
Subject: Your participation in the MES 10 conference, Hyderabad 2019

From: Prof. C. K. Raju (ckr@ckraju.net)

To: gnguru@mail.jnu.ac.in; gopalguru2001@gmail.com;

Cc: rg1@illinois.edu;

Date: Thursday, 21 June 2018 5:24 AM

Dear Prof Gopal Guru,

You may or may not recall me as a former colleague. [I was in both the mathematics and statistics departments of Pune University 1981-88. I resigned in 1988 on the grounds that corruption, hence incompetence, had got institutionalised. The University accepted it happily! (Remember the numerous engineering colleges which opened then? Public outrage in Pune was quenched by blackening N. C. Joshi's face and making him ride a donkey, but that did not end the matter of commercialisation of education or the manipulation of the university to suit it.) But then I physically moved back into the Pune University campus in 1988 itself as part of C-DAC, India's first supercomputer project, and stayed on till 1991 when I moved on to the Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla.]

However, I write to you in two capacities. (1) As editor designate of the EPW, you have a special responsibility to preserve academic ethics. (2) As a dalit ideologue you should do justice to dalit contributions to science.

My immediate ethical concern is with your proposed participation as an inaugural speaker in the [10th international conference on mathematics education and society, Hyderabad, Jan-Feb 2019](#).

The ethical concern is that you are sharing the platform with George G. Joseph, who has been serially and brazenly plagiarising my work on

calculus transmission (from India to Europe) for the last two decades. By sharing the platform you are effectively endorsing the dirty politics of epistemic appropriation (*and* the bad academics from the resulting epistemic distortion).

Joseph's modus operandi was simple. Briefly, in the year 2000 Joseph organized a conference in Trivandrum. He called for papers, and simply appropriated my entire paper on calculus transmission submitted to him as the conference organizer. (I could not attend the conference.) Later, he repeatedly claimed it as his own work.

Therefore, by participating in the Hyderabad conference you will be indirectly endorsing this corrupt academic practice of appropriating submitted papers, whatever excuse you may choose to give, should you decide to continue to participate. Caesar's wife should be above suspicion as they say. Or as the Jains maintain, your professed intentions do not matter, only your actions do. Ignorance, too, is not an acceptable excuse, especially not at a learned conference on teaching and learning.

1. George Joseph a serial plagiarist

Joseph is not just a plagiarist, he is a serial plagiarist, who has been serially plagiarising my work since 2000, as partly described in this public and documented but yet incomplete blog post: [George Joseph serial plagiarist](#).

My calculus projects and 1998 advertisement

The proofs are many. First, my work on the Indian origin of calculus was funded by the Indian National Science Academy, since 1998, and additionally the PHISPC since 1999. There are the corresponding government records. Particularly, note my public advertisement of July 1998 for a post-doctoral research associate (still archived at <http://mathforum.org/kb/message.jspa?messageID=1174792>) which caught Joseph's attention and led to his pre-meditated appropriation of

my thesis.

The plagiarised material was already published

Second, **the key content of my preliminary work on transmission of the calculus from India to Europe was already published.** It was summarised and presented by me as part of a plenary paper at a major international conference in Hawai'i in Jan 2000. **It was published** in 2001 in as "Computers, Mathematics Education, and the Alternative Epistemology of the Calculus in the *YuktiBhāsā Philosophy East and West* **51:3** (2001) 325--362. [An extract from that Hawai'i paper](#), most relevant to the question of transmission of calculus, is posted on my website. (See section 3 on History of the calculus.) This is a key aspect of my work plagiarised by Joseph and his accomplices and later published in their name after falsely stating that no one else had done anything on it before.

Joseph and accomplices had access to my unpublished work too

Third, Joseph had access to several of my unpublished papers from 1998, including the above one since it was written in 1999. The proof is simple, while plagiarising my work verbatim, he himself inadvertently acknowledged access to my unpublished work on the Indian calculus and its transmission. This related to work done since 1998, and given to him in 1999 and 2000.

Indeed six of my unpublished papers were cited in the plagiarised paper.

My paper submitted to Joseph's 2000 Trivandrum conference cited no less than six (6) of my then-unpublished papers, as is my style. (For details of the articles see the above blog post.)

