

# After 45 years of mass unemployment: If Holland had been just a bit nicer and more competent

Thomas Colignatus, June 4 2014  
<http://thomascool.eu>, <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com>  
Thomas Colignatus is the name in science of Thomas Cool  
Econometrician (Groningen 1982) and teacher of mathematics (Leiden 2008)  
Scheveningen, Holland

## Summary

The author presents some scientific innovations that meet with unwarranted opposition or neglect by fellow scientists. Local conditions in Holland are relevant since those affect direct communication. Discussion of this case might inspire an overall improvement in politeness and competence. A key insight for readers: it is advisable to ask questions first.

Consider the problem first in abstract manner and then concretely. (1) Abstractly: In the advancement of science it happens that researcher *A* has a new idea and tells researcher *B* about it. Since *B* did not launch the idea, and need not quite know what it entails, it is *B*'s role to ask questions first. Asking questions is not only polite and nice but basically part of scientific competence. The answers to those questions might cause *A* to retract the idea or *B* to accept it. It might be that *B* has been working on the same issue and feels that it isn't necessary to ask questions. Still, it is useful to verify common grounds. The proper attitude in science thus is to first ask questions, in particular when you do not understand something. When *B* quickly rejects a new idea as silly, then science gets stuck in the situation that *A* has developed a new idea and *B* has developed a vested interest in calling it silly. The situation would be worse when there wouldn't be a level playing field when *A* is a junior researcher and *B* a senior researcher. The idea gets blocked if the fast rejection by *B* is the standard attitude, or when other person *C* refers to *B* as the main source, with possible misrepresentation as to what the idea actually is. (2) Concretely: The author reports about his experience in doing science in Holland. Holland has the reputation of being tolerant and open-minded but it is better to look at some facts about the country. In the author's experience researchers in Holland may forget to ask questions and instead jump to rejection when findings contradict some strong convention or deeply held conviction. The maltreatment and scientific incompetence within the Dutch research community means that scientific results get blocked. If Holland had been just a bit nicer and more competent, then those results could have spread easier and the world could have been different. A key issue is the censorship of economic science since 1990 at the Dutch Central Planning Bureau (CPB). The author advises the world to boycott Holland till the censorship of his scientific work at the CPB is lifted.

Introduction .....	2
A problematic structure of scientific research .....	3
What will Europe do with Bernard Connolly ? .....	4
There was already censorship in 1990 before Connolly 1995.....	4
My experience presented as a case study.....	5
When there is a taboo: not reading or not asking questions.....	6
The Dutch mental disease .....	7
Logic, Liar paradox and Gödel's theorems .....	8
Economic Supreme Court and solution approach to unemployment .....	10
Economic science at the scientific bureau of the Dutch labour party .....	11
Voting theory and Arrow's Impossibility Theorem.....	12
The economics of ecological survival .....	13
Mathematics education .....	13
The simple mathematics of Jesus.....	15
Conclusion .....	16

## Introduction

Below I will summarize some scientific innovations that meet with unwarranted opposition or neglect by fellow scientists. I will present the innovations in chronological order from 1980 to 2014 so that the reader can put developments into perspective. Since 1980 there has been a steady accumulation, hopefully leading to a breakthrough of common disgust.

There is a obvious distinction between "*rejection because of being junk*" (also new junk) and "*rejection because of being new*" (not junk). The discussion below runs the risk of being ungrateful to the scholars who have actually looked at my results in the past and possibly found them wanting. However, I have been responsive to valid criticism, have been documenting what has been happening and my observations can be checked. For example, my book webpages may have "reading notes" that mention errors, omissions and addenda.

Local conditions in The Netherlands, henceforth Holland, affect direct communication. Holland has a reputation of being tolerant and open-minded. This needs correction.

An example is the case of lector dr. Willem Frederik Hermans (1921-1995), physical-geographer at the University of Groningen.<sup>1</sup> He was slandered around 1972, cleared by an investigation but the slanderers were not punished, and Hermans quit his job and moved to Paris. He also was an already famous novelist, and the slander likely had been caused by jealousy. A point is that Groningen is also the province where a lot of the Dutch natural gas is mined. A child can understand that such mining will tend to cause a lowering of the local earth surface. Groningen now is hit by ever more frequent and stronger earthquakes.<sup>2</sup> It stands to reason that when WFH had remained in Groningen, he *might* have warned about the dangers of such mining, and he could have done so eloquently. Groningen thus maltreated WFH and suffers the consequences but they haven't corrected either yet.<sup>3</sup> Another example of slander in Dutch society concerns prof. dr. Pim Fortuyn who was murdered in 2002. A paper of mine warned on the Dutch situation in May 2004 but Theo van Gogh was murdered in November 2004.<sup>4</sup> Extremist politician Geert Wilders has now only some 10-17% of the votes but is much more present in public debate, while other parties have shifted into his (intolerant) direction to win back votes. If there occurs another terrorist attack in Holland then Wilders can claim to have warned and will be high in the polls again, though the policy stance by Wilders actually furthers social division. Instead, my advice on tackling unemployment would greatly reduce social tensions.

Discussion of my experience in science might inspire an overall improvement in politeness and competence. A key insight for readers may be: *it is advisable to ask questions first*.

When you have read this paper, the point to check is whether you will support the boycott of Holland till the censorship of science there is solved. You could also start reading the books ALOE, VTFD, EWS, COTP and DRGTPE (see below), of which the PDFs are on my website, and you could post your review on your website. Those books have the entry level of first year students and work up to the innovations (while those entry levels are required to show where the innovations apply).

Let me first present a general setting and then look at what this paper will try to do. My apologies for some repetition, but this rather derives from the complexity of the issues.

First of all, though, let me point to the distinction between *protesting* and *name-calling*:

A protest is targetted at activating a resolution mechanism.

An example is the outrage by Paul Krugman in 1992 when he saw his scientific ideas abused:

<sup>1</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Willem\\_Frederik\\_Hermans](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Willem_Frederik_Hermans)

<sup>2</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Groningen\\_gas\\_field](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Groningen_gas_field)

<sup>3</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Literature/ZP/Index.html>

<sup>4</sup> <http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/wpawuwpgt/0405001.htm>

"Any satisfaction in seeing his work informing the policy debate was replaced by outrage at the appropriation of his ideas by these "policy entrepreneurs" (whom he has described as "intellectually dishonest self-proclaimed experts who tell politicians what they want to hear")." <sup>5</sup> It appears that a Google on "sheer intellectual outrage" nowadays generates a Dutch reference from 1996 <sup>6</sup> and my own reference in DRGTPE, <sup>7</sup> but the above from the IMF 2006 is okay too. Krugman had the advantage of not being neglected so that he had a position to protest from, but the outrage from neglect is as serious.

