

To the board of the *Nederlandse Vereniging van Wiskundeleraren* (NVvW),
(the Dutch association of teachers of mathematics)

June 28 2016

Concerning: Red Card for your present board, option to have a scientific committee and report,
request for speaking time at the "rondvraag" in the annual meeting of November 5 2016

Prolegomenon on the general situation	1
Table with contributions to education and didactics of mathematics	3
An invitation to read well	4
Talks at a Thai restaurant	6
Red Card for the board, and major reason for it	7
No proper respect by NVvW since 2008 for my scientific advice since 2008 for a parliamentary enquiry into mathematics education	7
No proper response by NVvW board of issues in 2015-2016	9
Yellow Card for the board, April 10 2016	10
Red Card for the chief editor of Euclides, May 9 2016	11
NVvW board doesn't act w.r.t. the Red Card for the chief editor of Euclides	12
Mathematicians fail w.r.t. education as well as they fail w.r.t. elections (Brexit)	12
Conclusion	13
Appendix A. Draft text working group on re-engineering math ed	15
Appendix B. Power abuse by new chief editor of Euclides [NCEE]	16

Dear chairman Swier Garst and other members of the board,

Prolegomenon on the general situation

Let me observe that the Dutch government in 2016 spends EUR 38.6 billion on education, science and culture, of which EUR 7.6 billion on secondary education. ¹ By comparison, the budget of NVvW with about 3000 members is about EUR 300 thousand or EUR 0.0003 billion. ² NVvW can only do a little (extra). Thus, I am very modest w.r.t. my expectations. Obviously too, the board's responsibility differs from mine as a member.

Secondly, this letter concerns mathematics education and its research, and thus let me mention that NVvW is an association of teachers and not an association of researchers. NVvW doesn't even have an science desk. At the recent convention "*Onderwijs meets onderzoek*" ("Education meets research") of June 20 2016, Arthur Bakker referred to a teacher / researcher who had the sensation of falling between quay and ship. This is not me. The "sometimes" is a personal experience since there is a **structural problem**, see below.

"Op school word ik als docent meer gezien als onderwijswetenschapper en niet meer als directe collega dier er altijd is en hetzelfde werk doet. Aan de universiteit word ik juist minder gezien als wetenschapper, maar meer als de docent die aan het promoveren is. Daardoor sta ik niet op de wal en niet op het schip, dat is **soms** wat lastig." (my emphasis) ³

¹ <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/prinsjesdag/documenten/begrotingen/2015/09/15/viii-onderwijs-cultuur-en-wetenschap-rijksbegroting-2016>

² This is exclusive of subsidies, while bit more funds would be at PWN.

<http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-03-22-Minister-krijgt-een-misleidend-Deltaplan-Wiskunde.pdf> Also, parents have expenditures e.g. perhaps on calculators and remedial teaching.

³ https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304173706_Van_docent_naar_onderzoeker. I take the quote from A.W.E.A. Bakx, A. Bakker and D. Beijaard (2014), "Promotieonderzoek door docenten om de kloof tussen onderzoek en onderwijspraktijk te verkleinen", *Pedagogische Studiën*, 91(3), 150-168, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261179891_Promotieonderzoek_door_docenten_om_de_kloof_tussen_onderzoek_en_onderwijspraktijk_te_verkleinen see the quote on p158, http://www.academia.edu/8148251/Promotieonderzoek_door_docenten_om_de_kloof_tussen_onderzoek_en_onderwijspraktijk_te_verkleinen

Thirdly, Arthur Bakker also observed:

"Het idee was dat docentervaring een voorsprong zou bieden ten opzichte van van jongere promovendi, maar de docentonderzoekers moesten gezien hun beta-achtergrond nog leren om sociaalwetenschappelijk onderzoek te doen (Knippels et al., 2008)." (Bakx, Bakker, Beijaard 2014, p163)⁴

Bakx et al. (2014) refer to beta-education in general and they also include mathematics in this,⁵ but **they do not refer** to my "*Elegance with Substance*" (EWS) (2009, 2015).⁶ I am a teacher of mathematics and do research on mathematics education not in a Ph.D. programme, so they may claim that I am not in the scope of their study. However, this would confuse the issue of scope with the issue of using the relevant literature. EWS is not only relevant but shows *also*:

- that mathematicians are trained for *abstraction* and not for empirical research,
- that mathematicians have not even learned to **observe** (apart from social science and statistical techniques),
- that this first training on abstraction apparently cannot be unlearned easily, not even in the training for teacher (whence there is educational reliance on 5000 years of tradition of not-observing).

Thus, the problem of mismatch is larger, and **structural**, and differs in quality and size from what Bakker et al. and the quoted teacher / researcher stated and likely were aware of. In the future there could also be Academic Schools, like Academic Hospitals where practice, research and training are integrated, also hopefully with a **Simon Stevin Institute** (SSI).

Fourthly, let me mention that a modern army has perhaps 10% soldiers operational in the field while the bulk of perhaps 90% is control and support. Dutch defence has 58,800 thousand persons, of which 16,900 civilians and 41,900 military.⁷ "Military" however doesn't mean *field operation*. The Dutch air force has 8,077 persons and 6,572 "military", but only 83 planes and 77 helicopters.⁸ This means 41 people per craft. One doesn't assume that air combat means combat with similar 41 enemies *within* each aircraft. Thus pilots are few and receive support. If education were organised in military style, then teachers would lose the professional responsibility and freedom to design their own lessons, and they would execute run-of-the-mill courses designed by a central command, as indeed happens at some educational facilities. Let us not be too pious on this: many school teams want colleagues to stick to the textbook, e.g. when there are parallel classes, and many teachers stick to the textbook anyway because this seems better for students. However, my main point is that the current organisation of education is problematic, whence my proposal since 2008 has been a national reorganisation into a Simon Stevin Institute (**SSI**). SSI is proposed to combine the advantages of collaboration with the advantages of teacher responsibility. It would be open and democratic and based in science (while research is also open-minded), and thus SSI would provide support and an environment for communication. I am greatly amazed that since 2008 nobody showed interest in SSI.⁹

Fifthly, there was the referendum on the Brexit of June 23 2016. "*Elegance with Substance*" explains that mathematicians fail w.r.t. education in the same manner as w.r.t. the global financial crisis¹⁰ or the theory of democracy, like now the referendum on the Brexit.¹¹ The notion that **abstract thinking mathematicians are a risk when dealing with reality** provides a perspective on more issues, and mathematics education is a key issue.

Sixthly, there is the following table (or section in this paper) with my contributions to education and didactics of mathematics. This doesn't imply that anyone agrees with these contributions.

