

# Why ALLEA doesn't see censorship of science in Holland

(i) ALLEA's *European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity*, (ii) my weblog critique, (iii) reply by Pieter Drenth, and (iv) this memo's response:

You only know what is censored when censorship is lifted

Thomas Colignatus  
December 16 2015  
Scheveningen, Holland

## Abstract

(1) ALLEA are *All European Academies of Sciences and Humanities*. For scientific integrity - including the humanities - ALLEA developed a legalistic Code of Conduct with an *Institutes & top-down* approach. An alternative is a *Scientist & bottom-up* approach. Potentially, both approaches are useful to have simultaneously in some balance. Forum Theory by A.D. de Groot would be the proper approach in resolving this. Forum Theory would help dealing with the tension between science and law. (2) In Holland there is censorship of economic science since 1990. (3) How is it possible that ALLEA has a Code of Conduct and there still is censorship of science in Holland ? Hypocrisy is "the practice of claiming to have higher standards or more noble beliefs than is the case" (Oxford). Pieter Drenth has been president of KNAW in 1990-1996 and of ALLEA in 2000-2006, and has an international reputation of defending the integrity of science, in particular with developing the framework of the ALLEA Code of Conduct. Drenth uses legalistic and unscientific arguments for neglecting the censorship of science in Holland. A protest against censorship of science in Holland will be less effective when foreigners think that Drenth has done such a good job in defending the integrity of science. (1-3) A weblog text received a reaction by Drenth. This present discussion evaluates that reaction.

1. Introduction.....	2
2. A first point: How to defend integrity of science (including the humanities).....	3
3. A second point: Hypocrisy and whether KNAW could or should act on the CPB case ..	5
4. Following the points in Drenth's reaction.....	6
5. Conclusions.....	10
Appendix A: P.J.D. Drenth: puntsgewijze reactie op de kritiek .....	11
Appendix B: Email exchange by Colignatus, Drenth and LOWI w.r.t. the weblog text on ALLEA and scientific integrity .....	14
Discussion.....	14
Date: Fri, 27 Nov 2015 00:17:51 +0100 TC -> PJDD .....	15
Date: Fri, 27 Nov 2015 11:03:33 +0100 TC -> LOWI .....	16
Date: Fri, 27 Nov 2015 00:17:51 +0100 TC -> PJDD .....	17
Date: Fri, 27 Nov 2015 17:03:02 +0100 PJDD -> TC .....	17
Date: Sat, 28 Nov 2015 10:47:42 +0100 TC -> PJDD.....	17
Date: Fri, 27 Nov 2015 11:03:33 +0100 TC -> LOWI .....	18
Date: Fri, 27 Nov 2015 00:17:51 +0100 TC -> PJDD .....	18
Date: Wed, 2 Dec 2015 09:18:23 +0000 LOWI -> TC.....	18
Date: Thu, 3 Dec 2015 12:25:31 +0100 PJDD -> TC .....	19
Date: Thu, 03 Dec 2015 20:46:50 +0100 TC -> PJDD .....	19
Date: Fri, 04 Dec 2015 11:00:51 +0100 TC -> PJDD.....	20
Date: Mon, 07 Dec 2015 18:58:48 +0100 TC -> PJDD .....	21
Date: Fri, 04 Dec 2015 11:00:51 +0100 TC -> PJDD .....	21
Date: Mon, 14 Dec 2015 15:29:49 +0100 TC -> PJDD .....	21
Date: Mon, 14 Dec 2015 23:23:57 +0100 PJDD -> TC .....	22

## 1. Introduction

**ALLEA** is the federation of *All European Academies* of Sciences and Humanities, see <http://www.allea.org>.

There is ALLEA's *European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (ECCRI)*, and I gave this a critical discussion.<sup>1</sup>

My weblog text also mentions the role played by Pieter Drenth, who was KNAW president 1990-1996 and ALLEA president 2000-2006, and who helped create ECCRI.<sup>2</sup>

- The weblog text refers to a video, in which Drenth says, when asked to become secretary at KNAW, that KNAW is a body that doesn't fight for a single university but "**for science for the whole of The Netherlands, you may say**".<sup>3</sup>
- Indeed: when there is **copyright of science in Holland since 1990** then one would expect to hear a protest by KNAW. But there wasn't.

### 1.1 The scientific reason to say something

Observe the *scientific* reason why I *must* say something about the role of KNAW. **Economic science requires a causal explanation for the world economic crisis since 2007. Part of the explanation is the suppression by government bodies of critical views by economic scientists working for them before 2007.**

- (i) A known whistleblower (without scientific position) is Bernard Connolly, see the book "*The rotten heart of Europe*", 1996. European politicians proceeded with the euro, and thanks to Connolly the Europeans cannot say that they weren't warned.
- (ii) I myself had a scientific position in 1982-1991 at the Dutch Central Planning Bureau (CPB). There is censorship of science **since** 1990 and abusive dismissal since 1991 by the directorate of the CPB, now for 25+ years. KNAW also in the period under Drenth hasn't done anything to protect me from those.
- (iii) Since the 1990's Dutch government has set up rules on integrity itself. But they still exclude looking into the "legally earlier" case since 1990, even though the case was in court while there came new rules and even though the censorship exists today.
- (iv) The 2007+ economic crisis confirms my analysis, but this evidence isn't looked into either. The directorate of CPB claims that it is a scientific institute, and should they not look at the evidence ?<sup>4</sup>

### 1.2 Drenth's reply and this very memo

I alerted professor Drenth to the weblog text, and indicated that I am open for comments. Drenth dismisses criticism on his policy choices. **Appendix A** contains Drenth's reply,<sup>5</sup> unfortunately but apparently by his deliberate choice in Dutch. **Appendix B** contains the email exchange in Dutch on this and his refusal to write a short English text. I have marginally improved my weblog text to reduce misunderstandings but Drenth still rejects the criticism.

Since my weblog text already deals with ALLEA ECCRI, this present text deals with Drenth's reply. The discussion in general is not about Drenth as a person of course. This memo is about his role and reply. It is rather important what he does not reply to. This present text gives an overview, and refers to the two appendices. Let us identify two main points and then look at minor points in Drenth's reply.

<sup>1</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/26/allea-defines-research-integrity-too-narrow>

<sup>2</sup> <https://pieterdrenth.wordpress.com/about>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vOuDZyjlrQ>, Dutch text (minute 55): "Het leek mij toch ook wel weer aardig om de KNAW [te doen], dat is een geheel nieuw orgaan [voor mij] waarin je niet vecht voor één universiteit maar voor de wetenschap van heel Nederland, zeg maar."

<sup>4</sup> <https://rwer.wordpress.com/2013/07/02/issue-no-64-of-real-world-economics-review>

<sup>5</sup> Drenth's reply is dated "20-12-2015" but this must be "02-12-2015".

### 1.3 No reply on some important issues

There are some important points that Drenth doesn't reply to. Note that he might reply to other people at other times, and that he merely does not reply to me directly. Still, I raised the issues, they are related to the above, and it would make sense to reply to me.

- When I alerted Drenth to my weblog text, I also referred to the 2007+ economic crisis, that occurred after his presidencies, and suggested that he gave the issue the benefit of the doubt, and that he informed the current KNAW president that it can be useful to talk with me. There is no reply, except perhaps the implication that it is not useful to talk with me.
- I also alerted him to the problem that research mathematicians (RM) pontificate on mathematics education research (MER) that they are not qualified for. His merely re-states (in point 8) the ALLEA Code of Conduct that this is annoying but doesn't amount to a breach of ALLEA research integrity. This is another example why that Code of Conduct is inadequate. Merely restating a criticised rule is no reply. In the video interview at minute 43 he states with a smile – it is unclear why this would be a cause for smiling - that students liked new editions of his textbook on Test Theory less when there appeared more formulas in them. But math education could be much improved when scientists would look into integrity breaches in MER that block this improvement. MR are so arrogant in their assumed qualification on empirical didactics that we are in need of rules against trespassing.
- My suggestion to revive Forum Theory by A.D. de Groot is important for breaking the stalemate in the discussion on integrity by reviving Forum Theory. Drenth in his statement of 2015-12-02 doesn't reply to this either. This is awkward since Drenth and A.D. de Groot were both psychologists involved in Test Theory, and they collaborated. Is Drenth going to be silent on this – and do A.D. de Groot a great disservice – or will he be happy to be reminded of this approach – and keep silent about who gave him the idea to combine integrity with Forum Theory ?
- There is a distinction between whistleblowers (who should be silent but speak) and scientists (who are expected to speak). Whistleblowers require additional laws, and then ALLEA / KNAW may say that they cannot do anything till such laws exist. However, scientists should already have protection: and the main problem is that ALLEA / KNAW don't provide this. Drenth confuses the categories, and refuses to give an example of a scientist who would be a "whistleblower".

