

My comments for the “Request for Comments” (RfC) in wikipedia

© Thomas Colignatus, March 20 2006
<http://www.dataweb.nl/~cool>

(Copyright note: the wikipedia quotes fall under the GNU license)

Summary

The articles in the internet-encyclopedia wikipedia on “voting system” and “Arrow’s impossibility theorem” contain inaccurate and scientifically unwarranted information, that is misleading for the readers. A proposal to correct and improve that information got blocked by two students from MIT and SIMS, who appeared insensitive to the issue of integrity of science. Apparently wikipedia and science don’t mix easily and institutes of science and learning could spend more time on fostering the scientific attitude. Internet procedures can be time-consuming and inefficient. Seen in the context of the world problem of managing over-population and 800 million people in near starvation, and using democratic procedures to decide on these issues, words fail.

Introduction.....	3
Outline of the discussion below	7
The general situation of education as relevant here	8
The points.....	10
Key points	10
Subsidiary points.....	10
First summary	11
Second summary	11
Discussion of the points.....	12
(1) Student One edits a topic without properly studying the topic	12
(2) Student One edits a topic using bureaucratic arguments instead of reasoned arguments.....	16
(3) Student Two supports the basic error, doesn't notice the integrity issue.....	21
(4) Student One "does tend to be more aggressive" (quote of Student Two).....	23
(5) Student One shows the symptoms of "bad faith" (as opposed to "good faith") ..	30
Conclusions.....	37
Appendices.....	38
(1) Development of the case	38
How it started.....	38
Borda Fixed Point	38
The Borda Fixed Point article as it is now	41
(2) A recent contribution by Student One.....	42
(3) The Request for Comments page – with my comments added	43
(4) Letter to MIT and SIMS, March 11 2006	57
Introduction.....	59
The key point	60
A communication to the professor of a student is called a "threat"	62
Other points to consider	63
Conclusions.....	64
References and Appendices	65
Basic links.....	65
A request for a time out is not respected.....	65
Accusations from someone who probably doesn't know much about voting theory	66

Introduction

Currently, the globe counts about 800 million people in near starvation. The world population was about 2.5 billion 60 years ago, is about 6.5 billion in these years, and can be expected to grow to 8 billion in the next 20 – 25 years. The demands on the world's resources can be expected to be such that environmental degradation, famines, diseases, violence and wars will increase on a much larger scale. What happened on 9/11 2001 in New York is only a small example of the turmoil that may be expected. A complex issue is the use of nuclear energy. With rising energy demand, nations will want to develop nuclear resources, but, how can the world control its use and possible abuse ? With these parameters, it is fitting of the historical task of economists, started by Adam Smith, to provide warranted scientific advice how these problems can be managed. And when the advice is good, but people and governments don't listen, then it can be researched why they don't listen and how that can be remedied. A proper management of the ensuing disasters would be clearly to the advantage of all, and it remains a scientific mystery why people don't heed advice that would benefit them.

In 1959, when the world population was about 2.8 billion and expected to double "in the next 50 years", Aldous Huxley, when teaching at the University of California at Santa Barbara, stated:

"It indicates very clearly that we are living in a world for which there are no historical precedents whatsoever and that we have to resign ourselves to thinking in entirely new ways about a problem which our fathers never had any occasion to think about so intensely." (p44)

and "(...) over-population is quite clearly one of the gravest problems which confront us, and the choice before us is either to let the problem be solved by nature in the most horrifying possible way or else to find some intelligent and humane method of solving it (...)" (p58) Aldous Huxley, "The human situation", Lectures at Santa Barbara 1959 (University of California), Harper & Row 1977

One may conclude that this sound advice has hardly been listened to and that little has been achieved.