One might hold that protests aren't so effective since they are quickly misunderstood and generate epicycles of noise. This indeed is a risk.

However, let science create ways that reduce the reasons for protesting and also ways that allow for protest such that it can be effective and isn't quickly misunderstood.

Do not think that the problem cannot be tackled, see for example my advice for an *Economic Supreme Court* (ESC) per country. <sup>8</sup> The US has an Office of Research Integrity. <sup>9</sup> Government advice however has a different position. The Dutch KNAW is blissfully absent here. <sup>10</sup>

### ***A problematic structure of scientific research***

Science has both the academia and the research institutes, and *the gaps inbetween*:

- The academia rely on conferences and peer-reviewed journals, that often depend upon the commercial publishing industry.
- The research institutes have tighter forms of quality control and allow working papers and books under the responsibility of the individual author.

The departments within these realms are islands. Scientists should find bridges across the gaps, otherwise ideas may be blocked or fall into those gaps.

One bridge for example is instant-peer-review when a researcher discusses a result by others, like nowadays happens on the internet. The proper attitude would be to let the findings speak for themselves. My hope is that other scientists start peer-reviewing my work by discussing it as it is, without the impediments by the journals.

The publishing industry allows for books by individual authors, and the publisher may organise a board of editors from various realms. When those editors rely on material that has been published in peer-reviewed journals first, then this essentially rehashes old material, though of course the new form of presentation can enhance the transfer of ideas while authors may introduce some new elements. <sup>11</sup> It remains important that self-published works can be used to present new findings.

Beware of the term "peer-review". A small group of editors and referees cannot judge upon what the general readership will think. Such small-scale "peer-review" should only remove basic misunderstandings. New findings should be published anyway so that a larger group can look at it too.

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2006/06/people.htm>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.volkskrant.nl/vk/nl/2680/Economie/archief/article/detail/442555/1996/10/19/PAUL-KRUGMAN-Kruisvaarder-tegen-kletseconomen.dhtml>

<sup>7</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Index.html>

<sup>8</sup> <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/about/>

<sup>9</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United\\_States\\_Office\\_of\\_Research\\_Integrity](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Office_of_Research_Integrity)

<sup>10</sup> <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2012/03/08/robbert-dijkgraaf-as-darth-vader/>

<sup>11</sup> An example might be that J.M. Keynes in the *Manchester Guardian* was on the Gold Standard but when bundling his ideas in the *Tract on Monetary Reform* advised to abolish it.

If a writer adheres to basic norms, the marginal value of a peer-review process at a journal or book publisher can be negligible. But such a process can also block results when the editors and referees are locked in some paradigm.

### ***What will Europe do with Bernard Connolly ?***

Bernard Connolly is an economist who worked at the European Commission and who warned in 1995 about the European Exchange Rate Mechanism (ERM) and the creation of the euro. He was dismissed with untruths. The European Court sustained the dismissal in a show of incompetence and hate of free speech.<sup>12</sup>

Of course, economic theory already supported Connolly in 1995. The economic crisis and the role of the euro since 2007 show empirically that European monetary arrangements indeed had a lot to worry about. The price of not-respecting science is huge.

Will the 50% unemployed Spanish youth have learned that lesson ?

What will the freedom loving peoples of Europe do with Bernard Connolly ? Will they accept a European Commission and bureaucracy that has shown willful deceit and abuse of power ?

### ***There was already censorship in 1990 before Connolly 1995***

One argument is that Connolly was a mere official and thus had limited rights of speech. Well, my appointment at the Dutch Central Planning Bureau in 1982-1991 was that of economic scientist. My work got censored in 1990 and I was dismissed in 1991 with untruths, while the Dutch court allowed this in a show of incompetence and hate of free speech.<sup>13</sup>

The Dutch court took guidance in the official government position provided by the directorate of the CPB itself. Assuming that the Dutch government doesn't cheat, the court did not investigate the case. An employee of the Dutch government has no right on an investigation.

The current economic crisis since 2007 confirms my analysis but the directorate of the CPB does not look into that evidence either. The Dutch minister of Finance Jeroen Dijsselbloem, who now takes the chair of the Eurozone, should be interested in the analysis on unemployment but is badly served by his CPB.

Note that it is not so helpful to suggest that I could send papers to peer-refereed journals. This procedure would not solve the censorship at the Dutch Central Planning Bureau. It is better that this censorship is lifted so that I can start sending papers from that position (if needed).

A distinction is that Connolly was well-known at that time and that his case concerns political manipulation in the context of established economic ideas, while I was and have been rather unknown and present new findings.

What will the freedom loving peoples of Europe do with me ? Will they regard Holland as the land of liberty and open-mindedness ? Or will they learn to respect science ?

Will the freedom loving peoples of Europe regard Geert Wilders with his "Party for Freedom" as confirmation of Dutch tolerance: even tolerance for those who restrict freedom (say of religion, or see the Wilders dissidents evicted from his party) ? Or will they regard this "Party for Freedom" as Orwellian New-Speak that exposes Dutch conformism and closed-mindedness ?<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bernard\\_Connolly](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bernard_Connolly)

<sup>13</sup> <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/about/>

<sup>14</sup> <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2014/05/30/tony-blair-2014-is-geert-wilders-2001/>

The beautified reputation of Holland works against science. Both in Holland and internationally. The facts about Holland are not so positive. Perhaps Holland is better than other countries in some respects, but the country doesn't meet some minimal requirements.

The Dutch language works as a dungeon sink since other nations cannot quite check what is happening in the country. We see conformism not only in the research community but also in the Dutch media with journalists even who have higher education and doctorates.

The situation is a bit complex since alongside the CPB-issue I also advance various innovations in science that meet with opposition also from the scientific world. Recently I was surprised by verbal aggression from some "freethinkers" and "skeptics". See below.

The crux of this paper is an invitation to scientists all over the world to try for unbiased reviews of my work, without the impediments of journals that are locked in old paradigms.

