

How the West lied and lost

The [reading list](#) contains a number of books, articles, videos, and press reports on the religious bias in mathematics. How did the West react to them?

Like anywhere else, there are good and honest people in the West. But the fact is that the West was dominated by the church, which ruled it for centuries through systematic lies. Millions of people in the West still have blind faith in those lies (a stable 50% of the US population according to Gallup polls). Then there are those who are too timid to protest because of the long and violent history of suppressing dissent in the West, which suppression continues today, in an equally organized if less brutal form. Less known, however, are those cheats and liars who promote those lies, and have an honoured place in the West, because the dystopian system sees those lies as essential.

The following Western reactions, from top-ranked universities, are as amusing, to a sceptical person, as the reception of mathematics in the West. Enjoy.

1. D. T. Whiteside. Late professor Cambridge University.

Background:

The scientist Isaac Newton was a devout Christian. Hence, he was totally opposed to the church, and called church priests the “most evil sort of people ever to have inhabited the earth” because he thought they had distorted the Bible, the very source of “gospel truth”. He worked for 50 years to try to restore the original Bible.¹ He was, of course, right in this belief. The Indian Aramaic Bibles were the oldest Bibles in the world. Hence, the Roman-Catholic bishop Menezes of Goa obtained those Bibles by trickery and made a bonfire of them in 1599 at the so-called Synod of Diamper (Udayamperoor). The church felt it necessary to destroy the evidence that its own Bible (James version) was so different from the original version. Similarly, after Newton’s death, the church suppressed his voluminous work: the 8 volume *History of the Church* to suppress the evidence Newton had uncovered of the changes it had made to the Bible for political gains.

It is not possible to cleanly separate Newton the honest theologian from Newton the scientist, because Newton’s religious beliefs crept into his mathematics and physics. He believed like Aquinas that his god ruled the world with eternal laws. Newton considered himself a sort-of prophet and thought those laws had been revealed to him (because he was born on 25th December according to a wrong calendar!) He thought that the laws of his god being “perfect” must be written in the “perfect” language of mathematics. To make calculus “perfect”, he made time metaphysical. His physics failed exactly for that reason, and had to be replaced by relativity which provided a physical definition of equal intervals of time.²

The issue

On 19 Dec 2002 someone asked on the *Historia Mathematica* mailing list whether any of Newton’s manuscripts were unpublished.³ D. T. Whiteside was the reigning Newton expert in Cambridge. He

1 C. K. Raju, “Newton’s secret”, chp. 4 in *The Eleven Pictures of Time*, Sage, 2003.

2 C. K. Raju, *Time: Towards a Consistent Theory*, Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1994.

3 <http://mathforum.org/kb/message.jspa?messageID=1184733>.

replied,⁴ “NONE, repeat NONE, of Newton mathematical manuscripts are unpublished”. Four hours earlier, I had replied that a “cartload” of Newton's manuscripts (his lifework in fact) were unpublished, and had remained secret for centuries.⁵ (The “cartload” was a term used by a 19th c. historian of Newton.)

Whiteside exploded in anger, but he was soon exposed even by others less informed.⁶ Newton's papers started leaking out since 1935, and a draft of his history of the church became available in 1969, leading to a revised biography. To suppress the resulting scandal, Imperial College started a Newton unit in 1998 to recover Newton's suppressed work (wow! after 270 years of suppression!). I had to tell Whiteside that he had offered only abuses and lies, and nothing of substance. I further said that while such abuses and misrepresentations were the norm with the church they are a sure sign of defeat in debate in the Indian tradition.⁷

Conclusions

The foremost authoritative Western historians, from Cambridge, have persistently told lies, even about their own colleagues, to defend what they call the gospel truth of the Bible! They defend their lies by abusing the critic. (Earlier, when they had more power, they would have defended it by imposing the tortures of the Inquisition upon the critic.) If this is the standard in Cambridge, you can imagine the standard elsewhere. Therefore, Western historians cannot be trusted to tell the truth about anything. This is especially true of the most “reputed” one's.