⁴ http://www.fisme.uu.nl/tdb/fulltext/knippels_ea_2008.pdf

⁵ <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/10/02/pierre-van-hiele-and-gerald-goldin-2>

⁶ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/Index.html>

⁷ <https://www.defensie.nl/overdefensie/inhoud/feiten-en-cijfers>

⁸ <https://www.defensie.nl/downloads/brochures/2015/12/15/kerngegevens-defensie>

⁹ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/Index.html> and

<https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/10/31/the-power-void-in-mathematics-education>

¹⁰ <http://www.ams.org/notices/201105/rtx110500699p.pdf>

¹¹ <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2016/04/22/referenda-tend-to-be-silly-and-dangerous-see-the-brexit>

Table with contributions to education and didactics of mathematics

Year	Items
1981 draft, 2007, 2011	Book "A Logic of Exceptions" (ALOE), in 2007 extended with the paradox on division by zero and algebraic approach to the derivative ¹²
2008	Long list of issues, and advice also as econometrician for an enquiry by parliament into mathematics education. ¹³ Notion of a "Simon Stevin Institute". ¹⁴ Trig rerigged (with xur and yur, later also archi, see COTP). ¹⁵
2009, 2015	Book "Elegance with Substance" (EWS): translates and extends the above. ¹⁶ Rejection of the KNAW 2009 report on arithmetic education, for neglecting the analysis of 2008 (notably on fractions and diagnosis on "mathematics").
2011	Book "Conquest of the Plane" (COTP), proof of concept of EWS. The notion of "named lines" as missing link in didactics. Notion of "Neoclassical mathematics for the schools". ¹⁷ Draft on infinity, see FMNAI 2015. Paper "Brain research and mathematics education: some comments", see SMOJ or FMNAI.
2012	Book "Een kind wil aardige en geen gemene getallen" (EKWA). ¹⁸ Notion of "Tellen en rekenen met tig" (booklet 2015). Notion of Dutch or English as dialects of mathematics. ¹⁹ Extended draft on infinity. Book: "The Simple Mathematics of Jesus" (SMOJ). ²⁰ Comment: "David Tall versus EWS en COTP". ²¹
2013	Letter on cTWO. ²² Paper "Pas op met wiskunde over verkiezingen" (beware of mathematics about elections). ²³
2014	Paper "Pierre van Hiele, David Tall and Hans Freudenthal: Getting the facts right". ²⁴ Paper "Education, division & derivative: Putting a Sky above a Field or a Meadow". ²⁵ Identification of the collective breach of integrity, in relation to EWS and also the KNAW 2009 report. ²⁶
2015	Books "Foundations of Mathematics. A Neoclassical Approach to Infinity" (FMNAI). ²⁷ Book "A child wants nice and no mean numbers" (CWNN). ²⁸ Use of $H = -1$. Identification of the breach of integrity of science by Jan van de Craats and Ben Wilbrink. ²⁹ Discovery of the fatal flaw in the KNAW 2009 report on arithmetic education, namely the neglect of preparation for algebra. ³⁰ Statement of a general theory of knowledge. ³¹
2016	Letters to NRO, VOR and teacher trainers, KNAW and CPB. ³² Didactics of quadratic functions. ³³ Correction on fail and success rates. ³⁴

¹² <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/ALOE/Index.html>

¹³ <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/Wetenschap/Artikelen/2008-04-17-WiskundeOnderwijs.pdf>

¹⁴ <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/Wetenschap/Artikelen/2008-11-11-Simon-Stevin-Instituut.pdf>

¹⁵ <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2014/07/14/an-archi-gif-compliments-to-lucas-v-barbosa>

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

¹⁷ <http://www.thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2011-09-06-NeoclassicalMathematics.pdf>

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

¹⁹ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2012-03-31-NederlandsAlsDialectVanWiskunde.html>

²⁰ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/SMOJ/Index.html>

²¹ <http://www.nieuwarchief.nl/serie5/pdf/naw5-2012-13-4-262.pdf>

²² <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2013-02-06-Colignatus-nav-cTWO-Eindrapport.html>

²³ <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/Wetenschap/Artikelen/2013-02-14->

[PasOpMetWiskundeOverVerkiezingen.html](http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/Wetenschap/Artikelen/2013-02-14-PasOpMetWiskundeOverVerkiezingen.html)

²⁴ <https://arxiv.org/abs/1408.1930>

²⁵ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2014-09-08-Sky-Field-Meadow.pdf>

²⁶ <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2014/07/16/integrity-of-science-in-dutch-research-in-didactics-of-mathematics>

²⁷ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/FMNAI/Index.html>

²⁸ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/NiceNumbers/Index.html>

²⁹ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2015-09-15-Breach-by-Jan-van-de-Craats-and-Ben-Wilbrink-wrt-scientific-integrity.html>

³⁰ <http://www.wiskundebrief.nl/721.htm#5>

³¹ <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/24/a-general-theory-of-knowledge>

³² <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/English/Science/Letters/2016-05-17-Letter-to-KNAW-and-CPB.pdf>

An invitation to read well

After the above as prolegomenon, I must insist that people **read well**. Certainly **teachers of mathematics** may be asked to read well. Also, I implore you to keep in mind these points:

- Tolerance is not the same as neglecting issues:
<http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/English/Science/2016-06-12-Essay-NRC-KHMW.pdf>
- I am a decent, kind, modest, understanding and helpful person and I am also a competent econometrician and researcher in mathematics education.³⁵ My texts like this letter are clear. I only present results that I checked and double checked. I am human and may make mistakes but when there would arise issues then look first at other possible causes than blaming the messenger. Please read EWS. EWS is not my dictate how the world should look like, but is an invitation to think and communicate, and if that were not obvious to start with, then please explain to me why you would think otherwise. Read my work well, instead of jumping to conclusions. **First ask questions** when something would not be clear. Do not expect that I can anticipate all possible confusions, and if I were to try then the book would be 1000 times thicker. A typical reaction of a closed mind is to jump to a conclusion and reject an argument, and not ask questions because the argument has already been rejected. If you reject EWS and would not have questions, perhaps take a course in science methodology and communication (but perhaps not the course given by Arthur Bakker).
- My proposal since 2008 has been a **parliamentarian enquiry** into mathematics education.³⁶ Perhaps you are not at home in economics and then I advise you to schedule more time to study on the relevant theory.³⁷ Since 2008, **NVvW blocks key information** that would contribute to the decision of parliament to start such an enquiry, see below.
- Since 2008 I document what has been happening. I always try to be a clear and precise as possible in this documentation, so that parliamentarians cannot say that I wasn't.
- The **chronological order** is that I presented my analysis first in 2008 and that subsequently some authors have misrepresented my analysis and attacked my person and started burking my findings. I protest against this maltreatment. My protest is on content and not on person. This noise might create the idea as if I "started", or as if my protest was inaccurate: but check the chronology. Also I have continuously extended the analysis with new points on content, and maltreaters have been neglecting such opportunities for them to resolve their misunderstanding and retract. A recent finding is <http://www.wiskundebrief.nl/738.htm#5>
- In 2009, I asked professor Martin Goedhart in Groningen whether a (draft of) EWS could be a basis for a thesis. His reply was that it wasn't a thesis. *This had not been my question*. See the email exchange p38-42.³⁸ Goedhart spoke the truth: it wasn't a thesis. But he also breached truth by not replying to the question. Goedhart's implied suggestion was that I would be so simple-minded to think that EWS would be a thesis. Was this only a misunderstanding and bad reading of the question? No, because he originally replied that he would look whether EWS could be developed into a thesis. Perhaps he had forgotten about this when he finished reading (from June 3 to September 6)? Or was the non-reply a deliberate and rather horrible way to block further communication? My reply to Goedhart was that I observed that he was not motivated to look whether EWS could be developed into a thesis. If Goedhart had adopted the frame of mind that I would be simple-minded, then he might think that he needn't answer, and he didn't answer indeed. This exchange was polite but I am rather shocked that a professor in mathematics and science education doesn't read well or uses such horrible way of blockage, and doesn't see the value of EWS anyway.