### ***My experience presented as a case study***

A case study gives details that are lost in a general study. The following gives a review of how some of my own work has been and is being received in the scientific community in Holland. I will not look at the successes<sup>15</sup> but at some crucial failures. Perhaps the problem is more general but for the present purposes it suffices when I restrict this report to my own experience in Holland.

I am an econometrician (Groningen 1982) and teacher of mathematics (Leiden 2008). In the latter capacity I do research in the didactics of mathematics as well. I do not have a Ph. D. title while academics might tend to require this. However, science is not limited to the academia. My contributions have been mostly from research institutes and from my own position, via working papers and self-published books *not* in peer-reviewed journals.

However, if a Ph.D. committee would accept ALOE as a thesis in logic,<sup>16</sup> or DRGTPE as a thesis in economics,<sup>17</sup> or VTFD as a thesis in the theory of welfare and voting,<sup>18</sup> or COTP as a thesis in the didactics of mathematics,<sup>19</sup> then I would not protest. I invite professors to promote this. It shouldn't be so complex to observe that these books contain original and relevant contributions to science. Perhaps the academia are stuck in the medieval model of master-apprentice relationships but real masters should see that there are also non-medieval ways to advance science.

I have studied various other topics too but want to focus now on what I regard as key misunderstandings, see the selection below. The topics apparently are controversial themselves so perhaps it shouldn't be surprising that my own work adds to the controversy.

However, my work is intended to remove misunderstanding, and thus I am surprised to observe the opposite effect.

Of the following issues and results, those that might be called applied mathematics are easier to check by outsiders. Of importance is my paper "*What a mathematician might wish to to know about my work*".<sup>20</sup> Its abstract reads:

---

<sup>15</sup> My cv is on my website. I don't have time for the procedures of peer-reviewed journals. Successes might perhaps be a peer reviewed publication of a Dutch version of <http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/wpawuwpur/9703001.htm> or a recent paper on money in RWER <http://rwer.wordpress.com/2013/07/02/issue-no-64-of-real-world-economics-review>. Successes might be a review by Ron Stone in the Economic Journal 1998 of my software <http://thomascool.eu/TheEconomicsPack/index.html> or a review by Richard Gill of my books EWS and COTP in the journal NAW of the Dutch Royal Mathematical Society <http://www.nieuwarchief.nl/serie5/pdf/naw5-2012-13-1-064.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/ALOE/Index.html>

<sup>17</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Index.html>

<sup>18</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/VTFD/Index.html>

<sup>19</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/COTP/Index.html>

<sup>20</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2013-03-26-WAMMWTKAMW.pdf>

Mathematicians have contributed to confusions in the areas of logic, voting theory and the education of mathematics itself. While mankind may mistake abstract ideas for reality, mathematicians are not immune for this either. Part of my work has been to correct such mistakes. It would be useful when mathematicians study those corrections with an open mind, so that we can get better logic, more democracy and proper education in mathematics.

My work in economics can be corroborated by fellow econometricians. The main result concerns the suggestion of an *Economic Supreme Court*.

My book DRGTPE contains a theorem with proof on stylized facts, and it requires a discussion on the "*definition & reality methodology*" to understand its meaning and relevance. There is also a solution approach to unemployment, with again a theorem and proof on stylized facts.<sup>21</sup>

A paper on money after the 2007+ economic crisis has in fact appeared in a peer-reviewed journal and then the whole discussion shifts to *impact* and wider than Holland itself.<sup>22</sup>

Before we proceed with a review of my work and its reception in Holland, it seems useful to discuss some aspects of that country.

### ***When there is a taboo: not reading or not asking questions***

Over the course of these works I frequently encountered closed minds. My approach has been and is that research findings speak for themselves. However, this appears not to be the general attitude. What doesn't agree with accepted paradigms apparently quickly becomes taboo.

A key observation is that fellow-scientists don't even ask questions. Politeness doesn't mean to answer with "Thank you for your note". It means to answer with "Thank you for your note *because ...* " (and give the reason).

This paper tends to regard politeness and competence as symbiotic. We allow for the situation that the one can be present without the other, but overall the two tend to combine. This is the virtuous process: If you don't ask questions first because you are incompetent, then you might do so because you are being polite: and the answers might increase your competence.

A standard in the academia is (double) blind peer-review. Perhaps this causes academics to a modicum of politeness towards each other in those journals. Perhaps this causes academics to think that this is not needed elsewhere. It would be better to have academics stand out in the open, and learn that politeness is required overall.

A submission can be published with the referee report and the author's rejoinder. If none retracts, publish as it is. Other readers can benefit from that added discussion.

Let us first formulate the situation in abstract manner. In the advancement of science it happens that researcher *A* has a new idea and tells researcher *B* about it. Since *B* did not launch the idea and need not quite know what it entails, it is *B*'s role to first ask questions. Asking questions is not only polite and nice but basically part of scientific competence. The answers to those questions might cause *A* to retract the idea or *B* to accept it. It might be that *B* has been working on the same issue and feels that it isn't necessary to ask questions. Still, it is useful to verify common grounds. The proper attitude in science is to first ask questions, in particular when you do not understand something. When *B* quickly rejects a new idea as silly, then science gets stuck in the situation that *A* has developed a new idea and *B* has developed a vested interest in calling it silly. The situation would be worse when there isn't a

---

<sup>21</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Index.html>

<sup>22</sup> <http://rwer.wordpress.com/2013/07/02/issue-no-64-of-real-world-economics-review/>

level playing field when *A* is a junior researcher and *B* a senior researcher. The idea gets blocked if the fast rejection by *B* is the standard attitude, or when another person *C* refers to *B* as the main source, with possible misrepresentation as to what the idea actually is.

Let us turn abstract *A*, *B* and *C* into more concrete terms. Below I report about my experience in doing science in Holland. Holland has the reputation of being tolerant and open-minded but it is better to look at some facts about the country. In my experience researchers in Holland don't ask questions and instead jump to rejection when findings contradict some strong convention or deeply held conviction. The maltreatment and scientific incompetence within the Dutch research community means that scientific results get blocked. If Holland had been just a bit nicer and more competent then those results could have spread easier and the world could have been different.

Particular problematic is the censorship of economic science since 1990 at the Dutch Central Planning Bureau (CPB). My advice to the world is to boycott Holland till the censorship of my scientific work at the CPB is lifted.

On the effectiveness of boycotts, see here.<sup>23</sup>

The case might inspire an overall improvement in politeness and competence in asking questions first.