2. Sir Michael Atiyah, former President Royal Society.

Background

My book *Time: Towards a Consistent Theory* was published in 1994 by a prominent publisher (Kluwer, now Springer). In this book I argued that Einstein made a mistake regarding relativity (since he copied the basic idea of time measurement from Henri Poincaré without fully understanding its mathematical implications). My book pointed out that correcting that mathematical mistake leads to a new type of equations for physics, called functional differential equations, and that this involved a paradigm shift in physics. I published the first solutions of those equations in 2004.⁸

The issue

On the centenary of Einstein's special relativity paper (of 1905), Sir Michael Atiyah, a former President of the Royal Society, gave an Einstein lecture on 21 Oct 2005. To judge by the honours he has received (both Fields medal and Abel prize) Atiyah must be the best mathematician in the world! Atiyah repeated my idea of a paradigm shift in physics through functional differential equations, but added the bottom line “don't forget that I suggested it”.⁹ Since Atiyah's talk was videocast, I came to know of it

4 <http://mathforum.org/kb/message.jspa?messageID=1184735>.

5 <http://mathforum.org/kb/message.jspa?messageID=1184734>.

6 <http://mathforum.org/kb/message.jspa?messageID=1184736>.

7 <http://mathforum.org/kb/message.jspa?messageID=1184740>.

8 C. K. Raju, “The electrodynamic 2-body problem and the origin of quantum mechanics”, *Found. Phys.* **34** (2004) pp. 937–62. For an easy account, see “Functional differential equations: a new paradigm in physics”. *Physics Education* (India), **29**(3), July-Sep 2013, Article 1. <http://physedu.in/uploads/publication/11/200/29.3.1FDEs-in-physics-part-1.pdf>. *Physics Education* (India), **29**(3), July-Sep 2013, Article 2. <http://physedu.in/uploads/publication/11/201/29.3.2FDEs-in-physics-part-2.pdf>.

9 Full supporting documents are archived along with full details at <http://ckraju.net/atiyah/atiyahcase.html>.

almost immediately, and Atiyah was immediately informed of my 1994 book and 2004 paper. He replied¹⁰ on 28 October 2005, saying my book and paper were relevant to “his ideas”. This was hardly satisfactory, but that was not the end of the matter.

In June 2006, this Einstein talk was reported prominently in an article in the *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*.¹¹ This is a very widely read journal, often used by mathematicians to establish priority. The article repeated the claim of a paradigm shift in physics, and *again* restated the bottom line quoting Atiyah as saying “don’t forget that I suggested it”. Once again, there was no reference to my prior work. On the contrary, in their anxiety to give credit to Atiyah, the authors (presumably in collusion with Atiyah) named the idea after him as “Atiyah’s hypothesis”.

This time there was no doubt at all that this was deliberate, for the authors of the article would have naturally discussed it with Atiyah (who definitely knew of my prior work). So my prior work should have been cited. But had they done that, they would not have been able to name it “Atiyah’s hypothesis”. I asked the authors of the article to confirm that they had discussed the matter with Atiyah. After a lot of dilly dallying they finally admitted discussing the article with Atiyah before publication. After this admission was extracted, Atiyah immediately suggested that the *Notices* should carry an acknowledgment to my work. This was done in a patronising way in April 2007.¹²

Now, according to the published ethical guidelines of the American Mathematical Society,¹³ claiming ignorance of published past work *even once* is unethical (since such ignorance can be easily feigned). Therefore, according to the AMS ethical guidelines, Atiyah should have apologised for unethically claiming to be ignorant of my work the first time. (Indeed, my work was widely disseminated even through newspapers, and known to Atiyah’s colleagues in both Cambridge and Edinburgh. Atiyah, speaking on Einstein, would have to be a very incompetent researcher not to know of my position on Einstein.) But no apology was forthcoming from Atiyah.