Since about 1970 economists have spent ever more research time on how people use information. It is within this context that I decided to check upon the quality of information in wikipedia and wikinfo, two encyclopedia's on the world wide web. One is reminded here of Diderot's original encyclopedia that helped the spread of new ideas in the period of the French Revolution. It may be observed that encyclopedia's can be parasitic on proper scientific research when they rephrase scientific findings to circumvent issues of copyright. When a scientist has spent years of research to find the proper words or formulas, he would be quoted in science, but could be rephrased in an encyclopedia, so that the latter becomes the copyright holder. It depends upon the quality of the encyclopedia whether original words are quoted and references to the original sources included. Sometimes a scientific researcher is invited to provide a encyclopedia

text on his or her finding, as e.g. Kenneth Arrow was invited for the article on his impossibility theorem in the New Palgrave. A key test on quality thus is how the encyclopedia relates to science and helps to foster the spread of human knowledge.

The websites en.wikipedia.org and www.wikinfo.org are mostly self-explanatory. Next to the “article” there is a “talk page” where the editors discuss the “revisions”. There is also a history log of past revisions. The key property of these internet encyclopedia’s is that people can freely join as editors and start collaborating on articles. The difference between wikipedia and wikinfo is that wikipedia has no threshold to participation, which also appears to cause occasional “edit wars” with “vandals”. Studies have shown that articles within wikipedia still tend to be very stable, i.e. when an article is vandalized by one of the editors then it is quickly restored, due to the fact that the editing group tends to keep a close watch on what is happening to their subject.

My check of course concerned the material on which I have done some research and am able to say a little. My research deals primarily with ways to improve living conditions and the state of democracy, including the world management problem. In my research I developed the concepts of tax void, dynamic marginal tax rate, Economic Supreme Court and Borda fixed point, amongst other things, such as the proper definition of economics and the proper definition of risk. Unfortunately, my work got censured in 1989 by the Dutch government. This causes all kinds of complications. Basically I wait till the censorship of science by the Dutch government has been solved. In the mean time I tend to not-submit my work to peer reviewed journals but to put my work on the web so that people can see what the censorship is about. When the censorship has been solved then I can start joining the usual scientific process again.

I observed that the information in the encyclopedia’s on these subjects, as of February 15 2006, was inaccurate and scientifically unwarranted. Having observed this, and noting the open access of the internet encyclopedia’s, I took the liberty to improve the articles.

My approach to improve the articles was as follows. First of all, I provided a reasoned argument that fitted in with the existing article and the “talk page”, so that the editors could understand what the improvement was about. Secondly, I provided a reference with more material to read up. Generally, my reference was to my own publication, available on the internet, where the argument was developed in full and other references could be found.

This approach fits in with the situation. Note that I referred to the Diderot encyclopedia that contributed to the “spread of new ideas”. Newness is a relative concept. What is new to the readers was no longer new to the editors. For the editors, the true criterion is soundness. If the editors don’t know anything about the subject, they might invoke sources of authority – e.g. peer reviewed journals. If the editors have knowledge about the subject, then they will understand a reasoned argument. Thus, my approach in improving the articles was to provide such reasoned argument.

It seems that various edits up to March 10 2006 have been accepted by the various editing groups – though only time will tell whether the edits are stable.

There however was one particular instant at wikipedia where a senior student in computer science at MIT completely rejected my edits on voting theory.

With the improvements removed again, wikipedia thus still contains inaccurate and scientifically unwarranted information on voting theory, misleading its readers.

The following discussion hence will concern only wikipedia on this issue of voting theory, and not discuss wikinfo or the other topics in wikipedia.

Note that my reference to the label “student” is factual. This co-editor at wikipedia who blocked my edits on voting theory lists himself as a senior student in computer science at MIT. One might refer to the co-editor as “co-editor” only, as one might suppose that it would be immaterial whether the co-editor is a baker or a car-salesperson. However, the latter is not entirely true, since a scientist works under the code of scientific integrity and a student is aspiring to be a scientist. Hence it adds information to identify the student as a student. Also, when I refer to this co-editor as “student”, it is not my intention to create the impression that this person “needs to learn”. While being graduated myself and having a professional life of some decades, I still consider myself a student in the subjects that I study. Thus, I still need to learn a lot myself. Also, I am not personally involved with the education of this student. Thus, by using the label “student”, I merely wish to identify that the issue can be judged from the angle of scientific integrity.

