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Congratulations

"On behalf of the KfW Banking Group I would like to congratulate the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) on the occasion of its 50th anniversary. Many of our staff have been greatly influenced in matters of development policy within the DIE and established contacts that have endured over the years and across organisational borders. The DIE is also indispensable as source of inspiration - successfully combining both theory and practice in its research and advisory work. We wish you continuing success!"

Norbert Kloppenburg, KfW Banking Group

"Over the past 50 years, the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) has provided important impulses in the field of international co-operation. Matters of global sustainability and environmental and climate protection have occupied a central role in this. Many congratulations! Keep it up!"

Barbara Hendricks, Federal Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety

"I congratulate the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) for its valuable work on global issues and international development over the last 50 years. The Institute’s activities and research, such as the contribution to the European Report on Development initiative, have significantly helped to improve knowledge-based policy making in European and international organisations."

Françoise Moreau, European Commission, DG-Development and Cooperation-EuropeAid
“DIE has fundamentally influenced the mode of thought in development policy in Germany over the past 50 years and has matured into one of the leading think-tanks. Development keeps surprising us and requires strategic forward thinking. The DIE will therefore be needed over the next 50 years. Congratulations on all that has been achieved to date and best wishes for the future.”

Joachim von Braun, Centre for Development Research (ZEF)

“50 years of the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) represent 50 years of well-founded scientific research into the central future-related topics regarding development co-operation. Not only have these been of major significance to VENRO and non-governmental organisations, they continue to be. We look forward in the years to come to well-considered analyses and inspiring thoughts on the future of international co-operation. We offer our heartfelt congratulations and wish you all power and courage for the future!”

Bernd Bornhorst, VENRO

“50 years of the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) – means 50 years of application-oriented departmental research and high level scientific work. Research is questioning and breaking through age old patterns of thought, overstepping boundaries and having the courage to tread new paths. In this respect, throughout the 50 years of its existence, DIE has very much convincingly understood how to help support and characterise the Federal Government’s development policy in a critical, constructive manner. At times this has revealed uncomfortable truths yet has always been instructive and result-orientated. The complexity of the global challenges at hand requires diverse and even innovative solution approaches and DIE offers precisely this. With their research, the staff at DIE will continue to be central to solving the problems of human-kind in the future and for this I wish them continuing success!”

Friedrich Kitschelt, State Secretary in the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
Fifty years of the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) – it is an honour for both of us to be able to speak at this jubilee on behalf of an institute that has such a long and remarkable history - and no doubt future, in view of the increasing international interrelations and growing importance of many emerging and developing countries. Global development co-operation is set to increase further in significance with these worldwide economic, political, social and ecological interdependencies.

DIE was created 50 years ago, as a training institute. There was a requirement to train management staff for the newly-created German development policy institutions. 1971 saw the addition of research and policy-advising activities – the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) soon identified new requirements for the nascent institute to serve. These fields of tasks remain central to the Institute to this day and it is a unique character trait that the three fields are not isolated from each other but are instead amalgamated with one another: research topics arise from both problems in practice and academic curiosity and the desire to close gaps in knowledge; the training benefits from academic knowledge and the reflection of practical experience; policy advice draws on research and serves to address questions regarding the future development of the policy area.

Over the years it is possible to observe how DIE has grown to address its tasks and tackle new questions and issues. In the first training course, in 1965, we find a broad spectrum of subjects ranging from “Communication in the service of distributing new ideas and practices, investigated in the example of Afghanistan” and on to “Problems of developing new land in the Bolivian lowlands through the resettlement of highland Indios”. From the present-day viewpoint, a curiously topical range of themes, although communication today is most of all electronic and the indigenous population of the Bolivian highlands and lowlands is now the politically dominant class.

In the 1970s and 1980s the Institute began to focus on in-depth research into development problems in sectors and regions. The opening up of the developing countries to the global economy from the mid-1980s onwards became a central theme.
Institute honed its academic and scientific profile and acquired the capability to advise the BMZ, particularly on strategic and programmatic issues. There was also good cause for this, as rapid development successes as a consequence of development co-operation proved the exception.

In the last 15–20 years we have observed how “the South” is changing, resulting in a reduction in disparity between the countries, although this inequality is growing within many of the countries themselves. Own development resources are being created within the countries and it is becoming apparent that a sustainable improvement in living conditions is primarily a question of political priorities and constellations. The significance of classic development policy is receding as a result – but there is an ambitious international agenda that takes social justice, political participation and ecological sustainability as an obligation towards present and future generations seriously: in countries rich and poor, development co-operation issues have a position of great importance.

Today, there are new challenges facing international co-operation. There is a need to adapt our economic practices to ensure the full provision of renewable energy sources by 2050. Therefore, we are now familiar with the technology, many more people have the necessary training and education to comprehend and assist this rapid transition and the financial resources required are available. At the same time, cultural co-operation is also growing in significance. In a post-Western world order it is important for bridges to be built between, for example, Asian, Islamic and Western world views in order to keep international conflicts manageable.

Under these conditions, being at the forefront of research, policy advice and training is a privilege and a great responsibility that we at the DIE are happy to bear. At this point we would like to express our thanks, first and foremost to the staff at the DIE, who, with their commitment, their passion for knowledge and their actions, have made the institute what it is today. And, naturally, we also wish to thank our shareholders, the members of our Board of Trustees and our research partners throughout the world, who support and accompany us on our path. Of one thing we are certain: global development co-operation can only be as good as the knowledge foundations upon which it is built.
Message from the President of the Federal Republic of Germany for the German Development Institute’s 50th anniversary

This Annual Report is something very special. The German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) looks back not just over the past few months but over half a century of research, consultancy and training. Heartfelt congratulations!

To all the Institute’s members and partners I would like to say a personal thank you for your input and ideas, and above all for your readiness to measure the success of your work in terms of realities on the ground. This approach influences even the kind of language you use. Many of those who publish on development and its complex ramifications employ a jargon often hard for non-experts to understand. Not so the DIE. You are adept also at communicating with the journalist looking for examples of trade protectionism or the teenager preparing a class presentation on child poverty. From short film on YouTube to high-calibre study, you make use of virtually all available channels to inform and advise.

You help develop entirely new concepts, moreover, when reality has made current ways of thinking and communicating obsolete. And you remind us how important it is to look beyond traditional “either-or” distinctions – conventional categories such as industrialised and developing countries, donors and beneficiaries, North and South. Instead, you insist on the need to think globally, network with others and take decisions. This is something I heartily endorse. Responding to challenges such as climate change or finite natural resources requires not only coalitions of the like-minded but broad-based, preferably universal coalitions. Anyone grasping this fact has moved far beyond the classical understanding of development that prevailed fifty years ago and acquired a truly global perspective.

Interdisciplinary research holds the key to a deeper understanding of today’s world. That is what makes it in my view so valuable. Governments and international organisations still have repeated arguments over the best division of labour between their various ministries and departments. The DIE, by contrast, has long seen development as a holistic process involving economic, environmental, foreign

Joachim Gauck
The President of the Federal Republic of Germany
and security aspects, something above all inseparable from personal responsibility. Those enrolling in the DIE’s Postgraduate Training Programme or Global Governance School will of course hone their expertise and leadership skills. But also and not least, they will find themselves growing as people. When they invest year by year in each in-take, their teachers and mentors are not just doing a job. They are making a gift to the international community.

Another thing I would like to highlight – and one of your research areas – is democracy promotion, a subject which has long been very close to my heart. To talk about promoting democracy is easy enough. Yet how realistic is this in today’s conflict regions? How can civil society and human rights defenders be supported, how can democracy be consolidated? And how in specific cases can the line be precisely drawn between interfering in internal affairs and standing up for human rights? Anyone seeking a perceptive analysis of such issues will find the DIE has what they need.

For half a century now the DIE has staunchly defended the freedom of research. So my appeal to all DIE members is this: continue to seek out the facts. And continue to feed your expertise into international debates – for example, the discussion over post-2015 global sustainable development goals. Ending hunger and exploitation, pushing for better education and greater political participation, protecting our natural resources – on these and many other social, economic and ecological issues the voice of the German Development Institute needs to be heard also in future. And when you speak out on such matters, I hope and trust that you will impress all concerned with the same admirable qualities you have demonstrated since 1964: hard-hitting analysis, drive and commitment.

With warm greetings from Berlin to Bonn!

Joachim Gauck
It gives me great pleasure, in my capacity as Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development, to congratulate the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungs-politik (DIE) on its fiftieth birthday. Since taking up office, I have experienced for myself the excellent work carried out by the DIE in terms of research, policy advice and training, and departmental research for the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). For example, the DIE has provided strong and highly competent support to one of the most important conceptual projects of the BMZ in the current legislative term – the Charter for the Future. This Charter, which we will present jointly on 24 November 2014, will serve as a basis for the German input to the creation of a new set of sustainable global development goals. This will be the first-ever document to support Germany’s input that has been drawn up using a broad-based consultation process involving all development actors in Germany from science and academia, civil society, church organisations and people from all walks of life. The numerous papers and presentations contributed by the DIE play a significant part in this splendid achievement! I wish to offer my sincere thanks to all staff at the DIE for their good work.

I would like to mention a few more examples of the outstanding work carried out by the DIE:

- The head of the institute, Professor Dirk Messner, has been co-chairing the German Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN Germany) with Professor Klaus Topfer since May 2014. The Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development is very much involved with SDSN Germany. I am very grateful to Professor Messner for his emphatic commitment, which superbly complements our joint efforts to establish development policy as a visible driver, pillar and core concept of the global agenda on sustainability and the future.

- The contributions made by the DIE to the German Advisory Council on Global Change (WBGU) of the German government and to the Council for Sustainable Development are similarly valuable for the policy of the German government. They help to ensure that the work done in development policy research is noticed far beyond the tighter-knit development cooperation community in Germany, impacting on all fields of policy.
• With its Managing Global Governance programme the DIE has managed to involve young academics and scientists as well as practitioners from politics and administration in emerging countries in joint efforts to develop solutions to the global challenges facing humanity. Thus, the DIE is helping to realise a fundamental principle underpinning my values-based development policy in a significant field: enabling people to develop their own solutions and competently realise them in sustainable ways. This is about developing solutions not for but with our partners worldwide, supporting them in their efforts to assume ownership and responsibility.