But the actual fact is that Atiyah claimed ignorance *twice*, once *after* he was informed! There was no possibility of ignorance of my earlier work the second time. *That* certainly calls for an apology. However, neither Atiyah nor the authors of the article made any apology. Perhaps there was a good explanation? But no explanation was given. Instead, just as common thieves do, the full facts were suppressed, and the acknowledgment deliberately gave the false impression that this was the first time Atiyah came to know of my prior work. This was done with the active connivance of the editor of the *Notices of the AMS*, Andy Magid, who regularly lectures his students on ethics.

I wrote a letter pointing out that the correct facts should be stated: that the false claim of priority had been made twice, without referring to my work once, and the second time was *after* Atiyah was personally informed. Instead of an acknowledgment, the second time, the false claim of priority had been deliberately strengthened by adding the false nomenclature of “Atiyah’s hypothesis” (most mathematicians go by nomenclature and not actual historical facts).

But that was not all. There was a mistake in the article, as often happens when people copy without full understanding. Thus, the terminology of “Atiyah’s hypothesis”, while socially savvy, involved a

10 http://ckraju.net/atiyah/Atiyah_response_1.pdf.

11 <http://www.ams.org/notices/200606/comm-walker.pdf>. For the relevant excerpt, see http://ckraju.net/atiyah/Johnson_Walker_excerpt.pdf.

12 <http://www.ams.org/notices/200704/commentary-web.pdf>. Obviously there was an attempt to bury the acknowledgment. The excerpt is clearer: http://ckraju.net/atiyah/Belated_mention_NoticesApril2007.pdf.

13 <http://www.ams.org/secretary/ethics.html>.

mistake from the point of view of physics, since no hypothesis is needed for functional differential equations in physics. However, the editor refused to publish my letter. He gave no reasons, so he effectively said that as editor of an important journal he had the right to bypass ethics, he had the right to suppress the facts, and he had the right to retain mistakes in the journal. A petition signed by around 50 people was submitted to the *Notices*, and the American Mathematical Society to the effect that I should be allowed to present my side.¹⁴ This was just ignored: presumably, the Society used a high moral principle of editorial freedom (to act unethically to suppress facts and promote mistakes)!

Later on, three people appointed by an ethics committee indicted Atiyah by finding a prima facie case against him.¹⁵ Now if a prima facie case has been found, the matter should have been investigated further. However, Atiyah was successful in getting further enquiry squelched. Characteristically, no formal Indian mathematician took a stand on this matter.

Conclusions

First, the topmost Western mathematicians and scientists are still being produced in the traditional Western way of copying ideas from others without acknowledgment and passing it off as their own work. The Western claims of creative achievements in science rest mostly on the lies the West has told.¹⁶ Westerners are keenly aware of this, hence there is so much institutional support for plagiarism in the West. Atiyah was well aware that he would receive full institutional support, else he would not have brazenly done it twice: he was confident (from past experience?) of getting away.

Secondly, the entire process of benchmarking science today is based on blind trust in the honesty of Western editors, who decide referees in secret. If this is what an editor of a prominent journal is willing to do publicly, imagine the manipulations editors could carry out privately! So, trust in editors of “reputed” journals is clearly misplaced. (Blind trust usually is.) It is not just a case of one unethical and irresponsible editor, the system selects such people as editors for their pliability.

Lastly, Indian “experts” in formal mathematics will invariably side with the West, ethics be damned. Clearly a better way has to be found than relying on these sold-out “experts”.

3. George Joseph, Dennis Almeida etc. (Manchester, Exeter, Princeton University)

Background

The calculus was transmitted from India to Europe. To gather evidence for this, I initiated a research project in 1998 and advertised the position of a post-doctoral research associate.¹⁷ This caused a sensation worldwide. Shortly after this advertisement, I was contacted by Dennis Almeida from Exeter University. He was a close friend of George Joseph, primarily an economist and lawyer, who has written a popular-level book on the history of mathematics. Like the early colonised people, I was then unaware at that time that I was being set up.

While Almeida knew nothing about the history of mathematics, he promised to raise some funds from Exeter to support my travel to Rome for consulting the Jesuit archives and the Vatican library. He

14 http://ckraju.net/atiyah/Petition_against_celebrity_justice.pdf.