The dirty trick Joseph used was this. He anonymised my Trivandrum paper and published it illegally in his 2002 conference proceedings (a) without seeking copyright clearance, and (b) without even informing me. (I learnt about it in 2010.) As a trained lawyer he is fully aware that he is involved in multiple illegalities. However, because he is utterly

incompetent both as an academic and a liar, he copied verbatim, and hence he just retained those citations to my unpublished work, and did not update the references to my work or remove them.

Exeter ethics committee prohibited appropriation by anonymisation

In 2004 a complaint was made to Exeter University, against Joseph's co-conspirator, Almeida. That ethics committee noted Joseph's trick of appropriation by anonymisation, and explicitly prohibited it (a prohibition which both Joseph and his accomplice brazenly ignored later.) This prohibition came **despite the fact that Joseph participated in that ethics committee meeting posing as a neutral observer.** He unethically hid the fact that he was a co-plagiarist (obvious conflict of interests in one plagiarist pretending to be disinterested and defending his accomplice). He also illegally hid the fact that he is a trained lawyer, and therefore cannot defend his accomplice. **He did his best to mislead the ethics committee with utter lies.** Those are provable and documented lies, and were recorded by the Exeter committee as coming from him. Because Joseph lies so often, at the drop of a hat, he directly contradicted those lies on record with other provable and documented lies in his published work from 2004. A 2004 newspaper report of that otherwise wishy-washy Exeter ethics committee report is posted at http://ckraju.net/Joseph/HT_report_8_Nov_04.pdf. The original ethics committee report is also posted online.

Manchester news release

Later, in 2007, Joseph, as per his pre-meditated plan, of appropriation by anonymisation, claimed authorship of a near-verbatim version of my paper. (See above blog for copies of the three near-identical papers: the 1999 one I submitted for Joseph's 2000 Trivandrum conference, the one he published anonymously in 2002, without my consent or copyright clearance and the one for which he claimed credit in 2007.) Note that he used the original pre-meditated strategy of appropriation by anonymization, throwing to the winds the prohibition against it by the Exeter ethics committee. A near-verbatim version of my 1999 paper,

earlier published anonymously by Joseph in 2002, was posted on the Manchester University website in 2007. The key difference was that the anonymity was disambiguated differently: Joseph too now claimed authorship. The major change in the paper was that the anonymous author acquired a new affiliation to Manchester University.¹

The accompanying fake news release from Manchester disclosed the names of the anonymous authors, one of them being Joseph. That fake news release from Manchester University **falsely stated that the supporting paper was unpublished in 2007: though it had already been published in 2002.** (Anyway, why does an unpublished paper qualify for a news release? Quite apart from its abysmal ethical standard, that is the Manchester University academic standard!)

Colonial education teaches blind trust in the West and equally blind distrust of the non-West. So, to the colonised minds of Indian science journalists, a fake news release from Manchester, even when supported only by an unpublished paper, is far more credible than a 500 page published book by an Indian. **So, the Manchester fake news release made front page news in all Indian newspapers.**

And, only one paper, *Hindustan Times*, was responsible enough to investigate and later **publish a retraction:** http://ckraju.net/Joseph/HT_correction_25_Aug_07.pdf.

Note that even that unpublished Manchester paper retained the citations to my unpublished articles, from my 1999 paper, except for a clumsy attempt to delete one citation. The deletion was clumsy because a later footnote cited it "as cited earlier"! That citation was sought to be deleted as a cover up: material from that 1999 paper was plagiarised in the 2000 edition of Joseph's book, and is the key selling point of his book.

As you see Joseph is not only a brazen plagiarist, he is a thoroughly incompetent academic who gave himself away by sticking to verbatim

copying and was too weak a scholar to update the references in the plagiarised paper even after a gap of eight years. (Actually, my unpublished papers had been published by then, as had my PHSIPC volume *Cultural Foundations of Mathematics: the nature of mathematical proof and the transmission of calculus from India to Europe in the 16th c. CE*, Pearson Longman 2007.) If you associate with him, some of the dirt of his unethical behaviour will stick to EPW.

There are lots more proofs of my authorship of the 2002/2007 plagiarised paper: my writing style, and my choice of words, or for example, the fact that some of the citations are to material that I alone could have legally possessed, and so on. But I won't go into all that here.

Epistemic test: plagiarists are often incompetent

A key test of plagiarism is my epistemic test used to prove transmission of calculus from India to Europe. Did these repeatedly professed authors understand my paper whose authorship they claimed? There is ample proof they did not. That is what happens with those who steal or copy (like students in an exam); they do not fully understand what they copy.

