

You have given no valid reason to reject part 1, but accept part 2, Re: Reminder Re: 7th National Conference on Mathematics Education

From: Prof. C. K. Raju (ckr@ckraju.net)
To: mathsconference18@gmail.com
Cc: secy.ncert@nic.in
Bcc: sandeep_d@hemendrakotharifoundation.org
Date: Thursday, 13 December, 2018, 6:59 am IST

Dear Conference Team,

My earlier email (below) clearly says, "understanding the Indian tradition of geometry [in the sulba-sutra-s] is a **pre-requisite** for understanding the Indian calculus."

That is, the Indian calculus originates from a **different** way of doing geometry, different from that taught in your Class IX math text, chapter 5 on "Euclid's geometry" (different definition of point, angle, different instruments, etc.)

That is, part 2, and part 1 are NOT two independent papers, but two parts of a single paper. To explain the origin of the Indian calculus, I must first explain that Indian geometry was different, and why that is beneficial, as in this published paper on the [Indian rope trick](#) from ten years ago, and as in my decolonised calculus courses taught over the last ten years.

So, you can either accept both parts of my current paper, or only part 1 on rajju ganit.

This is quite feasible on the organizational reasons you have stated for rejecting part 1, that you will not accept more than one paper from a person.

However, your persistent unwillingness to accept part 1, combined with the inability to provide any logic for rejecting part 1 but accepting part 2, is clear confirmation that your real concern is elsewhere, to protect the false and wrong claims in your current class IX math text that traditional Indian sulba-sutra geometry was inferior, since practical. You don't want to allow any open debate on it.

You have not advanced any academic arguments, either now, or over the last decade, in favour of your false claims, or in favour of the false myth of Euclid, and his "superior" geometry as stated in your Class IX text. Even now you are unwilling to discuss my arguments against them, but choose to rely on censorship and authority.

False statements which persist in a compulsory school text damage public interest, and it becomes my duty to bring it to public notice to prevent school children from being misled.

The NCERT's continued opposition to traditional Indian geometry without any valid reasons is particularly ironic in a conference supposedly on traditional Indian ganita. This too needs to be brought to public notice, especially in the light of the ongoing debate on [mathematics and censorship](#).



**Mathematics, Decolonization and
Censorship: C. K. Raju**

Guest post by C.K.RAJU Did you find math difficult in school? Does your child? If so, what is the solution: chan...

Should you choose to change your mind, and allow a discussion on the Indian sulba sutra geometry by accepting part 1, for ready reference, my earlier email to you concerning my decade-old unanswered critique, and my Rs 2 lakh challenge prize, against the false myths in your school texts, is copied below.

C. K. Raju

CC NCERT Director

From: NCME 2018 <mathsconference18@gmail.com>

To: ckr@ckraju.net

Sent: Tuesday, 11 December 2018 8:22 PM

Subject: Re: Reminder Re: 7th National Conference on Mathematics Education

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Your paper entitled " Teaching alternative mathematics. 2 Calculus without limits' is accepted for presentation. The same has been communicated to you in our earlier mail.

Conference Team

On Wed, Dec 5, 2018 at 6:53 PM Prof. C. K. Raju <ckr@ckraju.net> wrote:

Dear Conference Team,

Waiting for your response. If your key concern is only to maximise the number of researchers, then the one paper of mine you should accept is the paper on Rajju Ganit.

Since the extended abstracts of both papers already have detailed references, you can use those as the final papers.

BTW, I will be conducting a day-long workshop on Alternative Mathematics, on Friday 7th at Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, starting 10.30 a.m., where the contents of both the papers will be discussed in depth. If anyone in your team is interested, you are welcome to attend.

