

White supremacy: its religious roots, and what must be done to eradicate it today

C. K. Raju*

Indian Institute of Education

G. D. Parikh Centre, J. P. Naik Bhavan

University of Mumbai, Kalina Campus

Santacruz (E), Mumbai 400 098

ckr@ckraju.net

Keywords: Dogma of Christian discovery of knowledge, from Christian to White supremacy, from White to Western supremacy, false history of science and bad philosophy of math, education supports racism

* Professor C. K. Raju is a physicist (*Time: Towards a Consistent Theory*, Kluwer/Springer 1996), mathematician. (*Cultural Foundations of Mathematics*, Pearson, 2007), computer scientist (he played a key role in building India's first supercomputer Param), and a philosopher (he was on the editorial board of the *Journal of Indian Council of Philosophical Research*). His book *The Eleven Pictures of Time: the Physics, Philosophy and Politics of Time Beliefs* (Sage, 2003) examined time beliefs at the interface of science, religion, and ethics, and explained how time perceptions in *both* science and religion have been politically manipulated to manipulate human values, and behaviour.. More details at <http://ckraju.net/cv>.

,

Abstract

The biggest hate crime in all history, the genocide of 100 million Native Americans, by Whites/Christians, was first instigated **as a moral imperative** on the evil dogma of Christian discovery (Raju 2015b) based on the long-standing state-church assertion of Christian supremacy, and motivated by greed for land grab (Bull Inter Caetera¹), and labour grab (slavery of non-Christians, Romanus Pontifex²). The pope recently informally repudiated the doctrine of Christian discovery, without even an apology. This is a criminal sham of [holocaust denial](#),³ now that the economic objectives of genocide (for land grab) and slavery (for labour grab) have been achieved, and the repercussions are damaging the credibility of church morality and the belief that the “rule of the law” is somehow just. Hence, as the first step to undo it, it is critically important to understand the mutated forms in which this dogma is sustained and actively propagated today.

Thus, it is little known (1) how and why this initial dogma of Christian supremacy subsequently **mutated** to the dogma of White supremacy during slavery, and further mutated [to](#) the dogma of Western supremacy during colonialism (Raju 2022b), when colonialism replaced land-grab and slavery as the major means of Western wealth. Also little-known is (2) how a **secular argument** from a **false history of science** was used, since the Crusades, as a “**doctrine of Christian discovery of knowledge**” for knowledge-grab. This portrayed early Greeks (“friends of Christians”) and then (post-“Renaissance”) Christians/Whites/West as “discoverers” of all scientific knowledge (Raju 2009), hence its “superior” owners just as Columbus or Vasco are portrayed as the “discoverers” hence owners of America or India.⁴ This fantasy “history”, that “Greeks/Christians/Whites/West discovered all science”, is still openly taught in schools and universities, propagated by Wikipedia, and sustains racist and colonial beliefs today. In actuality, early Greeks and Europeans, till the 16th c., were backward, lacked knowledge of even basic efficient arithmetic, which they repeatedly imported from India, initially via Arabs, but struggled for centuries to grasp.

Nevertheless, the prevailing false history of science cannot be easily dismantled because of the trick of anchoring false history in a bad philosophy of mathematics, fraudulently attributed to early Greeks, and declared “superior”. However, the method of axiomatic reasoning actually derives from a tricky Crusading church theology of reason.

To undo racism and colonialism, it is necessary first to stand up to BOTH the false history AND related bad philosophy underlying current math and through it science (Raju 2018c; 2016b). This task is made very difficult by the widespread mathematical and scientific illiteracy spread by colonial education, which forces people to rely on Western authority to decide truth in mathematics and science.

Introduction

Over 2 billion Christians worldwide see Christianity as a doctrine of love and morality. They are completely unexposed to non-Christian perceptions of Christianity. It is true that early Christianity was a doctrine of (sexual) love derived from “pagan” worship of phallic (Bacchanalian) (Raju 2012) symbols like the cross. Further, the (ante-Nicene) Christianity of Origen (Raju 2013a; 2014b) was indeed committed to the belief in equity, and to a belief in reincarnation (Raju 2003) remarkably similar to that in Hinduism.

All that changed after the church grabbed power in the Roman Empire. To quote Gibbon, the church “defended by violence the empire she had acquired by fraud” (Gibbon 1996 Chapter 16). (The fraud was to persuade Constantine that his military victory was due not to his military acumen but due to the symbol of the cross on his flag.) After gaining Constantine’s confidence through this superstition, the church priests “educated” (= converted) his son, and brought him to power in a coup, after Constantine’s death, killing the rest of his children. As is well known, Constantius II, functioning under the thumb of Christian priests, declared Christianity as the monopoly religion in the Roman Empire. To sustain this monopoly, the church priests incited mob violence against the “pagans”, eventually destroying every last pagan temple in the Roman Empire, and burning down the great library of Alexandria, in what I have called the first religious war (Raju 2012).

State-church and post-Nicene Christian dogma

What is less known, however, are the ways in which Christian dogma was repeatedly modified to suit the political need of Christian priests to hang on to their state power, using the key weapon in their political arsenal: superstitions based on mere fantasies. This is little known

because even the life-work of the famous scientist Isaac Newton, a 7-volume history of the church (Raju 2003, chp. 4, 'Newton's secret'), was suppressed and remains so to this day, though his rough notes eventually leaked out by 1970 (resulting in a revised biography of Newton which still skirts the central issue (Westfall 1983).

Obviously, the first thing the church priests abandoned was the belief in equity, for no state can treat its citizens on par with non-citizens. So, the benefit of turning Christian had to be explicitly spelt out, especially since ante-Nicene theologians like Justin Martyr admitted the obvious similarity between earlier pagan and later Christian beliefs in matters such as virgin birth, crucifixion etc. (A. Roberts & J. Donaldson 1980 chp. 21),⁵ but tried to pass it off with **the adjunct fantasy** of "the Devil's parody" or "plagiarism in anticipation" (Raju 2012 chp. 1, 'Devil's parody')!

Augustine's apocalyptic time and eternal damnation

The little-understood way this transformation in church dogmas was achieved was through Augustine's apocalyptic time (Raju 2003), which made the division between heaven and hell permanent (it was earlier temporary, as in Origen and in popular-level Hinduism). The aim was to frighten people with visions of *eternal* damnation. This was distinct from the earlier notion of hell as a reform school, also found in the pre-Nicene theology of Origen. A graphic account of these new "moral" beliefs can be found in Dante (Dante Alighieri 1996), especially the idea of Christian morality: that good and bad is defined by obedience to Christian priests, as in Dante's crude depiction of the eternal tortures in hell to which Paigambar ("Prophet") Muhammad is subjected.

Side-by-side, Origen's belief in reincarnation (Raju 2013; 2014b)⁶ (remarkably similar to that in Hinduism) was changed to Augustine's belief in resurrection (Raju 2003), or the meta-physical fantasy of life after death exactly once. This change was later reflected in the 6th c. edict on "cyclic time" by Justinian and the 5th Ecumenical Council. To amplify the fear of the fantasy of eternal damnation, and inject a sense of urgency to sell conversion, time was speeded up. The world was about to end, just as it was asserted to be recently created. On the creationist fantasies of Christian scholars like Bishop Ussher and John Lightfoot (Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University), the exact instant of creation in the Bible was determined (White 1897). It was also commonly asserted that the apocalyptic fantasy of eternal damnation was just around the corner ("repent for the end of the world is near"), to amplify the fear of eternal damnation, so that obedience to the Christian priests was an urgent call to action.