## 2. A first point: How to defend integrity of science (including the humanities)

My weblog entry opposes on one hand the legalistic ALLEA ECCRI *Institutes & top-down* approach to on the other hand a *Scientist & bottom-up* approach. The A.D. de Groot Forum Theory would aspire a balance.

The text indicates various costs to the current ALLEA ECCRI approach. My suggestion is that ALLEA doesn't see those costs since they are focused on their approach. They are not even interested in trying to *discover* those other costs of neglect.

Drenth doesn't agree with this analysis. (i) He rejects the costs that I mentioned. (ii) He neglects them in cases that I did not mention (those that are "not observed" and cases that are costly since only dealt with end-of-pipe (Diederik Stapel was discovered late)). This is a curious lack of interest.

### 2.1 A Code for Employers ?

Perhaps a way to rephrase the issue: There could also be a *European Code of Conduct for Employers of Scientists (including the Humanities)* (ECCESH). Employers will now hold that they are doing their best by supporting and developing the ECCRI. But the idea is to look at this from the opposite angle. Good employers of scientists would e.g. embrace Forum Theory,

support internal democracy, have open access publication by having their own publishing outlet, do not commit censorship, support victims of censorship from elsewhere.

- From the viewpoint of an employer, one can understand the ALLEA approach. Scientists have the protection of science. It is difficult to take action when they do something wrong, since a wrong-doer can claim protection from science. Hence it is useful when there is a legal framework to tackle wrong-doing.
- As an employer, you can always get rid of an employee. You just claim that work relations have become impossible, and then judges can only accept the annulment of the work contract. At least, this is how it works in Holland. This also gives employers great power for censorship: they can always threaten to dismiss you when you as a scientist publish something (as you should as a scientist). As far as I know, ALLEA / KNAW don't do anything about this loophole. (Yes, we all know about well-known scientists who have some protection since they are known by the popular press. Consider the step-down in 1999-2000 of Joseph Stiglitz as chief economist of the World Bank – who got the Nobel Prize in 2001. However, Stiglitz was not in a position of chief scientist, as far as I know. The problem are the unknown scientists without such protection either from law or media or ALLEA. When ALLEA doesn't protect them, then they might be seen as whistleblowers, which may make the situation worse because more confused.)

## 2.2 The impact of Forum Theory

Drenth (point 9 below) claims that I suggested that Forum Theory would prevent all problems with integrity. I never said so. With Drenth's misrepresentation, the argument is reduced to mere opposing views, and there is no progress. Hence my suggestion is:

- Let us do an experiment with the Forum Theory approach. Let us start with Holland.
- Let Drenth specify what would be needed for him to change opinion.
- I specified some cases that could be tackled, like the CPB-case and the case of mathematics education research. In both cases I proposed a parliamentary enquiry.<sup>6</sup> Let scientists already do such enquiries as far as possible. This might save Dutch parliament time later on. Let us tackle these cases and see whether the events may change Drenth's view on the best approach to defend scientific integrity (in Holland).

## 2.3 Assuming authority for a field that you are not qualified for

The next problem is mentioned in point 8 below. A particular case of when the ALLEA ECCRI fails is when a scientist qualified for field A makes statements about field B. ECCRI allows it because scientist A is only tested in the own field A and not in the other field B. It would however still be a breach of scientific integrity: since you cannot assume authority for something that you are not qualified for. Statements about logic and common scientific practices are acceptable, and questions are also acceptable (to see for A how the various scientists in field B react), but to assume authority is not acceptable.

It is curious that ECCRI allows it, but it is not so curious anymore once we understand that ECCRI originates from litigation. If ECCRI would declare "(presistent) assumed authority" to be fraudulent, then it would open a can of worms, since it doesn't have legal tools to distinguish the fields A and B. ECCRI has no Forum Theory as a tool to distinguish the fields. Conclusion: assuming an authority that one doesn't have remains a breach of scientific integrity, and the adoption of Forum Theory will improve the integrity of science.

An example is Jan van de Craats in Holland.<sup>7</sup> He is emeritus research mathematician (RM) and makes statements about mathematics education research (MER) also for primary education which he isn't qualified for. According to ECCRI he doesn't do anything wrong in RM and is off the hook. On 2015-12-01 I discovered that Van de Craats also got a more

---

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/PE\\_werk\\_CPB](http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/PE_werk_CPB) and <http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/tk-onderzoek-wiskundeonderwijs>

<sup>7</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2015-09-15-Breach-by-Jan-van-de-Craats-and-Ben-Wilbrink-wrt-scientific-integrity.html>

recent appointment as professor in "didactics of mathematics" at the Open University (OU) in Holland: perhaps this provides for a formal qualification for primary education too, but it doesn't mean that there is a material qualification. Perhaps Van de Craats wrote so much about didactics (that he isn't qualified for) that the search committee at OU thought that he was qualified. If he has become "legally qualified" then his performance actually can be challenged under the ECCRI rules for being deliberately negligent (reducing the issue to legalities again). (I have asked OU some questions and hope to find out more later on.) Overall, this breach of integrity is not without consequences. RM at KNAW itself are in breach themselves too, and KNAW helped produce a deficient report on education on arithmetic.<sup>8</sup> The discussion in Holland about "realistic mathematics education" (RME) also affects views in other countries in the world like the USA, see also the OECD discussion on "21<sup>st</sup> century skills".<sup>9</sup>

### 3. A second point: Hypocrisy and whether KNAW could or should act on the CPB case

My criticism of KNAW / Drenth is that it is hypocritical to say that you defend the integrity of science (all over Europe) and allow censorship of science in Holland. Drenth informs us that he wrote a newspaper article about the pseudo-science of graphology: so why would he not write a newspaper article about the censorship of economic science since 1990 by the directorate of the Dutch CPB ? When Parliament is alerted by this protest from the (former) president of KNAW, then Parliament can decide to investigate the issue or not.

Hypocrisy is:

"the practice of claiming to have higher standards or more noble beliefs than is the case" (Oxford Dictionaries).

I find this curious:

- Drenth denies that he was informed about my letters in 1992-1995 and claims that those were handled 'administratively' by the then-director Ch. Moen. (Or later officer Dirk de Hen.)
- He doesn't object to how my letters have been treated.
- When he is informed just now, he still says that KNAW cannot deal with employer-employee relations. (Apparently Moen executed policy that Drenth still supports, too.)
- Thus by implication he would have reacted in 1992-1996 in the same manner, and still not deem this hypocritical w.r.t. defending integrity of science for the whole of Holland (or later Europe).
- He does not accept the distinction between science (my position) and legalities (his position). He dismisses my diagnosis of "dismal hypocrisy" as a personal attack. This is disingenuous. He should be aware that scientific integrity is a scientific notion and not a legal notion.

In answer:

- I originally wrote: "we can only suppose that the issue was also discussed with Drenth" (emphasis on "suppose"). The news here is that the supposition fails: apparently Drenth gave director Moen authority to deal with matters on agreed policy. This doesn't change however that Drenth is responsible for policy and delegation and those delegated acts. He misstates his responsibility by emphasising "I didn't know" and allowing that this might suggest to people that he wasn't responsible. Why doesn't he clearly say: "Though I didn't know I am still responsible." ?
- There was no personal attack. I never met Drenth and have no view about his person. This part of the weblog text deals with Drenth as president of KNAW and ALLEA. The

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2014-07-08-Colignatus-aan-KNAW-LOWI.html>

<sup>9</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/12/08/computer-algebra-is-a-revolution-but-21st-century-skills-q>

statement is that the president of KNAW is hypocritical in neglecting that employment law can be abused. And in this early period, when the case was in court, the president was Drenth. The discussion makes the substitution "Drenth" for "President KNAW 1990-1996" but that does not amount to a personal attack. It is important to make the substitution, because Drenth proceeded as president ALLEA 2000-2006 and has become an icon of scientific integrity: which is a huge misunderstanding.