³³ <http://www.wiskundebrief.nl/738.htm#5>

³⁴ <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2016/06/17/success-rate-trade-off-for-students-and-schools>

³⁵ Bakker's reference to social science above should not distract. Econometrics provides empirical mindset and techniques, and the education for teacher provides pedagogy.

³⁶ <http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/tk-onderzoek-wiskundeonderwijs>

³⁷ Wikipedia is a portal and no source. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_economy
https://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parlementaire_enqu%C3%AAte_naar_de_toestand_in_fabrieken_en_werkplaatsen en <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Drgtpe/Index.html>

³⁸ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/BHRM/2015-10-28-Malconduct-VanBerkel-VanMaanen-Goedhart-LB-VG.pdf>

- There has been a "math war" between "realistic mathematics education" (RME) and "traditional mathematics education" (TME). I have kept my distance and do not participate in any such war. In my analysis RME and TME are ideologies and not science. Please do not put me in one camp or the other, as "math warriors" perhaps have been doing.³⁹

The latter RME vs TME math war requires a bit more explanation since I must presume that you and other readers of this letter might not have seen my documentation of 2008-2016.

The KNAW 2009 report on arithmetic education concluded that RME had been introduced into education without evidence. An analogy is the "studiehuis" ("tweede fase"),⁴⁰ but for RME Freudenthal cs. had done so gradually. RME is an ideology, comparable to astrology or homeopathy. The KNAW report should have concluded that the Freudenthal Institute should not be at a university. I support that conclusion, not because I would have joined TME, but it derives from the position of science. However, the KNAW 2009 report did not state that conclusion. The main cause must be that the authors like chairman Jan Karel Lenstra were not properly trained empirical scientists in mathematics education, see below letter to KNAW and CPB. The KNAW committee might hold that it wasn't their mission to evaluate the Freudenthal Institute, but scientists would be open to such derived conclusions, and at least would have concluded to the advice of such an evaluation.

Please observe that the RME vs TME math war isn't resolved but has gone **underground**. I am not aware of any employee at the Freudenthal Institute (and they employ many people) who has stated and openly accepted the empirical fact that RME has been exposed as a failure indeed. Please observe that the RME ideologues have teamed up with the easy victims in beta fields: the shallow argument is that physics, biology etcetera provide "contexts" while the true reason is that such beta-fields have no knowledge or interest in mathematics education research itself. (At the June 20 event it suddenly wasn't "realistic context" but "authentic context". Another rephrasing of "contexts" is "wiskundige denkactiviteiten", which term confuses thinking and acting. An earlier effort at rephrasing "realistic" was into "realistic as experienced in meaning by the student but which might not be real at all" (paraphrased). RME is strong at rephrasing but weak at acknowledging reality and truth and making real progress.)

Actually, I am not aware of a statement by Arthur Bakker at Freudenthal Institute on the failure of RME. I do not intend to evaluate Bakker's work, but cause for worry is:

- Bakker's background is in mathematics and (also abstract) philosophy, and it is not guaranteed that he has learned to do empirical research even though he "teaches" it.
- Bakker's 2004 thesis⁴¹ was under two adherents of "realistic mathematics education" (RME) Koeno Gravemeijer and Jan de Lange while a third supervisor was experimental psychologist Gellof Kanselaar. Perhaps Kanselaar provided balance – but it leads too far for me to read and evaluate this thesis. Let me mention that pages 5-8 take RME as a foundation, and it is not mentioned that Freudenthal stole and distorted ideas from Pierre van Hiele and that none of Freudenthal's collaborators protested.
- The Bakx, Bakker, Beijaard (2014) paper referred to above has neither quality nor relevance. I referred to it only on some of its limitations. It kicks in some open doors about "boundary crossing" which really adds nothing, has a small sample $n = 19$ (with 3 who fell between quay and ship), collates mathematics (abstraction) with physics and biology (empirics) because of some "beta" stamp, and has nothing new to contribute w.r.t. the already known bottlenecks for non-academics at academia. The paper looks only at Ph.D. students in some accepted Ph.D. programme, while there must also be other research. The paper neglects EWS. **The authors assume that Freudenthal Institute does research, but the KNAW 2009 report showed that it hadn't.** It doesn't discuss that schools and teachers of mathematics are misinformed by such delusions. The paper serves the phenomenon that academics can claim that they "published a paper" and that it can be included in a "list of publications".

³⁹ <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2016/01/24/graphical-displays-about-the-math-war>

⁴⁰ Interview with Jan Jimkes by Japke-d. Bouma,

http://www.beteronderwijsnederland.nl/files/'Het_werd_doorgedrukt'_Tegen_het_Studiehuis.pdf

⁴¹ <http://www.fi.uu.nl/publicaties/literatuur/6274.pdf>

- PM. Bakker is also thesis supervisor for Kees Hoogland, who in Euclides misrepresented the autobiography of John Allen Paulos for RME.⁴² Hoogland refuses to give an English translation (also for Paulos) about the key problematic paragraph. Obviously a thesis supervisor is not responsible for what a Ph.D. student does but such misrepresentation and unwillingness to co-operate is less likely if there are strong conditions on science.

Thus, I am amazed that the "Onderwijs meets onderzoek" event of June 20 2016 had invited Paul Drijvers (Freudenthal Institute)⁴³ and Arthur Bakker (Freudenthal Institute) as important speakers, and not me, who advises with convincing evidence that Freudenthal Institute should not be at university and that Drijvers should not be professor (and I protest that my protest wasn't looked into). NVvW sent me a certificate of participation that states that NVvW was responsible for organising the event. So let me hold you accountable for its failure and raise the issue of quality control. If you hold that the quality is guaranteed by the involvement of academics, then why don't you ask those about the KNAW report, and why don't you support the advice for a parliamentary enquiry, that then can also look into the issue why Freudenthal Institute is still at university ?

Talks at a Thai restaurant

Since the annual meeting of 2015, chairman Swier Garst and I have had three talks in person. Two were dinners at a Thai restaurant, which ambiance enhanced communication. I appreciate that NVvW took care of the bill since my idea was that those talks shouldn't have been necessary. This talking and cost could have been avoided when NVvW had responded better in 2008-2014. A fourth (intermediate) talk floundered at an unfortunate moment when Swier had a double appointment and failed to inform me in time. Given the current sick situation I appreciate it much that Swier was willing to speak with me. I suggested in November 2015 that I would give a presentation of EWS to the full board, yet this invitation apparently has not been accepted.