C. K. Raju

From: Prof. C. K. Raju <ckr@ckraju.net>
To: NCME 2018 <mathsconference18@gmail.com>
Cc: "secy.ncert@nic.in" <secy.ncert@nic.in>
Sent: Tuesday, 4 December 2018 7:57 PM
Subject: Re: 7th National Conference on Mathematics Education

Dear Conference Team,

Thanks for clarifying that the aim of the conference is to reach the maximum number of researchers, and that other academic concerns, such as the accuracy of your school texts, are unimportant.

However, in that case, please accept only the paper on Rajju Ganit.

In any case, understanding the Indian tradition of geometry is a prerequisite for understanding the Indian calculus, therefore, it is also more logical to accept that Rajju ganit paper.

C. K. Raju

From: NCME 2018 <mathsconference18@gmail.com>
To: ckr@ckraju.net
Sent: Tuesday, 4 December 2018 10:59 AM
Subject: 7th National Conference on Mathematics Education

Dear Sir/ Madam,
The purpose of the conference is to reach maximum number of researchers in Mathematics Education. It is not possible to accept multiple papers from one participant.
Conference Team

From: Prof. C. K. Raju <ckr@ckraju.net>
To: NCME 2018 <mathsconference18@gmail.com>
Cc: "secy.ncert@nic.in" <secy.ncert@nic.in>

Sent: Monday, 3 December 2018 5:09 AM

Subject: Reminder: why did you reject the Rajju Ganit paper? Re: Which paper? Re: Acceptance of Paper

Dear Conference Team,

This is just a gentle reminder to please address my concern: why have you rejected my Rajju Ganit paper? This concern has already been raised twice earlier, but has gone unanswered. It is standard academic practice that while you need not offer any reason for accepting a paper, you do have to offer some reason for rejecting it.

The paper on Rajju Ganit concerns the Indian sulba sutra tradition of geometry on which I have performed extensive pedagogical experiments across India, and explained why it is superior to the geometry you teach today. See, e.g., the poster at [C. K. Raju's Blog » Blog Archive » Rajju Ganit workshop from today](#), and the related appreciative media reports at [C. K. Raju's Blog » Blog Archive » Alternative math: media reports](#). (There are many other appreciative media reports.)

[C. K. Raju's Blog » Blog Archive » Alternative math: media reports](#)

[C. K. Raju's Blog » Blog Archive » Rajju Ganit workshop from today](#)

I do understand that your class IX text (chp. 5, "Euclid's geometry", p. 79) explicitly states that the Indian sulba sutra tradition is an inferior kind of geometry, since "practical", compared to what some Greeks purportedly did, and which you teach our school children to imitate. But why are you unwilling for an open discussion on this topic?

Further, as you and many others probably know (see above blog post) **I have offered a Euclid challenge prize of Rs 2 lakhs** for the slightest **primary** evidence about even the existence of Euclid, as falsely claimed in your school text. In ten years no one from NCERT or anywhere else in the world could claim the prize and justify what your school text states. The leading Western expert publicly agreed with me long ago.

At the time when Krishna Kumar was your Director, he deputed you former head of the math department Hukam Singh, to attend my IIC seminar on my book *Cultural Foundations of Mathematics* (Pearson Longman, 2007). When asked to provide evidence, Hukam Singh regrettably said there is no need for evidence, since the textbook is decided by a committee, and children should blindly trust the decisions of the committee, and not ask for evidence.

Neither could your former Director, Parveen Sinclair, directly responsible for the content of the above school text, provide the slightest evidence for Euclid when asked (since 2007) and my prize of Rs 2 lakhs has remained unclaimed for the last decade, as is well known to a

large number of people.

In fact, as explained in my book *Euclid and Jesus: How and why the church changed mathematics and Christianity across two religious wars* (Multiversity, Penang, 2012) in the name of the fictitious Euclid what you actually teach students is to imitate the church theology of reason. This is a serious matter which needs public discussion, which is all I am asking for.

So, once again, especially in the light of the above, please either accept also the rajju ganit paper or do provide your reasons for rejecting it. Just keeping quiet is not a valid answer and may precipitate a public scandal.

C. K. Raju

CC NCERT Director