- It is a breach of scientific integrity by Drenth 2015 to misrepresent this, and qualify this as a personal attack. The issue has been explained to him, he has seen the draft of this memo, and he persists in denouncing this scientific protest as a personal attack. (See elsewhere about reprisals on whistleblowers, and how denigrating persons reduces the willingness of other people to talk with them.)

I relate the video on Drenth's scientific career to the failure as president of KNAW and ALLEA. It is difficult to understand that a scientist opposed to pseudo-science (graphology) can still neglect Forum Theory and fall for the superficial arguments and taboo of "employer-employee law". He is not even interested in *researching* that employment law can be abused, and what can be done against this loophole. My discussion of the video is not intended as amateur psychology but targeted at deconstruction. It should help viewers of the video to be alert on some angles. After the reply I have edited the text to emphasize this.

#### 4. Following the points in Drenth's reaction

- (1) Apparently ECCRI is not clear enough that "research integrity" is also used to avoid the confusion of science versus humanities. It is better that they say so than that I adapt my text. ECCRI already specifies that science stands for "Wissenschaft" (including the humanities), but apparently ECCRI doesn't believe that people will read and remember this. Why not the simple solution of speaking about a code for *the sciences and the humanities* ? My point was: be clearer on this. My point also was: the focus on only research (publications, say 10%) is too simple (there is also 90%).
- (2) My criticism wasn't that ECCRI should also discuss "external" issues. My point was that there are breaches of integrity that are not included in ECCRI because its definition is *too narrow*. A good solution approach is to enhance Forum Theory (A.D. de Groot).
- (3) On this issue of the demarcation between "internal" and "external" ethics, Drenth turns my specific argument w.r.t. ECCRI into a general argument against vagueness, which becomes a straw man that can be burned. I never said that vagueness has never some merit. Children love vagueness since it gives them certainty. See the Sorites problem, see Fuzzy logic. Forum Theory helps in dealing with vagueness. My point was directed at ECCRI, and I really did specify costs. Drenth's reply neglects those costs. See main point one above.
- (4) That there are other things not in the code, is also shown by the diagram in the weblog text.
- (5) W.r.t. the term "falsification" we see it confirmed that ECCRI wasn't written by scientists interested in methodology, but likely by lawyers. Given the suggestion to link up with De Groot's Forum Theory, it is better to link up with Karl Popper. The alternative term is "manipulation".
- (6) Drenth's reply at this point is an informative reference to a book by Nick Steneck<sup>10</sup> and an OECD conference in Tokyo. Indeed, not doing something positive is not necessarily something negative. It still doesn't answer the issue. One can try to legally list all kinds of possible misdemeanors, but it is better to use Forum Theory. (Perhaps this is a repetition of the comparison of Napoleonic and Common Law, but there is no good reason, and only a bureaucratic one, why ALLEA / KNAW take sides with the employers.)
- (7) I would no longer *expect* the Dutch LOWI to look into *all possible cases of integrity*, if LOWI would change its name into only what it does deal with: **specifically named cases of misconduct: fabrication, manipulation, plagiarism**. Once LOWI has changed its

---

<sup>10</sup> <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~nsteneck/publications/publications.html>

name, I would still expect the scientific community to do something about scientific integrity in general. See the cases of CPB and mathematics education.

(8) There are some subpoints:

- (a) It is interesting that "reviews" are mentioned. In this case, vagueness can also turn against views common for LOWI. Sometimes "reviews" are deliberately destructive, which LOWI neglects, see <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/COTP/LOWI/Index.html>
- (b) There is the argument: Drenth holds that when someone abuses authority in one domain for statements in another domain that this person isn't qualified for, then this is irritating and no mortal sin. I find this very amazing. One can imagine cases when it is rather innocent and without much impact indeed. But there are also cases with much impact. (i) A single case, like in an appointment. (ii) Systematically, like the research mathematicians (RM) pontificating on mathematics education research (MER). Drenth merely restates a view and doesn't reply to the criticism.
- (c) Drenth's suggestion is that scientists can also be whistleblowers. I find this strange. Doesn't a scientist have freedom of speech ? Best is that Drenth gives examples of scientists who spoke up in their field of competence, and who should be regarded as whistleblowers rather than scientists. (Whistleblowing may require separate laws for protecting those who should be silent but still speak.)
- (d) Censorship in private companies is mentioned. But when this doesn't deal with scientists but with normal employees with only a scientific training, then this concerns civil liberties and not censorship of science.
- (e) One can list all kinds of cases. I never suggested that there is a book with all such cases.

(9) It is stated under this point that I would have argued that Forum Theory would resolve all cases of misconduct (more than just fabrication, manipulation and plagiarism). I never said so. (See the first main point in the Introduction, on costs.)

(10) It is stated that it would be clear nonsense, that ALLEA ECCRI would allow employers to protect their institutes, and not do enough to block censorship by those employers. See the "first point" in the Introduction that highlights the power that employers have to enforce censorship, which ALLEA ECCRI doesn't do anything about. Let scientists start dealing with the two cases that I mentioned on CPB and RM / MER, and let us see whether this causes stirs or not.

(11) There are some subpoints again.

- (a) This is the argument that KNAW cannot deal with "individual" "conflicts" "between employer and employee". This is full of words that require deconstruction. (a1) Is it a *conflict*, when the employer abuses employment law ? I don't regard the CPB issue as a conflict but as censorship and as an abuse of employment law. (a2) The CPB is government-funded, and potentially the director would be a scientist too (but in this case he came from the bureaucracy). To what extent is this an arrangement of "employment law" (like in the market place) and to what extent an arrangement for doing scientific research ? (a3) To what extent does the censorship of an "individual" scientist destroy the foundations of CPB and the assumptions in Parliament on the rules on scientific advice for economic policy making ? (a1-a3) It would help when KNAW gets advice from economists before dropping the case with this superficial prejudice on "employment law".
- (b) The claim that KNAW has no jurisdiction distracts from what is proposed. KNAW can at least discuss the case with me and see what it can do. It can testify in court. It can support the advice to boycott Holland till the issue is resolved. There are so many things that can be done. Yes, write a newspaper article for instance (like Drenth did on graphology).<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Compare this: On 2015-10-03 Piet Borst wrote about the "tyranny of a dumb model" how the CPB models investment in science as consumption without contribution to economic growth. <http://www.nrc.nl/handelsblad/2015/10/03/tirannie-van-dom-model-1540045> See two errors by Borst: (a) he writes about economics while he has no training as an economist, (b) he doesn't do what he can