• The recognition the DIE has garnered throughout the world over the course of the years is largely thanks to the work of its academic staff, currently about ninety in number. Here I would like to mention Dr. Jörn Grävingholt in particular, who, in his position as co-chair of the Advisory Board for Civilian Crisis Prevention of the German government, has done more than almost anyone else to put the stamp of development policy on the Comprehensive Approach – a central element of German foreign relations – what I like to call comprehensive development – and to take it from the drawing board to tangible implementation.

For these reasons, it is important to me that the fiftieth birthday of the DIE is not totally taken up with speeches and public accolades, but that I have the opportunity above all to converse in depth with the staff of the DIE. Solving the big challenges of the future for the present era requires the knowledge and dedication of many critical and committed minds – including, in particular, those at the DIE.

It is important that this fiftieth birthday is more than just a nostalgic exercise in navel gazing; it needs to serve as a rallying cry to move forward. Together and with fresh energy and resolution, we need to face the huge challenges that are confronting humanity.

In the context of the global political challenges we face – such as the post-2015 process for sustainable development or the conclusion of a binding climate treaty in 2015 – this applies in particular to our three special development policy initiatives “One World – No Hunger”, “Tackling the root causes of displacement – reintegrating refugees”, and “Stability and development in the MENA region”. And I would be grateful for the active and conceptual support of the DIE.

I hope – and I am confident – that the DIE will not have to wait until it turns 100 but will be able to say by its fifty-fifth birthday that it has played a decisive role in mastering this huge challenge for humanity and human decency.

Regards,
Dr. Gerd Müller
The German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), one of the world’s leading think tanks on issues regarding global development and international co-operation, is celebrating its birthday. And it truly is grounds for celebration, not just for Bonn, the international city of science, academia and the UN.

With its interdisciplinary alignment, the Institute combines research, consulting and training, forming a key interface between theory and practice. The current focal points of its work represent central themes for the future:

- the future of development policy within the scope of the new post-2015 agenda,
- changing poverty patterns,
- sustainable transformation processes,
- questions of future democratic government and international co-operation,
- forms of new global middle classes.

In these fields the experts at DIE co-operate on numerous international research and policy networks and act as accomplished partners. All under one roof! This is what makes the DIE so valuable – for science and academia, but also for the fields of politics, media and administration, for whom it provides key knowledge and recommendations for action.

I would like to quote the UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon to illustrate just why I appreciate the work of DIE so much. At the World Economic Forum 2011 in Davos he pointed out that the economic model of the 20th century had run its course: “Our current economic model is a global suicide pact. We mined our way to growth. We burned our way to prosperity. We believed in consumption without consequences. Those days are gone.”

Fortunately, this view is increasingly prevailing. It is also the foundation of our research strategy in North Rhine-Westphalia and forms the basis of research policy in both Germany and Europe. We acknowledge the key global challenges – such as climate change, scarcity of resources and population development. We are also aware of their effects. And we know that these major social challenges are intrinsically linked to the way in which we do business. In many areas they are even the consequence of a form of economic development that can no longer be supported. Across borders – and not according to the polluter-pays principle.

Svenja Schulze
Minister for Innovation, Science and Research of the State of North Rhine-Westphalia
We also know that the major global challenges cannot be overcome by technological means alone. Taken on their own, these even exacerbate social inequality in some cases, enhancing problems of distribution and possibly triggering global conflicts as a result.

Ban Ki-Moon is right: we require comprehensive solutions that not only cross borders, but also take account of social consequences in particular. The necessity of a comprehensive approach was already acknowledged by Nobel Prize for Peace winner Willy Brandt in 1980, when he called for: “The globalisation of risks and challenges – war, chaos, self-destruction – calls for a type of ‘world domestic policy’.” The term ‘world domestic policy’ makes it evident that we all have a responsibility for peace, sustainability and humane living conditions – all around the world. All fields of politics need to co-operate on this.

This is also how we in North Rhine-Westphalia see our scientific and research policy, which views sustainable development as a task for the future. National or regional concepts can only ever be a part of the whole. The new EU framework programme for research and innovation is also oriented towards the major global challenges.

At DIE the new, extended role of the sciences is already fulfilled. This can be witnessed in the activities of DIE, which are dedicated to precisely this task. Our world is in a process of transition. This brings with it challenges that cannot be overcome with the knowledge, strategies and technologies that have been tried and tested thus far. New ways of thinking for new answers are required here. We need scientific and academic approaches

- that assume greater responsibility for society,
- that function in an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary manner,
- that mediate between society and politics,
- that develop expertise in evaluation and resolution,
- that sensitise and motivate.

For the state of North Rhine-Westphalia the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) represents a key component in the commitment to one world and is a boon to the international scientific and academic city of Bonn. I would like to thank all of the staff at DIE for the work they have put in and offer my warm congratulations for the anniversary in 2014, as well as wishing DIE and its staff every further success in their valuable work.

Yours,

Svenja Schulze
"The international development agenda is undergoing transformation. More and more, we realise that welfare and well-being in poor and rich countries is shaped at global level. Improved global governance and a revitalised multilateralism are among the greatest challenges of our time. The German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) is a key reference point: deeply rooted in values of compassion and solidarity, committed to partnership and dialogue, rigorous in research, and passionate in communication."

Simon Maxwell CBE, Overseas Development Institute

"Today, in its 50th year, the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) is one of the most important and well-recognised institutes on matters of development policy and global development worldwide. Whether it be at an international, European, national or regional level – there is simply no alternative to the DIE and its expertise. I would like to offer the DIE my heartfelt congratulations on 50 years of successful research into and support for global development processes – the need for an institute like the DIE will certainly not diminish in the next 50 years."

Angelica Schwall-Düren, Minister for Federal Affairs, Europe and Media for the Federal State of North-Rhine Westphalia

"The German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) had success with its research and policy advice if this was empirically well-founded and the conclusions were practically relevant and implementation oriented. Sustained effects were achieved by virtue of the fact that year on year, 20 course graduates took the latest knowledge into the institutions accommodating them. I wish the institute continued success, and that modicum of luck that is indispensable even for established institutes."

Hans-Helmut Taake, Director of the DIE from 1980 – 2003
“Many congratulations from the SWP to our colleagues at the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE): We gladly look to Bonn for quality analyses and ideas on development and development policy. We look forward to the next 50 years of successful partnership.”

Volker Perthes, SWP – Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik

“Development co-operation is teamwork! In Germany this teamwork has existed since 2 March 1964 at the latest. The founding at this point of DIE was a very important step in the right direction for ensuring that our international partnerships are always on a solid footing. In a rapidly changing networked world we not only need sustainable projects on the ground, we also require, above all, contextual analyses of current challenges. For 50 years now DIE has been providing support for German and international development co-operation through its excellent research and policy advice. This would not have been possible without its many dedicated members of staff who commit their knowledge and skills every day, again and again. For this reason, I would like to congratulate you all on this, “your”, 50th birthday and I hope that DIE enjoys everything that one could wish for from one’s heart on such an occasion – many more years to come, a young, fresh spirit full of new ideas and that all projects, big and small, are a resounding success! Happy Birthday!”

Karl Ulrich Mayer, Leibniz Association

“On behalf of the Leibniz Association I would like to warmly congratulate the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) on its anniversary. With its close relationship between research and policy advice the DIE takes a very similar approach to the Leibniz Institutes. Not least for this reason have we enjoyed many years of successful co-operation between the DIE and the Leibniz Association. We want to hold onto this in the future and together freely practise science to the benefit and wellbeing of mankind, according to the principles of Leibniz.”

Dagmar Wöhrl, MP, Head of Committee on Economic Cooperation and Development
Visibility and influence through knowledge – the DIE publications

Publications are the key product of an institute such as the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), which is engaged in research, policy advice and training. They ensure continuous access of the public – researchers and students, politicians, the public realm and the media – to the knowledge gained from research and the insights derived from the continuous dialogue with politics and practice. The publications illustrate how the profile of the Institute has changed over the course of the decades, following the cycles and topics of development policy, and how the institute sets its own research agenda. Of particular interest are publications that put new themes on the international agenda, influence public debate or serve as a source of irritation because they run contrary to the prevailing political mood.

The history of DIE contains a number of such fascinating examples. I would like to highlight three of these, which are also of interest today:

**March 1961**
US General Lucius D. Clay proposes the creation of a German institute to train specialists in issues relating to developing countries.

**October 1962**
The Cuban missile crisis is sparked by the stationing of medium-range Soviet missiles in the country, creating greater awareness of the risk of a global nuclear conflict.

*We have had our lands despoiled under the terms of what was supposedly the law of the land but was only a recognition of the right of the strongest. [...] Who can forget, finally, the burst of rifle fire in which so many of our brothers perished, the cells into which the authorities threw those who no longer were willing to submit to a rule where justice meant oppression and exploitation?*

Patrice Lumumba, first Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, 1960
The most explosive of these was the proposal published by Thomas Kampffmeyer in 1987 for a settlement to resolve the debt crisis that developing countries found themselves in. Orientation for this came from the London Debt Agreement of 1953, which saw part of the debts of the Federal Republic of Germany cancelled by the allies. In 1988 the annual conference of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank took place in Berlin, with parallel congresses, discussion events and demonstrations drawing an enormous audience. At that time DIE, as an institute close to the government, was also regarded with scepticism, in spite of this publication, which – based on careful analysis – referred to the debt crisis of the developing countries as a crisis of solvency rather than liquidity. Kampffmeyer turned against the prevailing model of crisis management, instead proposing a general framework to enable debt relief on a case-by-case basis, giving developing countries the opportunity for sustained economic
recovery. This proposal led to considerable conflict with the Federal Ministry of Finance, although this did not deter the institute from publishing. It was not until 1996 that the IMF, The World Bank and public creditors agreed on debt relief for highly-indebted low-income countries. Since the financial markets crisis of 2007 work has been underway on an insolvency code for states, with the Institute actively involved in the process in the person of Kathrin Berensmann.