### ***The Dutch mental disease***

In economics we already have the term "*Dutch disease*" for the situation when a natural resource enhances richness but nevertheless causes economic problems.<sup>24</sup> The term was coined after the situation in Holland when the economic exploitation of newly discovered natural gas resources raised the exchange rate of the Dutch guilder and caused problems for the original export industry and its employment.

In my analysis there is also the phenomenon of a "*Dutch mental disease*": the availability of new scientific insights may enhance intellectual richness but can nevertheless cause irrationality from those who reject those insights. New findings namely can cause cognitive dissonance, with denial and neglect of those findings, and even an attitude to "kill the messenger". What is taught at Dutch universities has become pseudoscience. The present discussion is intended to clarify the case.

The reader will object that one cannot condemn an entire country based upon only one's own experience. Besides, I am an econometrician and teacher of mathematics, and no (social) psychiatrist, and thus not qualified to judge on (collective) mental disease. However, let me refer to an earlier paper that refers to social psychology that provides some indications.<sup>25</sup>

Readers may think: if someone has a mental disease, it surely must be the author of this paper. At this point, it cannot be denied that the reader should be careful. The only fair answer is to proceed and let the findings speak for themselves.

Let me mention one good reason why I present only my scientific findings and why I don't try to provide more body of proof for a mental disease of Dutch society.

The reason is scientific modesty. I am only an econometrician and teacher of mathematics. I can only be a witness of my own experience, and I should not speak for others. I leave it to other scholars to dissect Dutch society and arrive at more general conclusions. But I would take the liberty to question the arguments of those who hold that Holland isn't being irrational.

---

<sup>23</sup> <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2013/08/18/earth-economics/>  
<http://www.voxeu.org/article/do-economic-sanctions-make-sense>

<sup>24</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dutch\\_disease](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dutch_disease)

<sup>25</sup> <http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/wpawuwpot/9605001.htm>

My position is essentially one of logic. My findings can be corroborated, and they show that Holland is being irrational. Holland allows unemployment and hides it in welfare arrangements, while it would be more economical to increase employment. Holland has a dysfunctional CPB instead of an Economic Supreme Court. Holland uses inoptimal voting schemes so that results aren't as democratic as they could be. Holland allows teachers of mathematics to teach traditional ways that aren't as clear as mathematics should be. These findings carry the power of logic, and it doesn't seem necessary that this is supported by more statistics from other cases.

Perhaps Holland is a pinnacle of sanity in a world of insanity, and perhaps my experience is only the exception that proves the rule. I doubt whether such alternative view could be corroborated however. I tend to think that the chaos in Holland is larger than w.r.t. my work only.

Dutch opinions are quite divided, for example, on either supporting European integration and suffer the taxes needed to support Southern Europe, or reducing European influence and let Southern Europe find its own destiny. At first glance differing political views are not necessarily indicative of insanity. My advice however is to look at people individually and show their flip-flop inconsistencies. It can be observed in leading politicians but also highly regarded professors how they become irrational when conventions are challenged. Check how Dutch people still don't protest against the dismissal of Bernard Connolly. But it is not my task to show this, and I shouldn't try since people might regard my criticism as biased.

To close this introduction, let me mention Dewanand.<sup>26</sup> He is best seen as a writer with a complex struggle to find his way in life, and whose writing actually benefits from that struggle and thus earns respect. He was born in Dutch Suriname, of Hindu descent, and went to study in TU Delft. He met with racism and developed a mental disorder, didn't complete his studies and was down and out. After 9/11 he flipped and sent out envelopes with white powder. He was put in confinement and forced to treatment. Now, with medication, he writes his books. His book "Holland: Paradise or Hell?" is fun to read, at moments of leisure. His style is unadorned. The quality comes from the associations that only he with his background can develop and that are refreshing compared to standard views. My fear is that he might be dead serious on various points while I rather read it with irony, for example:

"Now you can experience the typical fruits of the Dutch paradise first-hand by exploring its real networking economy, its social securities, its caretaking and its rich, historical culture. Moreover, the dark side of the Netherlands is revealed [as well, as] a sandbox of chilling, real-life examples of poverty and crime."

Dewanand's website may suggest that he didn't take his medication but once you read his book on Holland you better understand his perspective. It doesn't prove my point, but it sketches the kind of problems that researchers meet who want to arrive at a balanced view on Holland.

Hence, there is reason in my approach to keep it simple: to document my own experience, and to advise to boycott Holland till the censorship of my scientific work by the CPB-directorate is lifted.

### ***Logic, Liar paradox and Gödel's theorems***

My book *A logic of exceptions* (ALOE) (1981, 2007) is a first year university introduction into logic, the Liar paradox and Gödel's incompleteness theorems. It creates the standard environment and then identifies some new solution approaches. The new elements need to be accepted by the logic community but can be presented to first year students as well. Richard Gill, professor of mathematical statistics at Leiden, gave it a fair review in the journal of the Dutch Royal Mathematical Society.<sup>27</sup> Another review is by the European Mathematical Society (EMS).<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Dewanand, "Holland: Paradise of Hell", 2010, <http://sbpra.com/dewanand>. My review is at <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2014/05/16/review-and-praise-for-holland-paradise-or-hell-q-by-dewanand-2010/>

<sup>27</sup> <http://www.nieuwarchief.nl/serie5/pdf/naw5-2008-09-3-217.pdf>

<sup>28</sup> <http://www.euro-math-soc.eu/node/2494>



The Liar proposition is "*This is false*". If it is true, then it is false. If it is false, then it is true. There are three solution approaches: levels, provability or three-valued logic.

(1) Russell and Tarski introduce logical levels. Truth would be a property of sentences of a lower level. There would be a ground level of basic observations but an infinity of meta-levels on top. The drawback is that positive self-reference is excluded, like "*This is true*". Selfreference is a key property of language, and this model of logic thus doesn't fit language. The logical advice is "do not form certain sentences" but this is strange if you can.

(2) Brouwer and Gödel focus on provability. The Gödeliar sentence is "*This is not provable*". If it is provable, then the system contains a false expression. This kind of system would not seem to be much useful. If it is not provable, then the system would become incomplete. Incompleteness means that the system is unable to prove all the theorems that it should prove. Gödel's first theorem is that all consistent mathematical systems that are sufficiently expressive so that they also contain arithmetic are necessarily incomplete. The common interpretation is: It is now formally proven that there are logical limits to what mathematics can achieve. Gödel became a hero in logic, was appointed at IAS and walked with Einstein. Eventually he became something of a cult hero too, and the incompleteness was extended by some people to the limits of science and human understanding, and hence the need for spirituality to see final truths.