There were many other such fantasies invented to aid the rule of Christian priests through superstitions which aroused fear: e.g., the pagan doctrine of celebrating creation and sexual love was twisted to the doctrine of asexual love and the related doctrine of sin intended to arouse fear of engaging in the most natural and essential physical acts, and the need to rush to the Christian priest for "confession" and absolution. Recall also that the related belief in the miracle of virgin birth (understood literally) consequently became the basis of all Christian ethics: for if Jesus himself was born of original sin, how could he save others from sin and eternal damnation?

Systematically false history as a tool to rule

However, the ruler is always fearful of losing power, and this is especially true when that power is based on mere superstitious fantasies, and there is a vocal and critical opposition which threatens to disrupt those fantasies (as there was of pagans in the Roman empire despite extreme violence against them). Therefore (and this is central to the current article),

Orosius invented the trick of using a fantasy history which “proved” that the Christian god rewarded Christians (and punished non-Christians) even in this very life, and not merely after death. Orosius’ *History Against the Pagans* remained the model for Christian history until the Crusades. Because church power is based on superstitions/fantasies, Christian priests also taught faith, for faith is a con-trickster’s dream come true, for it enables belief in any silly fantasy whatsoever. Therefore, also, church history too is based on faith, not hard evidence.

This business of writing false triumphalist history, based on fantasy and faith rather than evidence, is no medieval glitch; it is, as we will see, critical to racism and its continued propagation today. For the moment, we note that Arnold Toynbee’s (1957) *Study of History*, and Francis Fukuyama’s apocalypse-now thesis of the “end of history” are obvious manifestations of that same naked Christian triumphalist history in more recent times.

Orosius’ *History Against the Pagans* was abandoned as the model of church history during the Crusades, for the pagans were exterminated, and Muslims were the new religious enemy of Christian priests. The Crusades, regardless of any papal pronouncements, actually started in the mid-11th century, when combined Christian armies started attacking Muslim-ruled cities in Europe, after the Umayyad Khilafat in Spain had self-splintered into small taifa-s, so became an easy target. This was a tempting target for the Muslims in Spain were still enormously wealthy, compared to Christian Europe which was poor.

False Crusading history and Greek glorification

During the Crusades, or the second religious war initiated by the church, it encountered a new problem. Muslims were not only wealthier (and the desire for wealth grab was the real reason

for the Crusades) but also more knowledgeable, e.g., in building bridges etc. Initially, Christian Crusading spies like Adelard of Bath were sent to ferret out this knowledge. However, it was eventually realized that there was an easier way to grab Muslim knowledge. There was a huge Arabic library at Toledo which had fallen in 1085. The knowledge which Christian Europe needed could be directly obtained from the library by translating its books. However, there was a major obstacle for Christians to learn from these books, since the church practice was to burn all heretical (= non-Christian) books. This policy certainly applied to Muslims with whom the church was then fighting an open religious war. But that knowledge was needed to win the war.

The Christian priests solved this problem the usual way they solve all problems: they invented a new fantasy history. All secular knowledge in these Arabic books was declared to have been discovered or originated by early Greeks, as Wikipedia still tell us. Why early Greeks? Because the early Greeks were regarded as the sole friends of Christians, since Eusebius; Christianity was at war with all others. Therefore, all this knowledge in Arabic libraries was declared by fantasy to be a Christian inheritance, and translated into Latin starting 1125.

The need for knowledge to win the Crusades is clear from the fact that all the early European universities, such as Oxford, Cambridge, and Paris etc., were set up by the church during the Crusades. These texts translated from Arabic to Latin, but attributed to early Greeks such as “Euclid”, were used as initial textbooks in these first European universities for centuries (Raju 2019). Later, all scientific knowledge after the Crusades (\approx “Renaissance”) was said to have been discovered by Christians. This story (“doctrine of Christian discovery of knowledge”) is repeated by Wikipedia today.

The method of inventing adjunct fantasies

How could that false history continue till the present time, without evidence? This involves a trick central to the church technique of rule by superstitious fantasy. The trick is that the moment a fantasy seems to be failing, a new adjunct fantasy is invented in support.

Thus, the first question is this: Why is there no primary evidence from early Greek times, for purported Greek achievements in math and science? To overcome this problem, the adjunct fantasy invented was that the Greek “golden age” was followed by a “dark age” when all knowledge was suddenly and totally lost (including knowledge of the most basic efficient primary-school arithmetic, needed for any science, which later came to Europe only after the 13th c. Fibonacci, from India via Arabs!). Note that this was not a universal dark age but overlapped with the Islamic golden age, so, for clarity, it must be called the Christian dark age. What were the horrifying social reasons for the purported sudden and catastrophic loss of knowledge during the Christian dark age? No reasons are offered for this miracle any more than reasons are offered in the fairy tale of how a pumpkin suddenly turned into a carriage for Cinderella and mice turned into horses.

The second question, naturally, is this: if the knowledge was lost for so long, how then did we ever get to know about this lost knowledge of Greek achievements? Yet another adjunct fantasy is invented to explain this. That this lost knowledge suddenly and miraculously resurfaced well over a thousand years later during the “renaissance” with no explanation for where it was hiding or why.

But how exactly do we know that the knowledge which was lost (of which we have no record) was **exactly** the same as the knowledge which was found? And that, contrary to all

common sense, others made no scientific discoveries, so that nothing of any consequence was added in-between? However, people who believed for centuries in virgin birth as the basis of ethics, have no difficulty in having faith in this. But obviously, the church priests understand that such a chain of fantasies (“accumulation of hypotheses”) makes the original fantasy irrefutable and un-falsifiable, on Popper’s criterion. Therefore, one can cling to it for ever.

The dogma of Christian/White/Western discovery of knowledge

Before further examining the lack of evidence for this fantasy of the Greek/Christian discovery of all scientific knowledge, let us first clarify how this false Crusading history was subsequently used to defend racism and promote colonialism. The doctrine of Christian discovery was used to promote the genocide of native populations in the Americas (and later Australia). But it was also used for another genocide—to justify enslaving people from Africa. Indeed, that was the context in which the bull *Romanus Pontifex* was first promulgated: to morally justify enslaving captives brought back to Europe from sub-Saharan Africa.

This dogma of Christian supremacy remained the basis of the moral justification for genocide and slavery until the end of the 17th century (Raju 2022b). However, by this time, the large-scale trans-Atlantic slave trade, which was the major source of wealth for Europe then, had brought about some changes. Thus, slaves made an ideal captive audience for over-enthusiastic Christian priests eager to notch up conversions. This resulted in large-scale conversions of Black slaves.

That created a further problem. Europe, to allay petty crimes and the possibility of revolt (as later in France), due its large numbers of poor people, had started exporting its poor to the "New World" (= Americas). But due to slavery, these exported poor Europeans in the Americas could find no proper employment because wage prices were depressed due to the wide prevalence of slavery which provided almost free labour.

These exported poor Europeans, now in the Americas, started objecting to slavery for their own economic benefit. The argument was simple. If Christian supremacy was the moral justification for slavery, as initially asserted, what was the moral justification now that Blacks had converted to Christianity?

White supremacy and the curse of Ham

The church priests reacted to this opposition by doing what they always did: they invented a new adjunct fantasy to "solve" the problem! The new fantasy came to be known as the "Curse of Ham", a misreading of the Curse of Kam, from Kam or Egyptian Kmt, meaning black. In simple terms, Blacks were to be kept enslaved even after converting to Christianity since the Christian god had cursed all Blacks. This fantasy, or the belief in White supremacy, soon replaced the earlier belief in Christian supremacy as the moral justification for slavery.

