideeën in de economische wetenschap ingebracht door niet-economen.

Nee, dat wist ik nog niet.

Het lijkt me lastig wanneer een niet-econoom dit meent te kunnen beoordelen.

Bijvoorbeeld: De eerste Nobelprijswinnaars waren Tinbergen (fysicus) en Frisch (econoom). Dan let ik op de bal: uit het werk van Tinbergen blijkt namelijk dat hij voldoende op economie gestudeerd heeft om hem toch als econoom te herkennen.

Bijvoorbeeld: Een niet-econoom of zelfs een kind kan mij op een gedachte brengen t.a.v. economie. Maar, dan ben ik wel economisch geschoold om het belang van zo'n inzicht te waarderen. Dat is niet een man spelen maar een vak uitoefenen.

Op een enkele uitzondering na hebben vak-economen de crisis van 2007+ niet zien aankomen.

Mijn protest tegen Dirk Bezemer is dat hij niet wil onderkennen en aan anderen getuigen dat ik hier ook een waarschuwing heb laten horen. Hij kan dit nagaan en op zijn lijstje opnemen. Waarom doet hij dat niet?

Waarom gaat u dit feit niet na?

Dan kunt u ook aan Dirk vragen waarom hij me niet op het lijstje zet.

Ik acht het onjuist van Klaas van Egmond en Bert de Vries alsof zij zouden stellen dat economen zich hebben gediskwalificeerd door die crisis niet te zien aankomen, waardoor zij het recht krijgen om te doen alsof zijzelf wel iets nuttigs over de economie kunnen vertellen.

Ik heb wel degelijk een waarschuwing laten horen. Het parlement had dit kunnen onderzoeken.

Je kunt niet zeggen dat alle economen hadden moeten waarschuwen voor de crisis. Er zijn voldoende waarschuwingen geweest, en het accent ligt op "voldoende". Dat deze waarschuwingen van economen niet gehoord zijn, ligt niet aan de economische wetenschap, maar aan het structureel falen van de Trias Politica t.a.v. de staathuishoudkunde. Zie mijn boek DRGTPE.

En ik laat nu ook een waarschuwing horen t.a.v. Klaas van Egmond en Bert de Vries en SFL.

Zoals al in de jaren '80 aangegeven door de econoom Minsky en zoals nu in de praktijk blijkt, veronderstellen de meeste economische modellen dat geld er niet toe doet en banken onbelangrijk zijn. Die misvatting is ons dus heel duur komen te staan.

Maar die misvatting had ikzelf niet. Zie hierboven t.a.v. de term "voldoende".

Je uitgangspunt is blijkbaar dat iedereen in zijn 'wetenschappelijke' hokje moet blijven. Dat is een deel van het probleem, zeker als het om duurzaamheid gaat; iedereen zoomt in, en niemand zoomt uit (Freek de Jonge). Het gaat tegenwoordig juist om interdisciplinaire samenwerking. Mensen die zich daar aan wagen krijgen de wind van voren. Waarom niet alleen op de bal spelen in plaats van op de man ?

Ik ben allergisch voor hokjesgeest en het spelen van de man ipv de bal.

Dus, neem deze allergie mee, en lees mijn kritiek nog eens, om te begrijpen wat ik zeg.

Voor milieu-duurzaamheid: zie onder.

2 Wat dat laatste betreft heb ik waardering voor je inhoudelijke commentaar. Ik heb met de veronderstelling dat de $velocity = 1$ (geldhoeveelheid ongeveer gelijk aan BNP (pY)) inderdaad verwarring gesticht. Hoewel we op grond van onze berekeningen die veronderstelling menen te kunnen rechtvaardigen, is voorzichtigheid inderdaad geboden.

Ja, bij hersenchirurgie moet je niet bij de voeten beginnen. Ik waardeer dit toenemend inzicht.

In een nieuwe versie van ons working paper hebben we berekend welke hoeveelheden geld concreet gecreëerd kunnen / moeten worden wanneer bijvoorbeeld 3 % inflatie wordt nagestreefd. Met vrij grote zekerheid kan worden gesteld dat het onder de huidige omstandigheden om enkele tientallen miljarden € per jaar gaat, en voor de politieke discussie is die nauwkeurigheid voldoende. We zijn nu bezig om het model te publiceren in de peer reviewed literatuur, juist om wetenschappelijk debat en kritiek op te zoeken. We blijven van mening dat een model, als een voor iedereen te bezichtigen, transparant beeld van de (gepercipieerde) werkelijkheid, het enige middel is om de tot nu toe chaotische discussies te kanaliseren.