ALOE however shows that a small criterion turns the Gödeliar back into the Liar, so that Gödel didn't solve anything, and didn't prove anything useful since these are only steps in the Liar paradox. The small criterion is that the model should reflect its application, so that what is proven must also be true. Models that don't have this property (for at least one application) are useless to consider. Of course, this leads to philosophical discussion about what mathematical truth would be, but we should be able to cut this short by again relying on arithmetic.

Brouwer's original *intuitionism* mixes up truth and proof. Heyting advised "do not use not", but this is convoluted. (Heyting and Brouwer apparently devised consistent propositional axioms but for me these still need some good interpretation.)

(3) The third way out is to use three-valued logic, where a sentence can be nonsensical (and doesn't represent a proper proposition). A problem is the Liar sentence for such threevalued logic, Liar3 = "*This sentence is false or nonsensical*". However, ALOE presents a new approach to deal with this. The claim is that this gives the first definitive solution to the liar paradox since it started plaguing logicians 2300 years ago.

Unfortunately, the professor of logic in 1981 did not appreciate the approach, if he understood it. I shelved this since I was graduating in econometrics in 1982 anyway. Only in 2006 after a cross-atlantic home move I saw it again and even got time to look into it again. I programmed the book in Mathematica, a system for doing mathematics on the computer. Working with three-valued logic is tedious but can be handled by the computer.

Incidentally, a small idea in 1981 was to make a distinction between static and dynamic logic. The implication ("if *A* then *B*") would be static, while inference ("*A* thus *B*") would be dynamic. The use of these words "static" and "dynamic" gives only a slight clarification, since logicians are quite aware of the difference between implication and inference. The idea derived from the distinction in economics between static and dynamic equilibrium. It was an idea that I also mentioned to that professor and that he liked. In 2007 I noticed that said professor had earned a huge research grant on "active logic". I enquired, but he hasn't responded whether there might be a reason for some reference. And of course he apparently doesn't want to look into ALOE (again).

I tried to discuss ALOE with two professors of logic, but one started pulling my leg and the other let him do so. I informed a group of researchers on logic in Holland that the book existed, and that I would be interested in presenting and discussing it, but they essentially did not respond. Thus, notwithstanding the fair reviews mentioned above, the situation is, so to

say, undynamic. ALOE is not used in the education of first year students, and they are instead educated in the folly of Russell, Tarski, Brouwer and Gödel. Indeed see also Logicomix.<sup>29</sup>

### ***Economic Supreme Court and solution approach to unemployment***

In 1982-1991 I worked in the position of econometrician and scientist at the Dutch Central Planning Bureau (CPB). The CPB had been founded in 1945 by later Nobel Prize winner Jan Tinbergen (1903-1994) to assist the government in establishing its "central economic plan". The idea is that the national budget requires a forecast based upon economic science. The Great Depression had taught that an economy can be subject to self-inflicted loss of aggregate demand. A detached scientific forecast should help to prevent repetition. The CPB indeed has greatly contributed to Dutch economic welfare - up to the point where it went wrong. In the USA a similar position is for the Council of Economic Advisors.

I observed the following problem. CPB-projections actually are conditional upon the success of government plans. Thus they are not unconditional. The CPB assumes that the government will do as planned, that such plans are faithfully executed, and reach their target. The CPB is a state bureau and resides under the Minister of Economic Affairs. It would be strange when the government would speak with two different tongues. Differences are discussed internally, and effort is made to resolve issues. It happens on occasion that the CPB actually criticises policy. But overall, the CPB doesn't adopt the unconditional forecast.

It is commonly argued that the CPB is independent so that its work could be trusted. This however is the wrong criterion. Independence still allows going astray. The proper criterion is being scientific. Being scientific implies independence, but not conversely.

In 1945 the decision to put the CPB under the Ministry wings was decidedly rational. The world had hardly any experience with econometric forecasting for the budget. In 1990 when I did my analysis, I could look back at a record of 45 years, with success and failure. The success came from quality work and the failure came from the lack of being scientific.

Around 1990, the conclusion was that proper forecasts required unconditionality and hence also a scientific position of the CPB. Given its track record, it could be promoted to an independent position alongside the other government functions. This implied an amendment of the Trias Politica. Montesquieu had emphasized the checks and balances of government with the separation of executive, legislative and judiciary powers. The new idea is a Tetras Politica with an *Economic Supreme Court* (ESC), at the same level as the other three powers, and with the power to veto the budget if it contains misleading information, notably w.r.t. the deficit and national debt. The role of scientists at the ESC concerns the quality of information, while it remains to parliament to decide where the funds go to. The ESC would be open to science and society so that scientific criticism would have ample room to function too.

The analysis is available in my book "*Definition & Reality in the General Theory of Political Economy*" (DRGTPE) (2000, 2011).<sup>30</sup> To my amazement I haven't been able to get someone to review it.

DRGTPE is essentially from before the 2007+ economic crisis, though contains a warning, and is required to solve it properly. The crisis itself caused me to write some papers too, and those are collected in "*Common Sense: Boycott Holland*" (CSBH) (2012), with an obvious reference to Thomas Paine and his advice to abolish the monarchy.<sup>31</sup>

In the development of the analysis on the Economic Supreme Court, I used unemployment as the main example. Consider the minimum wage. It consists of the net minimum that the worker takes home, and the taxes and premiums on top. Their sum gives the gross minimum

---

<sup>29</sup> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logicomix>

<sup>30</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Index.html>

<sup>31</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/CSBH/Index.html>

wage cost that the employer has to bear. Hopefully the worker is so productive that there is also some profit. The difference between net and gross wage is commonly called the tax wedge. My fellow economists tend to regard that wedge as point in a diagram. However, at the level of the minimum wage, that tax wedge also becomes a productivity range. In that range taxes and premiums are levied but are not collected because workers are not allowed to work and earn income below the minimum wage. That wedge becomes a *tax void*.

For example, consider a worker who has a productivity at the level of the net minimum wage, so that he or she could provide for basic necessities, and would not need to depend upon state support. A productivity at the level of the net minimum however means that this worker does not have a productivity at the required gross level. The employer can't hire this person, because the productivity isn't sufficient to cover the costs. Hence the taxes and premiums that are in the statute books aren't collected. The worker becomes unemployed and dependent upon state support. This holds for the whole range from net income to gross minimum wage cost. A whole class of workers is made unemployed and dependent. This is more dramatic in Europe than in the USA, but also applies to the USA.