- (c) The argument that KNAW doesn't have the manpower is unconvincing. KNAW can ask academics to look at aspects of the issue and publish about it. Other scientists can speak out so that I am no longer forced to do this protesting myself, and wait for the discussion in parliament about the evidence. KNAW can also look into the other case that I mentioned, on mathematics education research. This may help people to understand some general principles that I want to adhere to: good science.
- (d) See main point two for the responsible position of the president of KNAW. (PM. Even if a note by Drenth would turn up, he still might say that he only wrote or signed what was prepared by director Moen, given stated policy.) What is relevant now is the confirmation by Drenth of the stated policy in 1990-2015: **the use of superficial fallacies for the wilful neglect of censorship of economic science since 1990 in Holland.**
- (12) Professor Drenth states that he sees personal attacks and ad hominem disqualifications, with my use of terms of dismal hypocrisy, president's failure, vanity, bachelor level of mathematical knowledge. To be sure:
- (a) My webtext discussion makes the substitution "Pieter Drenth" for "President KNAW 1990-1996" but this substitution does not amount logically to a personal attack. It is important to make the substitution, because Drenth proceeded as president ALLEA 2000-2006 and has become an icon of scientific integrity: which is a huge misunderstanding, and a burden for me to explain to readers of the protest against censorship. (Doesn't he see the connection between this censorship at CPB, the creation of the euro, the 2007+ crisis, the current state of the world ? Doesn't he know: *You only know what is censored once censorship is lifted.*)
- (b) ECCRI speaks out against "reprisals on whistleblowers". The same would hold for "reprisals on scientists who protest against censorship". Whistleblowers need special protection, since in normal life they are supposed to be silent. Instead, scientists should have free speech (check your employment contract). Thus Drenth should be very careful in dealing with my criticism: he must protest against misrepresentation if I would misrepresent his views, but he also must respect my protest, without reprisal and without trying to induce others to neglect it because of his authority and reputation. We should expect at least the same care as I have taken to alert viewers of the video to critical aspects.  
PM. I wonder about his signature with "prof.dr.". Perhaps he uses his titles always. His titles are rather irrelevant for the issue at hand: (b1) economics, economic policy making and the crisis, (b2) understanding of integrity of science. One might say that a Ph.D. title and professorship are helpful for understanding integrity of science, but Diederik Stapel had both and I have neither. My weblog text indicates that Drenth missed some key insights. There is no use of these titles for the reply to my weblog text. Their use is rather an abuse – and at best Drenth is not sensitive to this.
- (c) There is really no need to react so sternly against this criticism as Drenth does. I have specified clearly that I have received no support from KNAW in 1990-2015 on this issue of censorship of science in Holland, not even an invitation to come and talk about it. The arguments given by Drenth are superficial and inadequate, and of bureaucratic and legalistic nature with the appearance of decency but still scientifically inadequate. I should be allowed to try to understand what is happening, and indicate some points for viewers to watch the video critically so that they gain perspective.
- (d) I wrote "at risk of vanity". Why misrepresent this, and just speak of "vanity" ?
- (e) I did not say that the book "Testtheorie" (4<sup>de</sup> editie, 2006 ?) contains errors. I said that it hadn't stopped psychometricians to present invalid research on number sense and arithmetic, which is causing quite some problems since at least since 2007 and perhaps already 1988.<sup>12</sup>

---

and should do: protect science. For scientists it is simple to establish that there is censorship. I had informed Borst about the censorship of economic science by the directorate of the CPB before.

<sup>12</sup> <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/06/pierre-van-hiele-and-adriaan-de-groot>



- (f) I never saw "Testtheorie". It is intended as an introduction It is used e.g. in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of pedagogy at RUG. <sup>13</sup> It might be a valuable book for bachelor students. I am not judging professor Drenth's mathematical skills by this book, and neither of co-author prof. dr. K. Sijtsma (dean of faculty in Tilburg). <sup>14</sup> Authors of a book for bachelors generally have higher understanding of the material themselves. (In TSOM I rely on Karel F. Drenth (1945-2010). <sup>15</sup>)
- (g) I have done no magic *test at distance* of Drenth's math skills in past or present. I just warned viewers of the video that when the video speaks about mathematical skills, surpassing those of his contemporary students in psychology around 1945, then viewers should be critical about what that level actually was, and that it might suffice at the level of a current bachelor.
- (h) Tailwind. Indeed, I hardly know anything about the history of psychology in the Netherlands. I am responding largely to this video. I consider it a tailwind when Snijders and De Groot asked him to write a book on Test Theory, since this meant from the outset a support from two key figures. (It is not clear why they didn't use an American book, or translate it. At minute 41 in the video there is talk about translating APA rules, that causes Drenth to remark that there is a greater need for an introductory book, and then they ask why he doesn't write it himself.)
- (i) Graphology. Again don't misrepresent. I spoke about "international science and its computers". The video interview mentioned the period in 1968-69 but apparently Drenth has looked up the proper period and found 1963. In that case I may revise the text a bit, dropping five years from this topic of the tailwind. This 1963 still is 18 years after the end of WW 2. There has been quite a technological development, see this video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q07PhW5sCEk> It may well be that graphology was still important around 1963 but a new check today shows that A.D. de Groot did some critical tests in 1947 and that the approach was stopped by the thesis by Abraham Jansen (1963), "Toetsing van grafologische uitspraken: een experimentele studie", written under supervision by A.D. de Groot. <sup>16</sup> There is also a report of a working group in that year, that likely relates to this thesis. It still seems that Drenth has had tailwind. Video minutes 43:30-45:00 gives his assumption that his crusade against graphology helped in eradicating the approach. He states that his crusade was started by three large articles by graphologist Wolters in "NRC-Handelsblad" (though created by a merger in 1970), with his reply in three large articles. He "got later support from the thesis by Jansen". Everyone who stops for a moment of critical consideration should agree that the scientific evidence given by the thesis by Jansen would have weighed more than the three newspaper articles by Drenth, or his later public discussion with Wittenberg, chair of the association of graphologists. Remember that this is not a discussion about graphology. It is a discussion on not admitting: "I was deluded and didn't do anything about the censorship of science at CPB".
- (j) "Industrial Democracy in Europe" (IDE): Listening to the video again, minute 46, I also note that Drenth considers the IDE project a success. An IDE report is still in 1993, see the Drenth, Thierry & Wolff (1998), "*Handbook of Work and Organizational Psychology: Vol 4: Organizational Psychology*", 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, p235. <sup>17</sup> However, one of the papers that has been hit by censorship at CPB since 1990 concerns Arrow's

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.stuvia.com/doc/59461/samenvatting-testtheorie--drenth-en-sijtsma>

<sup>14</sup> [https://www.tilburguniversity.edu/nl/webwijs/show/k.sijtsma\\_nl.htm](https://www.tilburguniversity.edu/nl/webwijs/show/k.sijtsma_nl.htm)

<sup>15</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/TSOM/Index.html>

<sup>16</sup> See this nice interview with A.D. de Groot, two years before his death, <http://issuu.com/onderwijsmuseum/docs/lessen20081>, page 19 second column, and <http://skepsis.nl/grafo.html>

<sup>17</sup> <https://books.google.nl/books?id=GOzmGuwr2KAC&pg=PA235&lpg=PA235&dq=IDE+democracy+psychology&source=bl&ots=11ghHgflB2&sig=TYaSW17lluMuhend2ylLHxh5OQo&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUK EwiP6duW1sHJAhWGIQ4KHemnDZgQ6AEIJTAC#v=onepage&q=IDE%20democracy%20psychology&f=false>

Impossibility Theorem on voting theory, that would tend to change perceptions on democracy.<sup>18</sup>

- (k) Drenth states that he is a psychologist and has, in his capacity as a psychologist, his own opinion concerning my weblog text. This is highly mystifying. Why would he want to make a statement like that ? It can't be positive since he calls the ending of the weblog text negative.
- (k1) Is he suggesting that I am no longer an unbiased scientist, but a biased person who cannot be taken serious as a scientist ? Is he suggesting that I am a lunatic ? I consider this statement a breach of integrity of science.
- (k2) He claims for himself the freedom to make a judgement (though doesn't inform us about it, except that it has professional status in psychology and is negative), which freedom, at least of expression, he denies for me - perhaps because I don't try to do psychology (even amateurish).
- (k3) My impression is that he hasn't succeeded in trying to imagine how a scientist might reason who has experienced censorship of science since 1990 and neglect of this by a president of KNAW and ALLEA who pontificates about integrity of science, "for science for the whole of The Netherlands, you may say".
- (l) Points (a)-(k) have been communicated to Drenth in draft form. They have not caused him to retract (k) and neither changed his statement that he regards this part of the weblog text as a personal attack. This part of his reply is not reasonable, unless the objective is to disqualify the critic and the messenger of the bad news. I informed Drenth that he was in breach of integrity of science here, but apparently it did not register.

## 5. Conclusions

We have touched upon ALLEA and ECCRI. It is useful to be aware of governance. Scientists (including the humanities) have done research, are co-opted onto governing boards and regulate the scientific process. Scientists entering into management are not necessarily good managers to start with. There are courses for the scientific management of science. Management meets the law and its lawyers too. Integrity of science is a topic within this framework.

My weblog text analyses that employers and lawyers have taken precedence, and that it is better that they become subordinate ( if they ever were: again) to the Forum of science. Aspects for that Forum are notions of democracy and methodology.

To understand the present situation in economics and scientific integrity we observe the crucial role of the censorship of economic science in Holland since 1990. In this, there is the role played by Pieter Drenth, president KNAW 1990-1996 and president ALLEA 2000-2006, who has done much about scientific integrity. It appears that Drenth has followed the path of the employers and the lawyers. He has neglected the censorship of science in Holland, using superficial arguments that have only the appearance of reason, and that are directly against the integrity of science.