Ten years before, 1986, it was the integration of Spain, Portugal and Greece into the European Community (EC) that was on the agenda. DIE was one of the first to highlight the opportunities, but also the difficulties, that the accession of these countries would have for their economies and the European economy as a whole. At that time they still counted as developing countries, consequently receiving support from the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation (BMZ). How could their small industrial operations, frequently craftsman-like in character, survive competition with highly-efficient German, French and Italian companies? What opportunities existed for modernisation, what type of assistance was required and to what extent was this reconcilable with the goals of an open world trade order? Analysis at that time indicated that the EC of the 1970s still spoke of a common industrial policy, but that this conflicted with the goal of dismantling barriers to world trade and the exploitation of comparative advantages.

Twenty years later European economic policy was also characterised by integration into the world market and economic globalisation. Publications on the concept of systemic competitiveness developed by Klaus Eßer, Wolfgang Hillebrand, Dirk Messner and Jörg Meyer-Stamer now attracted enhanced interest in Germany and abroad. This concept presented an alternative model to the prevailing neo-liberal Washington consensus, linking economic development capability to institutional and economic capabilities at various social levels, which enable countries to actively join processes of technological change and benefit from economic globalisation. This concept was embedded in the broader theoretical debate on social modernisation and more recent research into path dependency in corporate decisions, national innovation systems and how these influence the ability of countries to participate in global value chains and to thereby promote their social development. Within the scope of this work, for many years DIE co-operated with leading economists and innovation researchers, in particular the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) as well as CEPAL and FLACSO. Today, DIE co-operates with the IDS primarily in the field of low-carbon development and renewable energy sources in Asian countries.

Beyond their content, these three publications also display a change that has proved highly influential on the current publications of DIE: in the
1970s and 1980s publication was mostly in-house. In the 1990s the institute began to co-operate with German and British publishers. Since 2008 DIE has published over 20 books annually, with acclaimed publishers such as Springer, Nomos, Routledge, Taylor and Francis and Zed Books, as well as in-house. This has allowed DIE to significantly enhance its international visibility:

In 2012 Thomas Fues (DIE), Sachin Chaturvedi (RIS) and Elizabeth Sidiropoulos (SAIIA) published the first book worldwide to cover the new efforts in development co-operation by countries such as China, Brazil, India and South Africa (Development Cooperation and Emerging Powers. New Partners or Old Patterns?, ZED Books).

In 2013 Julia Leininger published research findings on the interrelation between democracy promotion, the securing of peace and stability and other development goals together with Sonja Grimm (University Konstanz) and Tina Freyburg (University of Warwick) (Conflicting objectives in democracy promotion: do all good things go together?, Routledge).

In 2010 Jörg Faust and Susanne Neubert published Wirksamere Entwicklungspolitik (Nomos) – more effective development policy – on reforms in German development policy following the Paris Declaration.

In 2014 Anna Pegels published a book on Green industrial policies in emerging countries (Routledge), detailing the research findings of the DIE in China, India and the EU.

Imme Scholz
Dr. Imme Scholz is the Deputy Director of the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) and works on issues at the interface of environment and development. In 2014 she was appointed to the Sustainable Development Council, which advises the Federal Chancellery. www.die-gdi.de/en/imme-scholz/
50 years of dynamic knowledge

The last decade of development has made it increasingly apparent that, in spite of all the successes in tackling absolute poverty, the future will be characterised by new global challenges. According to current prognoses, economic growth will not return to the level prior to the economic and financial crisis. Essential natural resources for securing the survival of poor people in particular – such as water, fertile soil, forest and fish resources – are becoming increasingly scarce, and at a faster pace. In addition, the consequences of climate change, already tangible in many areas, characterise the “new normal” for international co-operation.

The major international development agencies – as well as the multilateral development banks – are limbering up to deliver the right, innovative solutions for more demanding partners in this more complex environment. Traditional financing approaches involving public funding are taking a back seat. The knowledge offered with the financing is often the

August 1967
The Bangkok Declaration is signed, establishing the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) as a forum for cooperation between member states.

September 1969
The Pearson Commission on International Development publishes its report on the work of the World Bank between 1948 and 1968. The Pearson Report provides the rationale for decades of development policy work: it is a moral duty and is in the enlightened self-interest of wealthy countries.

We believe that the flow of official development aid, the only kind which really involves a burden on the taxpayer, should reach 0.7 per cent of the Gross National Product by 1975.
Lester B. Pearson, Head of the Pearson Commission on International Development

real motivation for ongoing co-operation for partner countries and participating actors. Developing and emerging countries wish to learn from their peers and request support in order to filter out the best concepts and instruments for their specific context. Decision-making processes should be padded out far more analytically in order to support difficult allocation decisions and sustain results.

This means that knowledge and solution competence are increasingly becoming the new "currency" of international co-operation. But what does this trend signify for the institutions that produce this knowledge, if at the same time the range and competition of the knowledge cosmos has expanded and providers from the developing countries themselves are becoming increasingly active in this field? What is the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) able to offer as co-operation partner to an institution such as, for example, the World Bank, that others are not able to offer?
Ongoing excellence, as documented by DIE through its top ranking amongst global sustainable development Think Tanks over numerous consecutive years is undoubtedly vital, but not sufficient in its own right.

The uniqueness of the knowledge product appears to be even more key. The DIE contributes a combination of knowledge forms to the debate, which distinguishes it clearly from other Think Tanks. It became evident much earlier than elsewhere that the development policy debate is facing a fundamental paradigm shift. Because today, combating poverty and increasing prosperity must be considered within the boundaries of planetary limits. A combination of technological, economic, institutional and cultural creativity is required in order to overcome the transformational processes that we are faced with. At the same time, amongst the leading actors in development co-operation the realisation has dawned that traditional one-dimensional solutions to the processing of central development problems are falling short. Our partners, particularly those in emerging economies, are becoming increasingly urgent in their search for multi-sectoral and innovative solutions that have already proved themselves in other countries, preferably developing ones with similar conditions.

Against this background, DIE was quick to identify the need to resort more to interdisciplinary teams in knowledge production and policy advice, in order to satisfy the new requirements. At the same time, the consequences for subject selection in research as well as for co-operation with other knowledge providers and producers and own expertise orientation need to be taken into consideration. In this respect, DIE has made astonishing progress, expanding and innovatively developing its partnership network and range of themes in the field of research and policy consulting in recent years to account for the new premises of sustainable development.

There is also another trend that was recognised at a very early stage. Today, solution competence and proposals need to arise in co-operation with partners, institutions, academics and civil society groups from developing and emerging countries in particular. Correctly, many up-and-coming countries with success in tackling poverty such as Brazil, China, Malaysia and South Korea are looking to offer their own concepts and experience for development in less developed countries and are actively challenging multilateral development institutions to elevate this knowledge and practical experience and process it for further dissemination. The establishment of knowledge hubs of the World Bank Group in collaboration with South Korea, China, South Africa and Brazil is an expression of this new confidence and the desire to treat south-south co-operation on an equal footing.

Learning from the global south, but above all learning, researching and reflecting with the “south” has become the overriding goal in knowledge and

---

**January 1972**
Klaus Billerbeck publishes a series of papers entitled ‘Europäisierung der Entwicklungshilfe’ examining the influence of Europe on development co-operation.

**January 1973**
DIE relocates within Berlin moving from Messeadamm 22 to Fraunhoferstraße 33–36 in Berlin’s Charlottenburg district.

**March 1972**
The Club of Rome publishes the study ‘Limits to Growth’.

**June 1972**
The United Nations holds its first Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm, launching the annual World Environment Day.
consulting operations. The DIE has successfully utilised the Global Governance School within the scope of the Managing Global Governance programme (MGG) to establish such a network with knowledge institutions and academics from the “south”. In the MGG partner countries DIE has potential contacts who can act as “door openers” and allies in the establishment of global governance at various different levels, from Think Tanks and governments to NGOs, beyond the contacts of the state development organisations. Today, joint publications, conferences and the participation of the MGG partner countries in the postgraduate programme are an established component in the research and training operations of DIE.

The DIE has also developed itself consistently in this respect, astonishing many partners, including major international actors, with the range of contacts and robust working relationships with knowledge actors from the developing and emerging countries. In this respect DIE appears to be very well prepared to continue to make key contributions to the further development of development and global structural politics on the national and international stage.

Ingrid-Gabriela Hoven

Ingrid-Gabriela Hoven has been Representative for Climate Issues at the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) since June 2014. Prior to this she served as Executive Director at the World Bank Group representing Germany. Ms. Hoven studied Economics and Political Science in Gießen and Paris.

But in my view the fundamental case for development assistance is the moral one. The whole of human history has recognized the principle – at least in the abstract – that the rich and the powerful have a moral obligation to assist the poor and the weak.

Robert S. McNamara, President of the World Bank, 1973

September 1973

World Bank President Robert S. McNamara delivers a highly acclaimed speech in which he announces a policy shift by the Bank in favour of the poor.

January 1974

‘Alternativen der künftigen Gestaltung des internationalen Handels mit Rohstoffen. Ein Denkansatz zur Neuordnung der Weltwirtschaft’ is published by K. Billerbeck.
“The size of your dreams must always exceed your current capacity to achieve them. If your dreams do not scare you, they are not big enough.”

Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, President of Liberia
“The globalisation of risks and challenges requires a kind of globalised domestic politics that extends not only beyond a skyline of church spires but also far beyond national borders.”

Willy Brandt, Federal Chancellor of West Germany 1969–1974
Over 60 years of German development policy: no sign of retiring yet

Unnoticed by many, German development policy marked its 60th birthday two years ago. As is the case in life, it took around 20 years to become fully grown. It began in 1952 with financial involvement in an aid programme of the United Nations in support of the economic development of countries of what was then referred to as the Third World, whilst 1956 saw the establishment of a “50 million fund” by the Foreign Office for bilateral aid – “Deutsche Mark”, naturally. At the end of the 1950s the German Bundestag began to actively support north-south policies. The growing financial volumes of aid, managed by various federal ministries, and coalition policy considerations resulted in the founding of the Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation (BMZ) in 1961. It was not until 1993 that the suffix “and Development” was added. The BMZ was initially a coordination ministry. In 1964 it was granted responsibility for principles and programmes of development policy, as well as technical co-operation and, in 1972, responsibility

April 1974
Case studies on copper (Klaus Billerbeck), crops (Helmut Brandt) and tropical wood (Hans-Helmut Lembke) discuss the re-structuring of the commodity markets.

July 1974
West Germany defeats the Netherlands 2:1 in the final and gains the second World Cup soccer title.