My analysis got blocked by the CPB-directorate and wasn't allowed the process towards publication in the series "under the name of the author". This is censorship of science, as my position was scientific. Though I had tenure, I was dismissed with untruths, and the government judges allowed this, taking the statements by the directorate as sufficient evidence and not starting an independent investigation.

Incidentally, the CPB-director who committed this censorship of science w.r.t. my work and who dismissed me with untruths, is Gerrit Zalm, who later became minister of Finance and accepted the euro treaty. He now is CEO of ABN-AMRO, a major bank that got nationalised after the 2007+ crisis.<sup>32</sup> His background is not in econometrics but in economics without much mathematics, and he made his career within the bureaucracy before he was appointed from there into the CPB-directorate.

After my dismissal, the CPB-directorate started international visitations by economic scientists to enhance its openness to science. I informed the visitation committees about my protest against censorship but they declined looking into it and tend to praise the CPB for its great work. This may be seen as a process of contamination.<sup>33</sup>

Since virtually nobody in Holland cares about this censorship of science I advise to a boycott of Holland till the issue is resolved.<sup>34</sup>

The issue of unemployment in Holland relates to the Dutch export surplus and the problem in Europe with the external balances. Holland creates unemployment by its welfare system and tries to solve it by a low wage policy, exporting unemployment to other countries. A recent discussion of the Dutch export surplus is by H.J. Witteveen, former managing director of the IMF. My comments are added.<sup>35</sup>

### ***Economic science at the scientific bureau of the Dutch labour party***

One might hold that policy insights better be supported by some political party, otherwise the other parties don't tend to understand why they should look into it. New insights may percolate very slowly via general education and perhaps by new books that everyone reads, but at one point new insights still must be sponsored by a political party. Thus it is very useful that Dutch parties tend to have scientific bureaus that scan new findings in science. The Dutch government actually gives subsidies to political parties to have "scientific bureau"s.

Relevant is thus also the treatment of my economic analyses by the scientific bureau of a Dutch political party. Mr. Dijsselbloem is member of the social democratic party PvdA, that I

---

<sup>32</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gerrit\\_Zalm](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gerrit_Zalm)

<sup>33</sup> <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2013/02/21/contamination/>

<sup>34</sup> <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/about/>

<sup>35</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Crisis-2007plus/2014-05-21-Comments-on-Valedictory-Lecture-by-Witteveen.html>

was a member of in 1975-1991 as well, and I saw my analysis also maltreated at its scientific bureau, the *Wiardi Beckman Stichting* (WBS). Clearly I cannot remain a member of a political party that accepts censorship of science by the government. Apparently Dijsselbloem doesn't receive counter-information from his WBS either.

When I developed my analysis on unemployment in 1990, I was invited to give presentations at the economic departments of the universities of Groningen and Maastricht, and I also gave a presentation at the Dutch national economics research day. I still don't understand why there was no clear response at that time, I haven't seen any argument, then and since. Anyhow, I also sent a copy to the WBS. I was amazed that I was not invited to come and discuss it. One would expect that the Labour party would be interested in fighting unemployment. Apparently they were more interested in blocking my analysis from discussion. In 1991 I left the PvdA. Around 1990 they could get 30% of the vote, now they are down to 10% and it should be 0% but the remaining voters may not know that the PvdA doesn't do anything about censorship of science.

The secretary of the economic committee at WBS in 1990-91 was Paul de Beer, also an econometrician, and currently professor and director of the labour research department at the University of Amsterdam and similarly for the main Dutch labour union FNV. It later appeared to me that he was, at that time around 1990, in favour of a "basic income" (BI). I hope that this preference didn't interfere with the blockage to look into a better alternative. It later appeared that also Gerrit Zalm, who dismissed me, was in favour of a BI. Also Milton Friedman was a proponent of a BI. The BI-approach is to abolish the welfare state and replace it with a meagre benefit for all. As an economic model, it is useful to study and be aware of it, but as a policy it is somewhat strange if there is also the alternative to restore full employment. Adherents to the BI apparently tend not to be interested in alternative approaches. They already have a solution, so why look at other arguments? With the huge unemployment now in Europe, the BI adherents united in BIEN apparently feel greatly encouraged. I haven't noticed that they are interested in doing something about the censorship of science in Holland. I now also observed that Paul de Beer disinform the public.<sup>36</sup> Reporting on this didn't help.<sup>37</sup>

The PvdA was in government in 1994-2002 with prime minister Wim Kok (PvdA).<sup>38</sup> His minister of finance was Gerrit Zalm, who supported the euro, even though he at the CPB had expressed warnings. Kok's minister of Social Affairs and Employment was Ad Melkert.<sup>39</sup> Kok's economic policy earned praise by Bill Clinton and Tony Blair, as he apparently succeeded in creating economic growth, reduce unemployment and maintain a decent welfare state. The trick was a low wage policy and a huge export surplus. Soon Gerhard Schröder of Germany copied that policy.<sup>40</sup> By consequence, Germany and Holland now out-compete Southern Europe. The surpluses of the North are the deficits of the South. The South is in severe Depression, as they have huge debts to pay off while unemployment may be around 20%. The economic policy by Kok, Zalm and Melkert was a disaster, as my analysis on unemployment had already shown in 1990, but was censored by Zalm at CPB and blocked by WBS.

## ***Voting theory and Arrow's Impossibility Theorem***

Mathematician Kenneth Arrow presented an Impossibility Theorem, that there would be no good voting system to support the conditions for veritable democracy. This was one of various results that got him awarded with a Nobel Prize in economics. When I studied above CPB issue, I also had reason to look into Arrow's proposition. My conclusion was that Arrow has a mathematical result but his verbal interpretation is not correct, and people are misled as to what he has achieved.

---

<sup>36</sup> <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2014/04/10/the-pure-evil-of-a-basic-income/>

<sup>37</sup> <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2014/05/22/more-proof-on-basic-income-cult-behaviour/>

<sup>38</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wim\\_Kok](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wim_Kok)

<sup>39</sup> <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2012/04/23/ad-melkert-and-ilo/>

<sup>40</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gerhard\\_Schr%C3%B6der](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gerhard_Schr%C3%B6der)

Consider two people who are at a deadlock. They flip a coin to decide what to do. Arrow requires that a procedure in the same situation should always lead to the same outcome, and he cannot deal with outcomes that flip around. Hence he decides to "impossibility of democracy". To prevent the easy deadlock, Arrow requires at least three options, but the principle remains the same. Arrows mathematical result doesn't quite cover proper notions of democracy.