Met een bruto GDP van EUR 600 bn en $V = 2$ en groei van 1,5% moet je inderdaad naar een hogere inflatie dan 2% om de term "tientallen miljarden" te rechtvaardigen. Je kunt het ook naar Europa opschalen. Maar ik gaf ook aan dat seigniorage nodig was om de kosten van het transactie-bankieren te dekken: en daar zegt u niets over.

Ik onderschrijf de methodiek van Tinbergen dat we modellen moeten maken en deze aan data toetsen.

Ik waarschuw tegen niet-economen die denken dat ze economie doen door modellen te maken.

Wanneer je een kind achter het stuur van een auto zet, heeft dat kind nog lang geen rijbewijs.

Het is niet ondenkbaar dat dit model het "peer review" proces van een economisch tijdschrift zal passeren. Zwaaien met titels en doen alsof SFL ook economie is, kan referees op het verkeerde been zetten. In sommige tijdschriften wordt alleen getoetst op leesbaarheid. Wanneer enkele "peers" een model gepubliceerd laten worden, kun je niet concluderen dat het gevalideerd is en wetenschappelijk geaccepteerd.

Voor de goede orde: ik heb het model verder niet bekeken. Mijn conclusies zijn gebaseerd op mijn studie econometrie, ervaring bij het CPB 1982-1991, mijn boeken DRGTPE en CSBH,

en algemeen economisch inzicht bij lezing van de position papers en aanhoren van de video-opname.

Wilt u bij indiening van uw artikel aan tijdschriften ook wijzen op mijn kritiek in de weblink ? U kunt samenvatten wat die kritiek was en hoe u uw analyse daarop heeft aangepast.

<https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/17/dirk-bezemer-disinforms-dutch-parliament>

3 Je commentaar gaat op verschillende plaatsen te kort door de bocht, wat geen sterke indruk maakt wanneer je beweert uit naam van de wetenschap te opereren.

Je slordige opmerkingen over het werk van Roefi Hueting m.b.t. Duurzaam Nationaal Inkomen treffen mij zeer onaangenaam.

Mijn opmerkingen zijn niet slordig. Zij betreffen de andere reden waarom SFL mank gaat.

We hebben in het RIVM en later in het milieuplanbureau jarenlang geld en tijd in het project geïnvesteerd, mede op (terecht) verzoek van toenmalig minister Pronk. Na vele jaren zijn we er allemaal van overtuigd geraakt dat het niet gaat werken.

De kosten van berekening van het mDNI bedragen 0,25% van de begroting van het CBS. Vergelijk dit eens met 3,5% GDP die aan de Tweede Kamer wordt voorgespiegeld ...

U zou deze conclusie "dat dit niet gaat werken" moeten specificeren, met de mogelijkheid van weerwoord door Hueting, in plaats van het mDNI dood te zwijgen. U bent ook geen econoom en "dat dit niet gaat werken" is dan ook een lastige positie, waarin u eerst economie zou moeten leren voordat zo'n conclusie gedragen kan worden. Het is dan zuiverder om aan de Tweede Kamer te rapporteren dat u er niet over kunt oordelen en dat men nader onderzoek dient te betrachten.

Kunt u aangeven waar u in uw periode bij het MNP heeft onderbouwd "dat het niet gaan werken" en dit met Hueting heeft doorgesproken ?

Op de website van Hueting staat een briefwisseling over de monitor 2009 maar dat was toch na uw periode ?

<http://www.sni-hueting.info/NL/index.html>

In het DNI wordt het nationaal inkomen gecorrigeerd voor met name milieuschade.

Het gaat immers alleen om die milieu-duurzaamheid.

Al die andere vormen van "duurzaamheid" zijn verwarrend t.a.v. de oorspronkelijke doelen t.a.v. milieu-duurzaamheid.