As I have studied voting theory for quite some years now, and wrote a book on it, I could observe that the arguments of that student were rash and improper. He hadn’t studied the edits that he rejected, hadn’t studied the reasoned arguments that I had provided, hadn’t studied the references provided, and the “reasons” that he gave for rejection were merely bureaucratic, namely that there would be some rule of the encyclopedia that would be violated.

Now, one wonders whether an online encyclopedia should be an environment where editors have a duty to educate other editors, (even) via the tedious editing process of that encyclopedia. This would be a most inefficient process, and it would put the burden on the “teaching editor” while the “student editor” isn’t aware of the problem and perhaps considers himself to be the “teacher editor”. In fact, I had already provided some “education”, by providing the edits and the reasoned arguments to support them, and I don’t think that one can expect more of me.

Clearly, similar problems of “different views” arise within a newspaper, or a scientific journal, or in education itself (e.g. when a student writes a thesis on a subject that the teacher is less familiar with, or when teachers are on a course in teaching methods). Each environment and situation will have its “modus operandi”. A general approach is the scientific attitude, to be modest about one’s own contribution, to ask questions, to acutely observe what is the problem, to study, and only then forward an opinion, albeit a

temporary opinion to be easily surrendered for a better one. This attitude fosters co-operation, for, when a remark is made, one knows that it has been thought about, so that one can reason towards a resolution. An entirely different situation arises of course when a reasoned argument is rejected by the invocation of bureaucratic arguments. In this case, one either smiles and rejects the invocation, or one requires a bigger bureaucrat to correct the situation. (Interestingly, in a democracy, the highest managers are controlled by popular vote, while this requires a voting method – but don't rely on wikipedia to accurately inform you about voting theory.)

At wikipedia, the student who didn't study took offence of my observation that he didn't study, filed a "Request for Comments" (RfC), and misconstrued my position in such a way that others blocked me "indefinitely" from editing wikipedia.

It appears that all this has become a time-consuming process.

I consider it an abomination that my valuable research time, that I wish to dedicate to the survival of mankind, is stolen by a student who doesn't study, who distorts information, who abuses his insider-position; while the final effect still is that this online encyclopedia still provides inaccurate and scientifically unwarranted information on voting theory, misleading its readers.

The RfC procedure seems to be that an issue is posted on the internet, that everybody can enter texts, and then ... someone would have to decide ? In this RfC procedure, there is the option that I enter some comments.

It should be obvious that I have been ambivalent about doing so. As I said earlier:

On the one hand: I dislike to get involved in this, not only since I have to familiarize me first with what this procedure involves, but also since [the students provided /TC] a biased report and trying to restore this report into a balanced account will take a lot of time. In my view it would have been proper that these students first had the desired discussion with their professors, before they created this page. [...] So, on this hand, I would tend to wait it all out, let the professors talk to their students, so that they see the point, and can withdraw all this. [...]

On the other hand: I had intended to join wikipedia and I realize that various people are considering the situation, so that there is a lot of work involved for more people. It may also be a good learning experience for wikipedia that talking to your professor is not a threat and that when a scientist invokes the integrity of science clause then you shouldn't reply with a block.

In balance, I decided to create this text. I will post it on my own website, since I do not wish to relinquish the copyrights to that RfC page. The RfC page can contain a link to my website. Since I have been blocked from wikipedia, I cannot edit the RfC page, and will ask another person to include the link to this text on my website.