15 <http://www.scientificvalues.org/cases.html>. Scroll down to case No. 2 of 2007.

16 See, e.g., C. K. Raju, *Is Science Western in Origin?* Multiversity, Penang, Daanish Books, Delhi, 2009. Reprint, Other India Bookstore, Goa.

17 http://sunsite.utk.edu/math_archives/.http/hypermail/historia/jul98/0067.html.

claimed to be motivated by his Indian connections and a desire to do something for India. He suggested that to raise more funds from his University, I should write a paper, giving the address as Exeter University, and that this could be done anonymously in the manner of Bourbaki, in the name of “the Aryabhata group”. At that time, I did not suspect his intentions, and thought he was proposing this as a matter of high principle. Almeida was ignorant of both mathematics, and history, so I wrote almost all the paper (as is clear from my language style), except for one or two sentences in one paragraph, which was the substance of Almeida's contribution.

This paper was to be physically presented by me at a conference organized by George Joseph in January 2000 in Trivandrum, Kerala, so the anonymity didn't really matter. However, at the last minute, I was invited to a conference in Hawai'i with clashing dates. Almeida said to go ahead and he would manage it in Trivandrum. I presented my paper in Hawai'i and cited the Trivandrum paper in it as a joint work.¹⁸

Later, Almeida invited George Joseph to join a project aiming to raise UK pounds 100,000 from the Leverhulme Trust to study the transmission of the calculus from India to Europe. The invitation to Joseph was extended on the grounds that a British citizen was essential. George Joseph wanted to take control, and this was unacceptable, so I dropped out, and told them that it would be unethical for them to go ahead with the project without my participation.

The issues

However, without my knowledge they went ahead, and even coopted my former research associate promising him a high salary. Through him they got access to all my notes and collection of research material. But, typical of the West, their knowledge and creativity was very limited. Therefore, later, Almeida along with my former research associate just copied my article and got it published in a journal published by Almeida's family friend.¹⁹ Because of their ignorance the article had many mistakes. I came to know of it through the McAndrews propagandist website which glorified those authors in the usual Western way. The MacAndrews website refused to take responsibility.

Next I complained to Exeter university. The Exeter university formed an ethics committee. Since the facts were all on record, including the funding of my trip to Rome by Exeter university, this resulted in a formal warning to Almeida (who was defended by Joseph, a trained lawyer). This matter was reported prominently in the newspapers.²⁰ Almeida was later sacked, and apologised to me personally. He later tendered a written and signed apology,²¹ which again proved to be a just a dishonest ploy.

When I first met Joseph in Mumbai in 1998, gave him a copy of an unpublished earlier paper on calculus transmission, which I had presented at a conference in Agra, a few days earlier. Joseph promptly copied a passage from it in the 2nd edition of his book, brought out by Princeton university press. The proof of copying is that he foolishly copied also the mistakes from my article! At that time I was unaware of it, since I did not look at the 2nd edition of his work. Indeed, Joseph intended to grab credit for my thesis. He even presented my own thesis (in the Trivandrum paper) in front of me in a

18 C. K. Raju, “Computers, Mathematics Education, and the Alternative Epistemology of the Calculus in the YuktiBhâsâ”, *Philosophy East and West*, 51(3) (2001) pp. 325–362. <http://ckraju.net/papers/Hawaii.pdf>.

19 For a detailed discussion of the errors in this paper, see *Cultural Foundations of Mathematics*, Appendix 7A, “Transmission of the transmission thesis”.

20 See, e.g., http://ckraju.net/Joseph/HT_report_8_Nov_04.pdf.

21 The two apologies are posted at http://ckraju.net/Joseph/Almeida_first_apology.pdf, and http://ckraju.net/Joseph/Almeida_new_apology.jpg.

Bangalore conference in 2000. (He was unaware that I would be attending the conference.) Naturally, I openly charged Joseph with plagiarism, on the spot, and he could not immediately respond to the charge. (Later he privately said he didn't know me(!) and had got the paper from Almeida.)

