

Professor Alan D. Gilbert  
The President and Vice-Chancellor  
The University of Manchester  
Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK  
[president@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:president@manchester.ac.uk)

15 July 2007

Dear Vice-Chancellor,

1. This refers to a sensational but incorrect news release of 13 Aug 2007 originating from the Manchester university website (**Annexure 1**). Please also refer to my earlier mail to Mr M. Addelman, your Media Relation Office, and its auto-acknowledgment of 23 Aug 2007 (copy attached, **Annexure 2**). Also attached (**Annexure 3**) is a correction of 25 Aug 2007 put out by the *Hindustan Times*, New Delhi, to that incorrect news report originating from the website of your university. For various reasons, including ill-health, I could not pursue the complaint further at that time. Recently, some fresh evidence has emerged that has made clear that **Dr G. J. Joseph, former Reader in Economics in your School of Social Sciences, has been systematically appropriating my ideas without acknowledgment since 2000**. The fraudulent news release of 13 Aug 2007 was only the culmination of this long-term process.

1.1. Dr Joseph had also used my ideas to obtain financial grants from the Arts and Humanities Research Board (AHRB), 2002-2005 (with a possible further extension) for a project entitled "Medieval Kerala Mathematics: The Possibility of its Transmission to Europe". In fact, I had earlier obtained funds for an investigation along similar lines from the Indian National Science Academy in 1998, and had advertised my project internationally in an advertisement of July 1998 still archived at [http://sunsite.utk.edu/math\\_archives/.http/hypermail/historia/jul98/0067.html](http://sunsite.utk.edu/math_archives/.http/hypermail/historia/jul98/0067.html). It was after this advertisement that Almeida and Joseph met me and inveigled their way into my confidence. They promised to raise further funds for my project and did raise some funds from Exeter university for my travel to Rome for archival work etc. In this manner, and to justify further funding, they obtained access to my unpublished papers. They then falsely showed my work in their own names to obtain funding from AHRB. A separate complaint is being made to AHRB in this connection. As I understand it, using plagiarised work to obtain or justify public funds amounts to corruption. Before complaining to AHRB, I would like to ascertain the exact stand of the Manchester university in this matter. The full details are given below.

2. First, permit me to say that one naturally wonders by what ethical or academic standards Manchester university found an unpublished paper from seven years earlier as newsworthy. If this was a mistake, a public clarification ought to have been issued, but I am not aware this was done. That a 7-year old paper was used for such sensational publicity already indicates a serious problem; it also indicates absence of any serious research on this topic by Joseph right up to 2007. Anyway, I hope that, in his own interests, Mr Addelman has preserved the evidence intact, namely, (1) the news report that was placed on the website of Manchester university, and (2) the two unpublished papers that were used to support that news report. If not, that would clearly make him an accessory to the whole sorry affair.

3. The following are the details.

3.1 **Manchester 2007 "Aryabhata group" paper.** In support of your news release of 13 Aug 2007, Mr Addelman supplied two unpublished papers. The author of one of the unpublished papers was stated to be the "Aryabhata group", and **the affiliations given were those of Exeter and Manchester**

**universities.** (This paper is subsequently called the Manchester 2007 paper.) The accompanying news release mentioned the names only of Joseph and D. Almeida unambiguously identifying these two as constituting the “Aryabhata group” which had done that research.

**3.2 Exeter warning against using “Aryabhata group” as author.** By way of background, Exeter university had in 2004 already conducted an investigation into a related matter. **Clause 8b of the report had categorically warned Almeida against using the term “Aryabhata Group” as author in any future work.** (A copy of the investigation report, a related news item, and Almeida’s two subsequent apologies to me was sent to you earlier, and is again attached as **Annexure 4** for ready reference.) The reason for this prohibition was (clause 10a) that the ambiguity in the term “Aryabhata group” was earlier exploited to appropriate my work without acknowledgment. Joseph was well aware of this Exeter investigation, and had participated in the deliberations of the committee (as stated in clause 2d). As clarified in **Annexure 5**, he even misled the Exeter committee in various ways.