This RfC discussion has some value:

- (a) Voting theory is important for every citizen in a democracy, and readers of these lines may pick up some insights,
- (b) It is relevant to observe how wikipedia and science interact (on this topic of voting)
- (c) Students could learn not to be afraid of their professors

As valuable as these general points are, the discussion below however takes place within the context of a wikipedia RfC and “indefinite block”, which makes for a less agreeable environment. There are tedious statements “this person did this” and “then that person did that” which is unproductive writing and reading. Perhaps I should be “above all this”, don’t put my head under this guillotine, entirely reject this RfC problem and let wikipedia be wikipedia (and a paradise for students who don’t study). Originally, though, I thought wikipedia an interesting project, and my impression still is that it may still deserve the benefit of the doubt.

The discussion seems to focus on the positions of Student One at MIT, who thus started the problem, but also Student Two at SIMS, University of California at Berkeley, who was interfering in an unhelpful way. Objectivity is helped by using neutral labels. If we abstract from their names, then we can see the more general points above, and then the students get room to learn from the situation and to get on with their lives. In the discussion below, though, it cannot be avoided to mention their (user) names at occasion since they caused the RfC & block, and they themselves request an answer.

By taking up my time in a disproportional amount, I ask the students a small symbolic repayment, \$300 from Rob Speer and \$150 from Joseph Lorenzo Hall, at my bank account: Postbank giro 3736767, Arnhem, Holland (Swift account ING.B.NL.2A 3736767), putting your order to the name of Thomas Cool, Scheveningen, Holland.

Outline of the discussion below

The discussion below is somewhat complex.

First I will clarify the general situation of education, as relevant for this discussion. This helps to understand that the “private” world of wikipedia should not be opposed to science.

Then five points are identified that need to be discussed, two key points and three subsidiary points. There are two summaries, taken from other locations, that underline these points.

Subsequently, these points are developed in detail.

Though the issue is obvious, there can still be a separate section on conclusions.

The appendices contain: (1) a review of the development of the case, (2) a recent contribution by Student One, (3) the “Request for Comments” (RfC) page with my comments added, (4) my letter of March 11 2006 to MIT and SIMS

Thus, my comments for the RfC page must be seen as subsidiary to the discussion in the main body of the text, and cannot be seen as separate entries.

The general situation of education as relevant here

An outsider can refer students to their professors if that would contribute to the solution of an issue, or inform the professors of the problem and ask them to discuss this with the students. This can be done in general but is particularly useful when the integrity of science is involved. The wikipedia students however considered it a “threat” that their professors would be contacted.

Aldous Huxley, already quoted above, provides another excellent quote for the current problem:

“The state of amphibiousness between society and the individual, between history and biography, is an odd and uneasy kind of existence. But we have to accept it, and in the process of education we have to prepare young people to live in both worlds – to live as best they can in their individual world and, if possible, to take in intelligent interest in the historical one. They probably can never feel the historical world subjectively as they should – or perhaps they shouldn’t; I think it is a great blessing that we *don’t* feel it subjectively most of the time. Anyway, they should be aware of it intellectually and objectively, so as to be able to be useful citizens. For this is always the problem with human beings – to realize amphibiousness and to know that they must make the best of this world and of that.” (p121) Aldous Huxley, “The human situation”, Lectures at Santa Barbara 1959 (University of California), Harper & Row 1977

In the present example the students seem to live in their “private world” of wikipedia and they claim that they can neglect the historical world of both (integrity of) science and the world wide web. It would be useful that their professor explains to them that they cannot do so.

That is, I tried to explain it to them, but they apparently didn’t see me as a trustworthy source, and thus a chat with their professors could help.

I refer to my letter of March 11 2006 to the president of MIT and the dean of SIMS .

The Chancellor of MIT (<http://web.mit.edu/chancellor/> “The Chancellor has oversight responsibility for graduate and undergraduate education at MIT, student life, student services, and research policy.”) sent me this reply:

Phillip Clay <plclay@MIT.EDU>

To: cool@dataweb.nl

Date: Thu, 16 Mar 2006 18:33:01 -0500

Subject: Problem with integrity of science and two of your students

MIT takes ethics and allegations of violations of ethics seriously. We have many policies stressing the importance of ethics and ethics are an important part of the content of our educational programs.

