

'Who shall judge ?':  
Authorship, Attribution and  
Accountability

“Who shall be judge whether the prince or legislative act contrary to their trust? . . . The people shall be judge; for who shall be judge whether the trustee or deputy acts well and according to the trust reposed in him, but he who deposes him. . . .”—LOCKE, *Second Treatise of Civil Government*, chap. XIX.

# The People Shall Judge

*Readings in the Formation of American Policy*

VOLUME I

Selected and Edited by

**THE STAFF, SOCIAL SCIENCES 1**

*The College of the University of Chicago*



# Hedy Lamarr



**Actress Hedy Lamarr and composer George Antheil are being honored by the EFF this year with a special award for a key component of wireless data systems. In 1942 Lamarr, and Antheil, discovered "frequency-hopping" that is now the basis for the spread spectrum radio systems used in the products ranging from cell phones to wireless networking systems.**

# Authorship

Usually in alphabetical Order

However, to make a point:

ON A CONJECTURE OF GOODEARL:  
JACOBSON RADICAL  
NON-NIL ALGEBRAS OF GELFAND-  
KIRILLOV DIMENSION 2

AGATA SMOKTUNOWICZ AND  
LAURENT BARTHOLDI

# Acknowledgment


Usually,

Acknowledgment

I am grateful to Jason Bell and to the anonymous referees for many helpful suggestions.

# DATA FABRICATION

Not Always What We Think



**But is this the full list?**

## Acknowledgement

In the Summer issue of *The Mathematical Intelligencer*, vol. 32, no. 2, we presented, with permission, a geometric-combinatoric pattern due to Anthony Hill. This was an array of 66 six-segment graphs, whose significance, and extraordinary origin, were explained on p. 3 of the issue; the array appeared on the cover. Its creator, Anthony

Hill, has pointed out to us that the colors in the cover design have no role in its status as solution of a certain combinatorial problem, and he asks that we apologize for departing from his concept by using color. We take full responsibility for this design decision, and we regret our failure to carry out his intentions in this respect. We hope Mr. Hill is comforted by the fact that every careful reader of the explanation we published will appreciate the meaning of his discovery and the irrelevance of the colors thereto.

Chandler Davis and Marjorie Senechal


However,

sometimes...

18th-Century Ship at the World Trade Center Site

# ARCHAEOLOGY

www.archaeology.org A publication of the Archaeological Institute of America November/December 2010



Origins of  
**Chocolate**

## Who Were the **Etruscans?**

Medieval Siberian Fortress

Spain's Doomed  
**Colonial Fleet**


**PLUS:**  
Timberhenge, Pompeii,  
Confederate POW Camp,  
Lawrence of Arabia

# The Correct Image

# ARCHAEOLOGY

18th-Century Ship at the World Trade Center Site

www.archaeology.com    A subscription to the Archaeological Institute of America    0003-8113/12/010000-00



Origins of  
**Chocolate**

Who Were the  
**Etruscans?**

Medieval Siberian Fortress

Spain's Doomed  
**Colonial Fleet**

PLUS:  
Timberline, Pompeii,  
Confederate POW Camp,  
Lawrence of Arabia

## Etruscologist Response

We, as Etruscologists, would very much appreciate it if you would post the following correction, since it is our understanding that *Archaeology*, the magazine published by the Archaeological Institute of America, does not intend to print a correction. The November/December 2010 issue of *Archaeology* featured an article on the Etruscans with the Louvre terracotta sarcophagus on the cover flipped in its orientation. In the article itself, two more photographs were also misoriented: the Pyrgi inscription on p. 39 and the Etruscan mirror on p. 43. Far too many people think the Etruscans are mysterious; and *Archaeology* has certainly deepened the mystery by implying that the Etruscans dined reclining on their right elbows and eating with their left hands -- which, of course, seems eminently logical, since their language is written from right to left. In short, we are saddened to say that *Archaeology* must be used with caution as a scholarly source of information. Please feel free to circulate this notice. Sincerely,

Jocelyn Penny Small, RutgersUniversity

Richard De Puma, University of Iowa

Ingrid Edlund-Berry, University of Texas – Austin

i Nagy, University of Puget Sound

Gregory Warden, Southern Methodist University

# The Future?

1) Interactivity in Peer Review

Blogs, Wikis, etc.

2) Responses to “attacking” blogs

3) Non-traditional publication (ArXiv, eg.)



---

---

## ██████████ On Human Hypocrisy (and Human-Centric Bigotry): A Typical Computer-Assisted Proof is Far More Rigorous (and Certain!, and Deeper!) than a typical Human-Generated Proof, (and some suggestions on how to improve the reliability of published mathematics in "peer"-reviewed journals)

Written: Oct. 5, 2010 [Last update Nov. 2, 2010]

It took the Annals of Mathematics many years to finally accept, very reluctantly, ██████████ seminal, computer-assisted, article proving Kepler's 300-year-old conjecture, because they didn't trust computer proofs. It took them only a couple of months to accept a human-generated proof, by ██████████ that was later found, by ██████████ to be seriously flawed (and even though the error was pointed out more than five years ago, it took them about four years to publish a retraction). Annals editor ██████████ looked at the bright side, commenting that "mathematics is self-correcting". I am not so sure, Professor ██████████! For any crooked politician that has been caught, there are ten of them that have never (and will never) be caught. I am sure that there are many other humanly-generated Annals articles that are seriously flawed, because they were only checked by one or two human mathematicians, who would rather do their own research, and since they remain **anonymous** they are not accountable for their sloppy job.

If even the *high-brow*, pretentious, *Annals of Mathematics* contains flawed papers, I am sure that the *middle-brow* (but apparently equally pretentious) ██████████ contains even more incomplete proofs, and sometimes completely erroneous ones. After all, an average paper is read by at most two people (the author and the referee). Most people are so busy writing papers, that they don't have time to read them, and look for mistakes. Since the results published in the ██████████ are not as "earth-shattering" as those published by the Annals, the motivation of people to find errors is very much reduced, and the referees, being anonymous, often do a very sloppy job.

On the other hand, a *computer-assisted* proof is far more reliable than any human proof, since such proofs are supported by reliable computer calculations, that in the hands of competent authors, are performed in several independent ways, and one can compare outputs. The probability of error, while strictly larger than zero, of course (after all the programming is still done by fallible humans), is much smaller than a traditional human-generated proof.

Hence, I was really disappointed when the ██████████ decided to reject a recent [beautiful submission](#), by my brilliant student ██████████ and myself, written in a lucid