Thus Joseph grossly misunderstood the discussion of floating point numbers in my Hawai'i paper (cited above) and published an excessively foolish statement about it. (In his 2004 article, in *Race and Class*, he said, "Kerala mathematicians used floating point numbers to sum infinite series".)

To appreciate the utter foolishness of Joseph's statement you need to know something of floating point numbers used in computation (explained in my lecture-notes online). You also need to understand how to sum infinite series, or at least the formal theory of limits and real numbers. Most people don't, so Joseph continues to pose as an "expert": but it is my duty to warn people against such ignorant "experts".

Again, he and his co-author even more foolishly claimed (in the Manchester 2007 paper) that solar declination could be measured at sea,

making a mockery of my argument (in that very paper) that the motive for stealing calculus from Cochin was to solve the (specifically) European navigation problem. These claims by Joseph and Co. are so foolish that any half-way decent academician would have died of shame: but, of course, the colonially educated are deliberately kept equally ignorant of math so you may not recognize the extreme foolishness involved.

Anyway, ignorance cannot be an excuse for your participation in a learned conference, so, by participating in the conference you would be indirectly helping to spread all sorts of misconceptions for which you must accept responsibility.

Manchester ethics committee

The ethics committee from Manchester could simply not explain how a previously published paper, published in 2002 by Joseph himself, was declared "unpublished" in 2007, with the sole view to include Joseph as one of the "anonymous" authors. As I said the verbatim copy is verifiable, and was verified. The affiliation of the anonymous author was changed to include Manchester, and the accompanying news release declared Joseph an author.

Therefore, to save face, the Manchester ethics committee said it was a media office mistake. That was a pathetic excuse, for the news release was obviously written by Joseph himself (how did the media office know who the anonymous author was?) and was timed to coincide with the 60th anniversary of Indian independence.

But even that excuse was just an artifice. Manchester University is so shamelessly committed to plagiarism that it has put back that fake news item after taking it down. If it was a media office mistake why is it publicly preserved without publicly acknowledging that mistake? And the supporting paper is still "unpublished" after a decade though the news item is widely cited! On the usual British ethical standards, it is considered enough to acknowledge my existence, and "contribution" (for

the physical existence of my published book on the transmission of calculus is undeniable). The Manchester website deliberately does not explain that Joseph's contribution was only to stealing my article, and crafting the news release claiming credit.

Further details on my blog [George Joseph serial plagiarist](#).

There are other ethical aspects, for example, **the aspect of financial impropriety by Joseph, since the plagiarised paper was used both to obtain and justify a grant from the British AHRC**. By participating in the conference, you tacitly condone all these most pernicious academic practices.

I quite understand that many establishment academics would like to brush the whole thing aside, using the excuse that it is as something they don't quite understand, and which is none of their concern (the way some people may brush aside other ethical issues dear to you). If you ignore this, you have no moral ground left to complain when people ignore those.

However, there is another aspect of the matter which requires your attention.

2. The Indian calculus: the work of a dalit

As explained above, Joseph is a bad academic dabbling in the history of Indian mathematics with no proper understanding of either mathematics or primary Sanskrit sources, and, has hence made an ass of himself while plagiarising my work (examples given above are not exhaustive).

Therefore, all that Joseph has been chauvinistically tom-tomming is the "Kerala school", linking it to his ancestry from Kerala, to make money by selling his book (though he is a British citizen, loyal to Britain, brought up in South Africa).

Now, I have nothing against Kerala: my mother too was from Kerala

(and studied in college in the same small class of 5 students, with our late dalit President, K. R. Narayanan), but I am not a chauvinist. The claim that calculus was invented by the “Kerala school” is factually false, and academically misleading, and damaging to math education, so it is wrong to peddle it.

First, emphasizing only the “Kerala school” has the following political effect. The key exponents of the "Kerala school", such as Nilakantha Somasutvan, were the highest caste Namboodiri Brahmins, as the name itself clearly shows. **But the Indian calculus was actually the work of a dalit from Patna.** (I am not going to explain that here; if you are an expert on dalit thought, I take it you should keep track.)