This analysis was also blocked by the CPB-directorate. It eventually became the book "Voting theory for democracy" (VTFD).<sup>41</sup> Later on I designed the Borda Fixed Point (BordaFP) voting method.

I didn't find voting theorists in Holland to consider my findings. I was invited to give a presentation at Tilburg University but at the end of the presentation I was shocked to discover that people apparently hadn't been listening. One participant made the silly remark that there are no voting problems when people think alike.<sup>42</sup> Also, for years there is a text on a website for highschool students in Holland in which a deluded mathematician explains that "democracy isn't entirely fair", and the website managers don't allow criticism. Apparently in Holland the respect for an American Nobel Prize winner with a misleading result is infinitely larger than for an econometrician who has been dismissed from the CPB.<sup>43</sup>

It took a long while before I could get someone interested in writing a review. This actually happened outside of Holland but let me report on it anyway. Eventually Nic Tideman (Virginia Tech) was willing to look into it, and found Markus Schulze willing to look into it. Unfortunately the following happened. (1) Yes, I apparently had made an error on a minor point, and Schulze located it, which I immediately granted, see my Erratum on the website. (2) VTFD presents the BordaFP method on two pages, but Schulze looked at the first page only and neglected the other, and (perhaps given (1)) started pilloring the book as a whole. (3) Schulze stopped reading there and did not look at the more fundamental analysis in the later chapter on Arrow's theorem. See the book website for a longer discussion of the situation. The essential point: *ask questions first*. For example, show the draft review for commenting.<sup>44</sup>

## ***The economics of ecological survival***

Let me refer to this book only: *The Tinbergen & Huetting Approach in the Economics of Ecological Survival*.<sup>45</sup> I haven't found a publisher yet, haven't had time to look for it, and haven't had time to design a cover for another self-published book (that nobody will read).

## ***Mathematics education***

In 2008 I got an additional MSc degree of teacher of mathematics at Leiden University. I observed that mathematicians are trained for abstract thought and not for empirical research. When they are confronted with real-life students in class, they solve their cognitive dissonance by resorting to tradition. The training to become teachers apparently cannot undo what already has gone wrong in the training to be mathematician. The school math program is based upon tradition and not didactics. These points are developed in "*Elegance with Substance*" (EWS) (2009) and "*Conquest of the Plane*" (COTP) (2011).<sup>46</sup> Reviews are again by Richard Gill<sup>47</sup> and EMS.<sup>48</sup>

An examples is that  $2\frac{1}{2}$  is supposed to stand for "two *and* a half" (which is *plus*) but it is written as "two *times* a half" (compare  $2a$  in  $2a + 3a = 5a$ ). A pupil at elementary school first

<sup>41</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/VTFD/Index.html>

<sup>42</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/English/Science/Letters/SCT-working-group.html>

<sup>43</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/Wetenschap/Artikelen/2013-02-14-PasOpMetWiskundeOverVerkiezingen.html>

<sup>44</sup> <http://www.votingmatters.org.uk/ISSUE30/INDEX.HTM>

<sup>45</sup> <http://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/13899>

<sup>46</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/Index.html>

<sup>47</sup> <http://www.nieuwarchief.nl/serie5/pdf/naw5-2012-13-1-064.pdf>

<sup>48</sup> <http://www.euro-math-soc.eu/node/2081>

learns the mixed number  $2\frac{1}{2}$  but later learns about  $2a$  and then has to unlearn aspects again. In print it is neater, but in handwriting disasters can occur.

Since 1971 there was a reform in Dutch mathematics education by Hans Freudenthal (an assistant to Brouwer).<sup>49</sup> He didn't repair those errors in traditional mathematics education. Instead, he moved away from Euclidean methods to applied mathematics as in engineering. However, Freudenthal was still an abstract mathematician and wasn't trained in empirical didactics. His idea of "realism" is an abstract notion of "realism". In current Dutch math courses, students are supposed to learn about linear relationships by first considering real world linear processes, for example a steady stream of water from a faucet into a bucket. This isn't necessarily a good approach to learning mathematics, since watching or thinking about a stream of water doesn't necessarily kindle interest in abstract recognition of patterns. Nevertheless, the Freudenthal new error on didactics has become the new dogma. And we still have the errors in the old traditional math like  $2\frac{1}{2}$ .

Incidentally, the Freudenthal approach has caught on in the world. When I looked at this mathematical joke,<sup>50</sup> I was amazed to see that one of the originators was a Graduate student in Colorado with an "primary research interest" in amongst other things "Realistic Mathematics Education". It can or cannot be coincidence.

I am member of the Dutch association of teachers of mathematics (NVMW). This association has a journal called *Euclides*. I submitted my books EWS and COTP for review there too. For EWS, the reviewer wondered whether I would be a Don Quixote. He hadn't allowed me to read his draft review so that I had not been able to ask him why he would say such a thing. For COTP, the other reviewer opened all registers for slander. Since he works at TU Delft and at most an hour by electrical tram distance, it might have seemed sensible to invite me over, and discuss the issues using a blackboard. None of that. I and my work are portrayed as crackpot. The editors simply printed it as if this was the normal state of the world. When I protested against this procedure and slanderous print, the editors decided that they would no longer review any books by me. Since then there are two other books, indeed not reviewed by *Euclides*, this one<sup>51</sup> and *The simple mathematics of Jesus* (SMOJ) (2012) discussed below. Later on, another teacher of mathematics read COTP and was amazed by the severe criticism that he thought was out of place, and he advises to read with an open mind.<sup>52</sup>

The discussion on mathematics education is somewhat complicated by the fact that I also designed a new approach to calculus. As one may recall, Isaac Newton and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz developed derivative and integral, that Newton used to create his theory on gravity and the motion of celestial bodies. While they used infinitesimals, later mathematicians Cauchy and Weierstrasz developed the approach by limits, which is the current standard. I now developed an algebraic approach. It originally came up in ALOE 2007 as an approach to the "paradoxes by division by zero" but was later developed for didactics in EWS and in detail in COTP. For a distinct class of functions (at least those used in highschool and even by Newton himself) the algebraic approach is also an essential reformulation of calculus, and clearly superior to infinitesimals and limits. Now, saying something like this apparently causes mathematicians to become rather nervous, which is strange, since they can look at the formulas and verify it. I made a YouTube presentation, albeit slow and long, in the hope that the outside world is more sensitive to the oldfashioned "definition, theorem, proof" attitude.<sup>53</sup> Let me add that calculus is an important subject in highschool and that current teaching methods are quite undidactic while the algebraic approach is simpler, clearer and accurate.