Even by the standards of church fantasies, this "curse of Ham" was an extraordinarily silly fantasy used to assert White supremacy (as the replacement for Christian supremacy). That Ham saw Noah lying naked in a drunken stupor, and, therefore, the Christian god cursed Ham. The crime, in god's eye, apparently was not to publicly lie naked in a drunken stupor, but to *see* someone in that condition! Hence, the Christian god cursed Ham *and* all his progeny (meaning Blacks). Of course, if Ham's act did indicate there was such a genetic

defect, god should have taken the discredit for it; it was obviously a manufacturing defect, for which the Christian god was wholly responsible, so he should have punished himself!

What is amazing is the large number of top European intellectuals who believed in White supremacy based on this silly superstition. Till the American civil war, the Bible Defence of Slavery (Priest 1851) remained a major argument in support of slavery. This racist belief was even written into the constitution of several of the states in the US and later in apartheid South Africa, where this superstition officially persisted till 1992. Of course, racism still persists, even after the end of slavery and apartheid, and this article explains *why* it is so persistent.

False history and racism

Eventually, some Europeans did realize that the curse of Ham was an extraordinarily silly basis of ethics, to believe in the morality of the crime of slavery based on belief in White supremacy.

Therefore, Hume and then Immanuel Kant (Kant 2011) invented a new justification for racism. They argued that Whites were superior since they were the only ones creative in science, and Blacks were not. In support of this argument, they used the existing Crusading history of science. They made a minor change: the early Greeks were now classified as Whites, not as “friends of Christians”. In short, the Christian curse of Ham mutated to the racist “curse of Hume” and Kant, two clearly racist (Neugebauer 1990) philosophers of ethics, who anchored their ethics on a false history of the Greek origins of knowledge, which history they accepted on faith. (Incidentally, Hume made no original or creative contribution to philosophy; in

wrongly (Raju 2018a) claiming that logically deduced propositions are more certain than inductively inferred conclusions, he merely appropriated al Ghazali's thesis, of ontically broken time (Raju 2003), central to Sunni Islam, and known even to Aquinas.)

From White to Western supremacy: the Aryan race conjecture

This technique of modifying or continually inventing new adjunct fantasies, to suit the changing political circumstances, continued. When colonialism replaced slavery as the main source of Western wealth, the idea of White supremacy further mutated to the idea of Western supremacy (Raju 2022b). The reason for this was the Aryan race conjecture (Raju 2022c), or rather fantasy.

The reason to concoct that fantasy was that the first Europeans in India were shocked when they realized the numerous similarities between the ancient Sanskrit and Greek and Latin languages. Since Sanskrit is the older language, this naturally suggested the belief that the Greek and Latin languages *derived* from the Sanskrit, as Schlegel (1849) later explicitly asserted. Such speculations were fatal to Greek glorification and anathema to the British, who were trying to establish an empire, based on racist claims of their "superiority", for they suggested Greek inferiority.

By way of background contrary to the situation in the Americas, the Europeans were militarily weak (had bad guns, were poorer) in India, which had better steel since ancient times, and where rockets were known, and Mughals had brought canons, learning from Muhammad the Conqueror's 15th c. victory over fortified Constantinople (due to his better guns). But India was plunged into chaos in the 18th c., and the British had started gathering wealth, after their deceitful (Merchant 2024) win over the surviving remnants of the Moghul empire in Bengal. However, the British, like other European colonizers, well knew all they had was better lies,

not better guns, clear also from the casual way they were overthrown in the revolt of 1857. Hence, colonialism is characterized by the use of the soft power (Huntington 1997) of the church to offset European military weakness. Anyway, so much of Western “scholarship” then was about fantasizing about their White supremacy, and this fact, of the similarity of Greek and Latin with the ancient Sanskrit, was not compatible with those fantasies.

The linguist William Jones was brought by the British Viceroy Warren Hastings mainly to help the British rule India by dividing it along religious lines. Uneasy with the fact of the linguistic similarity, Jones invented a new adjunct fantasy in the tradition of Christian priests. To preserve White supremacy, he speculated (Jones 1799) that all three languages, Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit, had a common origin. This fantasy of a common origin of languages soon turned into the fantasy of a common *race* of people called Aryans.

This fantasy of a common race further grew into the White supremacist fantasy that India had earlier been conquered by a White race of Aryans who had peopled north India, driven the original inhabitants (called Dravidians) to the south of India, created the caste of Brahmins, and also created the Veda-s. How could they have done that when Greeks and Romans even lacked names for the large numbers named in the Yajurveda 17.2?

Contrary to many “scholarly” statements, these fantasies of White supremacy were first articulated and spread by the “skull pseudo scientist” Gobineau (1856) whose skull-pseudo-science based morality was translated and propagated as a major “scientific” support to defend biblically approved Black slavery in 1856 just before the American civil war.

It is common among miracle mongers and fantasizers to neglect details which would bust their claims. Another detail neglected by William Jones was that Sanskrit is also similar to Persian, not only to Greek and Latin. The similarity of Sanskrit to Persian is nothing remarkable since Persia is a geographical neighbour of ancient India which extended to Kandahar in Afghanistan. The similarity of Persian to Greek (and then Latin) is not remarkable since there WAS a real Persian conquest of early Greece (Achaemenid conquest), which lasted for centuries (Raju 2022c).

The Darius vase (Menninger 1969) from –300 CE has a tax-collector scene which shows the Persian conquerors collecting tax from the Greeks and counting it using an abacus. That is, Greeks learnt their number names (from Sanskrit via Persian) and also primitive pebble arithmetic from Persia to pay tax to their Persian conquerors. This pebble arithmetic continued to Romans, and Europe persisted in using exclusively “Roman numerals” till 10th c.

Greek and Roman pebble arithmetic

Alas, this abacus-based arithmetic was an inferior arithmetic. Thus, while the names of numbers in Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and Persian are similar, this similarity is true only for *small* numbers, for the simple reason that there are no names for large numbers in Greek and Latin!

The largest number name in Greek and Latin was the myriad, which is still regarded as connoting an uncountably large number in the English language and literature, though it is a puny 10,000. However, much larger numbers, such as a trillion (in Yajurveda 17.2), and later 10^{53} or 10^{108} are found in Indian tradition (Mitra 1877 chapter 12) from much earlier times. As such, Greek and Roman arithmetic was inferior, even in the simplest matter of counting! This Greek and Roman inferiority, even in basic (primary-school) arithmetic, obviously resulted in inferior science, a clear-cut, non-textual proof of which is the inferior and excessively unscientific (Raju 2024) Roman-Christian calendar, still in current use.

That Roman arithmetic is inferior should be obvious even to a dull mind because writing the number 1888 = MDCCCLXXXVIII in the Roman way takes 13 symbols instead of 4.

Nevertheless, the use of inferior Roman numerals persisted among White Christians of Europe and America until 1888. That number can still be found engraved on the building housing the public library in that American seat of learning at Cambridge, Mass.

How long it took Europeans to understand their inferiority even in primary-school arithmetic

However, this fact about the inferiority of Roman arithmetic took “superior” Europeans a thousand years or more just to understand! Eventually, in the 10th century, a future pope, Gerbert, realized that large numbers could not be readily written in Roman numerals and, therefore, imported “Arabic numerals” from Spain. However, his mammoth abacus, built by a shield maker, with 27 columns (Otisk 2015) and apices, was limited to *representing* large numbers, as large as 10^{27} , to break the myriad barrier which limited Greek and Roman arithmetic. Alas, he failed to understand the *efficiency* of Indian arithmetic by continuing to use the abacus tied to the whole inferior system of Greek and Roman pebble arithmetic. Other Europeans found it equally difficult to abandon the abacus, so Europeans remained mired in that paradigm of pebble arithmetic for many more centuries while they struggled to understand this imported Indian primary school arithmetic.