De huidige klimaatdiscussie maakt duidelijk dat we het niet eens kunnen worden over de vraag wat we schade noemen en hoe erg dat is, laat staan dat we dat wetenschappelijk verantwoord in geld kunnen uitdrukken. Bijvoorbeeld ooit geprobeerd uit te rekenen wat de schade in euro's is van een NO₂-concentratie die 50 % boven de norm ligt ? Het gaat hier dus helemaal niet om een kunstje voor vak-economen, maar om de ingewikkelde samenhang met toxicologie, epidemiologie, materiaalkunde, biodiversiteit, ecologie (draagkrachtstudies ecosystemen). Gelukkig komen die mensen wel uit hun vakspecialistische hokjes.

Eenzijds zegt u dat die disciplines moeten samenwerken, en anderzijds zegt u dat het een mission impossible is. U bent ernstig verward.

Het economisch begrip "nationaal inkomen" (NI) is "work in progress". Vorig jaar was er wederom zo'n statistisch aanpassing van het NI, met een extra overdracht aan Brussel. Het mDNI heeft ook dat karakter van "work in progress". Daar is helemaal niets mis mee. Voor de Tweede Kamer is het relevant te weten dat mDNI de stand van de wetenschap is.

<http://www.oekologisches-wirtschaften.de/index.php/oew/article/view/1204>

Het is aantoonbaar dat de bureaucratie waaronder MNP de Tweede Kamer informatie over het mDNI heeft onthouden. In feite bevestigt u dit. Want geeft u maar aan, waar u gerapporteerd heeft "dat het niet gaat werken".

Hier is mijn concept-boek over het onderwerp en u zou u diep moeten schamen over uw desinformatie en aanmatiging t.a.v. de economische wetenschap:

<https://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/63904>

Wat betreft je cynische commentaar op mijn boek (Een Vorm van Beschaving) moet ik constateren dat je het blijkbaar niet hebt gelezen, of zelfs de inhoudsopgave niet hebt bekeken.

Ik heb de online inhoudsopgave bekeken, en op grond van het getoonde gebrek aan economische kennis besloten dat ik het niet ga lezen.

Het is geen cynisch commentaar. Het is helder opgeschreven logica voor iemand die het anders misschien niet begrijpt.

Het gaat namelijk niet of nauwelijks over het verband tussen economie en religie, maar over het grote belang van waardepatronen en wereldbeelden voor het begrijpen van de grote duurzaamheidsproblemen van deze tijd. Economen en technologen hebben nu zo'n 40 jaar de kans gehad om het probleem op te lossen. Dat is niet gelukt en dat gaat ook niet meer lukken. Enige bescheidenheid zou daarom de economische wetenschap(per) sieren. Die mislukking was juist de reden van mij (en mijn collega's) om uit te zoomen en ons met die achterliggende, diepere oorzaken bezig te gaan houden. In een studie van 2004 (Duurzaamheidsverkenning) laten we al zien wat de gevolgen zijn wanneer het huidige waardepatroon blijft domineren. We hebben daarbij toen al gewezen op de spanningen die (t.g.v. bevolkingsgroei en klimaatverandering) in Afrika en het Midden Oosten zouden gaan optreden. De gevolgen daarvan kun je nu ieder avond op je TV zien. Echt, er zijn meer dingen op aarde dan waarvan jouw economische wijsheid droomt.

Dat zegt u tegen mij ? Tegen iemand die als student in 1975 de discussie over de Club van Rome meemaakte en die merkte dat men prijzen en geld achterwege liet, die het "Global 2000 Report to the President" in de kast heeft staan, die aan de CPB lange termijn studies "Scanning the Future" en "Nederland in Drievoud" 1990-2015 heeft meegedaan, en die in 1990 de conclusie trok dat het probleem ligt bij het structureel falen van de Trias Politica, zie mijn advies tot een parlementaire enquête (CPB-notitie 90-III-38, door directeur Gerrit Zalm van bespreking en publicatie tegengehouden, wat censuur van de wetenschap is), en zie DRGTPE.