In 2002, Joseph was instrumental in publishing my Trivandrum paper behind my back, without seeking my copyright permission, in the proceedings of the Trivandrum conference he had organized, just adding a note that it was presented by Almeida. (I came to know of this many years later, after I had initiated a formal complaint against Joseph.)

My book *Cultural Foundations of Mathematics*, detailing the evidence for the transmission of the calculus was published in April 2007. Shortly after that prominent newspaper reports (from the Times of India, Indian Express, and Hindu etc.) claimed that work on transmission of calculus was done by two people, Joseph and Almeida from Manchester and Exeter universities. When the matter of the earlier case of plagiarism and Almeida dismissal and apology were brought to light, only one newspaper (Hindustan Times) published a proper retraction. This shows that most of the media too blindly believe the West.

The “unpublished” paper by Almeida and Joseph, put up on the Manchester website in support of the media release, was a slight modification of my 2000 Trivandrum paper, published surreptitiously in 2002. The Manchester ethics committee could not find any way to explain how that paper published anonymously in 2002 acquired a new author from Manchester in 2007, and was passed off as original work done in Manchester. However, since the paper was in the name of the Aryabhata group, Joseph now admitted he was not an author of the paper, and that I was. So, the ethics committee said that it was a mistake made by their media office!

Even a three year old child will laugh at that assertion. Why didn't Joseph deny authorship earlier, when journalists were asking him questions? Why didn't he deny it for three years? (Obvious: he benefited from the publicity, and resulting sales, and stood to gain a lot of money, and also benefited by the denial!) Why didn't he issue a public retraction? How did the paper acquire an affiliated author from Manchester university? Does the media office of Manchester university put in the affiliation of authors of papers? If there was no author from Manchester, why was the paper given to the media office, and why did their media office put out a press release? Who wrote the press release? These questions were all left unanswered by the ethics committee.

Indeed, in my original complaint,²² I pointed out that Joseph had been stalking my work for seven years since 2000, and had copied a number of things from my works, without giving me credit or citing my work.²³ If this is a case of serial plagiarism, how could the Manchester committee chose to blame only the media office for the latest case?

Further, the earlier Exeter ethics committee had in its report against Almeida explicitly stated that “under no circumstances should attempts be made to publish with the Aryabhata group identified as the author”,²⁴ since this was the unethical stratagem used to grab credit the first time. Joseph participated in that committee to let Almeida off the hook, so he was well aware of this. So why was that *same* trick used *again*? (The Manchester paper identified the Aryabhata group as the author, but now gave the affiliation as both Manchester and Exeter universities.) And why did the Manchester committee excuse this clear violation of the directive of an earlier ethics committee?

22 <http://ckraju.net/Joseph/Complaint-about-Joseph-to-Manchester.pdf>.

23 <http://ckraju.net/Joseph/Annexures-Manchester.pdf>. Annexure 6: Plagiarism details.

24 <http://ckraju.net/Joseph/Annexures-Exeter.pdf>. Document 1, Exeter investigation report clause 8b.

This also show how the British system offered justice through two quibbles. The first quibble came from the Manchester ethics committee that it was the fault of the media office, and that the media office should apologise. The second quibble came from the Manchester administration which said that the ethics committee was not authorised to ask the media office to issue an apology!²⁵ That is, they would do nothing at all! Wonderful British system! Ultimately, they made some cosmetic changes on the Manchester website, 3 years after the fact, which changes are of no concern to anyone.

Even more interesting was the reaction of Princeton University Press. I pointed out that Joseph and Almeida were stalking my work since 2000, and that the latest case of plagiarism of a whole paper was a key means of selling the 3rd edition of Joseph's book, considering the newspaper headlines it had grabbed. Princeton University Press said they were happy with the profit from the resulting publicity, and completely comfortable with such ethical violations, since they were used in marketing, and not part of the book, and therefore the press was not legally liable, and didn't think it needed any remedy, except a possible acknowledgment to my work in future. That is, Princeton university press agreed with the ethical principle laid down by the Manchester ethics committee: for purposes of publicity and sales it is OK to claim credit as author of a paper, and this does not amount to plagiarism, for it was denied behind closed doors after three years.