Similarly for my suggestion in an email January 23 2016 that some members of the board could look into some topics. Notably Michiel Doorman (Freudenthal Institute) wrote a thesis⁴⁴ (though perhaps no real thesis) that involved the derivative, and he might look at my suggestion of an algebraic approach to the derivative.⁴⁵ Wim Caspers (TU Delft) might then look at other points in EWS and the proposal for a Simon Stevin Institute (SSI). It is useful to observe that Jeroen Spandaw who maltreated "Conquest of the Plane" (COTP) (2011)⁴⁶ is a colleague of Caspers at TU Delft, so that such a division of attention might be wise. Please observe that EWS and COTP apparently are boycotted at institutes of training of mathematics teachers and the association ELWIER, so that there is a real issue of integrity of science.⁴⁷

Swier has agreed in the Thai restaurant (drinking tea) that it would be relevant to try to set up a working group along the lines of **part** of my research in "*Elegance with Substance*" (EWS) (2009, 2015). **Appendix A** contains my **draft** text of June 5 concerning this consensus between Swier (2016) and me (2008). I can only hope that your board will agree with Swier, and otherwise I repeat my suggestion that the board invites me for a presentation. My suggestion to the board is to study the Appendix (draft) and EWS indeed. A recent result is on the didactics of quadratic functions, see <http://www.wiskundebrief.nl/738.htm#5>.

I saw Swier again at the convention "Onderwijs meets onderzoek" of June 20 and he told me that he plans this initiative in September 2016, since, in his judgement, the upcoming Summer vacation (Middle July 9, North July 16, South July 23) causes that our fellow teachers will lose interest and stop studying. I do not agree that it is wise to eliminate 2 out of 12 months of thinking, especially when there is more time for this in Summer. He did agree however that the available two months then should be used by the board to have a flying start in September.

It is useful that this working group is initiated. Still, I don't think that such a working group will be very effective without the **other part** of my analysis, namely the advice for an enquiry by parliament. There is some risk in inviting fellow teachers to spend their time on didactics and

⁴² <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2016/03/26/abuse-of-john-allen-paulos>

⁴³ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/BHRM/2015-10-28-Malconduct-Roorda-Daemen-Drijvers.pdf>

⁴⁴ <http://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/1727>

⁴⁵ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/COTP/Index.html>

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

⁴⁷ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2016-05-09-Letter-to-VOR-and-Trainers-of-teachers.pdf>

research that won't be used. Eventually, having this working group might cause more support for the advice to such a parliamentary enquiry. But why not say so immediately? Why assume that our fellow teachers have small frames of mind and cannot see the big picture? Thus, this letter to you is partly to remind you of these aspects.

Red Card for the board, and major reason for it

Apart from that, I am sorry to say that I must give your board a **Red Card**. This means that I ask you to resign and form a new board with no bias as your board has shown. I do not presume that you will actually hear what I say, and thus I request speaking time at the "rondvraag" in the annual meeting of November 5 2016. It would be best to have this as a full item on the agenda, but then this must be prepared with some committee. Likely you will not agree with such an agenda point and committee, whence I shall propose this in the "rondvraag". The Red Card at least expresses my judgement that you have failed as a board of NVvW over 2015-2016 and that I will say so to the rest of the world. Perhaps I am the only person who thinks so but let history judge. It doesn't mean that you should stop trying to communicate with me, of course. If you would invite me for a presentation then I would still give it. But the card has been given now and I will explain this in the "rondvraag".

A major reason to give you this Red Card is to protect my personal integrity and openness of mind ("onbevangenheid"). I want to live in truth and do not want to contribute to confusion. I document what has been happening since 2008, and this documentation must be clear and precise. My agreement with Swier Garst on **Appendix A** (draft) and **part** of my analysis should not be confused with the lack of progress or blockage on other issues. I do not want to give the impression that I would not be clear on this. NVvW must be fully informed. If parliament later asks questions about this, then I can refer to this letter.

At the "Onderwijs meets onderzoek" event of June 20 2016 at one session I surprised myself (and others) by a flare of indignation, fueled by all maltreatment in NVvW since 2008, also in this present year.⁴⁸ It was only a flare, and I immediately apologized for this lack of control, and fortunately it was accepted and the speaker remained unperturbed. With some contemplation I also arrive at the conclusion that I better express the problem and write this letter. I better give this present NVvW board this Red Card, rather than visit the annual convention of 2016 as if there would be no problem (and hopefully not listen to a misrepresenting lecture again⁴⁹).

No proper respect by NVvW since 2008 for my scientific advice since 2008 for a parliamentary enquiry into mathematics education

As an econometrician (Groningen 1982) (e.g. at the Central Planning Bureau (CPB) 1982-1991) and teacher of mathematics (Leiden 2008), I concluded in 2008 on mathematics education that the best advice was that parliament had an enquiry into mathematics education.^{50 51} "*Elegance with Substance*" repeated this advice for each nation in the world.⁵²

I have had no adequate response by the board of NVvW since 2008. I appreciate that the board at that time took the effort to reply, see the 9 lines in point 7 of the collected responses.⁵³ This response still is inadequate. People should be able to see this inadequacy, certainly now that 8 years of stagnation have passed. I don't mind it when people disagree with me, but please observe that the NVvW boards since 2008 have failed **to ask questions first**.

Teachers (and professors) of mathematics generally have made no study of economics and government. They may grow into management positions and might be able to do well in management up to some degree (say, "director of the Freudenthal Institute"). They might be able to speak with members of parliament and start to think that they know about parliament.

⁴⁸ I noticed that Jan Jimkes had a similar experience: "Ik werd zo boos, dat ik besloot al haar onjuiste argumenten op te schrijven." Above interview:

http://www.beteronderwijsnederland.nl/files/'Het_werd_doorgedrukt'_Tegen_het_Studiehuis.pdf

⁴⁹ <http://www.wiskundebrief.nl/724.htm#6>

⁵⁰ <http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/tk-onderzoek-wiskundeonderwijs>

⁵¹ <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/Wetenschap/Artikelen/2008-04-17-WiskundeOnderwijs.pdf>

⁵² <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/Index.html>

⁵³ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2009-10-15-Reacties.pdf>

Economists who study political economy and the management of the state obviously might also fail miserably (which judgement however requires expertise to judge). However, it is too simple for NVvW to assume that my advice within the realm of the **political economy of mathematics education** can be rejected in the manner as NVvW has been doing.

NVvW does not show proper respect for my competence as a scientist, econometrician and teacher of mathematics. Proper respect is to study the argument, ask questions when you don't understand something (or think that you disagree), and call in other experts even when you agree. Make sure that there is proper discussion. Part of monitoring the discussion might be to look into my background, e.g. also at the Dutch Central Planning Bureau (CPB), see below.

NVvW participates in PWN. PWN hired economists to write a report on the importance of mathematics education for the economy, but failed to introduce me to these fellow-economists. PWN thus is responsible for **blocking communication between economists**, and creates its own bubble of rosy information, and misleads the minister of education.⁵⁴

It is rather impossible to communicate with people who don't read well, who do not show an open mind and who are convinced that they are right. My response to this lack of respect for science has been an exercise in patience. My attitude has been to let time do its work. Everyone can compare the present situation (no parliamentary enquiry in 2008) with the counterfactual (a parliamentary enquiry in 2008 and the creation of the Simon Stevin Institute). Now try again for 2016 with the advantage of added documentation.⁵⁵ Are we to wait another 8 years ?