Setting aside both Kerala and Bihari chauvinism, the question of math education is this: whose work should one follow to actually *teach* the decolonised calculus today? The right history is needed for the right answer to that question. Ironically, neither you nor Joseph (both speaking at the Hyderabad conference on math education) ever taught mathematics or calculus, so how can I even explain the requirement of math education to you?

The details are all publicly available, and that is how I have been teaching decolonised calculus for the last ten years. ² (The decolonised calculus is completely different from and superior to the advanced calculus or rather formal mathematical analysis and advanced functional analysis, topological vector spaces and Schwartz distributions I used to teach in Pune University in the 1980's). My new calculus course has, incidentally, been taught in 9 universities in 3 countries (including [Ambedkar University Delhi](#)), and is running as a regular half-course in [SGT University, Gurgaon](#)). But of course few understand it and the indoctrinated colonised mind trusts its Western exploiter and distrusts its non-Western liberator. [Therefore, I now also have a decolonised course on school geometry (which follows the practical philosophy of the masons who penned the sulba sutra.)]

The related philosophy of zeroism (similar to Buddhist sunyavada) is used instead of the non-secular, church metaphysics of formalism to which the West and our university math departments are committed. (See, e.g., [video of my conversation with the Dalai Lama](#), or my [popular-level article on zeroism](#) for the [Springer encyclopedia](#). For the deep church connection to the philosophy of formal math, see e.g. my article for the *American Philosophy Association Newsletter*,³ or my popular level book *Euclid and Jesus: How and why the church changed mathematics and Christianity across two religious wars*. But the politics of church theology, especially its theology of of reason, is taboo for the colonially educated.

Anyway, by participating in this Hyderabad conference, together with Joseph, you would be endorsing not only a serial plagiarists, and an unreliable source, but you would also indirectly help to endorse an anti-dalit chauvinist who believes in cultural appropriation even while posing as a champion correcting historical wrongs. You would actively help hide the dalit origin of the calculus and help to suppress one of the greatest dalit scientific achievements of all times.

You would also suppress the key social fact that once upon a time, a dalit scientist could rise to such heights, and be so socially confident as to take excessively unpopular positions which were rejected not only by his opponents but even by some of his disciples, even centuries later (but he proved right). (Please do not caricature me: while dalits were surely exploited in Ambedkar's time, and especially ill-treated by the Peshwas, this was not always the case, e.g. when Buddhism dominated in India; Ambedkar understood that when he finally converted to Buddhism.) Some other dalit ideologues, of a different political persuasion than you, also advocate the same position AND actually understand the related new/old philosophy of mathematics.

3. Politics of math education

Since you don't know math, let me explain to you from the perspective of the politics of math education. The most important aspect of that politics today is decolonisation of math education. But decolonisation involves a critical perspective, and a possible change in the philosophy of mathematics. Such a critical perspective is impossible for the ignorant.

So have you considered what I teach: that your ignorance of maths is a key aspect of the politics of colonial education in math? Mass ignorance of the “educated” is a calculated device to maintain church superstitions. This is done by preserving the superstitious faith of the colonised mind in Western-approved experts, and by ruling out the heresy of an alternative philosophy of mathematics (and an alternative mathematics which naturally results in a different science, such as my testable, and theoretically necessary, correction to Newtonian gravitation).

This colonial politics of spreading ignorance and superstition among the “educated” has two consequences. Any attempt to articulate a different philosophy of mathematics, such as the one actually used by the dalit inventor of calculus (and as I teach today), is vigorously suppressed and censored, the way the church suppressed all “heresy” contrary to its most inequitable political dogmas.

As a concrete example, there is the [post-publication censorship of my article on decolonising math education](#), also in India by that champion of free speech, Scroll.in. Your predecessor, the former EPW editor Ram Reddy is on its payroll as an ombudsman and did nothing! Those ignorant of math MUST follow the West whenever an anti-Western heresy is articulated (Of course, some get over it; the [Wire put it back](#), and the article has been published in entirety as part of another article in [Journal of Black Studies](#), and is due to appear in *Rhodes Must Fall in Oxford*.)

Its no use just blaming ignorant journalists. Your colleagues in the JNU education school too censored me: Minati Panda first invited me, and then very crudely just stopped responding to my emails. (That is how one treats heretics, right?) The math “educationists” in JNU too are demonstrably ignorant: they have published papers containing foolish blunders in elementary math. They censor me because they know they are academically too incompetent to respond to what I say. That is a strong political reason, isn't it? The vicious racist attacks on me in South Africa after [my talks in University of Cape Town](#) follow exactly the same pattern.