Eventually, three *centuries* after Gerbert, Fibonacci understood that efficient arithmetic is useful for commerce and imported it from the Muslims of Black Africa, where he obtained a copy of al Khwarizmi's book on superior Indian arithmetic. But even after Fibonacci, this imported arithmetic remained confined to Florence, and even in Florence, there were vast suspicions around 0 so that, in 1299, Florence passed a law against 0 (which we still follow in

writing the amount in cheques in words (when not using Roman numerals). Fibonacci himself totally failed to understand negative numbers which were not used in his *Liber Abaci* (Sigler 2002 chp. 4 ‘On the subtraction of smaller numbers from larger numbers’), or by his source, al Khwarizmi, and are no part of any Greek or Roman arithmetic.

Eventually after another three centuries this Indian arithmetic spread to the rest of Europe. In the late 16th century Indian arithmetic was again directly imported by Jesuits based in India and this primary school arithmetic was incorporated as part of the Jesuit syllabus by Christoph Clavius (1583) ca. 1575 (Clavius 1575). Why did the best minds in Europe need to repeatedly import even Indian primary-school arithmetic across 500 years if early Greeks really had “discovered” all early science, as Wikipedia still propagates?

In fact, this aspect of negative numbers continued to befuddle leading Western minds until the end of the 19th century. An example from the end of the 19th century is Augustus De Morgan a professor at University College London, and a prolific writer who foolishly wrote that claiming $-9 < 0$ is complete nonsense and that “belief in ...the existence of witches... is ten thousand times more probable” (de Morgan 1898, 70–71)!

This real and easily verifiable history of persistent European difficulties even with primary school arithmetic, starting from early Greek times, and persisting across two thousand years, is completely at odds with the wild fantasies of early Greek achievements in math and science. The old fantasy-preserving fantasy of Dark Age plus Renaissance was invented only to explain the absence of evidence for Greek achievements and the sudden reappearance of that evidence over a thousand years later. This adjunct fantasy does not work to explain the

above facts, which provide **counter-evidence** against any early Greek achievements in math and science, due to bad arithmetic. Europe not only repeatedly imported primary school arithmetic from India but, more importantly, failed to properly understand it for almost another thousand years. A completely new adjunct fantasy must be invented, if at all any fantasy can counter the above facts to preserve Western self-glorification!

White/Western supremacy and derivative Byzantine Greek sources

Of course, the fraudulent Crusading claim of early Greek origins, of the knowledge in Arabic libraries, was fantasy based on pure faith. there is no evidence from any early Greek primary sources of any Greek knowledge of mathematics and science. We reiterate that **there ARE no such early Greek sources**. As Fowler (2004), one of the few honest historians of early Greek mathematics, admitted:

We possess no original versions of any Greek mathematical text, and most texts survive only in the form of Byzantine minuscule copies made from the mid-ninth century AD onwards. Our principal source of the Archimedes' works is such a Byzantine copy, made in the ninth or tenth century, **but lost in the sixteenth century**, and its contents have been **reconstructed** from four surviving copies of it made between 1450 and 1564. [emphasis added]

All sorts of fraudulent tricks have been used to preserve this fantasy history of the Greek origins of scientific knowledge, such as the adjunct fantasy of the (Christian) “Dark Age” (during the Islamic golden age) plus “Renaissance”. Actually, all available sources are from Byzantine Greek times typically from the 10th c. or later.

There are two key points here. First, (a) these Byzantine Greek texts all post-date the Islamic golden age (starting from about rule of Haroun al Rashid 8th-9th c.) when Byzantium (Turkey) was a tributary of Baghdad. Numerous Arabic texts, created by the huge investment in knowledge by Baghdad, were translated into Byzantine Greek. Secondly, (b) even before the Abbasids, Sanskrit texts were being translated into Arabic and Syriac and later to Byzantine Greek. The classic example is the Panchatantra tales which were translated into Arabic and Syriac in the 7th c., and from Syriac to Byzantine Greek by Simon Seth in about 1050 (Gibbon 1996). (There was a clear Indian-Syrian connection due to the Syrian Christians in India from about the 5th c.; the later translations of the Panchatantra from Byzantine Greek into Latin and European languages came to be known as Aesop's fables.)

The immediate point is that the Crusading and racist assumption that there were no external inputs into the Arabic and later Byzantine Greek sources of math and science is blatantly false. The simple fact is that science depends upon mathematics and the most elementary mathematics of primary school arithmetic was imported from India by Baghdad in the 9th century and from there into Europe during the Crusades by the 13th century. Noticeably, Arabs imported even primary-school arithmetic from India, not Greece, which had inferior arithmetic.

The example of “Ptolemy”

Naturally, the Byzantine Greeks, who were effectively under Arabic rule during the 8th-9th c., absorbed this imported knowledge first. But we are asked to believe, contrary to commonsense, that the suddenly vanished early Greek manuscripts were preserved at great cost only for posterity and not for their practical use. Hence, we are asked to believe the absurdity that the vanished manuscript did not accrete any updated knowledge, as usual in science. E.g., the star list in “Ptolemy's” Almagest (an Arabic text corresponding to the late

Byzantine Greek Syntaxis) is headed by the *current* pole star (useful for navigation only from about the 10th c. onward), which was not the pole star in the purported time (2nd c.) of “Claudius” Ptolemy (due to the precession of the equinoxes). But, of course, someone can easily invent yet another adjunct fantasy/hypothesis why that star heads the list, like Abu Ben Adham, though that list was purportedly made at the time when that star had no practical relevance.

Racist premises of false history

While false history is used to defend racism, we have to understand that the relationship is circular: racism is used to support the creation of false history. The classic example of such racist prejudices is this quote from Newton’s biographer Florian Cajori:

A large number of astronomical and mathematical works were written by Arabic authors. Yet we fail to find a single important principle in mathematics brought forth by the Arabic mind. Whatever discoveries they made, were in fields previously traversed by the Greeks.... The Arabic mind did not possess that penetrative insight and invention by which mathematicians in Europe afterwards revolutionised the science. The Arabs were ... not original. (Cajori 1909, 116–17)

One could more easily deny any originality to the early Greeks, who copied everything from their gods to their architecture from Egyptians and Persians, and use that denial to construct a better history.

There is a subtler circular way in which racist prejudices are injected into false history. Thus, suppose there was originally a core astronomy text dating back to early Greek times. How

exactly do we know that this dating back extends only to the Greeks but not before them to the Egyptians?

This is contrary to all known facts because it is admitted that the Greeks of Athens were totally uncreative in mathematics and science. This is admitted even in Western history, which is so deeply mired in falsehoods. Therefore, all the claims of early Greek scientific achievements come from Alexandria, in Africa, which was the capital of Greek-ruled Egypt when ancient Egypt was in a state of terminal decline. What was the reason for this sudden rise in creativity?

Egyptian origin of Julian and Christian calendar

Now, considering that some Greeks (Ptolemy dynasty, until Cleopatra) were ruling Egypt, it is natural that they had access to Egyptian knowledge, as symbolised by the Great Library of Alexandria, which consisted mainly of Egyptian books, and they would have translated some books to Greek. Egyptians certainly had astronomy, and they (Raju 2014a; *A Tale of Two Calendars - Dr C K Raju - India Inspires Talks* 2015) (Sosigenes) created the Julian calendar, AFTER the Roman conquest of Greeks extended to Greek-ruled Egypt. This calendar reformed the lousy earlier Roman calendar, which was so bad it took an intercalary year of 445 days to correct it.