It is useful to see this also in the light of the recent CPB report "*Kansrijk Onderwijsbeleid*".⁵⁶ Earlier, I warned that the combination of CPB and mathematics education was risky.⁵⁷ In the present study, the former colleagues neglect the option of the Simon Stevin Institute. The emphasis on "statistical results" neglects the issues of political economy or institutional economics. There is a dangerous cocktail of neglect by NVvW and neglect by KNAW and CPB. See:

<http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/English/Science/Letters/2016-05-17-Letter-to-KNAW-and-CPB.pdf>

<http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/English/Science/Letters/2016-05-25-Letter-to-KNAW-and-CPB-supplement.pdf>

There is a particular other problem with CPB and censorship of science. Overall, I am horrified that Dutch society accepts censorship of science since 1990 by the directorate of the CPB. It is not difficult to verify that this censorship exists,⁵⁸ and thus it is not clear why a civilized person would not protect science. There is this grand story about Galileo and the Pope and supposedly Holland is a tolerant country and wouldn't do the same, but Holland does commit censorship of science. My horror concerns the whole of Dutch society, and to my regret there is no evidence that the community of Dutch mathematics education can be excluded, even though this community has had a chance to see work of mine in the for me new area of mathematics education. I do not want to mix needlessly the world of economic advice with the world of mathematics education - though EWS shows where a proper mix exists, namely in the political economy of mathematics education - but there remains the phenomenon that Dutch teachers of mathematics tend to be participants in Dutch society.

I haven't had much time to look at "Kansrijk Onderwijsbeleid" yet. It causes discussion, e.g. about differentiation in primary education (PE).⁵⁹ This discussion should not distract. However, it might be useful to mention the following. CPB might be right on this particular issue of differentiation but perhaps for the wrong reasons.⁶⁰ I tend to support Henk Boonstra on this issue.^{61 62} When we have differentiation in secondary education (SE) then logic dictates that such would also be useful for PE. A condition for younger children must be that school is close

⁵⁴ http://www.platformwiskunde.nl/home_deloitte_rapport.htm

⁵⁵ <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/10/31/the-power-void-in-mathematics-education>

⁵⁶ <http://www.cpb.nl/publicatie/kansrijk-onderwijsbeleid>

⁵⁷ <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/Wetenschap/Artikelen/2011-07-12-Colignatus-Wiskunde-CPB.html>

⁵⁸ <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/TPnCPB/NVMC/Verslag.html>

⁵⁹ <http://stukroodvlees.nl/kansrijk-onderwijsbeleid-de-economische-tunnelvisie-van-het-cpb>

⁶⁰ <http://www.volkskrant.nl/ opinie/groeperen-van-leerlingen-leidt-wel-tot-betere-prestaties~a4327267>

⁶¹ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2016-03-16-Henk-Boonstra-on-Elementary-School.html>

⁶² <http://henkboonstra.blogspot.nl/2016/06/313-cpb-en-anders-indelen-van-klassen.html>

at home, and that differentiations must not be rigid.⁶³ The burden of proof is on who doesn't want to differentiate.⁶⁴ Don't group pupils of the same level, but group them on learning speed and learning style, because a younger fast pupil might temporarily have the same level as an older slow student but it doesn't help to group these together. Do not take current training of elementary school teachers as the null hypothesis, but first define a standard that must be met. Please observe that all studies on teaching effectiveness are seriously distorted by RME vs TME math wars and psychometricians refusing to study mathematics education,⁶⁵ and that it would be important to first restore common sense and science.⁶⁶ One of my advices has been that teachers at university also adopt supportive positions at elementary schools, to break down barriers to mutual understanding (academics about schools and pupils, teachers about research). Admittedly, formats must be developed so that this indeed results into support and communication and not increased frustration on both sides.

No proper response by NVvW board of issues in 2015-2016

Over the course of 2015-2016 I have mentioned some issues that would naturally require attention by the NVvW. I may not have alerted the board to all such issues, but I hope that I may presume e.g. that the board reads the Wiskunde-brief. The reaction of NVvW board to such issues has been *burking* (Dutch: "doodzwijgen"). For example, there has been no mention of the following in the NVvW Nieuwsbrief (letter to the members) of January, March, May or June. I appreciate it that Swier Garst was willing to speak to me at length but why not pass on the information, and reply on content? The list of points need not be complete.

- This is a summary of core problems in the education in mathematics and arithmetic: <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-04-10-kern-misstanden.pdf>
- This is my report that **NVvW is a seriously sick association**: <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-03-11-NVvW-is-een-ernstig-zieke-vereniging.pdf>
- I wrote a long paper that shows that Hans Freudenthal (1905-1990) committed intellectual theft of ideas by Piere van Hiele (1909-2010), and reported on this summarily in November 2015, using a key point of evidence: <http://www.wiskundebrief.nl/718.htm#7> Apparently all those researchers on didactics of mathematics who refer to Freudenthal and/or Van Hiele have not been able to spot the abuse. I find this rather shocking on their competence, but can also explain this by the observation that those must have been ideologues and / or mathematicians who don't quite know what empirical science means. This is not ad hominem but a factual observation on competence, and perhaps a contribution to the statistics of the inflow of ideology into Dutch university. What is amazing is the lack of interest when the point is clarified.
- Above message on Freudenthal's fraud got a reply by Henk van der Kooij that was an ad hominem attack on me instead of an argument on content. **Swier Garst had stated to me that he would not accept an ad hominem**. However, as far as I can tell and presuming that Henk is member of NVvW too, Swier did not ask Henk to retract the ad hominem and to substantiate his criticism. See <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-03-11-Henk-vd-Kooij-Freudenthal-VanHiele.pdf>
- I wrote a longer paper that showed that the KNAW report of 2009 by Jan Karel Lenstra on arithmetic education contained a major flaw that destroyed its main conclusion. Apparently all the "experts" (ideologues) on arithmetic at Freudenthal Institute or association NVORWO or "Volgens Bartjens" / "Panama Post" or "arithmetic co-ordinators"⁶⁷ or CITO or the Inspectorate of Education ("Onderwijsinspectie") had not been able to spot that flaw. A summary of November 2015 is at <http://www.wiskundebrief.nl/721.htm#5> I am curious why Jan van de Craats of the TME sect did not spot the flaw either, even though Liesbeth van

⁶³ <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2016/06/19/success-rate-trade-off-ctnd>

⁶⁴ <http://www.volkskrant.nl/ opinie/vmbo-ers-niet-gebaat-bij-uitstel-selectie~a4328658>

⁶⁵ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2016-05-09-Letter-to-VOR-and-Trainers-of-teachers.pdf>

⁶⁶ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/NiceNumbers/Index.html>

⁶⁷ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-03-08-Post-HBO-opleiding-rekencoördinatoren.pdf>

der Plas in 2009 provided the criticism before the KNAW report was published.⁶⁸ A likely explanation is that KNAW 2009 referred to "empirics" as "statistical papers" and that Jan van de Craats knows neither empirics nor statistics. (Validity is a key issue for statistics, and a single counterexample can destroy a whole battery of tests.) It is also amazing that NVvW itself didn't question these "experts". Why not respond to my finding ?