<http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/TPnCPB/Record/1990/12/18/index.html>

<http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Index.html>

Nee, als dit uw nieuwe samenvatting van uw boek is, dan luidt wederom de conclusie dat u opnieuw het wiel wil uitvinden. Uw weigert netjes staathuishoudkunde te bestuderen, u legitimeert die weigering door te stellen dat economen het al 40 jaar mishebben - maar dat wist u 40 jaar geleden ook al - waarna zij aan de kant kunnen worden geschoven, en u aan uw vierkante wiel kunt schaven.

Neen: wat de leden van de Tweede Kamer en lezers in Nederland dienen te weten: het probleem in de voorbereiding van het economisch beleid is dat de wetenschap structureel geweld wordt aangedaan, door censuur van die wetenschap (Gerrit Zalm was geen wetenschapper maar kwam uit de bureaucratie van EZ), andere bureaucratie zoals rond Hueting's mDNI, en door zulke vermeende "wetenschappers" als Klaas van Egmond en Bert

de Vries die zich niet houden aan de normen van wetenschap en die niet optreden tegen overheidsensuur alsook het wangedrag door Dirk Bezemer.

=====
2
=====

Date: Wed, 18 Nov 2015 21:01:19 KvE to TC cc SFL (* B *)

From: "Egmond, N.D. van \ (Klaas\)" <N.D.vanEgmond / ~ / uu.nl>

To: "Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus",
<cie.fin / ~ / tweedekamer.nl>

Cc: "Tilburg, R. van \ (Rens\)" <R.vanTilburg / ~ / uu.nl>,
"Vries, B.J.M. de \ (Bert\)" <B.J.M.deVries / ~ / uu.nl>,
"Wijffels, H.H.F. \ (Herman\)" <H.H.F.Wijffels / ~ / uu.nl>,
<e.m.sent / ~ / fm.ru.nl>,
<klamer / ~ / eshcc.eur.nl>,
"Sanders, M.W.J.L. \ (Mark\)" <M.W.J.L.Sanders / ~ / uu.nl>,
"Schenk, E.J.J. \ (Hans\)" <E.J.J.Schenk / ~ / uu.nl>,
"Kool, C.J.M. \ (Clemens\)" <C.J.M.Kool / ~ / uu.nl>,
<staveren / ~ / iss.nl>,
"Boot, A.W.A." <A.W.A.Boot / ~ / uva.nl>,
<h.a.benink / ~ / uvt.nl>,
"Luuk de Waal Malefijt" <l.dwm / ~ / onsgeld.nu>

Beste Thomas Cool,

Bij deze een korte reactie op je 'wetenschappelijk protest'.

1 Je grootste ergernis lijkt te zijn dat veel van de SFL-betrokkenen geen economen zijn. Zoals je weet zijn de beste ideeën in de economische wetenschap ingebracht door niet-economen. Op een enkele uitzondering na hebben vak-economen de crisis van 2007+ niet zien aankomen. Zoals al in de jaren '80 aangegeven door de econoom Minsky en zoals nu in de praktijk blijkt, veronderstellen de meeste economische modellen dat geld er niet toe doet en banken onbelangrijk zijn. Die misvatting is ons dus heel duur komen te staan. Je uitgangspunt is blijkbaar dat iedereen in zijn 'wetenschappelijke' hokje moet blijven. Dat is een deel van het probleem, zeker als het om duurzaamheid gaat; iedereen zoomt in, en niemand zoomt uit (Freek de Jonge). Het gaat tegenwoordig juist om interdisciplinaire samenwerking. Mensen die zich daar aan wagen krijgen de wind van voren. Waarom niet alleen op de bal spelen in plaats van op de man ?

2 Wat dat laatste betreft heb ik waardering voor je inhoudelijke commentaar. Ik heb met de veronderstelling dat de $velocity = 1$ (geldhoeveelheid ongeveer gelijk aan BNP (pY)) inderdaad verwarring gesticht. Hoewel we op grond van onze berekeningen die veronderstelling menen te kunnen rechtvaardigen, is voorzichtigheid inderdaad geboden. In een nieuwe versie van ons working paper hebben we berekend welke hoeveelheden geld concreet gecreëerd kunnen / moeten worden wanneer bijvoorbeeld 3 % inflatie wordt nagestreefd. Met vrij grote zekerheid kan worden gesteld dat het onder de huidige omstandigheden om enkele tientallen miljarden € per jaar gaat, en voor de politieke discussie is die nauwkeurigheid voldoende. We zijn nu bezig om het model te publiceren in de peer reviewed literatuur, juist om wetenschappelijk debat en kritiek op te zoeken. We blijven van mening dat een model, als een voor iedereen te bezichtigen, transparant beeld van de (gepercipieerde) werkelijkheid, het enige middel is om de tot nu toe chaotische discussies te kanaliseren.