The weblog discussion gave Drenth a second chance to evaluate the argument and to see where it went wrong already in 1990-1996. He still does not see it. The criticism on content is interpreted by him as a personal attack. He signs with his titles that are not relevant here. He claims that his background in psychology allows for arguments that he will not state and try to prove. Though he has written much on (the legal approach to) scientific integrity, it is telling that he doesn't see that he now is in breach of scientific integrity himself.

We want to explain what happened in 1990-2015. This discussion is part of the explanation. The discussion is not about Drenth as a person but this memo is about his role. Foreigners are served with an identification of the hypocrisy in Holland exported to ALLEA.

---

<sup>18</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/VTFD/Index.html>

## Appendix A: P.J.D. Drenth: puntsgewijze reactie op de kritiek

Prof. Dr. P.J.D. Drenth  
Amsterdam, 2015-12-02.

Hierbij een puntsgewijze reactie op de kritiek van Thomas Cool inzake ALLEA's Code of Conduct for Research Integrity, de KNAW en het LOWI in zijn webbericht in [boycottholland](#).

1. Het verschil tussen de termen scientific integrity en research integrity, waarover in de ALLEA/ESF werkgroep Code of Conduct uitvoerig is gediscussieerd, heeft een andere achtergrond dan Cool veronderstelt. Het ging niet om een bredere of engere definitie van integriteit, maar simpelweg om het feit dat volgens de Engelse werkgroepleden scientific integrity in een Engels sprekende omgeving zou worden gelezen als iets dat alleen op natuurwetenschappen (sciences) betrekking zou hebben en niet ook op humanities. Dat research integrity wel specifiek klinkt dan scientific integrity is juist, maar eigenlijk ook de bedoeling.
2. Want er is uitdrukkelijk gekozen voor een beperking tot wat is genoemd 'internal' ethische problemen en schending van integriteitsnormen. De Code is in ieder geval niet ook gericht op 'external' ethische problemen, zoals ethiek van toepassingen, ethische problemen van het medisch onderzoek, cloning, stamcel research, vrijheid van onderwerpkeuze, de sociale relevantie van research, aanvaardbaarheid van dierproeven, en dergelijke. Niet dat die vragen niet relevant zijn, maar ze vallen buiten het kader van de opdracht. Die was gericht op integriteitsproblemen en wangedrag bij opzet, uitvoering en rapportage van research. Een uitputtende behandeling van (ook) de externe ethische problemen zou een heel boek of zelfs verschillende boekwerken vereisen, en in ieder geval niet leiden tot een bruikbare en algemeen geaccepteerde Code.
3. Dat de demarcatielijn tussen interne en externe ethische problemen niet altijd scherp is, is natuurlijk, in tegenstelling tot wat Cool stelt, geen argument de onderscheiding niet te mogen maken. Het verschil tussen 'teasing' en 'bullying' is ook niet altijd scherp aan te geven, maar daarom mag je die twee begrippen toch wel onderscheiden? Hiermee vervalt ook de conclusie van Cool dat 'ALLEA is on the wrong track'.
4. Ook bij het verrichten van onderzoek zelf zijn er nog vele ontoelaatbare gedragsaspecten, die niet in de Code zijn terug te vinden. Bullying van medewerkers, sexual harassment, machtsmisbruik, arbeidsconflicten, censuur bij privaat onderzoek, het gebruik van een verkeerd design (anders dan met opzet misleidend), foute statistieken (uit onkunde) e.d. zijn ongewenst en veelal ontoelaatbaar, maar vallen niet onder de Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. Voor de oplossing of preventie hiervan moeten andere (soms gewoon legale) middelen en methoden ingezet worden. De Code richt zich op het misleiden van lezers/gebruikers door wetenschappelijk wangedrag, dat 'intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly' plaatsvindt.

5. Wij hebben de in de literatuur gangbare term 'falsification' overgenomen. Ik heb zelf in lezingen en geschriften ook al opgemerkt dat deze term twee betekenissen heeft: de ene het negatieve 'vervalsen', en de andere de positieve Popperiaanse 'falsificatie'. Een andere term (ik heb zelf in de 1996 publicatie de term 'deceit' en in Nederlandse voordrachten de term 'vervalsen' gebruikt) zou misschien beter zijn geweest, maar dan mist men de aansluiting bij de gangbare trits FFP.
6. Dan de categorie 'questionable research practices'. Ik hoop dat de geciteerde Rene Custers verwijst naar het boek van Nick Steneck (Introduction to the conduct of responsible research, ORI, 2004), waar deze materie exact zo wordt gepresenteerd. Ook tijdens de Science Forum meeting van de OECD in Tokyo hebben we ons uitvoerig met deze categorie bezig gehouden. Er zijn drie subgroepen in deze categorie te onderscheiden. Ten eerste misdrijvingen t.a.v. personen (machtsmisbruik, seksuele intimidatie, discriminatie, e.d.). Hiervoor dienen bestuurlijke correcties of zelfs mogelijk correcties via de rechter. Ten tweede zogenoemde 'minor misdemeanors': een onwelkome observatie weglaten, onjuist en voordelig afronden, een beetje selectief citeren, etc. De Code vindt dit ontoelaatbaar en noemt dit gewoon wetenschappelijk wangedrag, zij het in statu nascendi. Ten derde allerlei zaken die te maken hebben met data management, publicatieregels, peer review, technische en ethische problemen bij uitvoering van onderzoek. Voor deze categorie moeten afspraken, agreements en regels vastgesteld te worden, waarvoor we een groot aantal aanbevelingen hebben geformuleerd (guidelines for good practice rules). Niet alle overtredingen van deze rules zijn onmiddellijk als wetenschappelijk wangedrag aan te merken.
7. Mutatis mutandis geldt veel van wat hier is opgemerkt ook voor het LOWI. Ook het LOWI richt zich op schendingen van de wetenschappelijke integriteit in de vorm van vervalsing, misleiding en diefstal van intellectueel eigendom, en niet ook, zoals Cool ten onrechte verwacht, op alle verdere ethische problemen en conflicten in de wetenschap.
8. Niet alle onacceptabele aspecten van research vallen dus onder de CoC, met als consequentie dat ze door wangedragcommissies zouden moeten worden onderzocht. Sloppy research dient door het Forum (peers, reviewers) te worden opgemerkt en bekritiseerd, en via training en opleiding te worden aangepakt. Onzin en onverdedigbare stellingnames moeten in het gewone wetenschappelijk discours worden bestreden. Onjuiste of unfaire book reviews dienen door normale kritiek en weerwoorden te worden weerlegd. Ten onrechte expertise suggereren, bijvoorbeeld door het voeren van titels bij communicatie over andere dan eigen wetenschapsgebieden, is irritant, maar geen doodzonde. Klokkenluiders (niet noodzakelijkerwijs 'non-scientific' personen, zoals Cool stelt) dienen beschermd te worden door beschermende maatregelen. Censuur bij publicaties binnen private organisaties, adviesbureau's en bedrijven is (meestal) niet verstandig, maar niet ongeoorloofd. Ontoegankelijkheid van onderzoeksresultaten door publicatie in te dure commerciële tijdschriften is ongewenst (vandaar het bevorderen van en steun voor 'open access' door de KNAW en ALLEA, evenals in Nederland door NWO, zie een persbericht ter zake vorige week), maar kan

niet worden aangemerkt als een gevolg van wetenschappelijk wangedrag. Zo zijn er vele ongewenste en ongepaste processen en gedragingen in de wetenschap die niet onder direct toezicht en verantwoordelijkheid van LOWI, KNAW of de Code of Conduct van ALLEA/ESF vallen, maar een andere, vaak reguliere wijze van bestrijding of weerlegging vergen.