- The NVvW board had been wrongly advising Parliament and minister about the policy on arithmetic and "rekentoets": <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-03-06-NVVW-bestuur-desinformeert-het-parlement-over-het-rekenen.pdf> en <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-03-12-Brief-aan-TK-cieOCW-onderwijs-wiskunde-rekenen-rekentoets.pdf>
- I clarified that the lecture by Koeno Gravemeijer at the NVvW annual meeting of 2015 was disinforming and selective on economics and biased w.r.t. "realistic mathematics education" (RME). Nobody of the board asked me for further information, given my expertise on this, which is also a pity w.r.t. the Onderwijs2032 confusions. <http://www.wiskundebrief.nl/724.htm#6>

Yellow Card for the board, April 10 2016

On April 20 2016 I gave the NVvW board a **Yellow Card** when:

- My submissions to the NVvW internal internet forum were moved by you to a newly created separate location "archieff" where these will generally not be seen by other members of NVvW. The link to these "archieff" messages (seven by me, one is by Hans Wisbrun) is: <https://www.nvvw.nl/forum#/categories/archieff> I am fully aware that some seven messages might be more than from the average member, but please observe that my messages might increase in number when people don't read my work well etcetera.
- The board's stated reason was that the 2016 exam finals were approaching and that our colleagues would otherwise not be able to find messages on these. This "reason" does not make sense. CE 2016 got a subdirectory for itself.

I protest to this action as an effort at censorship or burking. My suggestion is that you clarify this to the annual meeting.

Please observe that it is bizarre that also my report that the **NVvW is a seriously sick association** has been hit by this censorship or burking. The report on sickness is answered by making the patient more sick ?

In a democratic society and a professional association, the freedom of expression is crucial to identify problems and to find ways of progress. My texts are civilised and on content and to the point. If some text is problematic, please explain this first on content. One might not like the reports but that is a wholly different issue and no reason to treat them like this. My report on NVvW refers to the **kicking to the death** of soccer linesman Ronald Nieuwenhuizen in 2012.⁶⁹ I hope that people understand that it is with good reason that I compare what has been happening in NVvW in 2008-2016 with this deadly hooliganism. Better kicked to death than suffer NVvW. In civil society it aren't goals in soccer that bring improvement, but it are scientific results like EWS and my other books. When the board of NVvW allows these works to be maltreated as has been happening then you don't understand what civil society is.

⁶⁸ <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/English/Science/Letters/2016-05-25-Letter-to-KNAW-and-CPB-supplement.pdf>

⁶⁹ <http://www.rtlnieuws.nl/nieuws/binnenland/betaald-voetbal-staat-stil-bij-doodtrappen-grensrechter>

Red Card for the chief editor of Euclides, May 9 2016

In May 2016 I gave a Red Card to the new chief editor of Euclides [NCEE] for maltreating two of my submissions to the journal and by not responding to my letter on the censorship w.r.t. my books since 2012.⁷⁰

- The first article concerned the idea to use $H = -1$, thus, to represent -1 with an algebraic symbol, wisely chosen as H , like the imaginary number i . This appears to allow a key improvement in didactics. [NCEE] rejected the submission by stating that Euclides was meant more for reports on recent developments. This misrepresents that Euclides also looks into didactics. See the paper <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-01-10-negatieve-getallen-breuken-Simon-Stevin-Instituut.pdf> and the email exchange <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-03-09-Emails-negatieve-getallen-breuken-SSI.pdf>
- The second article concerned the Simon Stevin Institute, and here [NCEE] simply did not react to the submission. The paper is: <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-03-03-Het-Simon-Stevin-Instituut.pdf>
- In the past, Euclides maltreated my books "*Elegance with Substance*" (2009, 2015) and "*Conquest of the Plane*" (2011) by publishing "reviews" that include ad hominem and misrepresentation and slander. Is it acceptable to refer to "zonderling", "Don Quichote" and "pseudo-mathematics" ? My protest against this abuse caused Euclides since 2012 to boycott new books by me.⁷¹ Swier Garst suggested to me that there was a new chief editor [NCEE], and that I try again. This became the following letter, but [NCEE] never replied to this: <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2016-03-10-Email-Euclides-tav-censuur-boeken.pdf>

This issue is a bit intransparent since there have been other differences of judgement between me and the editors of Euclides in 2016 (see the NVvW forum). E.g. these specific points:

- E.g. Michiel Doorman (Freudenthal Institute) referred in Euclides 91-3 (December 2015) to Hans Freudenthal for the notion of "anti-didactic inversion" while Freudenthal only coined that **phrase** while the original inventor of the notion was Pierre van Hiele, so that Doorman as a scientist should give proper reference. It would be proper for him to also protest against the abuse by Freudenthal. (Technically, Doorman referred to the thesis by Sacha La Bastide – Van Gemert, and then didn't observe that this thesis contains a crucial inconsistency, see my paper on the matter.⁷²)
- E.g. Kees Hoogland in Euclides 91-5 (March 2016) abused the autobiography by John Allen Paulos for "realistic mathematics education", see <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2016/03/26/abuse-of-john-allen-paulos>

Overall, I refer to names of people because of their publications. I have used the label [NCEE] because the editor has a different function. However, for his background I must refer to his website.⁷³ I thus realised later that [NCEE] has been the editor of the *Nieuwe Wiskrant*, the no longer existing journal of the Freudenthal Institute that advocated "realistic mathematics education" (RME). This institute better be called "Freudenthal Head in the Clouds Realistic Mathematics Institute" (FHCRMI), for we better get rid of the idea as if Freudenthal knew about mathematics education other than via ideology. This schoolyear-edition 91 of Euclides shows a bias to RME that [NCEE] might not be aware of because of his background. One would want to make amends for this background (otherwise it would look like an ad hominem apart from serious questions about ideology and competence) but my protest was that he did not reply in content to my criticism on content.

⁷⁰ See point 23 on page 23 of <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2016-05-09-Letter-to-VOR-and-Trainers-of-teachers.pdf>

⁷¹ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/AardigeGetallen/2012-06-Gedoe-bij-Euclides.html>

⁷² <https://arxiv.org/abs/1408.1930>

⁷³ <http://www.uu.nl/staff/AJGGoris/0>

NVvW board doesn't act w.r.t. the Red Card for the chief editor of Euclides

When I informed [NCEE] about this Red Card for him, his reply was correctly that he should leave the field, and his false inference was that he would "therefor" no longer respond to mail by me. See **Appendix B**. [NCEE]'s response is a deliberate misrepresentation and abuse of power.

Obviously I have no power to appoint or dismiss an editor at Euclides. My conclusion that the current editor should be replaced is based upon his performance, and does not mean that I should be blocked from submitting an article. [NCEE] is seriously confused.

The NVvW board knows about this, and doesn't act. I explained the situation to the board in a message of May 10 2016. When I spoke with Swier Garst in the Thai restaurant on May 31 2016 he was reluctant to say anything about this. I took this as a sign that the board wasn't going to act indeed. We might have discussed this in equally aimable fashion as the issue in **Appendix A** but at some moment the sun sets and one has to go home.