October 1974
The UNCTAD Symposium on Patterns of Resource Use, Environment and Development Strategies adopts the Cocoyoc Declaration.

Human beings have basic needs: food, shelter, clothing, health, education. […] Development should not be limited to the satisfaction of basic needs. There are other needs, other goals, and other values. Development includes freedom of expression and impression, the right to give and to receive ideas and stimulus.

The Cocoyoc Declaration 1974
for bilateral and multilateral financial co-operation. Only then was development policy established as a de facto political field in its own right. Following German reunification a number of the development co-operation projects of the former German Democratic Republic (GDR) were continued. In 1998 the BMZ received responsibility within the Federal Government for the development co-operation of the European Union as the last major sphere of competence.

Despite numerous changes, German development policy displays a range of constants. It was and is part of the overall policy of the Federal Government. Its goals have always lain between international solidarity and self-interests of varying degrees. It enjoys no priority in domestic politics and public perception, but is able to lean upon a basic political consensus amongst the parties represented in the German Bundestag, in spite of differences of detail. These have never instrumentalised it for the polarisa-
tion of domestic politics or demagoguery. In contrast to many other donor countries, Germany has no law covering development policy, but instead an own ministry and a strong organisational structure. This comprises the BMZ, parastatal executing agencies and numerous non-governmental organisations involved in implementing projects. A further constant is the fact that Germany conducts development co-operation at bilateral, European and multilateral levels and that, in spite of declared intentions to the contrary, has never attained the international target of 0.7 % of gross national product for official development assistance (ODA) (highest level 1983: 0.47 %, lowest level 1999: 0.26 %, 2013: 0.38 %).

The changes first of all concern the overall political framework. At the beginning, two motives were paramount: firstly, international solidarity as an obligation of the increasingly economically strong Federal Republic, which had itself benefited from the Marshall Plan aid, and secondly, the efforts to achieve worldwide recognition for the Federal Republic in the bipolar world. The latter led to the extension of development co-operation to cover well over 100 countries (referred to by critics as the “watering can approach”) and culminated in the Hallstein Doctrine, which linked development aid to non-recognition of the GDR. The context altered during the course of the policy of détente and with the accession of both German states to the United Nations in 1973. German development policy was then viewed as part of peacemaking policy and, with the end of the East-West conflict and growing awareness of the risks of globalisation, increasingly as an element of global structural policy. Below this level there were varying degrees of influence from other interests on development policy, such as export and employment interests. The solidarity motive, which explains why Germany conducts development co-operation with countries of little foreign, economic or geo-political significance, has also experienced a range of different connotations from humanitarian obligation to the mitigation of factors that produce refugee flows and the containment of cross-border risks.

German development policy has always followed the international paradigm shifts from the promotion of economic growth to satisfying basic needs, supporting structural adjustment, promotion of good governance and on to the millennium development goals and future sustainable development goals. It has considerable conceptual competence in numerous areas, as well as internationally-recognised expertise and professionalism in implementation. Both of these aspects have contributed to development policy acquiring a distinct profile within the Federal Government over the course of time. This is not only important for development policy to play its own role, but also to demand and promote the joint responsibility of all policies for global development (policy coherence for development) as frequently acknowledged both inter-
nationally and by the Federal Government. Competency disputes with the Foreign Office have also occurred, but (exceptions apart) have mostly been overcome in the form of pragmatic solutions. For a number of years now several other federal ministries, such as the Federal Ministry for the Environment have increasingly been applying their own funds to development co-operation. It is to be hoped that these ministries do not repeat the mistakes of previous decades, but instead use the experience of the BMZ and observe the international agreements on aid effectiveness, which have also been endorsed by Germany.

Will German development policy be able to enter well-deserved retirement in the near future? Unlikely. Even retirement at 67 will be out of the question, despite the fact that some contemporaries regard development policy as obsolescent. What is true is that the dynamics of international development have changed. There are fewer developing countries, emerging countries are increasingly acting as new donors, the significance of ODA compared to other sources of financing is diminishing. Nevertheless, in 2014 there are still over one billion people worldwide living in extreme poverty, 48 least developed countries and 45 fragile or failed states, to say nothing of numerous global development challenges. Germany has a major responsibility here. With its development policy it has key experience and potential. However, utilising this requires further reforms to enhance its effectiveness.

Guido Ashoff

Dr. Guido Ashoff, former senior researcher and head of the Department “Basis issues of bilateral and multilateral development policy” for many years.

www.die-gdi.de/en/guido-ashoff/
The global commons century

Tackling poverty remains high on the international development policy agenda, even though the number of people living in absolute poverty and societies which rank among the least developed countries is falling. Around 2.5 billion people still live on less than 2 USD per day. Development policy as global social policy and international solidarity in combating unacceptable living conditions remain important.

However, development policy is currently undergoing a radical transformation. Global interdependencies are generating global development opportunities and risks that call for new forms of international co-operation between all country groups. The 21st century will be the global commons century, an era in which an increasingly interlinked global population has to learn to protect the common basis for human civilisation and limit the mutual vulnerability between societies through co-operation. The worldwide discussion of sustainable development goals that all states will be forced to measure themselves against...
in future is already heralding this shift in perspective. Development policy is not well prepared per se to face these challenges. North-south, rich-poor, donor-recipient patterns make it harder to keep common interests in view. Well-meaning paternalism, the decades-old dominance of western countries in international policy processes are embedded in the genetic code of many donor organisations. Knee-jerk heaping of guilt on the industrialised countries and exaggerated tolerance of autocratic regimes in the south form part of G77 culture. The difficulty all participants face in achieving a shift towards reciprocal co-operation and joint responsibility for the global commons was evident at the Global Partnership conference of April 2014 in Mexico City, and remains visible in the current attempts to forge an alliance for a major climate deal in Paris in the autumn of 2015. The development of a renewed global culture of co-operation is therefore itself already a goal of international co-operation.
Five further areas of co-operation are apparent when it comes to moulding the era of the global commons.

In the coming decades a **global recycling economy** is required if the increasing prosperity of what will soon be 9 billion people is not to burst the boundaries of the earth system. In Germany around 15% of the resources used in the economy are currently recycled. By the middle of the century, by around 2070 at the latest, resources worldwide will need to be primarily utilised in closed cycles and emissions hazardous to the earth system (such as greenhouse gas emissions) reduced to zero. Without such a neutrality concept to ensure the performance of the earth system enduring prosperity will not be possible. Civilising setbacks, the renewed rise of poverty, the overburdening of societies through harmful global environmental change would then be the likely outcomes. The agreement of global guidelines to protect the earth system should be a prerequisite for putting the global economy on a sustainable course. International co-operation is also necessary in order to develop global infrastructures that are both ecologically sound (urban design, energy and mobility systems) and economically stable (financial systems).

**Inequality** is increasing in many societies. Inequality is a social challenge if large sections of the population have no access to the basic services (such as healthcare, education, housing) without which human development cannot function. Social disparities can also manifest themselves in legitimisation problems or even endanger democracies, whose promises are ultimately based on the premise that all citizens can have a share in social prosperity. Fair tax systems, the combating of tax evasion, programmes to overcome youth unemployment are consequently high on the agendas of Spain, the North African countries, The World Bank and regional development banks. Networks between all nations are increasing rapidly. At the same time, **entire societies are disintegrating**. Congo, South Sudan, Somalia, Afghanistan are classic examples of failing states. Iraq, Syria, Libya and Ukraine are part of a new group of economically further developed societies in which illegitimate rule is the starting point for social deterioration. War, violence, the questioning of national borders, in association with major flows of refugees and sphere-of-influence politics that were considered long gone appear to be on the rise once again. OECD countries, regional powers and emerging countries need to co-operate in order to stabilise the pillars of international peace and prevent regional conflicts from flaring up.

In the developing and emerging countries, particularly in Asia, burgeoning middle classes are developing, which could manoeuvre the world in very different directions. The new **middle classes** could press for democracy, overcome autocracy,
force environmental protection, facilitate the establishment of human rights and drive international co-operation. However, they could also tend towards nationalism and target prosperity without considering the economic and social costs of this. Examples exist for both of these dynamics. How can international co-operation be developed in order to form alliances for sustainability and democracy with the new middle classes?

The new communication technologies represent the first global platform on which people around the world can communicate in real time and at relatively low cost. The use of these technologies for global co-operation and worldwide learning processes is still in its infancy. The communication technologies can strengthen civil societies and therefore democracy; however, they also have the potential to promote powerful state surveillance structures; there is also the fear that private companies could establish networks of global data pools, rendering individuals or even states subject to the decisions of private communications companies. It is not yet clear which social formations will emerge on this basis, and it is dependent upon the legal frameworks and social standards that these technologies will be embedded in. National and international discussions on this subject are consequently of great significance.

Dirk Messner

Prof. Dr. Dirk Messner is the Director of the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Co-Director of the Käte Hamburger Kolleg / Centre for Global Cooperation Research and Co-Chair of the German Advisory Council on Global Change (WBGU). www.die-gdi.de/en/dirk-messner/

**January 1985**

Hans H. Lembke publishes the study ‘Energy Use in Residential Buildings in Greater Amman’, which examines the potential of energy-efficient construction methods for developing countries.

**April 1985**

José Sarney Costa is elected Brazil’s first civilian President, bringing to an end the country’s military dictatorship.

**May 1985**

Gudrun Lachenmann releases the study ‘Ökologie und Sozialstruktur in Mali’, DIE’s first publication on social and environmental inequality.
“Bonn is Germany’s United Nations City and a hub for sustainable development worldwide. We are proud to be home to key actors in German development co-operation. Amongst those, the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) has played a special role, demonstrating scientific excellence, successful policy making and high performance in development capacity building for half a century now. Congratulations on 50 years of leadership in German development policy, DIE!”

Jürgen Nimptsch, Mayor of Bonn and Vice Chair of the World Mayors Council on Climate Change

“The landscape of international co-operation and the development agenda is becoming more and more complex. Now in particular we need to urgently abandon familiar paths. Over a period of 50 years, DIE has gained the competence and the reputation as one of only very few institutes worldwide that can redraw the maps with vision and foresight. Many actors, not only German and even us as an ecclesiastic development service need this pioneering expertise and we wholeheartedly support its expansion rather than its downsizing.”