The early Greeks could not do it, for their own calendar was worse; so bad that “Greek calendars” were the butt of Roman jokes, as even OED tells us. The Egyptians even simplified the arithmetic so that backward Romans could understand the calendar despite their bad arithmetic. That the “Julian” calendar was Egyptian not Roman in origin is also clear from August, named after Augustus Caesar, because it took all of twenty years after Julius Caesar for Romans to correctly understand what was meant by a “leap year”.

This calendar was adopted as the Christian calendar by the first Nicene Council to determine a common date to celebrate Easter. This Roman-Christian calendar, in wide current use, is still a lousy calendar as is clear from the haphazard duration of months at 28, 29, 30, and 31 days, unconnected with any natural cycle, and the fact that its Gregorian reform used a complex system of leap years, not a precise fraction for the duration of the tropical year.

Against these facts staring at our face each day we consult the calendar, how do we know that this conjectured “core Ptolemy text” extends to only "Claudius" Ptolemy (who gets even the duration of the tropical year wrong), as Western historians now assert, and not to the earlier King Ptolemy II, as was earlier believed even by Europeans? The problem that racists had with this is clear: attributing it to the Greek king of Egypt, King Ptolemy II would make it clear that the real source of even this “core Ptolemy text” was from the knowledge of Black Egyptians rather than White Greeks, a clear proof of the inferiority of the scientific knowledge of White Greeks compared to that of Black Egyptians.

Black Athena

Hence, the only convincing answer to the above question (“Why Greeks, why not earlier Egyptians?”) is provided by Martin Bernal (1987) in his *Black Athena*. Martin Bernal's thesis is simply that after the Aryan race conjecture, Western historians denied credit to Egyptians because they were Black. Instead, all achievements of Egyptians were appropriated to White Greeks (“Aryans”), just as knowledge in Arabic libraries was earlier appropriated by falsely attributing its origin to the Greeks (Raju 2009).

As regards appropriation of Arabic knowledge to Greeks, it is best to reiterate the well-known fact that Arabs got their knowledge of even elementary arithmetic from India, NOT from

Greeks, just because Greeks were bad even at elementary arithmetic, hence Europe later learnt even primary school arithmetic from Arabs via Gerbert and Fibonacci, not from any Greek texts. How could the Greeks have done ANY science without proper arithmetic?

Sexagesimal fractions

Specifically, the most basic science of astronomy needs fractions since the duration of the year is a fraction of days. However, there is no way in early Greek (Attic) numerals or in Roman numerals to express fractions, especially a precise decimal fraction like 365.242. So how could the early Greeks have done any astronomy? Romans laughed at the Greek calendars, but the Julian reform of their own Roman calendar was possible only after the Roman conquest of Egypt. Such barbarian conquests invariably lead to flow of knowledge *towards* the barbarian conqueror. (Raju 2007 chp, 6, ‘Models of information transmission’)

Thus, if we look at the 10th-12th century book attributed to Ptolemy, we find that it uses sexagesimal fractions. Now, the fact is that sexagesimal fractions were used in Indian astronomy since Indian time-reckoning from ancient times was fully sexagesimal (Sarma 1985; Wilkinson and Sastri 1861). When Indian astronomy went to Arabs, this sexagesimal system was adopted by them. Hence, 9th century Arabic zijes are full of sexagesimal multiplication tables (which are difficult), and Ptolemy’s book hence talks about the “difficulty of multiplication”. Naturally, any later Byzantine Greek books on astronomy must have copied and updated the “core Ptolemy text” from Arabs.

However, saying this is heresy, for the West, which demands we **must** believe that early Greeks did it all, to maintain its claim of Christian/White/Western supremacy. But from where did Greeks get sexagesimal fractions? The answer usually given is “from Babylon”. Of

course, there is no *evidence* of any such transmission from Babylon (Iraq); it is all a matter of faith, and of adjunct fantasies to bolster faith. However, the sexagesimal system is a place-value system, and we saw above how Europeans took 5 centuries to understand even the easier decimal place-value system, and the difficulties the Arabs had with sexagesimals. Where is the sign of any such struggle in early Greece? In other words, the “Ptolemy” astronomy text is a late and accretive 10th c. text which reflects the input of sexagesimal arithmetic from India via Arabs into Byzantine Greek texts just to represent fractions needed for astronomy.

The example of Archimedes

Ptolemy is hardly the only example. Archimedes is known for his 10th c. or later work on the sphere and the cylinder (Heath 1996). But the volume of the cylinder was well known to Egyptians (Clagett 1999, RMP, problem 41 et seq.) as was the area of a circle. The volume of the sphere was known to Indians such as the 5th c. Aryabhata, (*Āryabhaṭa* 1976) except that he used the earlier simpler value of $\pi = 3.16 (= \sqrt{10})$, instead of his own value of π accurate to 6 decimal places. The correct formula for the volume of a sphere was first stated by the 8th-9th Shridhara (Shridhar (श्रीधर) 2004, *Trishatika* 56). Well before the actual dates of Byzantine Greek sources, Indian mathematics was flowing to Arabs and through them into Byzantine Greek texts.

I will not dwell on some of the detractors of Bernal, such as Lefkowitz, who asserts “Archimedes” did something “superior” to Egyptians, then goes on to hilariously assert (Lefkowitz 1996, 153) that “Archimedes determined that the **volume** of the cylinder was 3/2 the **area** of the sphere” (emphasis added). She is convinced about the superiority of “Archimedes”

though she does not know the primary school arithmetic that areas and volumes can't be compared. This is the height of credulous faith in White supremacy!

Interim summary

To reiterate, this Crusading “doctrine of discovery of knowledge”, that almost all early scientific knowledge was “discovered” by early Greeks (“the friends of Christians”), a doctrine for which there is zero evidence from early Greek sources, was first formulated to claim ownership of the knowledge available in Arabic libraries, and to claim that it was theologically correct. That appropriated knowledge was the foundation of the Western higher education system and its earliest universities set up by the church during the Crusades. That knowledge came from diverse sources; for example, Arabic knowledge of basic arithmetic (without which science is impossible) unquestionably came from India.

False history in precolonial and colonial times

This false history of science continued with a view to claim ownership of all knowledge generated even *after* the Crusades. That is, there was a doctrine of Christian discovery of all post-Crusade scientific knowledge.

More precisely the Crusading model of false history was followed first by the Inquisitional and then the discovery models (Raju 2022b) of false history of science. The purported Copernican revolution is an example of the Inquisitional model of false history. The Christian priest Copernicus copied from Ibn Shatir of the Maragheh school (Swerdlow and Neugebauer 1984). For fear of being branded a heretic and tortured by the Inquisition, like his friend Scultetus (Raju 2009), Copernicus hid his source: a Greek translation of Ibn Shatir's work he found in the Vatican library which he translated to Latin, and published only when he was on his death bed.

Likewise, the Christian discovery model of false history was very strong in later pre-colonial and colonial times.

Newton and the “discovery” of calculus

For reasons of space and complexity. We will give only one example here. Given the undeniable fact that Europeans were struggling with primary school arithmetic until the 16th century, how could Newton have invented calculus by the 17th century? Obviously, the story that Newton or Leibniz “discovered” calculus is false.