Mathematicians fail w.r.t. education as well as they fail w.r.t. elections (Brexit)

"*Elegance with Substance*" (EWS) explains that mathematicians fail w.r.t. education in the same manner as w.r.t. the global financial crisis⁷⁴ or the theory of democracy. There is now the example of the referendum on the Brexit of June 23 2016.⁷⁵ PM. I nowhere stated that mathematicians are solely responsible. But their role and contribution requires attention.

If NVvW had responded with more respect to my advice of 2008 to have an enquiry by parliament on mathematics education, then also this issue on voting mentioned in EWS would have come to the attention of the Dutch parliament, and so on ...

A key issue is the position of Dutch parliamentarian and former mathematics teacher **Paul van Meenen** (D66). The political party D66 has the "crown jewels" of direct elections of prime minister and mayors, district voting and referenda. These were chosen in 1966 by D66-founder Hans van Mierlo (referenda a bit later) because of infatuation with the USA and JFK, and not because of scientific research. Scientific research shows these "crown jewels" to be less democratic. Could Van Meenen confirm this? I suppose that NVvW would not tend to explain this to him and parliament too, when in the same room, when the agenda is on another issue. But remember Cato: "Carthaginem delendam esse." It really does not help when Van Meenen would be confirmed in a reputation based upon mathematics and mathematics education, while not mentioning the points of criticism w.r.t. these "crown jewels" of D66.

Officially politicians are responsible for elections, and secondly their advisors on political science, but often the chain of responsibility continues until there is an abstract thinking mathematician who confuses the issues, and often a reconstruction may show that people only follow him or her. See my warning to beware of mathematics for the theory of elections.⁷⁶

The editors of Euclides in 2011 maltreated my submission on the better analysis, though one must study this maltreatment carefully, since mathematicians have created so many confusions here that it might seem outwardly as if Euclides only treated the paper fairly and rejected its publication in Euclides on good grounds.⁷⁷

Recently, I discovered that Rob Bosch, member of the editors of Euclides for about 25 years, wrote his thesis on voting theory also under supervision of Jan van de Craats, leading spokesman of the ideology of TME. This must be a mathematics thesis, since I am not aware of study by neither Van de Craats nor Bosch about democracy in reality. There are all kinds of connections here.⁷⁸ I am happy with all kinds of mathematics and various kinds of connections, but the cumulation of confusion upon confusion is very problematic, especially when people **refuse to answer** to simple and clear questions.

⁷⁴ <http://www.ams.org/notices/201105/rtx110500699p.pdf>

⁷⁵ <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2016/04/22/referenda-tend-to-be-silly-and-dangerous-see-the-brexite>

⁷⁶ <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/Wetenschap/Artikelen/2013-02-14-PasOpMetWiskundeOverVerkiezingen.html>

⁷⁷ <http://thomascool.eu/Thomas/Nederlands/Wetenschap/Artikelen/2008-2011-Euclides-over-ZonderTijdGeenMoraliteit.html>

⁷⁸ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2016-03-15-Some-experiences-with-HdS-RB-FvdDS-JvdC.html>

Another example is that there is a crucial error on Kennislink.nl, made in 2005 and discovered by me in 2012. It is being made by mathematician Vincent van der Noort, and one can show that he didn't study democracy, but both he and the editors refuse to acknowledge this and repair that error.⁷⁹ The chief editor and journalist Sanne Deurloo (Chemistry) might have too much fear for mathematics to puncture the confusion, or the subsequent mathematics editors (Alex van den Brandhof 2012, Marc Seijlhouwer 2013, Arnout Jaspers in 2016) have too little interest in reality and democracy to care about this, or they also are freelancers who have to deal with the opinions of chief editor Deurloo who determines where the money goes. Obviously, when NVvW and Euclides maltreat my work, then Deurloo might get mixed messages about the quality of my work, and she might not develop any respect for my expert judgement that it is important to repair this error. The result: continued desinformation and cynicism about democracy and growing preference for "leadership" (and then there are the semantics about the difference with dictatorship).

Let me quote from my weblog:

- Referenda work only well when there are **two options** only, with a clear-cut Yes / No answer. This kind of question occurs only by exception.
- Normal issues have more options and grades of grey. With at least three options, there arises the Condorcet paradox. For such issues, there better be representative government, with a Parliament selected by proportional representation (PR), and which Parliaments uses more complex methods for bargaining and voting – see "*Voting Theory for Democracy*".⁸⁰
- The **pitfall** is that a question might seem to have a clear-cut Yes / No answer while it actually has other options and such grades. Check how the Brexit question masks the other options. It often is an issue of political manipulation to reduce a complex issue to seeming simplicity, and to create a situation such that the political leader who drafts the question might argue to have the backing of the people.
- Referenda belong to populism and not to democracy.

In the present case, Scotland now might leave the UK to remain with the EU. One might hold that they should stay with the UK as the decision of their recent referendum, but they might revise their view. In that case, one might argue that both referenda must be redone. In the end, representative government with proportional representation (PR) is much more sensible. A main problem for the UK is that it has district representation (DR), and that the question on the referendum on PR was crooked.⁸¹

I maintain and have proven that NVvW and Euclides have been obstructing the dissemination of both the theory of democracy and criticism about the abuse of mathematics in this area.

Conclusion

I have full respect when someone has another opinion. My books are invitations to think and communicate and research, and not my dictate how things should be. What I protest against are the misrepresentation and burking. When I protest then it is on content and to the point and not ad hominem.

The statement by the NVvW board of 2009 w.r.t. my analysis (point 7 in the collected responses⁸²) might be rather a misunderstanding than a misrepresentation. It fails because of insufficient respect, for not asking questions first and for jumping to conclusions. Such attitude is no proper base for neither the burking in 2008-2016 nor the tolerance for the abuse at Euclides.

The core of the Red Card for your current board of NVvW is burking and the effort at censorship (Yellow Card) and the lack of action w.r.t. abuse of power at Euclides and the dismal performance w.r.t. "*Onderwijs meets onderzoek*". I have documented in decent manner that the

⁷⁹ <https://vragen.wetenschapsagenda.nl/vraag/hoe-valt-een-wetenschappelijk-kwalijke-fout-op-kennislinknl-tav-democratie-te-corrigeren>

⁸⁰ <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/VTFD/Index.html>

⁸¹ Mathematics Teaching 222, January 5 2011, <http://www.atm.org.uk/Mathematics-Teaching-Journal-Archive/3921>, <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/VTFD/2010-05-27-Wrt-Referendum-on-PR.html>

⁸² <http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2009-10-15-Reacties.pdf>

NVvW is a seriously sick association, and this message should have had a chance to be heard by others and discussed rather than maltreated as you have chosen.