**3.3 The new evidence: Joseph’s record of misappropriation since 2000.** Although the Exeter investigation committee treated Joseph as a neutral party, the new evidence that has emerged is that it was Joseph who first initiated this process of appropriating my work, right from the 2000 edition of his *Crest of the Peacock*, brought out by the Princeton university press to whom a complaint has been separately made giving the details. However, I became aware of it only recently, and the full story is just beginning to emerge. **I particularly draw your attention to the Table in Annexure 6 which summarizes some of the story of Joseph’s misappropriation of my work between 2000-2007. The Appendix to Annexure 6 also lists half-a-dozen verbatim similarities between the Manchester 2007 paper and my earlier published work.** As you will see, apart from these cases of verbatim copying from my previously published work, there are also cases of copying from my previously *unpublished* work: as shown below, there are various ways to prove misappropriation here, including the fact that Joseph (and Almeida) blindly copied mistakes, demonstrating their basic lack of understanding of my thesis to which they laid claim.

**3.4 Trivandrum paper.** The Manchester 2007 “Aryabhata group” paper (please obtain a copy from Mr Addelman) itself says in its note 1 that it is based on research reported 7 years earlier at a Trivandrum conference, in 2000, organized by Joseph. (This 2000 paper is subsequently called “the Trivandrum paper”.)

**3.4.1 The Trivandrum paper (on which the Manchester 2007 paper is based) was actually written by me,** but presented by Almeida at that Trivandrum conference of 2000 since I was invited to a bigger parallel conference (8<sup>th</sup> East West Conference, Jan 2000) in Hawai’i. My plenary talk at Hawai’i was widely appreciated, and published in *Philosophy East and West* 51(3) 2001, pp. 325-62, and its note 28 cites this Trivandrum paper as due to “C. K. Raju and Dennis Almeida (Aryabhata group)”. A pre-publication version of this Hawai’i paper is attached as **Annexure 7**.

**3.4.2 Bid for funds from Leverhulme foundation.** Around mid-2000, after differences developed over an application for funds from the Leverhulme Foundation, I dissociated myself from that effort and expressly told Almeida and Joseph that it would be unethical on their part to proceed further on that project without my participation.

**3.4.3 Bangalore conference, December 2000.** However, as an organizer of the Trivandrum conference, Joseph had privileged access to the unpublished version of the Trivandrum paper. To my surprise, at a conference at Bangalore, in Dec 2000, Joseph tried to pass off key ideas of the Trivandrum paper as his own. When I challenged him he had no answer from the floor, but explained

privately later on how he could use various quibbles to evade responsibility. (*I did* complain to the conference organizers about this, but did not pursue the matter since at that time I did not know that Joseph had already picked up material from my work, without acknowledgment, in the 2000 edition of the *Crest of the Peacock*.)

**3.4.4 Publication of Trivandrum paper without my permission.** Both Joseph and Almeida were, of course, well aware that I had written the Trivandrum paper, and I was in touch with Joseph from Feb 1999 to mid-2000. However, he and Almeida unscrupulously misused their privileged access to the paper and got it published in the proceedings of the Trivandrum conference (November 2002, Kerala Shastra Sahitya Parishad), published under Joseph's guidance. The author of this paper was named as "Aryabhata group" but the composition of the group was not specified. However, **at no stage did I sign any agreement for copyright transfer. Nor did I ever authorise the anonymous publication of the Trivandrum paper in the name of the "Aryabhata group"**. (Indeed, I cited the Trivandrum paper *non-anonymously*, in my Hawai'i paper, published 2001.) In fact, I was not even *asked* for transfer of copyright permission, nor even *informed* about the publication of my paper, and remained unaware until very recently that the paper had been published. (A separate complaint is being made to/against the publishers of this Proceedings for this brazen act of copyright violation.) Clearly, Joseph and Almeida all along intended to play on the ambiguity in the term "Aryabhata group" and retrospectively claim the paper as their own as they eventually did through the Manchester news release of 2007 and the accompanying Manchester 2007 paper in the name of "Aryabhata group". It is clear that they hoped to (and did) gain monetarily from this. There clearly was private monetary benefit for Joseph through the publicity and enhanced sales of his book *Crest of the Peacock*.

