

Table 1: Summary of my work used without acknowledgment/permission by G. Joseph and D. Almeida 2000-2007

S. No.	When/Where	What was copied without acknowledgment	Source/fact suppressed	Remarks
1	<i>Crest of the Peacock</i> , 2 nd ed., 2000, p.356 : passage on Jesuits	Passage and idea that calculus was transmitted from India to Europe by Jesuits	Agra paper of Feb 1999. (Note its citation in the Hawai'i paper of Jan 2000, in note 58/59.)	Copied passage includes a mistake blindly copied by Joseph.
2.	<i>Crest of the Peacock</i> , 2 nd ed., 2000, p. 415, reference to "Aryabhata's" "octagon method" compared to Greek "hexagon" method of determining pi.	Statement that Aryabhata used an "octagon method" compared to "hexagon" method used by Greeks and Arabs. Novel terms introduced by me were copied.	Indo-China paper of 1998, section 4.2, first so named the "octagon" method, explained it, and compared it with the "hexagon" methods. Note peculiarity of these terms used as short form for "octagon doubling method" etc. These long (and original) sections are paraphrased in a single line by Joseph, giving only the short form that I used.	Joseph again blindly copied a mistake I made. Actually, Aryabhata did <i>not</i> use the "octagon" method which I mistakenly attributed to him using this peculiar nomenclature. Joseph neither explains these methods, nor gives any source. No other source existed/exists for the "octagon" method prior to my paper.
3.	<i>Crest of the Peacock</i> , 2 nd ed., 2000, p. 416-17	Observation that Euclidean geometry existed in India in parallel with traditional geometry to which it was <i>not</i> transmitted for centuries..	1. My Indo-China paper of 1998, section 2.5 on "non-transmission of information" due to epistemological barriers, which mentions Euclidean geometry. This is elaborated in sec 4.1 on "non-transmission of Euclidean geometry" due to epistemological differences, 2. Those differences were further explained in my "Euclid" paper of Feb 1999, at a Mumbai conference which Joseph attended.	No one earlier talked of epistemological differences in mathematics or geometry, which were treated as universal in Western thought. I did in 1998 to demonstrate epistemological barriers to transmission, and clearly explained these epistemological differences, further detailed in my "Euclid" paper.
4.	Joseph's talk at seminar in Bangalore, Dec 2000	Proposal that proof of transmission must use "opportunity, motivation, circumstantial and documentary evidence."	1. Hawai'i paper of Jan 2000 (published 2001) mentions "current legal standard of evidence" (p. 352), and details motivation, opportunity, circumstantial and documentary evidence. 2. Trivandrum paper of Jan 2000 based around this, .	Challenged Joseph publicly. (He had no answer from the floor.) Later complained to organizers of conference, but did not pursue matters. [Copy of email available/sent to you earlier.]
5.	Paper by Almeida et al in <i>J. Natural Geometry</i> , 2001.	1. Idea of calculus transmission from India to Europe. 2. Idea that Indian mathematics has a unique epistemology, and used floating point numbers which would be useful for mathematics education.	1. Trivandrum paper of Jan 2000. 2. Hawaii paper of Jan 2000 (published 2001).	Publicity stunt for this paper brought it to my notice and led to Exeter complaint of 2004. 1. Copy of Exeter investigation report 2004 sent. Note the injunction to not use "Aryabhata group" as author in future. 2. Section on "Transmission of the transmission thesis" in my 2007 book points out elementary mistakes made by these authors as clinching proof of copying.

S. No.	When/Where	What was copied without acknowledgment	Source/fact suppressed	Remarks
6.	Paper by “Aryabhata Group”, Proceedings of Trivandrum conference, 2002, for which Joseph was the chief academic advisor.	Entire paper was published without seeking my approval and even without informing me. This is a clear violation of copyright law by Joseph and Almeida acting together.	(a) My authorship of the paper was suppressed, and my permission was not taken for anonymous publication; (b) my permission was not sought for copyright transfer, and (c) I was not even informed of the publication of this paper, and believed until recently that it was unpublished.	Several proofs that paper was written by me. (a) Several of my unpublished papers are cited, (b) I had planted mistakes in the paper as explained in my 2004 complaint and 2007 book (when I still thought the paper was unpublished). The relevant mistakes are reproduced verbatim in this paper.
6.	Paper by Almeida and Joseph in <i>Race and Class</i> 2004, 2 nd paragraph of introduction, p. 46, repeated on p. 51 and in conclusions.	1. Key idea of an alternative Indian epistemology of mathematics, 2. the clarification that <i>pramana</i> is not the same as deductive proof, since it accepts empirical methods, 3. the use of numbers <i>like</i> floating point numbers.	1. Mathematics and Culture paper, published 1998 and 1999. 2. Indo-China paper of 1998, published 2002, sec. 4.1 3. “Euclid” paper, Mumbai conference Feb 1999, on alternative epistemology of Indian geometry, published 2001. 4. Hawai’i paper of Jan 2000 elaborates on difference between proof and <i>pramana</i> , and issues with floating point numbers, published 2001.	Mistakes made by Almeida et al. 2001 in asserting use of “floating point numbers” by “Kerala” mathematicians are repeated here. Indian numerals have a similar philosophical approach to the problem of representation: they are NOT floating point numbers as is wrongly asserted in this paper as well. An account of this mistake is published in my 2007 book. The idea that deduction is not infallible or universal is too big to be passed off without further discussion in one line.
7.	Paper by Almeida and Joseph in <i>Race and Class</i> 2004, remarks about Newton and Cavalieri, p. 47.	Key idea that European mathematicians (Newton, Cavalieri) had difficulty with the imported calculus because of the different way it handled infinities and infinitesimals. The authors neither explain nor provide a source.	1. The same points about Newton and Cavalieri are in <i>The Eleven Pictures of Time</i> (2003), e.g., p. 106, box on infinities. 2. My comments along these lines were publicly available on the web from the beginning of 2003.	The exact difficulties with infinity and infinitesimals that Newton and Cavalieri had are not explained, as they are in my books. This is highly non-trivial.
8.	Paper by Almeida and Joseph in <i>Race and Class</i> 2004, remarks on pp. 54-55 about no previous project to investigate the hypothesis of transmission of calculus.		1. My April 1998 INSA project on transmission of the calculus was suppressed. This was advertised in July 1998 (still archived on Historia Mathematica list). 2. My 1999 plan for a PHISPC volume on this subject was suppressed.	1. Almeida coopted my former research associate from the project, wrote a joint paper with him, and Almeida and Joseph obtained my project materials from him. 2. Almeida has given a signed statement of 22 Dec 1999, agreeing to be co-author of a chapter in this volume. So he certainly knew of this project.
9.	2007 news release on Manchester website + paper by “Aryabhata group”, Exeter and Manchester, supplied by Manchester Media relations officer + subsequent press statements by Joseph	Appendix gives 5 passages which agree near-verbatim with my previously published work. These are just examples and there is a far more substantial overlap with my earlier published work.	Various. But several pre-2000 unpublished papers of mine acknowledged (apparently by oversight).	This proves conclusively that Joseph had access to several of my unpublished papers (including Agra and Indo-China papers) from before 2000. Copied passages also conclusively prove plagiarism of cut-paste type by Joseph.