Later on, I also designed a new approach to infinity.<sup>54</sup> Together I am now proposing a neoclassical approach to highschool math.<sup>55</sup>

<sup>49</sup> <http://www.fi.uu.nl/en/projects/realme.html>

<sup>50</sup> <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2014/05/23/the-random-chance-that-you-are-right/>

<sup>51</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/Index.html>

<sup>52</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/COTP/2013-03-15-Boudri-over-COTP.pdf>

<sup>53</sup> [http://youtu.be/gn\\_BKZaDa-o](http://youtu.be/gn_BKZaDa-o)

<sup>54</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/ALOE/2012-03-26-CCPO-PCWA.pdf>

<sup>55</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2011-09-06-NeoclassicalMathematics.pdf>

## ***The simple mathematics of Jesus***

SMOJ<sup>56</sup> is an invitation to a multidisciplinary teaching project by teachers of *mathematics, history & government, and philosophy & religion*. It looks at the origin of Christianity and the figure of Jesus Christ. The subject would broaden mathematics education from numbers, formulas, functions and geometry towards a better understanding about history and abstraction. It will likely appeal to students since it also includes ancient civilizations, archeology, pyramids, astronomy and astrology, the flooding of the Black Sea, and so on, and there is even a real conspiracy theory that Jesus did not really exist but perhaps derives from myth or possibly even deliberate creation by reli-fiction writers.<sup>57</sup>

I was much amazed that the project proposal did not meet interest. It seems that Jesus has been claimed by university departments of theology and history, in particular New Testament Studies, so that it is deemed impossible that an econometric scientist and researcher in the didactics of mathematics might look at the subject from this angle.

It may also be that when I clarify that astrology was important around the time of Jesus, that some readers infer that I would be an astrology fan myself, which is a curious inference, even more so since I hardly know anything about astrology but enough not to be such a fan. However, I have no indication whether readers think like this, since I essentially have no response on this particular issue.

A curious episode developed. The chairperson of the Dutch "freethinkers" association, who proclaim to be against any dogma like religion and to support free speech, happened to be a historian of antiquity. Dr. Anton van Hooff proclaimed that there has existed a historical Jesus, so that my project proposal would be nonsense and shouldn't be spoken about.<sup>58</sup> Apparently he blocked any discussion amongst said association. At least, I haven't heard from any of them since. Also the editors of their "freethinker" magazine haven't responded to my submission of a summary of the project proposal. My review in Dutch is here.<sup>59</sup>

The episode caused me to read and review the book by Maurice Casey, "*Jesus. Evidence and Argument or Mythicist Myths*" (2014).<sup>60</sup> It appears that historians of antiquity tend to make the same common error. Let me quote professor Dale Allison of Princeton:

"But for me this is history, which means that we weigh probabilities and try to find the best working hypothesis. It's not a question of certainty. You can doubt everything if you want to. It's a question of what's more plausible, and it's my sense of things that positing an historical Jesus leaves us with fewer problems than the alternative."<sup>61</sup> (2014-01-26)

Trained in the empirical science of econometrics, I regard this as unscientific. A scientist should state the uncertainties and should not act as a judge. I further refer to my review of Casey's book.

But, w.r.t. the earlier suggestion of an *Economic Supreme Court*, here we see that such a court, while based in science, would still indeed need to decide on what a plausible forecast would be.

The proposal in SMOJ is of limited relevance. I attach more importance to the proposal of an Economic Supreme Court and the resolution of unemployment. Nevertheless, I am amazed that I managed to hit upon another bias and antiscientific attitude in another realm, history, that I was blissfully unaware of before.

While it also is a real shame that SMOJ has neither been discussed in the journal of Dutch mathematics teachers, as discussed above.

---

<sup>56</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/SMOJ/Index.html>

<sup>57</sup> <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2014/05/14/why-rewrite-the-old-testament-into-the-new-q/>

<sup>58</sup> <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2014/04/23/tacitus-is-too-vague-on-jesus-too/>

<sup>59</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/EVVJ/2014-05-04-Agnosme-wiskunde-Jezus.html>

<sup>60</sup> <http://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2014/05/12/review-of-maurice-casey-on-the-jesus-myth/>

<sup>61</sup> <http://christian-agnostic.blogspot.co.uk/2014/01/0-0-1-1963-11194-student-93-26-13131-14.html>

## Conclusion

It is somewhat amazing that one meets:

- some closed minds at university studying some logic,
- then other closed minds at the Central Planning Bureau on unemployment,
- then other closed minds at WBS, scientific bureau of the Dutch labour party,
- then other closed minds amongst the greens who would care about the environment,
- then other closed minds in mathematics education,
- then other closed minds at "freethinkers" and "skeptics",
- and not only this, but also such that each particular group of closed minds has an impact beyond reason.

There are open minds too but few and their impact seems limited against the destructive capacity of the closed minds.

For me, it is okay when one disagrees with my analysis, but where are the arguments *without slander*, and why block publication and discussion ?

Suppose that we can cut up each realm in 100 pieces. Let us assume that experts oversee each 99 of those pieces, but differing in the 1 remaining. There can be a lot of discussion before they manage to put the whole together again. In my experience, when I speak with such an expert, he or she starts explaining that this 1 point is wrong in my analysis, whence the analysis is not correct and I would be a crackpot. My suggestion is that it would be better to first ask questions rather than jump to conclusions.

Since 1990 I advise Holland to have a parliamentary enquiry.<sup>62</sup>

Since 2004 I advise the world to boycott Holland till the censorship of my scientific work by the directorate of the CPB is lifted.<sup>63</sup>

Looking back at the last ten years I don't see any reason to change that latter advice, rather more reasons to emphasise it.

---

<sup>62</sup> <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/TPnCPB/Record/1990/12/18/index.html>

<sup>63</sup> <http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/wpawuwpgt/0405001.htm>