**3.5 There are several lines of reasoning which demonstrate that the Trivandrum 2000 paper (and, consequently, significant parts of the Manchester 2007 paper) were actually written by me.**

**3.5.1 Passages copied verbatim from my Hawai'i paper.** First there is the substantive overlap with a section of my 2000 Hawai'i paper, published 2001 (including several passages copied verbatim), as brought out in Annexure 6. I emphasize that those are just **5 examples of verbatim reproduction**, and the Manchester 2007 paper hardly contains any serious point not already covered in the Hawai'i paper, and the Hawai'i paper is a lot deeper and more comprehensive.

**3.5.2 Exeter complaint and investigation report.** Another proof that I authored the Trivandrum paper is as follows. As stated earlier, a complaint was made in 2004 to the Exeter university. The substance of this complaint was that Almeida et al. in a paper of 2001 had *not* cited two key papers: (a) the Hawai'i paper, and (b) the Trivandrum paper (which I then believed to be still unpublished). My authorship of the Trivandrum paper was not contested during this Exeter investigation. **Specifically, the Exeter investigation report of 2004 took for granted my involvement with the "Aryabhata group", and hence prohibited the future use of this term so that I should not be denied due acknowledgment for my work.** Indeed, the report of the Exeter investigation committee suggests that Almeida argued that he had used the term "Aryabhata group" idealistically and not with a view to misappropriate credit for my work. The events of Manchester 2007 have shown by hindsight that any such argument about the "idealistic" use of the term "Aryabhata group" was a deliberate fraud played on the Exeter 2004 ethics committee by Almeida and Joseph acting in concert.

**3.5.3 Number of my unpublished papers cited due to hasty cut-paste copying.** Interestingly, the unpublished version of the Hawai'i paper is cited in footnote 8 of the "Aryabhata group" paper (from Manchester, 2007, for which these two now claim credit). **Please also look at footnotes 5, 10, 14, 15, 53 of the 2007 Manchester 2007 paper.** It is clear that whosoever wrote the Manchester 2007 paper

had unhindered access to half-a-dozen of my then-*unpublished* papers since 1998 and from before 2000. In fact, those citations were actually put in by me. (I have publicly explained that I tend to cite so many of my own works since my point of view tends to be so radically novel.)

**Evidently, these citations to my work have been retained in the Manchester 2007 paper due to a goof-up,** arising from hasty cut-paste editing of a paper originally written by me. Otherwise Joseph has never cited *any* of my numerous published or unpublished papers or published books of 2003 and 2007 in any other paper or book written by him between 2000 and 2007 (which in itself is a grossly unethical act). Obviously there was no sudden change of heart. Indeed, so keen is Joseph to suppress my prior work in this direction, that he and Almeida, in a 2004 article in *Race and Class*, have made a blatantly false statement in print denying the very existence of any project prior to 2002 to investigate transmission of the calculus, although they were well aware of my earlier Indian National Science Academy research project from 1998 and my Project of History of Indian Science Philosophy and Culture project from 1999.

**3.5.4 Mistakes copied blindly by Joseph and Almeida.** Yet another proof that I authored the Trivandrum paper is as follows. Having become a little suspicious and with a view to protect my authorship, I had deliberately injected a mistake in the Trivandrum paper. For an ignorant person, this mistake is hard to notice, for I changed only a single word “altitude” to “declination”. However, for a knowledgeable person it is clear that this change destroys the basic explanation as to why the Jesuits were so keen to obtain Indian calendrical texts for the Gregorian calendar reform needed for navigation. (The thesis is explained in detail in my book *The Eleven Pictures of Time*, Sage, 2003, pp. 327-336.) This mistake of substituting “declination” for “altitude” was blindly copied by Almeida et al. in their 2001 paper. This was not a typo but a conceptual mistake as explained in the attached extract [**Annexure 8**] from my book *Cultural Foundations of Mathematics: The Nature of Mathematical Proof and the Transmission of the Calculus from India to Europe in the 16<sup>th</sup> c. CE* (Pearson Longman, 2007). The mistake was retained in the version of the Trivandrum paper, published by Joseph without authorization in 2002, and it persists in the Manchester 2007 paper, which Joseph and Almeida claim to have authored. What most pitifully exposes their lack of understanding is that this point was already made in my 2004 complaint to Exeter, and also in my 2007 book on the subject which appeared in print in April 2007 several months before the Manchester news release of August 2007, but they did not understand their mistake even after it was pointed out! These authors have made/copied several other mistakes. How could these authors have written something they so evidently don’t understand? That shows it is not their own work.