Cornelia Füllkrug-Weitzel, Brot für die Welt & Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und Entwicklung

“The German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) is continuing its long tradition of thought leadership by convening the German Sustainable Development Solutions Network. SDSN Germany comprises Germany’s eminent research institutions on sustainable development and promises to play an important role in fostering a public debate on the sustainable development agenda and in promoting practical solutions. Over the coming years I look forward to working closely with DIE on supporting the design and implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals in Germany and beyond.”

Jeffrey Sachs, Columbia University’s Earth Institute & Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN)
"For 50 years DIE has provided constructively critical input to the debates concerning questions of global development. It brings up painful subjects, offers possible solutions and is an important partner in the field of politics. DIE has truly become an Institution! This is something the Institute can really be proud of and I would like to offer congratulations on behalf of the CDU/CSU parliamentary group on the occasion of its birthday!"

Sibylle Pfeiffer, MP, CDU/CSU parliamentary group

"DIE has been supporting the work of the German parliament for 50 years with its research. It is a trailblazer for new perspectives on international development and also a critical observer of political decisions. Its high-grade research work enhances debates on development policy with differentiated theses that can also be provocative, as well as with reliable findings that provide a solid foundation upon which to make political decisions. I am impressed again and again by the staff at the DIE with their tireless efforts to shape a more just world. This also gives a voice to those who often go unheard, namely the poorest people of this world. Many thanks for this! I would also like to especially thank Dirk Messner, who not only drives forward the work of the institute with incredible zeal for research but also presents it to the outside world with enthusiasm and persuasiveness. I wish you and your Institute continuing success in your work and look forward to your impulses for my own work."

Bärbel Kofler, Member of the German Bundestag, SPD parliamentary group

"It is with deep gratitude that we look back on our close co-operation from a personal, institutional and content-related point of view. As one of the most influential research institutes in the field of development policy DIE is an important partner for church development co-operation. DIE thinks ahead in the best possible sense and invites us to improve our work for the benefit of the poor so that all survive. So how will this great transformation come about? The answer - if many courageously work together to achieve a global partnership leading to One World for all. The work of DIE opens important horizons for us to this end. We would like to offer our congratulations and wish them God's blessing for this ground-breaking work in the years to come.

Pirmin Spiegel, Misereor
Post-2015: An opportunity for social and ecological development

2014 is set to see the merger of two processes currently underway within the framework of the United Nations (UN): the development of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and agreement on a successor to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which were set in 2001 with 2015 as target year. Proposals for a comprehensive post-2015 agenda are to be formulated in the coming year. The goals are to apply to both industrialised and developing countries. Sustainable development is to be the general guiding principle for the new agenda; but it remains to be seen just how this principle is reflected in the individual goals.

The 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro was the first milestone in the agreement on such a concept. Here it became generally acknowledged that human development is only possible in the long term if it addresses the three issues that were from then on referred to as the three “dimensions of sustainable development”. These are often referred to as the “three Rs” of environmental management: reducing environmental degradation; ensuring the provision of ecosystem services; and ensuring conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

The 1992 conference also marked the beginning of a process of international environmental agreements. With the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development came the Agenda 21, a programme of action to be implemented by the international community on an urgent and priority basis. The Agenda 21 also laid the foundation for a series of environmental summits. The first important international environmental conference that followed in 1997 was the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg. It is expected that those working on the post-2015 agenda will also take the Johannesburg Summit into account, for the first time as a formal part of a United Nations conference. The 1992 conference was the first milestone in the agreement on such a concept. Here it became generally acknowledged that human development is only possible in the long term if it addresses the three issues that were from then on referred to as the three “dimensions of sustainable development”. These are often referred to as the “three Rs” of environmental management: reducing environmental degradation; ensuring the provision of ecosystem services; and ensuring conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

Post-2015: An opportunity for social and ecological development

2014 is set to see the merger of two processes currently underway within the framework of the United Nations (UN): the development of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and agreement on a successor to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which were set in 2001 with 2015 as target year. Proposals for a comprehensive post-2015 agenda are to be formulated in the coming year. The goals are to apply to both industrialised and developing countries. Sustainable development is to be the general guiding principle for the new agenda; but it remains to be seen just how this principle is reflected in the individual goals.

The 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro was the first milestone in the agreement on such a concept. Here it became generally acknowledged that human development is only possible in the long term if it addresses the three issues that were from then on referred to as the three “dimensions of sustainable development”. These are often referred to as the “three Rs” of environmental management: reducing environmental degradation; ensuring the provision of ecosystem services; and ensuring conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.
development*: economic efficiency and economic growth, social justice and the protection of the environment and natural resources. However, in the majority of policy fields this concept failed to establish itself; with it only prevailing in the area of environmental policy over the course of the past two decades. In contrast, in the field of economic policy the co-existence of economic and ecological goals was long regarded as conflictive. An extensive discussion emerged regarding the question to which extent economic growth can still be achieved in the face of environmental protection efforts and the costs associated with these.

In the field of social policy the focus is almost exclusively upon the interaction of social and economic development. For example, the pro-poor growth debate of the last decade concentrated on the question of the extent to which growth could contribute to combating poverty, and under which circumstances this could occur.

---

**The three dimensions of sustainable development**

Economic growth and efficiency

Social justice

Environmental protection

Pro-poor growth debate 2000s

Ecology vs. economy debate 1990s

necessary debate related to the post-2015 agenda

---

We are the people!

A slogan much used in German history, becomes particularly associated with the Monday Demonstrations in the German Democratic Republic (GDR) in 1989.

May 1990

Four applicants from the GDR are able to take part in the 26th course of the Postgraduate Training Programme.

November 1989

The Berlin Wall falls, ushering in the process of reunification between East and West Germany and the end of the East-West conflict, and awakening hopes of a peace and development dividend.
In contrast, links between social justice and environmental protection were long kept separate. This also applied to the MDGs and the efforts of the international community to implement these. The dimension of environmental sustainability played a subordinated role here. Environmental protection was just one goal of many and the monitoring focused largely on other goals such as income poverty, education, the supply of drinking water and health.

In order to redress these shortcomings the future post-2015 agenda needs to reflect the three dimensions of sustainable development equally in the goals and address the following important issues: (1) What effect do social policies have on the environment? (2) What are the social effects of environmental policies? and (3) How can policies be created that pursue both the protection of the environment and natural resources as well as social justice?

To answer these questions it is first necessary to consider the interrelations between the social and the ecological dimensions of sustainable development. These are linked to one another very tightly. On the one hand, the poor are disproportionately affected by environmental change. Climate change and poor quality of soil, water and air are particularly detrimental to their lives, as they earn their living from natural resource-dependent economic sectors such as farming and fishing, live in areas such as coastal regions that are particularly prone to natural disasters and the consequences of climate change, and because they do not possess adequate resources to adapt to changes in the environment, such as climate change and its consequences. On the other hand, use of the environment and natural resources constitutes an existential basis for the poor and they are often forced to over-exploit these resources. These negative effects of poverty on the environment are often over-estimated, however. Prosperity and industrialisation make a far greater contribution to the current environmental changes.

In principle, the environmental effects of poverty-reducing social policies are rather limited. Reducing poverty through improved basic services, increased rights of participation and property as well as easier access to corresponding sources of income may even decrease the pressure on the environment and natural resources. Decisive in this is that poverty reduction and growing prosperity are uncoupled from use of the environment and natural resources.

Environmental policies, on the other hand, can have highly significant positive, but also negative, effects on the poor. For example, the establishment of protection areas or the lowering of energy subsidies for fossil fuels have positive effects on the environment but also burden the population affected with restricted use or higher costs. In turn, these are easier to circumvent for better-off sections of the population than the poor.
These interrelations need to be taken into consideration when formulating the goals of the post-2015 agenda. Whilst many of the “social” goals of the MDG agenda are mutually supportive of one another, conflicts certainly exist between these and many of the additional goals primarily in the environmental field proposed in the post-2015 discussion. These conflicts generally focus on the extent to which scarce resources can be used without exceeding the ecological boundaries. These conflicts can only be avoided through the integration of the individual sustainability dimensions into the respective goals of a future development agenda. However, if this proves successful, it offers the opportunity to promote social and ecological development parallel to one another.

Carmen Richerzhagen
Dr. Carmen Richerzhagen is a senior researcher in the Environmental Policy and Resource Management department. She researches international environmental and biodiversity policy and its social effects, global sustainability goals and the post-2015 agenda.
www.die-gdi.de/en/carmen-richerzhagen/

Markus Loewe
Dr. Markus Loewe is a senior researcher in the Sustainable Economic and Social Development department. His research topics include social protection, the MDGs, poverty reduction and small and medium enterprise promotion.
www.die-gdi.de/en/markus-loewe/

June 1992
Edith Kürzinger-Wiemann publishes ‘Umweltrichtige Entwicklungspolitik’ and other papers, supporting BMZ in its preparations for the UN Conference on Environment and Development.

January 1993
DIE publishes ‘Human rights and development co-operation’ by Peter Waller and other studies in preparation for the UN World Conference on Human Rights in 1993.

May 1994
DIE marks its 30th anniversary, during which time it has trained 592 graduates in its Postgraduate Training Programme.

June 1992
The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development is held in Rio de Janeiro, initiating a global debate on environmental issues. “Sustainable development” is to become the guiding principle, giving equal status to poverty reduction and the protection of natural resources.
TTIP – opportunities and risks for global development

Since July 2013, the European Union (EU) has been negotiating a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) with the United States of America (USA). TTIP would constitute the largest free trade agreement worldwide.

The TTIP negotiating agenda comprises far more than just the removal of trade barriers. Negotiations also cover the regulations for cross-border investment, competition policy, intellectual property and a broad range of regulations that often have only tenuous links to classic trade policy – with uncertain consequences for those countries that are not sat at the negotiating table.

TTIP is the subject of avid debate – albeit with a limited focus. Supporters and critics concentrate primarily on the effects of TTIP on Germany and Europe. Meanwhile, insufficient attention is paid to the implications of this mega regional for the rest of the world.

The dismantling of trade barriers between the USA and the EU would result in the two trading blocs...
trading increasingly with one another and importing less from other countries. On the whole, transatlantic tariffs are already low and TTIP would only lead to minor losses for third countries. However, emerging and developing countries could be harder hit in a number of sectors in which transatlantic tariffs remain high. In the textile and clothing sector, for example, low-income countries such as Bangladesh, Cambodia or Pakistan would have to fear a loss of exports as a result of TTIP.