9. De idee dat er bij een goed functionerend Forum van De Groot geen schendingen van normen van wetenschappelijke integriteit zouden voorkomen is een illusie.
10. Dat de ALLEA/ESF code instituties zou beschermen, zich alleen op overtredingen zou richten die 'public worry' veroorzaken, censorship zou toestaan, en geen misstanden zou bestrijden "that would cause a stir if tackled", is aperte onzin. Een ieder die de Code goed leest zal dat inzien.
11. De KNAW kan niet treden in individuele conflicten werkgever – werknemer, ook niet als het gaat om vermeende schending van ethische normen. De KNAW heeft daarvoor niet de bevoegdheid noch de mankracht. Dat is ook de reden dat de klacht van Cool over een conflict met zijn werkgever het CPB, begin 90 van de vorige eeuw bij de KNAW gedeponereerd, 'administratief' is afgehandeld. Het Bestuur van de KNAW heeft daarvan geen weet gehad. De stelling dat ik als President van de KNAW gefaald heb omdat ik mij destijds in deze zaak ter verdediging van Cool niet tot de rechter heb gewend leg ik dus gewoon naast mij neer.
12. Zoals ik in een e-mail aan Cool reeds heb gemeld betreur ik dat het einde van het stuk in boycottholland een onaangenaam karakter krijgt met persoonlijke aanvallen en ad hominem diskwalificaties. Dismal hypocrisy, president's failure, vanity, bachelor level of mathematical knowledge (heeft Cool wiskundige of statistische fouten ontdekt in ons boek "Testtheorie" (4<sup>de</sup> editie, 2006) ?)... Het gebruik van dat soort termen diskwalificeren m.i. eerder de schrijver. Bovendien blijkt uit sommige van zijn denigrerende uitspraken dat hij absoluut niet op de hoogte is van de geschiedenis van de psychologie in Nederland. Het succes van mijn boek over testtheorie (1<sup>ste</sup> druk 1966) zou komen omdat ik "worked in the tailwind of the mainstream of psychological testing". Het tegendeel is waar. Collega's Snijders en de Groot (beide lid van de testresearch commissie van het NIP, waarvan ik secretaris was) drongen er bij mij in 1964 op aan een meer '(neo-)positivistisch' boek over de psychologische test te schrijven, juist omdat de mainstream in de psychodiagnostiek nog klinisch/intuïtief was, en het volgens hen tijd werd voor een ommekeer. Datzelfde geldt voor grafologie waartegen ik in het geweer kwam. Grafologie was begin 60er jaren nog een wijd verbreid en toegepast selectiemiddel, en bepaald niet op haar retour, en uiteraard al helemaal niet door invloed van de computer zoals Cool stelt (dat is een absurditeit; we spreken over 1963!!). Waarom het stuk zo negatief en persoonlijk eindigt, weet ik niet precies, maar de psycholoog in mij denkt er het zijne van.

Prof. Dr. P.J.D. Drenth  
Amsterdam,  
20-12-2015. [should be 02 / TC]

## Appendix B: Email exchange by Colignatus, Drenth and LOWI w.r.t. the weblog text on ALLEA and scientific integrity

Thomas Colignatus  
December 16 2015

### **Discussion**

The following gives the anonymised emails in Dutch between Colignatus, Drenth and LOWI w.r.t. the weblog text on ALLEA and scientific integrity.

When I find that I must express some criticism w.r.t. the objectives or acts of an institution or a group or a person then I tend to inform them so that there is ample opportunity for correction. There may be considerations that I overlooked so that I have to revise the criticism. Or the institution or group or person revise the objectives or acts. Or there is a stalemate: but then it is informative to know that the institution or group or person knowingly pursue their course.

In this case ALLEA and KNAW / LOWI restrict scientific integrity to only some cases of what they call "research integrity". A main agent was Pieter Drenth, president KNAW 1990-1996 and president ALLEA 2000-2006. Drenth did nothing about the censorship of economic science since 1990 by the directorate of the Dutch Central Planning Bureau (CPB). I wrote a weblog text on the issue and informed LOWI and Drenth about it, and proposed a workshop. LOWI acknowledged that they had seen the message but will not do anything with it. Drenth gave some additional data that caused me to improve the weblog text, e.g. where a video locates an event on graphology around 1968 while it was in 1963. He also mentioned that he regarded parts of the text as an attack on his person. None of this is intended, which should be obvious in itself since I address Drenth in his capacity as president of KNAW and ALLEA. I adapted the text so that this should be even more than obvious. Unfortunately, Professor Drenth still states that he regards the (new) text as a personal attack. It is a pity that a reasoned argument and mentioning of the facts does not reach him. Disqualifying criticism as a personal attack is also a way of trying to suppress this criticism. Who will listen to me when I am presented as someone who does personal attacks ? It is ominous that LOWI does not respond positively to the suggestion of such a workshop, and doesn't give an argument. The best thing that I can do is to publish this exchange of emails so that others can see that no personal harm was and is intended and that I have given every opportunity to avoid such a misunderstanding.

Scientists must clean up the mess w.r.t. scientific integrity. The weblog text and this memo with its appendices will help them to understand what the mess is, how it came about, and what confusions block improvement.

Discussion.....	14
Date: Fri, 27 Nov 2015 00:17:51 +0100 TC -> PJDD .....	15
Date: Fri, 27 Nov 2015 11:03:33 +0100 TC -> LOWI .....	16
Date: Fri, 27 Nov 2015 17:03:02 +0100 PJDD -> TC .....	17
Date: Sat, 28 Nov 2015 10:47:42 +0100 TC -> PJDD.....	17
Date: Wed, 2 Dec 2015 09:18:23 +0000 LOWI -> TC.....	18
Date: Thu, 3 Dec 2015 12:25:31 +0100 PJDD -> TC.....	19
Date: Thu, 03 Dec 2015 20:46:50 +0100 TC -> PJDD.....	19
Date: Fri, 04 Dec 2015 11:00:51 +0100 TC -> PJDD.....	20
Date: Mon, 07 Dec 2015 18:58:48 +0100 TC -> PJDD .....	21
Date: Mon, 14 Dec 2015 15:29:49 +0100 TC -> PJDD .....	21
Date: Mon, 14 Dec 2015 23:23:57 +0100 PJDD -> TC.....	22

**Date: Fri, 27 Nov 2015 00:17:51 +0100 TC -> PJDD**

To: Pieter J.D. Drenth

From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

Subject: A.D. de Groot's Forum Theory in relatie tot Research Integrity

Aan prof. dr. Pieter Drenth

<https://pieterdrenth.wordpress.com/about>

Geachte professor Drenth,

Ik was verbaasd te merken - of wellicht was ik dit vergeten - dat uw achtergrond bestaat uit psychologische testtheorie. Ik heb het video-interview met u met belangstelling uitgezeten, en vond het aardig dat u ook De Groot en Selz noemde.

Mijn aanleiding te schrijven is A.D. de Groot's Forum Theorie in relatie tot Integriteit van onderzoek.

Mijn suggestie is dat ALLEA / LOWI zich blind staren op met name drie inbreuken op de integriteit (fabrikatie, manipulatie, plagiaat) en dat het beter is om het Forum van de Groot beter te laten werken, zodat ook allerlei andere verschijnselen kunnen worden aangepakt, zonder dat je nu van alles ingewikkeld moet gaan definiëren. Bijv. zijn er mensen die uitspraken doen op terreinen waarop ze niet onderlegd zijn, ook door wetenschappers, en die vallen nu officieel buiten beeld, want het zijn geen uitspraken / publicaties op hun eigen terrein van onderzoek. Den bijvoorbeeld aan wiskundigen die geen leraren wiskunde zijn, en die toch uitspraken doen over onderwijs in wiskunde.

Wel moet ik streng zijn. Ik constateer ook dat u in 1990-1996 president van de KNAW was, en dat ik de KNAW in die periode verschillende malen heb geschreven over de censuur van de wetenschap door de directie van het Centraal Planbureau (CPB). Die kwestie is nog steeds niet opgelost. De economische crisis van 2007+ bevestigt mijn analyse, maar niemand kijkt naar het feit dat dit een bevestiging is.

U krijgt van allerlei kanten lof voor uw werk voor KNAW en ALLEA, maar, in mijn ogen heeft u toch wel degelijk gefaald t.a.v. de integriteit van wetenschap in Nederland.

Ik heb deze gedachten hier neergelegd. Misschien wilt u uit respect voor A.D. de Groot daar toch eens naar kijken:

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

Ik zou het waarderen wanneer u uw dwaling zou inzien of, uit respect voor De Groot of uit verbazing over de economische crisis, terug wilt vallen op het principe van "voordeel van de twijfel", en aan de huidige president van de KNAW wilt doorgeven dat het wel degelijk nuttig kan zijn om met mij in gesprek te gaan. Tot op heden krijg ik geen reactie.