Calculus was stolen from India (Raju 2007). There is proof beyond reasonable doubt of theft of calculus on the standards of criminal law (Raju 2001): establishing opportunity, motivation, circumstantial and documentary evidence. All that Europeans did was to claim false credit for its “discovery”, and to morally justify this theft on the doctrine of Christian discovery (Raju 2020a) that all knowledge belongs to the first Christian to spot it. In a quarter century, there has been no intellectual response from the West to an iota of the evidence, only the stock church response of lying and attacking the person as the universal way to handle all heresies without knowledge or engagement.

Newton’s quarrel with Leibniz over priority for “discovery” of calculus was only about who was the first *Christian* discoverer of calculus. Indian works on calculus had been circulating in Europe since the time of Tycho Brahe, astronomer Royal to the Holy Roman Empire hence a recipient of Indian astronomy texts brought by Jesuits from India. Tycho’s planetary model is a carbon copy of Nilakantha’s Indian planetary model, and is very slightly different from the heliocentric model favoured by his assistant Johannes Kepler, from almost a century before Newton. Newton was well aware (Newton 1714) of the works of Cavalieri (Galileo's student, who had access to the Jesuit archives in the Vatican) and others. He was also aware

that Leibniz had access to these works translated and brought from India which were circulated first among Roman Catholics like Fermat and Pascal, then to Galileo and his student Cavalieri before they leaked to Protestants.

Newton called Leibniz “the second discoverer” in the sense of Christian discovery of knowledge. But the argument he used is interesting: that Leibniz had difficulty in understanding the infinite series of the Indian calculus (today named after him) and sought help. On the same argument (epistemic test) Newton failed to understand the calculus hence could not have created it. Newton never actually claimed to have invented the calculus but claimed only to have given it rigor. He claimed only the “discovery” of the Indian infinite sine series, (Raju 2016a) known from at least two centuries before him just as Leibniz claimed the Indian infinite series for π .

Describing Newton’s theft of calculus as its “discovery” is of course an absurd historical claim, but the West will doggedly stick to its lies and absurdities, irrespective of the evidence, since these lies are a source of great power. In 25 years, the West could produce no intellectual response to the evidence of calculus theft, and has just attacked my person to regard the heresy as settled, using the method of preserving lies the church taught it.

The final proof of calculus theft is Newton’s failure to fully understand the calculus (Raju 2020b). Newton's hopelessly confused fluxions were unacceptable to most Europeans whether it was Bishop Berkeley or Karl Marx. Eventually Dedekind (1963) in 1870 replaced confused fluxions with his theory of real numbers and limits, which is the current orthodoxy, but still pretty useless for any practical applications mostly done on computers today. Hence, California recently cancelled the calculus (Raju 2021b; 2021c).

We will not go further into this technical matter here but refer to the literature and the recent summary of calculus theft by the West and its current lack of understanding in the West, as described in this extended presentation at a mathematics conference in Australia.⁷

White supremacy and the philosophy of math

This brings us to the deeper and unsuspected point that the false and racist history of math is protected by tying it to a bad philosophy of math (Raju 2018c; 2017; 2016b).

Ever since the Crusades the West told glorious false tales of “Euclid” (Raju 2012; 2022a; 2011a). Indeed, because of these false stories and because of the church hegemony over the Western mind, during the Crusades, Inquisition, and “age of discovery”, Crusading church dogmas (of reason) have infiltrated the very philosophy of (axiomatic) Western ethnomathematics (Raju 2006; 2011b; 2023), globalised by colonialism.

Thus, not only is there no evidence for “Euclid” (Raju 2012), but there are no axiomatic proofs in the “Euclid” book (Raju 2022a). Verifying this last statement is a simple matter of opening the book and reading it. The very first proposition in the book lacks an axiomatic proof as does the last. However, Western historians doggedly cling to the falsehood of axiomatic proofs in the “Euclid” book by inventing adjunct fantasies. The rather odd adjunct fantasy that has been invented is that (the non-existent) Euclid *intended* to give axiomatic proofs, but failed to do so. How on earth can one verify the intentions of a non-existent person?

But openly admitting the absence of axiomatic proofs in the Euclid book would leave the West with egg all over its face, that for almost 750 years, no European carefully read even the first proposition in the book, though it was a prescribed text.

Crusading theology and the origin of axiomatic reasoning

However, there is a deeper reason here to cling to the falsehood “Euclid invented axiomatic proofs”. During the Crusades the church invented the Christian theology of reason to compete with the Islamic theology of reason (aql-i-kalam).

However, ruling Christian priests wanted full control over this Christian theology (or god-knowledge) so they could tell people what to do, claiming it was what god wanted. To this end, they banned the empirical or use of facts in reasoning, and claimed this ban on the empirical made reasoning “superior”. This prohibition of the empirical also characterizes the dogma of axiomatic proofs in present-day math claiming to make math “superior”. By this trick of prohibiting the empirical, the conclusions were made to depend purely on the axioms, which axioms were laid down solely on authority. For example, Aquinas (Aquinas, n.d.) laid down on authority that angels occupy no space and thereby concluded that several angels can fit on the head of a pin.

However, to hide the fact that the Crusading church had invented and promoted this method of reasoning MINUS the empirical, to suit its politics, the fantasy was erected that the “Euclid” book *had* such axiomatic proofs, when in actual fact, it has none, as summarised in this recent talk.⁸ To the contrary, as commonsense suggests, that book is instead linked to religious Egyptian mystery geometry of mathesis (Raju 2006; 2012) practised by early Greeks and unethically made public by Plato (Plato, n.d.-a; n.d.-c).

Exactly the same trick of prohibiting the empirical enables Western mathematicians today to control mathematical knowledge, or mathematical theorems or conclusions, through their control of the axioms of mathematics. Ownership is ultimately about control. By controlling mathematical knowledge, the West can also control certain aspects of science that are critical to the church, and empirically irrefutable, such as Stephen Hawking's creationism (Raju 2021a).

“Superior” axiomatic math: adds difficulty subtracts practical value

A further political advantage for the West is the following. The axiomatic method makes the simplest mathematics very difficult (Bertrand Russell needed 378 pages (Whitehead and Russell 1927 p. 378) to prove $1+1=2$, since the empirical way of showing that one orange and one orange make two oranges) is prohibited). Because of these difficulties, many people today are as terrified of mathematics as Europeans once were of eternal damnation. The political advantage is that this artificial difficulty added to mathematics has made mathematical illiteracy widespread, so the vast mass of common people is forced to blindly trust mathematical authority. That is, people are forced to trust the West on the Wikipedia norm. And Western and colonised mathematicians have pinned their faith in the fantasy of the Crusading church, based on a deliberate misreading of its chief ideological opponent al Ghazali, that the axiomatic method makes the conclusions (mathematical theorems) infallible (Raju 2018b).

At this time when the world again seems headed towards a nuclear war, it is interesting to recall the “Sputnik crisis” of 1957. This fear of Soviet Union among Americans triggered a huge educational reform to “modernize” education with a view to send a man to the moon. In mathematics, the basic thrust of this “reform”, led by the School Mathematics Study Group (MSG), was to promote the axiomatic method as a “superior” way to do math. Its report on

Geometry (School Mathematics Study Group 1961) is particularly interesting. Mathematicians have, of course, known since the 20th c. that there are no axiomatic proofs in the “Euclid” book. Hence, David Hilbert, in 1899, rewrote (Hilbert 1950) the book to provide the axiomatic proofs missing in it. Sadly, Hilbert’s marvellous adjunct fantasy did not fit the original “Euclid” book: for example, the original book is full of diagrams which, on the principles of mystery geometry and according to Plato (Plato, n.d.-b), arouse the soul, but which have no place in axiomatic proof (Russell 1902).