TTIP would have more comprehensive effects for emerging and developing countries if non-tariff trade barriers are also removed, in particular via the harmonisation or mutual recognition of standards and regulations. This could have a significant effect on a number of emerging and developing countries. The precise extent of these effects would depend upon the form taken by the regulatory co-operation.

In addition, TTIP also has immense indirect consequences, which will have a decisive influence on the
future of international trade and a significant effect on global development.

Firstly, the multilateral system of trading is being bypassed as never before by TTIP and other ongoing negotiations regarding mega regions, such as the Transpacific Partnership (TPP) negotiated between the USA and ten other countries. Instead of concentrating on the Doha Round of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the USA and the EU are utilising key political capital and administrative capacity in the negotiation of mega regions. From a development policy viewpoint, this has to be regarded critically. The WTO is and remains the institutional framework in which the trading interests of poor and small countries are best represented.

Secondly, the new transatlantic free trade area would not be merely a further addition to the list of already existing treaties. It represents a new course for the global trading system. The EU and the USA would use TTIP as a blueprint for future treaties with emerging and developing countries – and set standards for the development of global trade regulations. This represents enormous risks for emerging and developing countries if their interests are not taken into account when this course is set.

TTIP could therefore mark a key turning point for the global trade system. TTIP and other mega regionals threaten to further undermine the multilateral negotiations of the WTO. Even more dangerous: the negotiations will provoke the counter reaction of trading blocs being formed by emerging countries such as Brazil, India and, above all, China, none of whom are participating in the TTIP and TPP negotiations.

Instead of this potentially conflict-provoking approach of the transatlantic partners it would be better to place the focus on co-operation with emerging and developing countries – particularly in view of the enormous economic potential that these countries possess, as well as against the background of the current global challenges, which can only be resolved with the emerging and developing countries together.

The TTIP negotiations are a good opportunity to anchor development policy concerns in the emerging global system of trade. TTIP does not only imply risks, created wisely it can also have a positive effect on global development.

To ensure that TTIP is coherent with European and global development objectives the TTIP negotiations need to be examined with regard to these goals. The development policy actors should push for the examination of TTIP with regard to development compatibility. Moreover, the developing countries should be supported in their efforts to adapt to the consequences of TTIP for their economic structure, as well as to new standards.

In addition, the EU and the USA should adopt an inclusive rather than an exclusive approach in the scope of their regulatory co-operation. For example,
they could refrain from discriminating in the mutual recognition of their standards, so that third countries can also benefit from the potential advantages of transatlantic co-operation.

The negotiations regarding the TTIP treaty and other mega regionals should not result in the fragmentation of the global system of trade into competing trading blocs. This is why Germany should engage in dialogue with the emerging and developing countries regarding the revitalisation and reform of the multilateral trading process and the effects of TTIP on global development. This dialogue should be accompanied by joint research with co-operation partners in emerging and developing countries. One particularly innovative - but also challenging - move would be to align TTIP towards the future post-2015 objectives.

Axel Berger is a researcher in the World Economy and Development Financing department. He studied Political Science in Munich and conducts research on international investment treaties and their effects on developing countries.

www.die-gdi.de/en/axel-berger/

Clara Brandi is a researcher in the World Economy and Development Financing department. She gained a PhD from the European University Institute and conducts research on global economic governance with a focus on international trade and sustainable development.

www.die-gdi.de/en/clara-brandi/

**January 1996**
Klaus Eßer et al. publish a series of papers entitled ‘Globaler Wettbewerb und nationaler Handlungsspielraum’, presenting the concept of systemic competitiveness to a broader public and making a key contribution to the development policy debate.

**December 1997**
The Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, a commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, is signed.

The Kyoto Protocol states that “industrialized countries will reduce their combined greenhouse gas emissions by at least 5% compared to 1990 levels by the period 2008–2012. This legally binding commitment promises to produce an historic reversal of the upward trend in emissions that started in these countries some 150 years ago.”
“To congratulate the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) for its 50 years of successful performance is to congratulate my country and my region for such a brilliant contribution to policy advice, training of young professionals, research and consulting. DIE’s institutional independence, equanimity and intelligent orientation towards large emerging economies are the sound basis for an original and updated international technical co-operation strategy.”

Enrique Saravia, Instituto Saravia, Rio de Janeiro

“DIE ranks amongst the leading development policy Think Tanks and makes important contributions to debates especially in the political field. Nowadays in particular, global development matters are more important than ever before and require innovative and interdisciplinary research and policy advice institutes such as the DIE. On this the occasion of its 50th anniversary, I would like to offer my congratulations to its director, Prof. Dirk Messner and his team and wish them continuing success in the field of critical and independent research!"

Uwe Kekeritz, Member of the German Bundestag, German parliamentary group Bündnis 90/ Die Grünen

“The German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) recognised long before others that the poorest people of this Earth are particularly exposed to the global risks of climate change. The contributions of DIE to the analysis of global development issues are outstanding. Congratulations on such sharp-sightedness!”

Hans Joachim Schellnhuber, Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research
“Congratulations on a globally-relevant programme for research, policy advice and training! And a great big and very personal thank-you for the excellent co-operation as part of the University of Duisburg-Essen (UDE) MA programmes on development policy, as well as in our interdisciplinary “joint project” – the Käte Hamburger Kolleg / Centre for Global Cooperation Research.”

Tobias Debiel, INEF, Käte Hamburger Kolleg / Centre for Global Cooperation Research

“Development co-operation has undergone radical change in recent decades. Global environmental changes and development of markets have created completely new conditions. The German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) always ranked among the progressive thinkers within this process of change and its input is more in demand today than ever before.”

Claus Leggewie, Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities, Essen (KWI)

“I would like to congratulate the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) and all its staff on its 50th birthday. Today, thanks to its networking with development policy think-tanks worldwide, it ranks amongst the leading institutes involved in development policy and theory research and training. In addition, it offers policy advice to ministries, governments and organisations and significantly helps to shape international debate on development policy by virtue of its authority. Everybody involved in development co-operation profits from this. And last but not least, there are the many hundreds who thanks to the outstanding training at the DIE are today working in German, European and international development co-operation. For this I would like to also add my very personal thanks along with best wishes for the future.”

Bruno Wenn, DEG – Deutsche Investitions- und Entwicklungsgesellschaft mbH
Beyond aid – The influence of non-traditional development co-operation

Aid is one element in development co-operation, but arguably not the most important one. Emerging economies are increasingly engaging in developing countries. Their engagement includes development finance that would classify as ‘aid’. Their stronger effect, however, is clearly beyond aid. Development co-operation consists of an (important) element of finance, political co-operation and coordination of an increasing variety of actors, and the sharing knowledge with developing countries.

Aid makes up for less than one fifth (19 per cent) of the overall financial flows to developing countries. If used wisely – by both donor and recipient – it might help as a catalyst for some developments. But it clearly is not the major price for countries in need of capital inflows. Other major sources are private capital and remittances by migrants, and the latter are certainly increasing in importance. Yet, countries have different levels of attraction for private capital. For least developed countries, in other words: those most in...
need, flows of Official Development Assistance (ODA)
type of finance account for more than two thirds of
the financial flows (67%). The ODA-like flows include
estimates for a number of non-DAC member states,
such as China, Brazil, India, Qatar or Turkey. Non-DAC
donors are usually small donors in absolute numbers,
even though Qatar, Turkey, and Kuwait, for instance,
provide substantial amounts of aid in relation to their
Gross National Income (GNI). The bigger non-DAC
donors are China, with an estimate of USD 3 billion,
Turkey with about USD 2.5 billion, India with USD
1 billion, and Brazil and Russia are each in the range
of USD 1 billion. Yet, development co-operation is
a political endeavour as much as it is financial one.

Any co-operation happens in a political context
and co-operation for the purpose of development is
but one area in broader foreign relations of countries.
Emerging economies often do not regard develop-
ment co-operation as a distinct policy area and rather
see it as a way to increase linkages of their economies.
Trade between nations happens, and is, at times, strongly supported by state loans from emerging economies. Trade in itself, however, does not result in developmental effects. Investments across borders occur and are promoted and non-DAC development partners emphasise the aspect of ‘mutual benefit’, i.e. there is an openness about gaining from co-operation. Yet, the ‘mutuality’ of the benefits will have to be worked towards. The ‘tying’ of, say, Chinese aid to spending a proportion on it on good or services from China is not deemed something to be shy about. Some governments might actually appreciate package-deals as ‘turn-key projects’ also mean leaner process on the beneficiary side. It does, however, reduce choice for partners, and might, for instance, cut out domestic bidders from the co-operation or result in sub-standard work if supervision is lacking. On the other hand, at least in the early years of renewed interest, quick delivery on projects was one of the trademark characters of Chinese infrastructure work, which had benefits particularly for post-conflict environments.

Referring to non-DAC partners can serve a political function for developing countries. Emerging economies’ co-operation policy is strongly rooted in the Non-Aligned Movement, and thus emphasise ‘non-interference in internal affairs’. The understanding of what constitutes ‘internal affairs’ is rather orthodox for most developing countries. This is even more so in cases like China, where the political system has remained state-party monopolistic and unfree, so that non-interference is seen as also stifling criticism on the situation in China itself. This is attractive for a number of African leaders, and de facto reduces European pressure on undemocratic African regimes.

The necessity for a development-friendly policy “at home” is also emphasised by actors like China, India or Brazil. These countries, however, reach contrary conclusions from DAC donors on the consequences for their international development co-operation. While DAC countries try to support positive elements in governance and try to engage in a policy dialogue with partners, the non-DAC partners officially try to stay clear of domestic policy processes; they rather go through partner governments. This sounds easy and attractive. It does, however, become increasingly difficult for countries like China or India to claim ‘non-interference’, as any activity in a foreign country by Chinese or Brazilian citizens and companies makes them party to domestic policies there. The larger the investment and trade interests are, the less possible it is to pursue a policy of strictly following ‘hands off’, as assets and citizens need to be protected. This is even more so the case when enterprises enjoy strong backing of their home states – or are largely state-owned. For China, the conflict in Sudan was a clear case in point: its oil interests make it prone to engage with conflict parties, as open conflict will disrupt oil exports which are important for the Chinese economy.
No one element – aid, trade, investment, effects of migration – is likely to ‘trigger’ development single-handedly. Each of the activities can be supportive or not, but development, the social and economic advancement of a society, depends on good domestic policies. Institutions in developing countries clearly matter as facilitators or obstacles for development. Despite ‘non-interference’, non-traditional partners acknowledge the importance of a ‘good investment climate’ and good ‘soft infrastructure’, i.e. functioning institutions.