Conclusions

Once again, it is clear that Joseph was well aware of all the institutional support he would get from Manchester and Princeton universities, hence he brazenly continued doing what he did for so many years.

So, first the West stole the calculus, and then it tried to steal the credit for exposing the transmission of the calculus! And some of their most reputed institutions did their best to help. On the grounds of this sort of rotten history, we are asked to imitate their system, and their "reputable" institutions, which preserve their reputation through such laughable quibbles and skulduggery.

There is still one aspect of this episode which needs to be settled. The 2007 Manchester paper acknowledged funding received from the British Arts and Humanities Council after the paper was already published in 2002 (without my copyright clearance).

4. *Philosophia Mathematica* (Oxford University journal)

Background

When my book *Cultural Foundations of Mathematics* was published in 2007, it exposed as a superstition the Western claim that there is only one "universal" philosophy of mathematics, and that was done in the West. I expected that serious academics would debate this seriously. But what the leading Western philosophers did was hilarious. The editor of the Oxford journal *Philosophia Mathematica*, a little-known person called Robert Thomas, wrote to me out of the blue saying that if my book was any good it should be reviewed in his journal. This abusive tone immediately warned me that he was up to some mischief. However, I asked the publisher to send him a copy.

25 <http://ckraju.net/Joseph/Manchester-Univ-President-letter-26-April-2010.pdf>.

The issue

My book was reviewed by a theologian, J. Ferrieros, whose main argument was the shameless falsehood that I was not trained in mathematics. (Should I put up my degrees online? Won't help, they will fabricate some other falsehood!) The church has got away with such silly falsehoods for so long, that such falsehoods have become the stock practice among Western academics.

Now the fact is that Ferrieros was too ignorant and incompetent to review the book, which covered a wide area including the history and philosophy of the calculus in India. But he was unwilling to admit this truth. How could he, for he wanted to adopt the other stock church tactic: of striking a pose of superiority. So what could he do?

Hilariously, he said he would review only two chapters of the book. That is, Ferrieros just claimed like a buffoon that the rest of the book was not philosophy, so he would not review it! Now, as explained in my book *Euclid and Jesus*, the Western philosophical tradition was taken over from Islam and used as a weapon against it during the Crusades (at which time it was linked to the "Greek" tradition, itself stolen from Egypt). Accordingly, *Western philosophy is inextricably intertwined with Christian theology*. Clearly, Christian theology invaded philosophy first before penetrating mathematics. One should cleanse philosophy of that contamination. However, Ferrieros just claimed the opposite that anything which did not involve Christian theology could not, by his definition, be philosophy. At one stroke this Christian theological definition of "philosophy" makes the theological philosophy of mathematics universal! The editor heartily approved of this and boasted that soliciting a book for review, and then passing it on to an inferior and ignorant reviewer who could review only two chapters represented the highest quality of academics and philosophy known to the West! It is by such juvenile tricks that the Western philosophy of mathematics came to be regarded as universal!

Conclusions

Clearly we have yet another attempt to preserve Christian theology in mathematics, by making Christian theology normatively universal in philosophy. This is the unstated role assigned to yet another manipulative editor who plants such a review with the help of a compliant "academic". From any unbiased perspective, this way to answer philosophical objections by using falsehoods and twisted definitions is an admission that Christian theology (and the Western philosophy of mathematics based on it) is so weak, that there is no better way to defend it. Both editor and reviewer acted in the well known church tradition of falsehood which the Oxford University was founded to defend. If this is what they do openly, one can only guess what they do in secret to produce the acme of philosophy!