**3.5.5 Records of various agencies.** I have not mentioned the related records. My annual reports to the government funding agency (Indian National Science Academy), for example, mentioned this Trivandrum paper, and attached a copy. Did Joseph’s annual reports to Manchester mention it in the year 1999 or 2000?

**3.5.6 The five independent lines of proof mentioned above unambiguously demonstrate that the Manchester 2007 paper used large verbatim extracts from a paper written by me.** Almeida and Joseph plagiarised it using the trick of naming the author as “Aryabhata group”, and then claiming to constitute this group. This was an old trick, one which both Almeida and Joseph well knew to be unethical, and Almeida had already been formally warned against.

**3.6 Summary.** To summarise, Joseph has been systematically trying to appropriate credit for my work since 2000 by using ideas and passages from my papers, without acknowledging their origin. He did

this first in the *Crest of the Peacock* 2000 edition, followed by a talk in Bangalore, Dec 2000. He then encouraged his colleague Almeida to plagiarise my ideas in 2001, and then published an entire paper of mine anonymously in the proceedings of conference under his academic stewardship, without my permission, and in clear violation of the copyright law. (He did so with the intention of playing on the ambiguity to seize credit for the work later as he did in 2007 in the hope of benefiting from it personally.) He then used these publications to obtain an AHRB grant during which he again tried to suppress my work through various falsehoods, as in his *Race and Class* paper of 2004, denying the existence of my prior research projects, and some further underhand tricks which I will not recount here. This culminated in the plagiarised paper in the name of the “Aryabhata Group” put out in 2007 by the Manchester website in support of its news release of 13 Aug 2007. Almeida and Joseph had access to half-a-dozen of my unpublished papers between 1999 and 2000, and this is confirmed by citations to those papers due to a slip in the Manchester 2007 paper. They did not even understand key aspects of the contents of my paper to which they laid claim, and exhibited their lack of understanding in a transparent way through a string of mistakes in the *Crest of the Peacock* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), in the Manchester 2007 paper etc. Almeida had already been formally warned by the Exeter university not to use the trick of using “Aryabhata group” as author in any future work, since he had used this term in the past to appropriate my work, and Joseph was well aware of this; nevertheless the two ganged up to use the same trick in the Manchester 2007 paper.

Against this background, and before approaching the AHRB, I would appreciate knowing what you plan to do in the matter.

I appreciate that your Economics Department is very well reputed, but **I believe no institution can be blamed for the odd delinquent individual (unless it tries to whitewash the delinquency, and thus demonstrates institutional support for it)**. You will surely appreciate that the issue of the transmission of the calculus from India to Europe in the 16<sup>th</sup> c. (which is now established with my 2007 book) is a big issue in the history of science, and one which is also of great significance to Indians worldwide. When to this is added the analogous transmission of the transmission thesis, from India to Europe in the 21<sup>st</sup> c., and the broad trail of evidence that Joseph and Almeida have left, including their series of mistakes, **you will appreciate that the truth in the matter simply cannot be suppressed by any means**. I am sure your institution will emerge all the stronger by taking clear, stern, and publicly visible action in this matter, to clear your name, even if Joseph has left your institution.

Yours sincerely,

C. K. Raju

## List of Annexures

1. (a) Manchester news release of 13 Aug 2007 and (b) some derived news reports.
2. Email exchange with M. Addelman of 23 Aug 2007.
3. *Hindustan Times* correction of 25 Aug 2007.
4. (a) Exeter investigation report (b) related news item of 8 Nov 2004 (c) Almeida's two apologies.
5. Lacunae in Exeter investigation report
6. Plagiarism details including half a dozen cases of verbatim copying of my earlier published work by the Manchester 2007 paper claimed by Almeida and Joseph.
7. Excerpts from Hawai'i paper.
8. Excerpts from the section on "Transmission of the Transmission Thesis" from C. K. Raju, *Cultural Foundations of Mathematics*, Pearson Longman, April 2007.