Hence, the SMSG recommended the use of Birkhoff’s (1932) axioms which use real numbers as in the present-day Western misunderstanding of calculus. However, real numbers involve a metaphysics of infinity tied to church dogmas of eternity (Raju 2015a); they add difficulty to mathematics but no practical value to the task of sending a man to the moon. The easiest way to understand this is that NASA (or any other space agency) uses computers to calculate rocket trajectories, and computers do not and cannot use real numbers, but use floating point numbers instead for which even the associative law for addition fails (Raju 2001).⁹

This bad recommendation by SMSG, now being followed across the world even in China, arose from confounding three different types of mathematics—normal math, mystery (religious) math, and formal math—under a single label of “mathematics”. The normal and practical mathematics needed to send a man to the moon is simply not the “superior” mathematics of “Euclid” or its axiomatic reinterpretation by Birkhoff.

Conclusion

To successfully eradicate the evil assertions of White supremacy, these aspects, which support it by anchoring it in an essential part of the current education system, too, must be

dismantled. However, the trick of mixing up racism with history (the “curse of Hume and Kant” or the “doctrine of Christian discovery of knowledge”) on the one hand, and with the philosophy of mathematics (a compulsory subject) on the other has made racism very hard to dismantle.

Works cited

- A. Roberts & J. Donaldson, ed. 1980. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. 1. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- A Tale of Two Calendars - Dr C K Raju - India Inspires Talks*. 2015. New Delhi.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MvpuC7Dg4e0&feature=youtu.be>.
- Aquinas, Thomas. n.d. *Summa Theologica*. <http://www.newadvent.org/summa/1052.htm#article3>.
- Āryabhaṭa. 1976. *Āryabhaṭīya of Āryabhaṭa*. Edited by K. S. Shukla and K. V. Sarma. Delhi: Indian National Science Academy.
- Bernal, Martin. 1987. *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*. Vol. 1: The fabrication of ancient Greece 1785-1985. London: Free Association Books.
- Birkhoff, George D. 1932. 'A Set of Postulates for Plane Geometry, Based on Scale and Protractor'. *Annals of Mathematics* 33:329–45.
- Cajori, Florian. 1909. *A History of Mathematics*. London: Macmillan.
- Clagett, M. 1999. *Ancient Egyptian Science: A Source Book, Vol. 3 Ancient Egyptian Mathematics*. American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.
- Clavius, Christoph. 1575. *A Method of Promoting Mathematical Studies in the Schools of the Society*. See, Philips, E. C. 1941. 'The Proposals of Father Christopher Clavius, SJ, for Improving the Teaching of Mathematics'. *Bull. Amer. Assoc. Jesuit Scientists (Eastern Section)* 18 (4): 203–6.
- . 1583. *Arithmeticae Practicae [Practical Arithmetic]*. Rome: Dominici Basae.
- Dante Alighieri, trans. Charles S. Singleton. 1996. *Divine Comedy: Inferno*. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Chicago.

Dedekind, Richard. 1963. *Essays on the Theory of Numbers*. New York: Dover Publications.

<https://archive.org/details/essaysontheoryof0000dede>.

Fowler, D.H. 2004. ‘Logistic and Fractions in Early Greek Mathematics’”. In *Classics in the History of Greek Mathematics*, edited by Jean Christianidis, 367–80, 373. Boston Studies in the Philosophy and History of Science. Springer.

Gibbon, Edward. 1996. ‘The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire’. In *Great Books of the Western World*, 1:460, 562–64. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica.

Gobineau, A. De. 1856. *The Moral And Intellectual Diversity Of Races With Particular Reference To Their Respective Influence In The Civil And Political History Of Mankind*. Translated by H. Hotz. Philadelphia: B. Lippincott & Co.

Heath, T.L., trans. 1996. *On the Sphere and the Cylinder in The Works of Archimedes*. Vol. 10. Great Books of the Western World. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica.

Hilbert, David. 1950. *The Foundations of Geometry*. The Open Court Publishing Co., La Salle. <http://ckraju.net/geometry/Hilbert-Foundations-of-Geometry.pdf>.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1997. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. Viking, New Delhi.

Jones, W. 1799. ‘The Third Anniversary Discourse, Delivered 2d February, 1786: On the Hindus’”. In *The Works of Sir William Jones*, 1:19–34. London: G. G. and J. Robinson.

- Kant, Immanuel. 2011. *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and the Sublime and Other Writings*. Edited by P. Frierson and P. Guyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lefkowitz, Mary. 1996. *Not out of Africa*. New York: Basic Books.
- Merchant, Minhaz. 2024. 'Bribery and Betrayal'. Open The Magazine. 30 August 2024. <https://openthemagazine.com/columns/bribery-and-betrayal/>.
- Menninger, Karl. 1969. *Number Words and Number Symbols a Cultural History of Numbers*. Cambridge Mass: M.I.T. Press.
- Mitra, Rajendralal, ed. 1877. *The Lalita Vistara (ललित विस्तरः सुत)*. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- Morgan, Augustus de. 1898. *On the Study and Difficulties of Mathematics*. New Ed. Chicago: Open Court Pub.
- Neugebauer, C. 1990. 'The Racism of Kant and Hegel.' In *Indigenous Thinkers and Modern Debate on African Philosophy*, edited by H. Odera Oruka, 259–72. Leiden: Brill.
- Newton, Isaac. 1714. 'An Account of the Book Entituled *Commercium Epistolicum Collinii Et Aliorum, de Analysi Promota*'. *Philosophical Transaction of the Royal Society of London*, no. 342 (February), 173–224.
- Otisk, Marek. 2015. 'Descriptions and Images of the Early Medieval Latin Abacus'. *Średniowiecze Polskie i Powszechnie* 11:13–35.
- Plato. n.d.-a. *Meno*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Accessed 28 February 2021. <http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/meno.html>.

- . n.d.-b. *Phaedo*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Accessed 28 February 2021.
<http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/phaedo.html>.
- . n.d.-c. *The Republic, Book VII*. Translated by B. Jowett. Accessed 23 May 2021.
<http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/republic.8.vii.html>.
- Priest, Josiah. 1851. *Bible Defence of Slavery: To Which Is Added a Faithful Exposition of That System of Pseudo Philanthropy, Or Fanaticism, Modern Abolitionism ... and Proposing a Plan of National Colonization*. W.S. Brown.
- Raju, C. K. 2001. ‘Computers, Mathematics Education, and the Alternative Epistemology of the Calculus in the YuktiBhâsâ’’. *Philosophy East and West* 51 (3): 325–62.
<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/26555/pdf>.
- . 2003. *The Eleven Pictures of Time: The Physics, Philosophy and Politics of Time Beliefs*. Sage.
- . 2006. ‘The Religious Roots of Mathematics’. *Theory, Culture & Society* 23 (March):95–97.
- . 2007. *Cultural Foundations of Mathematics: The Nature of Mathematical Proof and the Transmission of the Calculus from India to Europe in the 16th c. CE*. Pearson Longman.
- . 2009. *Is Science Western in Origin?* Dissenting Knowledges Pamphlet Series. Multi-
 versity.
- . 2011a. ‘Decolonising History: Goodbye Euclid!’ Universiti Sains Malaysia, July 22.
<http://ckraju.net/blog/?p=63>.