Overigens ben ik inmiddels ook leraar wiskunde, en moet ik constateren dat psychometristen uitspraken doen over uitkomsten van rekensommen, zonder dat zij zich in de didactiek hebben verdiept. Ook hierop reageert de KNAW niet. Men heeft wiskundige Lenstra naar de rekenproblematiek laten kijken, maar die is wiskundige, en geen leraar wiskunde: en dat is een groot verschil. Wanneer deze problematiek van het onderwijs in wiskunde en rekenen u kan helpen om de oogkleppen t.a.v. mijn wetenschappelijke houding weg te nemen, dan wijs ik op deze link:

<http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2015-11-23-Het-rekenexperiment-op-kinderen-moet-en-kan-stoppen.html>

Met vriendelijke groet,

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

**Date: Fri, 27 Nov 2015 11:03:33 +0100 TC -> LOWI**

To: Secretariaat LOWI  
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Subject: A.D. de Groot's Forum Theory in relatie tot Research Integrity / Naam LOWI

Aan het LOWI

Geachte professor Fernhout,

In deze weblogtekst geef ik aan dat ALLEA beleidsmatig teveel vanuit een juridische blik naar wetenschappelijke integriteit kijkt, alsook teveel vanuit de instellingen en te weinig vanuit de individuen, en dat het zinvol is om de Forum Theorie van A.D. de Groot te gebruiken: opdat het wetenschappelijk proces zelf versterkt wordt zodat ontsporingen beter kunnen worden voorkomen.

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

In mijn weblogtekst geef ik enige kritiek t.a.v. het beleid van Pieter Drenth, die immers bovenstaande weg is ingeslagen. Derhalve heb ik hem het email hieronder gezonden opdat hij gelegenheid heeft te reageren. Op de video uit 2014 blijkt hij nog heel vitaal en ik hoop dat dit nu nog steeds zo is.

Gezien de beperkte blik van ALLEA / LOWI t.a.v. "wetenschappelijke integriteit" is mijn voorstel om voortaan te spreken over "Landelijk orgaan t.a.v. specifiek aangeduid wetenschappelijk wangedrag". Op dit moment zaait LOWI met zijn huidige naam grote verwarring, met steeds de noodzaak tot uitleg dat men niet naar wetenschappelijke integriteit kijkt maar alleen naar specifiek aangeduid wangedrag (fabrikatie, manipulatie, plagiaat). Door het kiezen van een juiste naam voor het Landelijk Orgaan zal ook duidelijker worden dat er nog veel werk valt te verzetten t.a.v. de wetenschappelijke integriteit zelf. Een voorbeeld betreft wetenschappers die buiten hun vakgebied treden en die toch autoriteit claimen, zoals wiskundigen die uitspraken doen over het onderwijs in wiskunde terwijl zij geen opleiding tot leraar hebben.

Een misverstand dat bij LOWI leeft is dat wanneer een zaak is afgehandeld conform bepaalde regels, zoals bijv. in het AWB, dat er dan verder ook niets meer aan zo'n zaak valt te doen. Vanuit de gedachte dat zaken ooit eens afgedaan moeten worden. Een wetenschapper die meent dat desalniettemin sprake is van inbreuk op de wetenschappelijke integriteit kan zo te kijk komen te staan als iemand die het beter weet dan LOWI en die zich niet aan de regels wil houden. De relevante vraag is echter wat er aan de juridische omgeving dient te veranderen zodat deze ondersteunend wordt aan de wetenschap en niet beperkend. De aanname dat juristen reeds voor perfecte ondersteuning hebben gezorgd lijkt me nogal riskant.

Mijn suggestie is hierover een workshop te houden waarin ook ik deze gedachten kan toelichten.

Met vriendelijke groet,

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



Date: Fri, 27 Nov 2015 00:17:51 +0100 TC -> PJDD  
To: Pieter J.D. Drenth  
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Subject: A.D. de Groot's Forum Theory in relatie tot Research Integrity

Aan prof. dr. Pieter Drenth  
<https://pieterdrenth.wordpress.com/about>

(... zie boven ....)

**Date: Fri, 27 Nov 2015 17:03:02 +0100 PJDD -> TC**

From: Pieter J.D. Drenth  
To: "Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus"  
Subject: RE: A.D. de Groot's Forum Theory in relatie tot Research Integrity

Geachte heer Cool,  
Dank voor uw e-mail bericht.  
Ik heb dit bericht alsmede de referenties eenmaal snel doorgenomen. Ik zal er zeker op terugkomen. Het begon interessant (zo moet wetenschappelijke discussie ook zijn). Jammer dat het betoog tegen het einde een onaangenaam (want ad personam) en wat rancuneus karakter kreeg. Ik zal me over weerzin die dergelijke betogen toch altijd opwekken heen zetten, en toch reageren. Ik moet u wel zeggen dat ik mij van ingekomen stukken van u bij het bestuur van de KNAW niets kan herinneren. Kan aan mij liggen, het kan ook zijn dat de directie van de KNAW (die altijd vergaderingen voorbereidt en stukken kiest en screent) dit niet heeft laten doorkomen. Er komt zoveel binnen dat de directie zelf bepaalde zaken afhandelt of onontvankelijk verklaart. Zoals gezegd, kom ik op uw mail terug.  
Met vriendelijke groet,  
PJD Drenth.

Prof. Dr. P.J.D. Drenth  
(... Amsterdam ...)

**Date: Sat, 28 Nov 2015 10:47:42 +0100 TC -> PJDD**

To: Pieter J.D. Drenth  
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Subject: Fwd: A.D. de Groot's Forum Theory in relatie tot Research Integrity / Naam LOWI

Geachte professor Drenth,

Hartelijk dank voor uw snelle reactie. Ik wacht dan af. Uw reactie geeft me in ieder geval het gevoel en de indruk dat ik er goed aan heb gedaan u te schrijven.

Laat ik in ieder geval wel opmerken dat ik in het geheel niet "rancuneus" ben. Mocht een tekst van mij bij u zo overkomen dan is het raadzaam te herlezen met een andere blik. Bijvoorbeeld heb ik wel degelijk zeer veel last gehad van inadequate respons vanuit KNAW, die doet alsof men wetenschap beschermt maar mij laat zwemmen. Dat is gewoon een feit. Dat moet de zwemmer kunnen zeggen zonder dat zijn woorden gediskwalificeerd worden. U kunt vervolgens uit al de zaken die ik heb onderzocht en te berde breng zien dat het mooie

resultaten zijn, en dat zou niet lukken met rancune want het lijkt me dat zoiets de onbevooroordeeldheid aantast. Bijv. waar ik t.a.v. uw presidentschap opmerk dat er sprake is van hypocrisie, kan dat ook bestuurlijke hypocrisie zijn, met inderdaad het probleem van de vele handen. Maar het moet genoemd kunnen worden. Het maakt een wezenlijk onderdeel uit van de empirische verklaring van de economische crisis dat kritische economen de mond gesnoerd wordt.

Ik heb het email aan u geciteerd in mijn email aan LOWI hieronder. Het bevestigt alleen mijn gevoel en indruk dat ik er goed aan gedaan heb u te schrijven. U kunt daarin ook zien dat mijn opstelling een wetenschappelijke is. De verwijzing naar De Groot is overigens ook een oude, dat is misschien ook aardig om op te merken (zie mijn citaat van hem in Trias Politica & Centraal Planbureau 1994).

(...)

Met vriendelijke groet,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Scheveningen

Date: Fri, 27 Nov 2015 11:03:33 +0100 TC -> LOWI  
To: Secretariaat LOWI  
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Subject: A.D. de Groot's Forum Theory in relatie tot Research Integrity / Naam LOWI

(... zie boven ...)

Date: Fri, 27 Nov 2015 00:17:51 +0100 TC -> PJDD  
To: Pieter J.D. Drenth  
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Subject: A.D. de Groot's Forum Theory in relatie tot Research Integrity

Aan prof. dr. Pieter Drenth  
<https://pieterdrenth.wordpress.com/about>

(... zie boven ...)