3 Je commentaar gaat op verschillende plaatsen te kort door de bocht, wat geen sterke indruk maakt wanneer je beweert uit naam van de wetenschap te opereren.

Je slordige opmerkingen over het werk van Roefi Hueting m.b.t. Duurzaam Nationaal Inkomen treffen mij zeer onaangenaam. We hebben in het RIVM en later in het milieuplanbureau jarenlang geld en tijd in het project geïnvesteerd, mede op (terecht) verzoek van toenmalig minister Pronk. Na vele jaren zijn we er allemaal van overtuigd geraakt dat het niet gaat werken. In het DNI wordt het nationaal inkomen gecorrigeerd voor met name milieuschade. De huidige klimaatdiscussie maakt duidelijk dat we het niet eens kunnen worden over de vraag wat we schade noemen en hoe erg dat is, laat staan dat we dat wetenschappelijk verantwoord in geld kunnen uitdrukken. Bijvoorbeeld ooit geprobeerd uit te rekenen wat de schade in euro's is van een NO2-concentratie die 50 % boven de norm ligt? Het gaat hier dus helemaal niet om een kunstje voor vak-economen, maar om de ingewikkelde samenhang met toxicologie, epidemiologie, materiaalkunde, biodiversiteit, ecologie (draagkrachtstudies ecosystemen). Gelukkig komen die mensen wel uit hun vakspecialistische hokjes.

Wat betreft je cynische commentaar op mijn boek (Een Vorm van Beschaving) moet ik constateren dat je het blijkbaar niet hebt gelezen, of zelfs de inhoudsopgave niet hebt bekeken. Het gaat namelijk niet of nauwelijks over het verband tussen economie en religie, maar over het grote belang van waardepatronen en wereldbeelden voor het begrijpen van de grote duurzaamheidsproblemen van deze tijd. Economen en technologen hebben nu zo'n 40 jaar de kans gehad om het probleem op te lossen. Dat is niet gelukt en dat gaat ook niet meer lukken. Enige bescheidenheid zou daarom de economische wetenschap(per) sieren. Die mislukking was juist de reden van mij (en mijn collega's) om uit te zoomen en ons met die achterliggende, diepere oorzaken bezig te gaan houden. In een studie van 2004 (Duurzaamheidsverkenning) laten we al zien wat de gevolgen zijn wanneer het huidige waardepatroon blijft domineren. We hebben daarbij toen al gewezen op de spanningen die (t.g.v. bevolkingsgroei en klimaatverandering) in Afrika en het Midden Oosten zouden gaan optreden. De gevolgen daarvan kun je nu ieder avond op je TV zien. Echt, er zijn meer dingen op aarde dan waarvan jouw economische wijsheid droomt.

groet

Klaas van Egmond

Sent: 18 November 2015 13:36 TC to TK Com. on Finance cc others (* A *)

