

Copy for the internet

To KNAW-LOWI
Official Secretary LOWI, XXXXX
P.O. Box 19121, 1000 GC Amsterdam

April 22 2015

Concerning: Appeal wr.t. your decision d.d. April 24 2014 on a slanderous "book review"

Dear dr. XXXXX,

The decision by LOWI d.d. April 24 2014, your ref. no. 2013 / 1775, allows a higher appeal, see page 9 of said decision. The full and signed decision that you sent to me states that the appeal must be directed to LOWI while the published and anonymised text (LOWIadvies2014nr6.pdf) states that the decision must be directed to the National Ombudsman: I presume that the full and signed statement takes precedence so that I must direct this to you.

The appeal is possible not w.r.t. content but only w.r.t. the procedure.

Overall, my reasoning is that I sent in my protest at TU Delft with good reason, and that something must have been wrong with the procedure, since the end result is that the protest has not been accepted. Overall, I feel wronged not only by the "reviewer" but now also by TU Delft and LOWI.

(1) Apparently, commission and board of TU Delft decided on content that my protest was not relevant, whence they did not invite me to discuss the issue, and whence they did not invite experts on the didactics of mathematics. The bias on content was that a "review" would not be "slanderous" but common practice. The bias on content thus determined the procedure. My protest was not taken seriously. Instead, if proper procedure had been followed, misunderstandings could have been discussed, experts could have been heard, and the protest could have been accepted.

(2) LOWI itself should have discussed the issue with me too. LOWI decided too early that it had all information and that it could take a decision without hearing more. Possibly, the bias that a "review" would not be "slanderous" caused neglect of proper procedure.

(3) LOWI suggests that my main concern is slander and that I should use common law to deal with that. However, I have explicitly protested w.r.t. the **integrity of science**. Why does LOWI treat me as if I would not understand this ? Bias feeds on bias. Apparently LOWI has not tested adequately against the integrity of science, and mistaken arguments as directed towards another interpretation.

(3a) I wonder whether you should have allowed me to read your decision in draft, for in that case I would have been able to warn against that wrong interpretation. This might perhaps be similar to actually invite me and discuss the case, which you didn't either. Let me say that integrity of science is not simple, and might not lend itself easily for "juridification" (as seems to be happening now).

(3b) Everyone with a background in mathematics - and LOWI doesn't use this - can see that the "review" does not discuss my novel suggestion on the derivative, and that the "reviewer" instead explains the traditional approach as if I would not understand it. This is not reviewing but a condescending treatment to degrade the book and its author. For everyone knowledgeable who has checked my book it will be clear that the "reviewer" here has mean intent. See what dr Boudri wrote. But clearly neither TU Delft nor LOWI have asked experts to check the book, to test the intent of the "review" and the false reporting. (PM. It is inappropriate to hold that the rule w.r.t. proper representation would only hold for "own research" since such knowledgeable experts would also accept that studying (my) novel work, and reporting on it fairly, belongs to such research.)

Kind regards,

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