5. Michael Witzel, Harvard University

Background

Like many other aspects of mathematics, probability theory developed in India in relation to the game of dice, mentioned in the Rgveda and the Mahabharata. In the latter text, this was related to sampling theory used to count the number of fruits in a tree (symbolically, the very tree whose fruit was used as five-faced dice). There was also an extensive development in early India of the theory of permutations and combinations (built into the earliest theory of Indian music used in the Vedic metre), the binary expansion (today called "Pascal's triangle") etc. There was, of course, a notion of probability as in the notion of a "fair game" of dice.

This notion of probability was never properly understood in the West. It is defined in formal mathematics today using Kolmogorov's postulates. However, sampling theory and statistics relies on empirically measured relative frequency. There should be a correspondence between the two. However, this empirical relative frequency is related to probability only indirectly through the law of large numbers. That "law" brings in a convoluted notion of infinity and supertasks as also a particular notion of limits, called "limits in probability" or "limits in measure". That is, trying to understand formal probability as some kind of limit of empirical relative frequency involves a logical fallacy known as "begging the question" (assuming what one wants to prove).

Finally, there are the peculiarities of quantum probability which can be understood by a change of logic to quasi-truth functional logic, used for parallel computing, and similar to the Buddhist logic of *catuskoti*. I wrote this paper²⁶ since all these issues needed to be clarified, and many people had long been pressing me to do so.

The issue

The exact date of the Rgveda is, of course, completely irrelevant to all the above points in the paper (and the date is not mentioned in the paper). However, the fact is that this date was very important for the Christian faith. The Vice Chancellor of Cambridge university spent a lifetime like Ussher to "prove" that the world was created in -4004 CE according to the genealogy in the Bible. This was gospel truth for Western academics including the orientalist in the 19th c. who studied Indian texts, and hence dated them so as to comply with their own superstitions. Therefore, all of them denied the possibility of texts older than that date of Biblical creation, and gave some silly reasoning in support, like the linguistic reasoning given by Max Mueller who did not even know the Sanskrit alphabet right (he misspelt the name of Chandogya upanishad). So, the Western dating of Indian texts is an example of how the worst church superstitions have penetrated Western academics, where facts can be fixed on mere authority, like that of the Bible or of scholars influenced by it. Accordingly, while announcing the paper on a mailing list,²⁷ I raised the issue of the date of the Rgveda, saying that I was impressed by Lokmanya Tilak's deep scholarship, who suggested a date of -4500 CE (before what Western scholars believed to be the date of creation of the world!).

I was quite aware that this was like waving a red flag to a bull, and was pleased that Western academics responded to it like brainless bulls. First, Michael Witzel from Harvard responded with the predictable "zombie" critique that I am a Hindu chauvinist. (This is a church simpleton's way of meeting any and all criticism; to articulate this typical church charge, there is never any need of any proof that I am even a Hindu.) On the contrary, Witzel is well known for his right-wing associations with the church.

The paper was clearly beyond Witzel's understanding, and he should have honestly admitted that he was out of his depth. But I have never seen it happen that Western academics admit the truth when they are out of their depth, because their believed superiority (based on the color of the skin etc) is such a big part of the story they tell about themselves. Admitting that they are out of their depth would destroy their sense of superiority. Therefore, instead of admitting the truth, they just tell some more lies.

What is amazing is how foolish were the lies Witzel told. Though he mouthed a lot of abuses, he

26 C. K. Raju, "Probability in Ancient India", chp. 37 in *Handbook of the Philosophy of Science, vol 7. Philosophy of Statistics*, ed, Dov M. Gabbay, Paul Thagard and John Woods. Elsevier, 2011, pp. 1175-1196 (<http://www.ckraju.net/papers/Probability-in-Ancient-India.pdf>).

27 C. K. Raju, H-Asia mailing list, 17 July 2011. <http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=H-Asia&month=1106&week=c&msg=m11WFIYjKIsbteW21BJ2tA&user=&pw=>.

realized that he could not get away with abuses alone, and had to state something substantive. To that end, he said,²⁸ that my “mistake” was that I believed in six-faced dice. Now, the number of faces of dice is completely irrelevant to the issue of probability! Further, my paper was and is posted on the Internet, and anyone can download it and search it to see in 30 seconds that I mention only five-faced dice. So, if this is the kind of brazen lie Witzel tells, about something which can so easily be checked, one can imagine what are the lies this leading Sanskrit expert tells about literature in Sanskrit which most Westerners would be unable to cross-check. Indeed, if he told such a foolish lie, it can only be because he is in the habit of telling the most absurd lies and getting away with them.