The colonised mind superstitiously trusts Western experts in math, but has never evaluated their trustworthiness, against the brazen record of Western plagiarism. For example, when Newton was (rightly) accused of plagiarising calculus, as President of the Royal Society he himself chaired the committee to look into that accusation and exonerated himself! (And don't forget my epistemic test and its consequences for math education: those who steal make mistakes as in Newton's utterly confused doctrine of fluxions a later version of which is institutionalised today.)

Newton was hardly an exception: another President of the Royal Society, and the supposedly top-ranking mathematician of the world, repeatedly stole my earlier published thesis (about Einstein on the centenary of Einstein's relativity paper). Of course, the existence of my prior published work had to be eventually acknowledged but the American Mathematical Society made out that it was an "innocent" oversight and deliberately suppressed the key fact that it was no oversight since it happened a second time, and that second time was [after the man had been directly informed of my published work](#).

This is quite apart from the fact that, on their own published ethics, claiming lack of awareness of prior published work is unethical. What

the AMS means is that prominent Westerners are permitted to plagiarise brazenly, and it is more than enough to acknowledge prior published work only *after* (and if) they are caught plagiarising. The silent academic is all support for that.

Clearly Western dishonesty is so persistent and brazen because dishonest individuals get strong institutional support for their dishonesty.

So, if you speak on math education from a position of ignorance of mathematics, you are furthering the colonial agenda of spreading superstitious faith in dishonest “world class” Western authorities. For example, even if you speak only of “equality of opportunity and access to education”, without enquiring into what is taught, you are repeating the agenda first stated by Macaulay in British parliament: state-supported education for the poor as the best and cheapest way to prevent the revolution that both he and Marx anticipated. You are deliberately bypassing completely the nature of that (church) “education” and thereby reinforcing the status quo!

4. Summary

To summarise, by giving the opening address at that conference, you would be ingloriously endorsing a serial plagiarist, an anti-dalit chauvinist, and an ignorant man who poses as a math educator though he has repeatedly made the most laughable elementary mathematical blunders in the process of cheating. Please do accept responsibility, for much is at stake: on my epistemic test, such endorsement may well end up misguiding millions of students. A person at your level cannot claim to be intervening “innocently”. If you speak on math education from a position of ignorance, you also tacitly endorse Western church superstitions, especially superstitions related to the church theology of reason (distinct from normal, everyday reason, even if you don’t understand that).

Please also note that since math education is a matter of great public

interest, this email is not necessarily private. I am right now marking a copy only to Prof. Rochelle Gutierrez with whom I had a casual email exchange some time back, who is also invited to the conference, so she too takes an informed decision. But the mail could be widely circulated.

I am not bothering to contact the organizers since I am tired of Western institutionalised support for dishonesty. Let their actions speak, instead of their excuses.

Sincerely,

C. K. Raju

1 The 2002 version of the same article, published by Joseph, had given only Univ. of Exeter as the affiliation. As a cover up Joseph falsely claimed an affiliation to Exeter University. This was denied by Exeter authorities, who refused to pursue an ethics complaint against Joseph on that ground that he was never affiliated with them (and his accomplice suddenly left the university).

2 E.g. "Teaching Mathematics with a Different Philosophy. 1: Formal mathematics as biased metaphysics". *Science and Culture* 77 (2011) 275--80. arXiv:1312.2099. "Teaching Mathematics with a Different Philosophy. 2: Calculus without limits" *Science and Culture* 77 (2011) 281--86. arXiv:1312.2100.

3 "Eternity and infinity: The Western misunderstanding of Indian mathematics and its consequences for science today," *American Philosophical Association New Letter Asian and Asican-American Philosophers and Philosophies*, 14 (2) 2015 pp. 27-33. <http://ckraju.net/papers/Eternity-and-infinity-Pages-from-APA.pdf>.

C. K. Raju, PhD (ISI), TGA Laureate
web: <http://ckraju.net>

Book previews

[Time: Towards a Consistent Theory](#)

[The Eleven Pictures of Time](#)

[Cultural Foundations of Mathematics](#)

[Euclid and Jesus](#)

[Is Science Western in Origin?](#)

Attachments

- [letter to Gopal Guru.pdf \(139.29 KB\)](#)