From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

To: cie.fin / ~ / tweedekamer.nl

Cc: Tilburg, R. van (Rens); Egmond, N.D. van (Klaas); Weyzig, F.; Vries, B.J.M. de (Bert); Zwaan, G.J. van der (Bert); Amman, H.M. (Hans); tegenlicht / ~ / vpro.nl; Ad.van.Oosten / ~ / Nieuwsuur.nl; Monique.Wijnans / ~ / Nieuwsuur.nl; marjan.minnesma / ~ / urgenda.nl; Wijffels, H.H.F. (Herman); rotmans / ~ / drift.eur.nl; e.m.sent / ~ / fm.ru.nl; klamer / ~ / eshcc.eur.nl; HOEVEN / ~ / ISS.NL; Sanders, M.W.J.L. (Mark); Schenk, E.J.J. (Hans); Kool, C.J.M. (Clemens); staveren / ~ / iss.nl; Boot, A.W.A.; h.a.benink / ~ / uvt.nl; studentenraad.dsz / ~ / vu.nl; bestuur / ~ / asva.nl; naitsoezn / ~ / groningenstudentenbond.nl; kritischestudentenutrecht / ~ / gmail.com; Peters, M.M.C.G. (Melanie); M.M.Leezenberg / ~ / uva.nl; info / ~ / janbor.nl; beekman / ~ / filosofie-oostwest.nl; a.vander.braak / ~ / vu.nl; L.J.R.Scholten; Waard, Peter de; t.meeus / ~ / nrc.nl; dejongsteven / ~ / gmail.com; Marc Chavannes; secretaris / ~ / wetenschapsjournalisten.nl; jesse / ~ / ftm.nl; M.Sommer / ~ / Volkskrant.nl; economie / ~ / trouw.nl; parlement / ~ / trouw.nl; ombudsman / ~ / volkskrant.nl; ombudsman / ~ / nrc.nl; cie.ez / ~ / tweedekamer.nl; cvandixhoorn / ~ / gmail.com; Luuk de Waal Malefijt; George van Houts

Subject: Wetenschappelijk protest tegen de misleidende informatie door Dirk Bezemer in het Rondetafelgesprek Geldstelsel d.d. 14 oktober 2015

Aan de Vaste Commissie voor Financiën

Geachte Commissie,

U had op 14 oktober 2015 een Rondetafelgesprek Geldstelsel.

Ik zag de video-opname pas onlangs.

Hier staat mijn wetenschappelijk protest tegen de misleidende informatie aan u gegeven door Dirk Bezemer:

<https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/17/dirk-bezemer-disinforms-dutch-parliament>

Ik doe kopie aan enkele indieners van de petitie. Alsook aan degenen die ik eerder in een email aan Van Dixhoorn in 2013 een waarschuwing deed t.a.v. het "Sustainable Finance Lab" van de Universiteit van Utrecht, met aldaar Bezemer en hoogleraar Van Egmond die u hoorde. Mocht van sommigen inmiddels de positie zijn veranderd, zoals wellicht vertrouwenspersoon Peters van de UU, dan verzoek ik betrokkene om het email door te sturen aan de opvolger.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
Econometrist (Groningen 1982) en leraar wiskunde (Leiden 2008)
Scheveningen
<http://thomascool.eu/>

PS 1. Een verzoek aan Rens van Tilburg (secretaris SFL) om dit email door te sturen aan de andere leden van het SFL die hierboven niet genoemd staan (zoals Peter Blom)

PS 2. Een verzoek aan Bert de Vries is om op zijn website ook te vermelden wat zijn vooropleiding is geweest (bijv. economie ?).

=====
3 About Copenhagen 2009
=====

Date: Wed, 02 Sep 2009 17:18:29 TC to WWV & IPCC cc RvD (** 2 **)

To: info / ~ / wwviews.org, IPCC-sec / ~ / wmo.int

From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

Subject: Copenhagen (after Mark Lynas's talk in Amsterdam, September 1)

Cc: secretariat / ~ / unfccc.int, executiveoffice / ~ / unep.org, lene / ~ /

peoplesclimateaction.dk, C.vandermeij / ~ / Rathenau.nl, j.staman / ~ / rathenau.nl, i-books / ~

/ antenna.nl, jhansen / ~ / giss.nasa.gov, info / ~ / debat.nl, dorlandv / ~ / knmi.nl, luttikhuis / ~

/ nrc.nl, secretaris / ~ / wetenschapsjournalisten.nl, peter.howells / ~ / uwe.ac.uk

Dear Sir, Madam,

Yesterday, Rathenau Institute organized a discussion in Amsterdam with Mark Lynas ("Six degrees"), Rob van Dorland (KNMI), and Paul Luttikhuis (NRC-Handelsblad), as part of the World Wide Views on Global Warming, in relation to the Copenhagen summit in December. The discussion was monitored by Peter van der Geer (debat.nl).

You are likely to think that Holland is a liberal and freedom loving country. You are likely to think that Rathenau Institute will collect all useful information and transmit this to you. I am sorry to inform you that this is not the case. Dutch culture does not respect freedom of thought and Rathenau Institute will surely not provide you with an adequate report.