Ideas and expertise – including connectivity with the target groups – matter. Where emphasis is on state-to-state co-operation only, the knowledge base is obviously limited to only some actors. One major challenge, particularly for least developed countries, is to retain information on new opportunities and to understand emerging actors’ agendas and drivers in order to see how to use their contribution for national development. People move across countries, be it on scholarships (which are considered ‘aid’) or in their personal capacity, for a variety of reasons. The knowledge and income that these individuals gain can also benefit development of their places of origin.

While emerging economies have a role to play as policy inspiration, they can also provide a range of technical expertise, and they might have lessons to share on their domestic development. They do, however, not represent an alternative model, but rather are an additional opportunity in an increasingly diverse global system.

Sven Grimm
Dr. Sven Grimm is senior researcher at the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) and extraordinary associate professor of Stellenbosch University, South Africa. He has been Director of the Centre for Chinese Studies in Stellenbosch between 2010 and 2014.
www.die-gdi.de/en/sven-grimm/
“If we hope to survive as a species and as a planet, we must reflect globally and collectively on well-being and justice.”

*Martha Nussbaum, Philosopher & Professor of Law and Ethics*
“Today's real borders are not between nations, but between powerful and powerless, free and fettered, privileged and humiliated.”

Kofi A. Annan, Secretary-General of the United Nations 1997–2006
In a satirical piece ‘How to Write about Africa’, Binyawanga Wainaina confronts the several caricatures that populate the representation of a continent consisting of fifty-four different countries. These include often circulated images of Africa in the western press “(a)n AK47, prominent ribs, naked breasts”. In similar vein, Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie laments the pitfalls of the ‘single story’ and Chinua Achebe hopes that the 21st century will bring in a much better ‘balance’ in terms of global story-telling while making a plea for a more holistic account of the politics of global ‘dispossession’. These are only some prominent African intellectual voices that make a case for valuing global diversity and inclusivity, not just in hypothetical terms but by implication in the policy realm as well. Such an argument is not restricted to Africa, but could easily apply to large parts of South America, Asia and the Arab world.

When thinking about development studies it is appropriate to start by asking whether it has been...
complicit in the intended or unintended distortion of the ‘life worlds’ of the global South or whether it has engaged these concerns progressively. Several disciplines like anthropology, area studies and international relations have been closely intertwined with Empire in the past, and have helped to reinforce these types of misrepresentation. And yet they have self-consciously sought to remedy those slants in recent decades. Misrepresentation often entails high human costs. The stains of the colonial past are resistant but all the above mentioned disciplines are appraised (to varying degrees) of the need to turn a new leaf. What about development studies? While some argue that the field is floundering and risks inconsequence, others think that with some re-invention its survival if not its continued presence is assured.

Development is the mantra not just in the Anglo-American world but has always found endorsement among ruling elites in the developing world. It is the content of development that is increasingly con-
tested. Scepticism about old modernisation paradigms with their trickle down rationales, the threat to livelihoods of people who called the bluff of Enlightenment ‘progress’ and fundamental questions as to what constitutes human well-being more broadly and how it can be evaluated inevitably opens a fresh can of worms. In short, development has come to mean different things to different people but everybody wants a slice of it.

What does the rise of old civilisation states do to complicate this narrative further? I use the word complicate consciously to suggest the erosion of the old status quo and the active contestation of the global privileges that traditional major powers hitherto assumed as a matter of natural right. The basic question is whether the global provision of public goods in the 21st century will be more egalitarian and just this time around? Without dwelling on history for too long, suffice it to say that the wealth of the traditional colonial powers was built on the economic drain of the colonised economies. What will be different now? There are at least three crucial challenges that confront the major powers in the contemporary international system. First, there is a need to go beyond cosmetics. Mere tokenism of better representation in international bodies will not suffice. What this entails is carrying out more thoroughgoing and deeper structural transformations that address the unevenness of contemporary globalisation. Second, there is a need to reject tempting stereotypes. Only with an open mind can we hear above the din of the usual background noises. These noises are generated by attention to trivialities without addressing fundamental asymmetries of global power, process and political outcomes. Only a change in mindset can offset these challenges. Such a task is easier accomplished in principle rather than actual practice. Thirdly, there is a need to look beyond the standard premises of conventional social science in order to depart from what scholars like Ulrich Beck have referred to as ‘methodological nationalism’. Our knee jerk reflex to examine all global issues from the vantage point of national interests is not likely to generate the most imaginative outcomes.

The DIE is well placed in many respects to lend an insightful perspective on the necessary transitions that are in tune with evolving global realities. It is nimble footed as illustrated in the considerable thought and refinement that has gone into its Global Governance School for young professionals from the emerging economies. It has been ahead of the curve both in terms of acknowledging fundamental changes in global multipolarity and has its political instincts in the right place while recognising the need to creatively extract social science insights into relevant and timely policy advice. To its added advantage is its receptivity in embracing multi-disciplinarity to coax the best from diverse learning experiences. Its willingness...
to converse with evolutionary biologists, anthropologists, experimental economists and Southern International Relations scholars among others speaks well of its capacity to listen and its own recognition that global problems cannot be solved by purely national logics augurs well for a more differentiated and nuanced outlook.

What can it do further to add to its existing sheen? There is perhaps greater scope for sustained theoretical engagement and innovation. While there appears to be a certain urgency to pronounce on issues of political expediency - global aid politics, democracy promotion, definitions of development with a big D, and the advocacy of liberal human rights and rule of law paradigms, I still think that all these issues merit much greater scrutiny away from the glare of policy. Academics like to let the dust settle before they pronounce and DIE’s own mandate to inform policy compels it to operate with a more limited temporal frame. However, there is likely to be no substitute to basic research with potentially long gestation periods that could seek to address all the difficult logjams of our times – from climate change dilemmas to the return of political economy focused on wealth and income inequalities. I would imagine that beyond pushing the policy envelope, DIE needs to consciously develop a research cluster devoted to theorising macro-historical and macro-economic change, prying open to rigorous scrutiny what constitutes justice and to whom. Most significantly, it should promote thinking of global inequality and legitimacy from the perspective which Achebe had so presciently thought of as, the ‘dispossessed’ in the 21st century. Development studies and DIE may have disparate intellectual lineages. However, today they share conjoined fortunes and therein lies the challenge.

**Siddharth Mallavarapu**

Professor Siddharth Mallavarapu is currently Chairperson, Department of International Relations at the South Asian University in New Delhi. His principal areas of academic focus include international relations theory, intellectual histories of the global south and global governance debates. He is an alumnus of the ‘Managing Global Governance’ programme and has been a Senior Fellow at the Käte Hamburger Kolleg / Centre for Global Cooperation Research.

---

**Chronicle**

- **September 2008** Major US bank Lehman Brothers collapses, marking the start of the global financial crisis.
- **November 2008** Barack Obama is elected as the 44th President of the United States.
- **January 2009** DIE is included for the first time in the ‘Global Go To Think Tank Ranking’ Index, ranking as one of the top-ten think tanks in the area of development policy.
- **June 2009** Imme Scholz succeeds Jürgen Wiemann as Deputy Director of DIE.
Can we learn from co-operation research?

The German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) has been taking part in an interdisciplinary research process since 2012 that is institutionally anchored at the Käte Hamburger Kolleg / Centre for Global Cooperation Research at the Universität Duisburg-Essen. The Centre views global co-operation as the key to the effective and legitimate tackling of pressing transnational challenges. Together with fellows from various regions of the world and academic/scientific disciplines the Centre attempts to scrutinise the foundations for human co-operation.

This direction of investigation is of great relevance to development policy and the DIE. Global, human-made environmental changes such as climate change or the loss of biological diversity threaten development processes and limit the development opportunities of future generations in both the global south and north. The tackling of such cross-border problem areas, the causes of which many contribute to and

---

**November 2010**

The German Council of Science and Humanities (Wissenschaftsrat) praises in its assessment of the progress made by DIE the “outstanding work in the areas of research, policy advice and training”.

**December 2010**

Tunisian fruit and vegetable seller Mohamed Bouazizi sets himself on fire, triggering the revolution in Tunisia and the Arab Spring.

**March 2011**

A tsunami leads to a nuclear meltdown in several reactors at the Fukushima nuclear power plant, resulting in the worst nuclear reactor disaster in history.

Fukushima changed my position on nuclear energy. [...] Renewables will be at the heart of our future energy supply plans.

German Chancellor Angela Merkel in her official statement on behalf of the German Government on 09.06.2011
which even more are affected by, calls for more effective collective action. In addition, in an age of global power shifts it is necessary to defend the admittedly imperfect legal order and extend this further. This, too, requires increased international co-operation. There is currently little positive news regarding global co-operation processes. In spite of an unprecedented density of interaction between various societies and continuous growth in the number of international organisations governments find it difficult to privilege the long-term global common good over short-term national interests.

What initial lessons for the global co-operation of tomorrow can we draw if it is not just the “usual suspects” political science, international relations, economics that have a say, but where cultural sciences, cognitive and neurosciences, evolutionary anthropology and psychology are also consulted?

The biological prerequisites for co-operation already exist. Humans display a high degree of
co-operative ability. Our success as a species is most likely down to this biological capability, in combination with our capacity for cumulative culture, i.e. the passing on and improvement of behaviour or artefacts across multiple generations. Although humans share the essential ability and motivation to co-operate with chimpanzees, from childhood onwards they are psychologically better equipped to co-operate with others. However, this does not mean that we have always found co-operation easy, particularly in large groups.

These findings from the field of biological anthropology indicate that the increasing complexity of human societies was only possible through co-operation – up to the present day with its mega cities, transnational companies and multilateral organisations. In view of this, it seems plausible that mankind should also be capable of mastering future crises through co-operation. The basic prerequisites for this, at least, are present.