- . 2011b. ‘Teaching Mathematics with a Different Philosophy. 1: Formal Mathematics as Biased Metaphysics’. *Science and Culture* 77 (7–8): 274–79.
- . 2012. *Euclid and Jesus: How and Why the Church Changed Mathematics and Christianity across Two Religious Wars*. Penang: Multiversity and Citizens International.
- . 2013. ‘The Harmony Principle’. *Philosophy East and West* 63 (4): 586–604.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/43285858>.
- . 2014a. ‘A Tale of Two Calendars’. In *Multicultural Knowledge and the University*, edited by Claude Alvares, 112–19. Penang: Multiversity. <http://ckraju.net/papers/ckr-calendar.html>.
- . 2014b. ‘The Harmony Principle’. In *Samvād and Svarāj*, edited by Shail Mayaram, 232–50. Sage.
- . 2015a. ‘Eternity and Infinity: The Western Misunderstanding of Indian Mathematics and Its Consequences for Science Today’. *American Philosophical Association Newsletter on Asian and Asian American Philosophers and Philosophies* 14 (2): 27–33.
- . 2015b. ‘The Meaning of Christian “Discovery”’. *Frontier Weekly*, January 2015.
- . 2016a. ‘Calculus’. In *Encyclopedia of Non-Western Science, Technology and Medicine*, 1010–15. Springer. <http://ckraju.net/papers/Springer/ckr-Springer-encyclopedia-calculus-1-final.pdf>.
- . 2016b. ‘To Decolonise Maths, Stand up to Its False History and Bad Philosophy’. *The Wire*, 2016. <https://thewire.in/75896/to-decolonise-maths-stand-up-to-its-false-history/>.

- . 2017. ‘Black Thoughts Matter: Decolonized Math, Academic Censorship, and the “Pythagorean” Proposition’. *Journal of Black Studies* 48 (3): 256–78.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0021934716688311>.
- . 2018a. ‘Decolonising Mathematics’. *AlterNation* 25 (2): 12–43b.
<https://doi.org/10.29086/2519-5476/2018/v25n2a2>
- . 2018b. ‘Decolonising Mathematics’. *AlterNation* 25 (2): 12–43b.
<https://doi.org/10.29086/2519-5476/2018/v25n2a2>.
- . 2018c. ‘To Decolonise Math Stand up to Its False History and Bad Philosophy’. In *Rhodes Must Fall: The Struggle to Decolonise the Racist Heart of Empire*, 265–70. London: Zed Books.
- . 2019. ‘How to Break the Hegemony Perpetuated by the University: Decolonised Courses in Mathematics and the History and Philosophy of Science’. *Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences* 26 (2): 86–109.
- . 2020a. ‘Marx and Mathematics. 2: “Discovery” of Calculus’. *Frontier Weekly*, 31 August 2020. <https://www.frontierweekly.com/views/aug-20/31-8-20-Marx%20and%20mathematics-2.html>.
- . 2020b. ‘Marx and Mathematics. 4: The Epistemic Test’. *Frontier Weekly*, 8 September 2020. <https://www.frontierweekly.com/views/sep-20/8-9-20-Marx%20and%20mathematics-4.html>.
- . 2021a. ‘A Singular Nobel?’ *Mainstream* 59 (7). <http://www.mainstream-weekly.net/article10406.html>.

- . 2021b. ‘California, Indian Calculus and the Technology Race. 1: The Indian Origin of Calculus and Its Transmission to Europe’. *Boloji.Com*, 11 December 2021. <https://www.boloji.com/articles/52924/california-indian-calculus>.
- . 2021c. ‘California, Indian Calculus and the Technology Race. 2: Don’t Cancel the Calculus, Make It Easy!’ *Boloji.Com*, 24 December 2021. <https://www.boloji.com/articles/52950/california-indian-calculus-and>.
- . 2022a. “‘Euclid’ Must Fall: The ‘Pythagorean’ ‘Theorem’ and the Rant of Racist and Civilizational Superiority - Part 2’”. *Arumaruka: Journal of Conversational Thinking* 1 (2): 57–105. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ajct.v1i2.5>.
- . 2022b. “‘Euclid’ Must Fall: The ‘Pythagorean’ ‘Theorem’ and the Rant of Racist and Civilizational Superiority — Part 1’”. *Arumaruka: Journal of Conversational Thinking* 1 (1): 127–56. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ajct.v1i1.6>.
- . 2022c. *Refutation of the Aryan Race Conjecture: The Arithmetic Evidence and Conquest-of-Greeks Theory*. Delhi: Kant Academic Publishers.
- . 2023. ‘Practical Ganita vs Religious Mathematics’. *Medium* (blog). 5 September 2023. https://medium.com/@c_k_raj/practical-ganita-vs-religious-mathematics-d908efc0f69f.
- . 2024. *Indian Calendar: Scientific Aspects*. Delhi: Kant Academic Publishers. <https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=ul0jEQAAQBAJ>.
- Russell, B. 1902. ‘The Teaching of Euclid’. *The Mathematical Gazette* 2 (33): 165–67.
- Sarma, K. V., ed. 1985. *Vedanga Jyotisa of Lagadh*. Translated by Notes T. S. Kupanna Sastri. New Delhi: INSA.

Schlegel, Frederick Von. 1849. *The Aesthetic and Miscellaneous Works of Frederick Von Schlegel*. 'On the Language and the Wisdom of the Indians'. Translated by E.J. Millington. London: Henry G. Bohn.

School Mathematics Study Group. 1961. *Geometry*. Yale University Press.

Shridhar (श्रीधर). 2004. त्रिशतिका. Edited by वेंकट कुटुंबशास्त्री. Translated by सद्यम्न आचार्य.
New Delhi: राष्ट्रीय संस्कृत संस्थान.

Sigler, L.E. 2002. *Fibonacci's Liber Abaci a Translation into Modern English of Leonardo Pisano's Book of Calculation*. New York NY: Springer.

Sverdlow, N.M., and O. Neugebauer. 1984. *Mathematical Astronomy in Copernicus's De Revolutionibus*. Vol. 1. New York: Springer.

Toynbee, Arnold. 1957. *A Study of History*. Oxford University Press.

Westfall, Richard S. 1983. *Never at Rest: A Biography of Isaac Newton*. Cambridge University Press.

White, Andrew D. 1897. *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*, D. Appleton and Co.

Whitehead, A. N., and B. Russell. 1927. *Principia Mathematica*. Cambridge University Press.

Wilkinson, L., and Bapudev Sastri, trans. 1861. *Surya Siddhant and the Siddhanta Siromani of Bhaskar II*. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.

Notes

- 1 <https://doctrineofdiscovery.org/inter-caetera/>.
- 2 <https://doctrineofdiscovery.org/the-bull-romanus-pontifex-nicholas-v/>.
- 3 “Pope disowns doctrine of discovery”, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=34aF4-rOamQ>.
- 4 “Discovery of India”, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EI4lPuAibKw>.
- 5 Justin Martyr, *First Apology*, chp. 21, “Analogies to the History of Christ”, <http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/justinmartyr-firstapology.html>.
- 6 See appendix on Origen at <http://ckraju.net/papers/Appendix-on-Origen.pdf>
- 7 <https://x.com/CKRaju14/status/1802818490015027609>. Direct link to full presentation: <http://ckraju.net/papers/presentations/ckr-australia-calculus-talk.html>, short abstract: <http://ckraju.net/papers/Australia-prcm-abstract-short.pdf>, full abstract: <http://ckraju.net/papers/Australia%20prcm%20abstract.pdf>.
- 8 <https://x.com/CKRaju14/status/1803958940876837118>, for all links. Abstract: <http://ckraju.net/papers/abstract-2-prcm-australia.pdf>, presentation: <http://ckraju.net/papers/presentations/australia-talk-2.html>.
- 9 See also this short video of a computer program demonstrating the failure of the associative law: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3sRqdxBemTM>.