I am writing to you as an economic scientist. This present email to you is the accurate report that you need, warranted by economic science.

As an economic scientist I protest against the censorship of science and the abuse of power by the Dutch Central Planning Bureau (CPB) since 1989/90. The CPB was founded in 1945 by Jan Tinbergen (1903), the first recipient in 1969 of the Nobel Prize in economics (with Ragnar Frisch). When I told Tinbergen about the censorship he reacted that a younger generation that he himself would have to resolve this. These younger generations till now neglect Tinbergen's advice, and the matter has not been resolved yet.

I also protest against Dutch indifference to this situation. In fact, since 2004 I advise to boycott of Holland till the censorship is resolved.

Links are provided below.

At the Amsterdam discussion, when I stated my protest against the censorship of science by the CPB directorate, discussion leader Van der Geer interrupted me, talked down to me, suggested that I had delusions of a conspiracy, and then ignored me for a long while. By consequence, my serious scientific contribution was suppressed and ridiculed. It is telling of Dutch culture that no one in the audience (at least to my knowlegde) protested against this treatment. Eventually Van der Geer allowed me to make some final remark, while admitting that he had indeed been ignoring me deliberately. I must admit that I felt quite intimidated and irritated by then. Thus, as I did not experience an open atmosphere, my last remark may not have been the most effective. (Which is part of the reason why Rathenau Institute will not provide an adequate report.)

I have been protesting against the censorship and abuse of power for some 20 years now (i.e. since I participated in the CPB long term projection "Scanning the future 1990-2015" and my comments were blocked by the directorate). Dutch society is apparently incapable of resolving this. When science is neglected then indeed a journalist like Lynas may write a book like "Six degrees" but such a book does not resolve the basic scientific questions on economic management, and it may actually distract from the relevant questions (since the question is not really whether there will be six degrees, while economic policy is more fuelled by fear for unemployment).

Hence, I again protest against all this disrespect for science, and see reason to inform you about this.

Subsequently, I want to draw your attention to the Tinbergen & Hueting Approach in the Economics of Ecological Survival. This approach dates back from at least 30 years. Economists neglected it since they were not interested in the environment. Ecologists neglected it since they disliked economics. What we see now is a disaster in scientific advice to society. This is not a purely Dutch phenomenon but an international phenomenon. However, there is a strong Dutch component, as you can read in the provided links.

Dr Roefie Hueting is a United Nations Global 500 Award winner. The UN statistical procedures on the environment are very much based upon his work. In my judgement Roefie Hueting is a serious candidate for the Nobel Prize in economics, if only his work was decently studied by my fellow economists. The way his work is being treated by economists and policy makers is an intellectual disgrace for both science and policy making. Remarkable is the failure of the grassroots environmental movement, in their dislike of anything economic, to investigate the Tinbergen & Hueting approach.

Thus, another practical suggestion - next to boycotting Holland - is that the Copenhagen summit adopts the Hueting indicator of "environmentally Sustainable National Income" (eSNI), alongside the traditional measure of national income. It will be relatively easy to implement the eSNI measure since it uses base material that UNStat already has adopted from Hueting's work. The measure is wider than only the climate, but it will be essential to monitor

economic development while indicators as CO2 or temperature are inadequate just by themselves.

Another suggestion is that you put this report prominently on your website. A final suggestion is that you dispatch a team of investigators to Holland to check the points that I have reported on, and put their report on your website. An effective policy on climate change starts by boycotting Holland till the censorship of science is resolved.

As said, links are provided below.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
<http://thomascool.eu>

PS. I copy to dr. Peter Howells of the RES Newsletter with the suggestion of publication.