We need to gain a better understanding of people and their diverse motivations and behaviour. In the mainstream of many sciences that deal with co-operation the model of the rational actor maximising his/her advantages remains dominant. Whilst this model may have its justification, it is somewhat reduced in meaning and dangerous in many respects: there is a risk of creating a self-fulfilling prophecy when, for example, one takes the view that the collapse of co-operation between China and the USA is unavoidable.

From a cognitive viewpoint it must be noted that the actions that we consider rational are often characterised by prejudice and short-sightedness. People are lethargic and find it hard to recognise the advantages of benefits that lie in the future. A bird in the hand appears significantly more attractive than two in the bush – a tendency that renders the major transformation towards sustainable economic and consumption patterns difficult and also does not make tackling climate problems any easier. It is also generally very difficult for people to place themselves in the position of others, as they are caught up in their own mindsets. This complicates co-operation in many ways, for example if a diplomat fails to recognise the potential for agreement due to the assumption of a significantly greater deviation in the “opponent’s” position.

We need to become better at assessing the complexity of global co-operation. Despite the cognitive and psychological limitations of human efforts at co-operation, co-operation between individuals and in small groups is considerably more effective than co-operation at a global level. One possible explanation for this lies in the concept of social identity. It is proven that co-operation works particularly well when those co-operating feel a sense of belonging to one another and may also distinguish themselves
from another group. However, at global level such identification with a global “we” is difficult, with national rivalries often emerging to the fore. It has been experimentally proven that, for example, a high degree of international interconnection of individuals enhances their tendency to invest in the solution of global problems. Generally speaking, there remains a need for considerably more research in order to determine how exactly global co-operation differs from other forms of co-operation and whether such findings gained from the co-operation of small groups can be transferred to the global level.

These are some of the interdisciplinary highlights of co-operation research that now need to be transposed into a broad programme of research. The Käte Hamburger Kolleg / Centre for Global Cooperation Research is currently establishing an academic/scientific learning and research community with a focus on the question of the opportunities and limits of global co-operation. Co-operation with the DIE plays a key role in this, not least when the goal is to identify new co-operation forms and determine the most promising possibilities for international collective action for the provision of (global) public goods.

**Silke Weinlich**

Dr. Silke Weinlich is head of the research unit “The (im)-possibility of co-operation” at the Käte Hamburger Kolleg / Centre for Global Cooperation Research. In her research she concentrates on international negotiations, the role of international organisations in world politics and the United Nations.

---

**May 2014**

DIE becomes an official member of the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) and founds “SDSN Germany” being led by Klaus Töpfer and Dirk Messner.

**September 2014**

The German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) holds a ceremony and an international conference to mark its 50th anniversary.

**July 2014**

Germany defeats Argentina in Brazil to claim its fourth World Cup soccer title.
"Dear German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), at Welthungerhilfe we very much appreciate your expertise and your independence. Your publications are “must-reads” in our organisation and are much quoted – whether it be in relation to the future of development co-operation or humanitarian crisis management. This is one of the reasons we are so glad to work with you at events or in strategic development. Congratulations on your Golden Jubilee from the neighbourhood of Bonn!"

Wolfgang Jamann, Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e. V.

"It is with great joy that I extend to you greetings as a long-time friend and co-operation partner of DIE. The past 50 years have seen DIE evolving into a leading research institute in Europe and one of world’s most renowned Think Tanks, playing an ever important role in international development. It was my honour and privilege to be part of the conference ‘Do Think Tanks think?’ of the Global Governance School and I was deeply inspired by interacting with my fellow panellists and GGS members. Please allow me to congratulate DIE on reaching this important milestone and I am looking forward to continued involvement in the years to come."

Ye Jiang, Institute for Global Governance Studies, Shanghai Institutes for International Studies

"50 years of the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) mean half a century of unique expertise in the field of development policy. Fortunately, much has changed: Five decades ago development policy in Germany was still in its infancy, today the Institute occupies 13th place in the world Think Tank rankings. The Institute is and remains one of the main supporting pillars of German development policy. Therefore, congratulations on the jubilee and many thanks for 50 years of valuable and liberal-minded research."

Claudia Lücking-Michel, Member of the German Bundestag
“The German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) is a mighty pillar of German development policy. Especially remarkable is the fact that its expertise based on innovative and thorough research is received far beyond the boundaries of Germany. The DIE is an important partner for the editorial department at E+Z/D+C, its input being of great value to the editors.”

Hans Dembowski, D+C Development and Cooperation

“Over the past 50 years the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) has significantly influenced the national debate regarding development policy and contributed toward repositioning development policy within the framework of German foreign policy – even in the face of opposition. It is difficult to imagine the international debate on development policy without the Institute. By virtue of its input, DIE is an important source of ideas for science and politics. Like GIGA the DIE is committed to the linking of theory and practice. Through its Postgraduate Training Programme it is making an important contribution to the training of executives in the field of development co-operation. It also trains young managers from emerging countries via its Global Governance School. For decades now there have been close working relationships between the staff at GIGA and DIE. This year GIGA is also celebrating its 50th anniversary and we look forward eagerly to the next 50 years of fruitful, intellectual exchange with DIE.”

Detlef Nolte, GIGA German Institute of Global and Area Studies

“The German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) is 50 years old, a milestone to which I would like to offer my congratulations to the Institute and all its staff. 1964 was also a baby boom year in this regard since one of the most highly regarded policy advice institutes in the world was to see the light of day. What is so special about DIE and why it is so successful is its interdisciplinary orientation: Research, Policy Advice and Training work hand in hand and mutually stimulate each other. Keep it up!”

Ulrich Kelber, Member of the German Bundestag, Parliamentary Secretary for State at the Federal Ministry of Justice and for Consumer Protection
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The German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) undertakes policy advice and training assignments on the basis of independent research.

Shareholders of DIE are the Federal Republic of Germany and the state of North Rhine-Westphalia with an institutional shareholding as well as project financing in the form of grants.

Business development in the financial year 2013

DIE is primarily financed via institutional grants from the federal government and the state of North Rhine-Westphalia. For the fulfilment of its tasks in the past year DIE claimed funding to the amount of € 5.5 m from the two shareholders in the scope of institutional support. In addition to this, the project funding received from the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and funds acquired from the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) amounted to a total of € 3.5 m.

Beyond this, DIE also received revenue from policy advice and and training services as well as third-party funds to the amount of € 0.4 m.

As a result of the increase in project funding DIE was able to further expand its research and policy advice activities compared to the previous years.

The training activities of the DIE in the financial year comprised the conclusion of the 48th course of the Postgraduate Training Programme and the first study months of the 49th course, which commenced in September 2013. In addition, the 11th Global Governance School was also held within the scope of the Managing Global Governance dialogue and further training programme conducted by DIE and the GIZ on behalf of the BMZ.

At the end of 2013 the DIE employed a staff of 125, of which 78 were employed in the academic/scientific field, 38 in services, six in Communications and three as trainee for office management clerks.
## Income Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income from Payments of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Federal State of North Rhine-Westphalia</td>
<td>5,490,969.28</td>
<td>4,844,034.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from Project business</td>
<td>3,949,598.31</td>
<td>3,402,350.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory variance of projects in progress from third-party funds</td>
<td>355,832.19</td>
<td>545,032.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating income</td>
<td>259,163.47</td>
<td>271,650.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Expenses</td>
<td>-6,719,651.01</td>
<td>-6,077,532.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation of intangible and tangible Assets</td>
<td>-159,802.24</td>
<td>-156,821.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration expenses</td>
<td>-2,369,003.83</td>
<td>-2,108,528.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>-551,358.86</td>
<td>-426,796.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Items for Grants toward Fixed Assets</td>
<td>-257,014.54</td>
<td>-294,395.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from other Securities</td>
<td>1,267.23</td>
<td>1,007.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Net Profit</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 January - 31 December 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>previous year Euro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Fixed Assets</strong></td>
<td>907,049.20</td>
<td>893,001.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Intangible Assets</td>
<td>107,482.50</td>
<td>112,922.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Tangible Assets</td>
<td>412,208.50</td>
<td>386,868.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Financial Assets</td>
<td>387,358.20</td>
<td>393,210.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>3,575,970.54</td>
<td>2,767,342.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Inventories</td>
<td>1,945,622.56</td>
<td>1,355,922.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Receivables and other Assets</td>
<td>788,842.14</td>
<td>445,259.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Cash in hand, Bank Balances</td>
<td>841,505.84</td>
<td>966,160.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Prepaid Expenses</strong></td>
<td>69,283.93</td>
<td>64,441.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Prepaid Expenses</td>
<td>69,283.93</td>
<td>64,441.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance Sheet Total:</strong></td>
<td>4,552,303.67</td>
<td>3,724,784.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 January – 31 December 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity and liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euro</td>
<td>previous year Euro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Shareholders' Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Subscribed Capital</td>
<td>25,564.59</td>
<td>25,564.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Special Reserve from Grants and Allowances for the Funding of Fixed Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Intangible Assets</td>
<td>107,482.50</td>
<td>112,922.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Tangible Assets</td>
<td>412,208.50</td>
<td>386,868.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Financial Assets</td>
<td>361,793.20</td>
<td>367,301.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Accruals</strong></td>
<td>737,944.00</td>
<td>410,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Accruals</td>
<td>737,944.00</td>
<td>410,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>2,907,310.88</td>
<td>2,422,027.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Advances Received</td>
<td>2,499,285.86</td>
<td>2,076,425.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Accounts Payable</td>
<td>26,280.62</td>
<td>169,877.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Other Liabilities</td>
<td>97,166.16</td>
<td>94,261.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Amounts due to Shareholders</td>
<td>284,578.24</td>
<td>81,462.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Annual Net Profit</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit and Loss</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance Sheet Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,552,303.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,724,784.67</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 January – 31 December 2013
“Earth provides enough to satisfy every man's need but not every man's greed.”

Mahatma Gandhi, Indian lawyer, leader of the resistance movement, publicist, ascet and pacifist
“In fact, it is not so easy to rule over a people who are aware of their rights, using traditional, patriarchal and paternalistic methods.”

Shirin Ebadi, Iranian lawyer and Nobel Peace Prize winner
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“We continue to live to an irresponsible extent at the expense of other parts of the world and as a burden for the future.”

“The true measure of the justice of a system is the amount of protection it guarantees to the weakest.”

Aung San Suu Kyi, Nobel Peace Prize winner and Burmese candidate for President
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