**Date: Wed, 2 Dec 2015 09:18:23 +0000 LOWI -> TC**  
From: Secretariaat LOWI  
To: "Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus",  
Secretariaat LOWI  
Cc: "Grace van Arkel LOWI",  
"Marij Frons LOWI"  
Subject: Info aan C RE: A.D. de Groot's Forum Theory in relatie tot Research Integrity /  
Naam LOWI

Geachte heer Cool,

Het LOWI heeft uw e-mail van 27 november 2015 met daarin uw suggestie voor een workshop ter kennisneming aangenomen.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Mr. dr. E. Grace van Arkel, Plv. Ambtelijk Secretaris Landelijk Orgaan Wetenschappelijke Integriteit

secretariaat lowi.nl  
www.lowi.nl

**Date: Thu, 3 Dec 2015 12:25:31 +0100**      **PJDD -> TC**

From: "Pieter Drenth"  
To: "'Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus"  
Cc: <secretariaat\_lowi.nl>  
Subject: RE: A.D. de Groot's Forum Theory in relatie tot Research Integrity / Naam LOWI

Geachte heer Cool,  
Hierbij zend ik u een puntsgewijze reactie op het stuk in 'boycottholland'.  
Ik meende er goed aan te doen uw punten van kritiek punt voor punt te behandelen. Ik denk dat u van onjuiste veronderstellingen bent uitgegaan ten aanzien van de taak en doelstellingen van zowel de ALLEA/ESF Code of Conduct als het LOWI.  
Omdat u uw brief ook aan het LOWI hebt gezonden zend ik eveneens een kopie van deze brief naar het LOWI.  
Met vriendelijke groet,  
PJD Drenth.

Prof. Dr. P.J.D. Drenth  
(... Amsterdam ...)

ATTACHMENT: see page 11

**Date: Thu, 03 Dec 2015 20:46:50 +0100**      **TC -> PJDD**

To: Pieter J.D. Drenth  
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Subject: Een vraag - RE: A.D. de Groot's Forum Theory in relatie tot Research Integrity / Naam LOWI

Geachte professor Drenth,

Mijn dank voor uw reactie. Ik kijk er zorgvuldig naar. Vanzelfsprekend is het niet mijn bedoeling om ad hominem argumenten te gebruiken. Ik heb nog geen beeld van hoe ik de tekst zou moeten aanpassen. Misschien komt het over als amateur psychologie maar dat is ook niet de bedoeling. Ik probeer werkelijk te begrijpen waarom u de censuur van de wetenschap door de rijksoverheid sinds 1990 niet ziet. Mijn aanstelling was een wetenschappelijke.

Een vraag is de volgende. U stelt dat ook wetenschappers klokkeluiders kunnen zijn. Wanneer het hun vakgebied is, doen ze gewoon hun werk wanneer zij spreken, en zijn zij geen klokkeluiders. Ik heb het niet over mensen met academische opleiding die voor een bedrijf werken en geen wetenschappelijke aanstelling hebben. Kunt u derhalve voorbeelden geven van wetenschappers die volgens u klokkeluiders zijn (op hun eigen vakgebied) ? Volgens mij kunt u niet zulke voorbeelden geven, maar worden dat voorbeelden van werkgevers die zulke mensen proberen te censureren. Maar ik kan het mis hebben.

(Hier is geen diepe casuïstiek nodig. Mij gaat het erom dat u wegwuift dat in Nederland censuur van de wetenschap door de overheid plaatsvindt, en dat het ambtenarenrecht daarvoor misbruikt is.)

PM. Suggesties voor namen in "De onwelkome boodschap":  
<http://www.volkskrant.nl/recensies/wetenschap-te-koop~a532014>

Het is overigens opmerkelijk dat Koebben en Tromp zo weinig aandacht aan de CPB-kwestie geven. Als ik had geweten dat Koebben zo oud zou worden had ik hem eerder gevraagd waarom:

<http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/TPnCPB/NVMC/Verslag.html>

Met vriendelijke groet,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Scheveningen

**Date: Fri, 04 Dec 2015 11:00:51 +0100**      **TC -> PJDD**

To: Pieter J.D. Drenth  
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Subject: Concept-reactie & procedure-voorstel

Geachte professor Drenth,

Ik moet vandaag echt naar andere dingen kijken, dus laat ik u mijn concept-reactie geven. Het idee hieronder kwam voort uit de concept-reactie, en kan nog steeds een eye-opener zijn.

Mijn procedure-voorstel is:

(1) Het is jammer dat u al aan LOWI kopie heeft gedaan, maar ik kan ermee leven. U moet ermee leven dat ik de weblogtekst nog niet kan aanpassen want er zijn nog onduidelijkheden.

(2) Kijkt u s.v.p. naar mijn concept-reactie, en wellicht wilt u dan uw NL tekst vervangen door een kortere EN tekst.

(3) Dan finaliseer ik mijn reactie op basis van die EN tekst. Dus u heeft nog alle ruimte om gebruik te maken van verhelderingen in mijn concept-tekst. Wanneer misverstanden zijn opgelost dan vervalt zo'n concept natuurlijk.

(4) We zouden geen vooruitgang boeken wanneer u zou zeggen dat u uw NL tekst integraal intrekt, en niet meer wilt protesteren tegen wat u persoonlijke aanvallen noemt. Dan zou u wel vinden dat er persoonlijke aanvallen zijn, maar dit niet willen zeggen (althans naar mij toe): en dat is ook weer niet de bedoeling: want er is van mijn kant helemaal niet zo'n bedoeling. Van mijn kant is weghalen van die tekst ook te eenvoudig: want ik probeer te begrijpen waar het misverstand zit. Hoe kan een wetenschapper als u zich zo laten meeslepen door beperkende juridische kaders die censuur in de hand werken ?

(5) We houden het kort. Met uw EN tekst en mijn reactie daarop doen we weer kopie aan LOWI. Mijn vraag aan u is in hoeverre uw EN tekst dan publicabel is.

(...)

Met vriendelijke groet,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Scheveningen

ATTACHMENT: see page **Error! Bookmark not defined.** (the original draft text has now been finalized)

**Date: Mon, 07 Dec 2015 18:58:48 +0100**      **TC -> PJDD**

To: Pieter J.D. Drenth  
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Subject: Update weblog text - Fwd: Concept-reactie & procedure-voorstel

Geachte professor Drenth,

Heeft u kans gehad om naar mijn rejoinder te kijken ? Inmiddels heb ik mijn weblog text aangepast. U kunt de aanpassingen vinden door in de tekst te zoeken naar "Update".

Dezelfde link:

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

Het procedure-voorstel is dan vrijwel als hieronderstaand. U heeft alvast een beeld hoe de tekst er gaat uitzien met de verheldering die uw reactie mogelijk maakt. Mijn hoop is dat u inderdaad een korte tekst in het Engels kunt formuleren die ook gepubliceerd mag worden.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

Date: Fri, 04 Dec 2015 11:00:51 +0100      TC -> PJDD

To: Pieter J.D. Drenth  
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Subject: Concept-reactie & procedure-voorstel

(... zie boven ....)

**Date: Mon, 14 Dec 2015 15:29:49 +0100**      **TC -> PJDD**

To: Pieter J.D. Drenth  
From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus  
Subject: Bent u nog van plan te reageren ?

Geachte professor Drenth,

Ik vraag me af of u nog van plan bent te reageren, met bijv. een korte Engelse tekst waarin u het ad hominem achterwege laat e.d.

Zo niet, dan kan ik mijn concept-rejoinder aanpassen en dit aan LOWI en bijv. ALLEA toezenden.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

**Date: Mon, 14 Dec 2015 23:23:57 +0100**

**PJDD -> TC**

From: Pieter J.D. Drenth

To: ""Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus"

Subject: RE: Bent u nog van plan te reageren ?

Geachte heer Cool,

Ik begrijp niet goed wat u wilt. U hebt een website-bericht opgestuurd. Ik heb geprobeerd veel van uw naar mijn mening onjuiste veronderstellingen te weerleggen. Collega Fernhout was het overigens geheel eens met mijn weergave van de scope en verantwoordelijkheden van het LOWI, zoals daarin beschreven. Ik heb ook bezwaar gemaakt tegen de wat ik beleef als persoonlijke en irrelevante aanvallen op mij. Die aanvallen blijven ook in het bijgestelde stuk voortduren. Welnu dat is dan jammer en geheel voor uw rekening. Ik heb geen behoefte aan verdere welles nietes discussies.

U groetend,  
PJDD

Prof. Dr. P.J.D. Drenth  
(... Amsterdam ...)