I suppose that a committee (with decent scientists) would confirm that my approach has been scientifically correct. My problem is that I have no idea who such decent scientists in Holland might be. If those scientists would have been widely available, then the period since 1990 would have looked differently. Instead, when universities speak about scientific integrity, then these are mostly the managers who want to protect the reputation of their institutes rather than protect individual victims.⁸³ KNAW / LOWI doesn't mind when Jan Karel Lenstra refuses to answer to criticism on his KNAW 2009 report.⁸⁴ Lenstra now heads the allocation of the NWO Spinoza prizes.⁸⁵ Perhaps NVvW can do a search for decent scientists who then can say what they think about these 2008-2015 and 2015-2016 periods on mathematics education and its research ?

Kind regards,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
Econometrician (Groningen 1982) and teacher of mathematics (Leiden 2008)
Scheveningen
<http://thomascool.eu>

⁸³ <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2015/11/26/allea-defines-research-integrity-too-narrow>

⁸⁴ <http://www.thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2014-07-22-Aan-KNAW-LOWI-tav-Jan-Karel-Lenstra.html>

⁸⁵ <https://boycottholland.wordpress.com/2012/06/05/the-dutch-spinoza-prize>

Appendix A. Draft text working group on re-engineering math ed

Date: Sun, 05 Jun 2016 09:59:39 +0200

To: Swier Garst

From: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus

Subject: Concept-tekst Werkgroep Herontwerp Onderwijs in Wiskunde (HOW)

Dag Swier,

Hieronder en in bijgaand Word document staat een tekstvoorstel voor facebook, Wiskunde-brief, nieuwsbrief en t.z.t. de NVvW website.

De relatie tot de werkgroep "Wiskunde voor Morgen" is ietwat problematisch. Ik heb me daarvoor aangemeld, maar geen reactie ontvangen. De NVvW website voor die werkgroep geeft ook geen ledenlijst.

Maar zoals mijn tekstvoorstel luidt kan in gescheiden paden worden begonnen, en kan werkende weg over de overlap worden gesproken. Het beste onderscheid is denklijk tussen onderzoek en implementatie, maar dan zou ik toch ook deel willen nemen aan het traject ter implementatie.

Met beste groet,

Thomas

=====

Werkgroep Herontwerp Onderwijs in Wiskunde (Werkgroep HOW)

2016-06-05

Concept-tekst van Thomas Colignatus voor Swier Garst

Het bestuur van de NVvW ondersteunt het denken over vernieuwende didactieken wanneer die een kans hebben om bij leerlingen tot betere kennis, vaardigheden en attitude te leiden. Er zijn minstens twee wijzen van aanpak voor vernieuwing. De eerste aanpak neemt de traditionele stof als uitgangspunt, en zoekt naar betere manieren van uitleg of werkvormen of toetsing. Dit geeft bijvoorbeeld de discussie over de "realistische" versus de "traditionele" didactiek. De NVvW heeft hiervoor een werkgroep "Wiskunde voor Morgen". De tweede aanpak stelt de traditionele stof ter discussie, pleegt een herontwerp, en maakt dan gebruik van de ervaringen uit de eerste methode voor de verdere implementatie. Thomas Colignatus heeft sinds 2008 laten zien dat die tweede aanpak tot soms verrassende inzichten kan leiden. Wellicht is implementatie iets van de verdere toekomst maar het maakt docenten wel alert op mogelijke hobbels en misverstanden bij leerlingen. Is het bijv. denkbaar dat de leerboeken in de toekomst niet alleen spreken over 360 graden of 2π radialen maar ook over het platte vlak zelf als eenheid voor de hoek, met een boog van 1 draai in het rond ? Het bestuur van de NVvW wil nu een werkgroep "Herontwerp Onderwijs in Wiskunde" (HOW) instellen om deze tweede aanpak te ondersteunen. De bedoeling is dat voorstellen, niet alleen van Colignatus maar ook anderen, worden uitgewerkt, bijv. voor toetsing in onderzoek bij NRO, het maken van voorbeelden van lessen, suggesties voor de leerboeken en computerprogrammatuur, exameneisen, en gevolgen voor het curriculum. Dit kan vrij ingewikkeld worden, omdat veranderingen kunnen cumuleren maar je niet teveel tegelijkertijd wilt veranderen. Belangstellenden worden verzocht zich aan te melden bij de secretaris Kees Garst secretaris@nvvw.nl cc Thomas Colignatus cool@dataweb.nl. Voorbeelden van mogelijke onderwerpen van discussie staan bijvoorbeeld in de boeken van Colignatus: "Elegance with Substance" (2009, 2015), "Conquest of the Plane" (2011), "Een kind wil aardige en geen gemene getallen" (2012), "A child wants nice and no mean numbers" (2015) en "Foundations of Mathematics. A Neoclassical Approach to Infinity" (2015).

Appendix B. Power abuse by new chief editor of Euclides [NCEE]

From: [NCEE]
To: "Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus", vakbladeuclides nwww.nl
Cc: DB NVvW, voorzitter wiskgenoot.nl
Subject: RE: Rode kaart voor [NCEE]
Date: Mon, 9 May 2016 18:45:03 +0000

Hallo Thomas,
Dank je voor de rode kaart. Dat betekent dat ik dit speelveld moet verlaten en dus niet meer in staat zal zijn op welke mail dan ook te reageren.
Groet!
[NCEE]

-----Oorspronkelijk bericht-----
Van: Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
Verzonden: maandag 9 mei 2016 18:23
Aan: vakbladeuclides nwww.nl
CC: db nwww.nl; voorzitter wiskgenoot.nl
Onderwerp: Rode kaart voor [NCEE]

Geachte redactie en [NCEE],

Julie zouden hiervan kunnen willen weten: In deze brief aan de VOR en lerarenopleidingen geef ik op pagina 23 (toevallig ook punt (23)) een rode kaart aan [NCEE], zie de onderbouwing.

<http://thomascool.eu/Papers/Math/2016-05-09-Letter-to-VOR-and-Trainers-of-teachers.pdf>

Een belangrijke factor is dat ik niets heb gehoord op de inzending van 3 & 5 maart (volledigheidshalve bijgesloten), *** twee maanden geleden ***, ook niet na herinner-vraag van 2 mei (zie onder).

Mogelijk is het druk besproken en is men nu met vakantie, maar ik wil niet langer het voordeel van de twijfel hanteren na de toegelichte andere negatieve ervaringen. Ik ontkom niet aan de indruk van bewust niet-reageren zonder expliciete melding dat dit gedaan wordt. Mocht dit abusief zijn dan hoor ik het graag.

Mijn bedoeling was eerst dit artikel over het Simon Stevin Instituut te plaatsen en dan een artikel over de fraude van Freudenthal. Dit kan nu qua planning lastig worden. Is het mogelijk nog spoedig en terzake te reageren ?

Voor de redactie wijs ik nog naar dit stukje in de wiskunde-brief over didactiek van kwadratische functies. Ik heb al vaak uitgelegd wat mijn algemene analyse is. Maar iedere nieuwe ontdekking kan ook weer voor anderen een eye-opener zijn t.a.v. wat ik zeg (en niet wat men denkt te horen).

<http://www.wiskundebrief.nl/738.htm#5>

Ik doe kopie aan het DB en, omdat de NVvW een ernstig zieke vereniging is en het bestuur al een gele kaart heeft gekregen, ook aan de voorzitter van KWG.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Thomas

(...)