Perhaps a good introduction to my person might be this discussion by prof. dr. Richard Gill (mathematical statistics Leiden and Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences):
<http://www.math.leidenuniv.nl/~naw/serie5/deel09/sep2008/reviewssep08.pdf>

My protest against censorship of science and abuse of power by the CPB directorate:
<http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/English/TPnCPB/Case.html>
<http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Institute/After35YearsOfMassUnemployment.html>

The Tinbergen & Hueting Approach in the Economics of Ecological Survival:
<http://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/13899>

Hueting's page
<http://www.sni-hueting.info>

Date: Mon, 23 Nov 2015 19:19:05 MS to TC cc all

From: "Sanders, M.W.J.L. \(\Mark\)" <M.W.J.L.Sanders / ~ / uu.nl>
To: "Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus"
Cc: "Kuipers Munneke, P. \(\Peter\)" <P.KuipersMunneke / ~ / uu.nl>, <rob.van.dorland / ~ / knmi.nl>, (...)
Subject: Re: W.r.t."Apocalyps in slowmotion" NRC November 21 2015

Hallo Thomas,

Kun je me van deze mailinglijst afhalen? Je hecht blijkbaar zeer aan (wetenschappelijke) integriteit en ik neem dus aan dat je de (fatsoens)normen tav het gebruik van emailadressen strikt zult naleven? Ik stel geen prijs op deze correspondentie en vertrouw erop dat je mijn adres per direct van je verzendlijst verwijderd.

Vriendelijke groeten,

Mark Sanders

(full email of 12 pages reproduced)

Date: Mon, 23 Nov 2015 19:28:49 PKM to TC only

From: "Kuipers Munneke, P. \(\Peter\)" <P.KuipersMunneke / ~ / uu.nl>
To: "Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus"
Subject: Re: W.r.t."Apocalyps in slowmotion" NRC November 21 2015

(No CC)

Beste Thomas Cool,

U hoeft mij niet te betrekken in deze discussie. Graag verzoek ik u mij niet langer deze correspondentie te sturen.

Hartelijke groet,
Peter Kuipers Munneke

(full email of 12 pages reproduced)

Date: Tue, 24 Nov 2015 06:27:39 PL to TC cc all

From: "Luttikhuis, Paul" <p.luttikhuis / ~ / nrc.nl>
To: "Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus"
Cc: (... full list of all recipients)
Subject: Re: W.r.t."Apocalyps in slowmotion" NRC November 21 2015

Beste Thomas,
Haal mij alsjeblieft van deze mailinglijst.
Paul Luttikhuis

Date: Tue, 24 Nov 2015 11:03:00 JR to TC cc all

From: "J. Rotmans" <rotmans / ~ / fsw.eur.nl>
To: "Luttikhuis, Paul" <p.luttikhuis / ~ / nrc.nl>,
"Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus"
Cc: (... full list of all recipients)
Subject: RE: W.r.t."Apocalyps in slowmotion" NRC November 21 2015

Mij ook graag verwijderen svp

Prof.dr.ir. Jan Rotmans

Dutch Research Institute for Transitions

(full email of 12 pages reproduced)

Date: Tue, 24 Nov 2015 13:22:57 KvE to TC cc all (* D *)

From: "Egmond, N.D. van \ (Klaas\)" <N.D.vanEgmond / ~ / uu.nl>
To: "Tilburg, R. van \ (Rens\)" <R.vanTilburg / ~ / uu.nl>,
"J. Rotmans" <rotmans / ~ / fsw.eur.nl>,
"Luttikhuis, Paul" <p.luttikhuis / ~ / nrc.nl>,
"Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus"
Cc: (... full list of all recipients)
Subject: verwijderen van email lijst !

Thomas Cool,

ik wens definitief van je email lijst te worden verwijderd, voordat ik opnieuw in de verleiding kom om serieus op je lastercampagne te reageren.

Ik wijs je er ten slotte nog één keer op dat ik te allen tijde, ook in het TK-hoorzitting, mij nadrukkelijk heb gepresenteerd als milieukundige en niet als econoom.

Klaas van Egmond
milieukundige

From: Tilburg, R. van (Rens) (...)

>

(full email of 12 pages reproduced)

Date: Thu, 26 Nov 2015 14:57:29 RvD to TC cc all (5 **)**

From: "Dorland van, Rob \(\KNMI\)" <rob.van.dorland / ~ / knmi.nl>

To: "Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus",

"Peter Kuipers Munneke" <P.KuipersMunneke / ~ / uu.nl>

Cc: (... full list of all recipients)

Subject: RE: W.r.t."Apocalyps in slowmotion" NRC November 21 2015

Thomas Cool

Mij graag verwijderen van de emaillijst. Ik beschouw het als spam.

Rob van Dorland

(...full email of 12 pages reproduced ...)