This is confirmed by next lie that Witzel told, which offered an “explanation” for why I made the supposed mistake I did. He said I followed Wilson's old translation! In fact, Wilson's translation of the Rgveda is online, and anyone can check the two translations to see that my translation is different. Indeed, since I did the translation myself, my translation is substantively different from all earlier one's as any half-way decent expert in the literature should have known. This shows how the topmost Western academics survive on just spinning the most absurd tales and telling the most foolish lies. They expect to be believed on the criterion of “reputability”, widely used by Western academics, and are quickly exposed by anyone who takes the trouble to check the facts. “He is a reputed scholar from a reputed institution, therefore he must be believed and the facts don't matter.” Further, the entire education of the colonised constantly teaches them to believe only Western authority. In fact, the state of Western academics today is clearly as bad as that of the church before the reformation!

Not only was Witzel ignorant of the mathematics of the Indian theory of music, he did not understand the RgVeda metre since he was not a practitioner who could actually recite the Veda-s. (Western experts *read* it using a dictionary, for they understand only scriptures.) I pointed this out too.

However, now it was the editor's turn. Clearly Western editors see their role as that of censors out to perform thought control (in the name of quality control) and preserve orthodoxy. India, for example, had a tradition of open debate, without the need for constant hegemonic “moderation”. Anyway, since my arguments were so strong and completely exposed Witzel, the editor tried to suppress them. Finally, he was forced to publish them after I almost initiated a public petition. But he did so a whole week later (that is a long time in cyber space). In the typical manner of Western editor writing a long preface to caution the readers: here be heretics who speak the truth.²⁹

Conclusions

The most reputable scholar from the most reputable university, Witzel, told such pathetic lies which were easily exposed just because he is in the habit of telling lies about Sanskrit texts, which lies others cannot easily check. He never apologised for the lies he told, presumably since he told them deliberately. He told those lies since he did not want to admit he was out of his depth, because authority is all about maintaining that pose of superiority and infallibility! The editor of the list fielded for him, with some quibbles, and openly warned others not to pursue the matter.

28 M. Witzel, H-Asia mailing list, 18 July 2011, <http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=H-Asia&month=1106&week=c&msg=NYMBLGXV6xef5JpjjEYXvA&user=&pw=>.

29 C. K. Raju response to Witzel, with a preface by Frank Conlon, H-Asia mailing list, 25 July 2011. <http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=H-Asia&month=1106&week=d&msg=rTFpmlp7sb2X%2bl0DI3pcrg&user=&pw=>.

6. Sundry cases.

The above examples of top academicians from top Western universities show the third-rate nature of a sample of top-rated Western academics. The long church tradition of suppressing dissent seems to have made them incapable of civilised debate, or even a modicum of honesty, and they only know how to gang up and cheat or to strike a pose of superiority and lie. I hope my own generation and future generations will learn a strong lesson from these examples.

But apart from these top Western academics there are others. To maintain so many falsehoods contrary to elementary commonsense, for so long, the church used an elaborate system, which included storm trooper (later also used by the Nazis, who also copied the church model of genocide). These barking dogs, who drivel on without data, are any number of lesser or unknown people, often priests, who set themselves up as crank-certifiers in the manner of the church's heretic certifiers! Their sole job is to launch personal attacks on critics to frighten dissenters. Anyone with a modicum of intelligence understands that launching a personal attack, howsoever disguised, is a clear admission of an inability to meet the critique. Therefore, this sort of thing is aimed at those who lack intelligence. Such unintelligent people are not part of my audience, and the symptom of a personal attack is sufficient for the intelligent.