We hope integrity is reinforced for our students at MIT, and that they take these lessons with them elsewhere. But we cannot monitor or get involved with the activities of members of our community that are not using MIT resources, are not on our campus, and are [not ?/TC] involved in MIT activities. We do educate our students to appreciate that they are adults and are subject to applicable law in all of their activities, and we, of course, take appropriate action when violations of law occur. We understand that you are not raising any violations of law.

The culture, protocol and standards are evolving in the wiki area, and this poses challenges as differing views on appropriate conduct are considered and resolved. These are issues that are debated in academic and other settings. We understand from your email that there is a Wikipedia process to consider your issues.

Thank you for raising an important issue.

Thus, if Student One doesn't use the computers at MIT for his wikipedia editing, and if students of MIT don't use wikipedia for their studies (on voting theory), then MIT doesn't consider getting involved in this. The Chancellor seems to assume that these conditions apply, and thus doesn't react to my statement: "My reason to contact you is to ask you to find a teacher or counselor at your school to have that chat."

It is a pity that, while I indicated that the wikipedia "process to consider your issues" is part of the problem, the Chancellor still refers me back to it.

Presumably, though, it was a useful exercise to send the letter, as the Chancellor thanks me for "raising an important issue".

It is up for debate amongst the wikipedia community whether "raising an important issue" is tantamount to a "threat", as the students argued that writing to their schools was a "threat" (which they maintained even after reading the letter to the schools).

PM. I have received no reaction from the Dean of SIMS. At a wikipedia page, I found this statement:

I'd like to clarify that Joe and I have not responded to any of Colignatus' off-Wikipedia actions (except that Joe sent an e-mail to his dean saying he should disregard Colignatus' e-mail, and the dean replied that he already had). This is not a combination of a Wikipedia dispute and an external dispute; it is a Wikipedia dispute, with one side of the dispute taking inappropriate off-Wikipedia actions (and getting blocked for it). rspeer / □æds□ 03:35, 15 March 2006 (UTC)
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia_talk:Requests_for_comment/Colignatus

The points

We can distinguish two **key points** and three **subsidiary points**. These points seem to be related but they can be distinguished for clarity.

Key points

The key points are:

- (1) Student One edits a topic without properly studying the topic
- (2) Student One edits a topic using bureaucratic arguments instead of reasoned arguments

These points hold even after he is warned about the integrity of science.

Subsidiary points

- (3) Student Two supports the basic error, doesn't notice the integrity issue
- (4) Student One "does tend to be more aggressive" (quote of Student Two)
- (4a) Student One used wikipedia labels {{prod}} and {{RfM}} too fast, not investigating the situation properly and putting the other editor into the situation that he couldn't simply edit but had to investigate wikipedia-procedures what this was all about.
- (4b) Student One talks down to the other user
- (5) Student One shows the symptoms of "bad faith" (as opposed to "good faith")
 - *neglects that answers have been given
 - *switches to other arguments
 - *misrepresents arguments
 - *gives false accusations
 - *calls something a "threat" which is no threat
 - *uses meta-methods to remove a person from the scene

First summary

A first summary of these points has been given in the letter to MIT and SIMS (replacing names with student labels):

The key point is that Student One holds wikipedia policy rules above the critical scientific attitude.

Other lines there are:

The basic point is that Student One didn't study the references that I gave him, but stuck to the wikipedia policy that references don't have to be read. Thus he applied wikipedia policy rules in a rather bureaucratic manner, and didn't adopt the critical scientific attitude. This attitude implies that he is instrumental in creating false information to the general public, while actually suggesting to the public that the information would be sound.

When confronted with this point, he didn't reply to this with rational conversation, but became very defensive of his position. Normal comments were called "threats".

The problem with Student Two is that he didn't recognize this behaviour, even when this was pointed out to him. He tried to mediate, but didn't see the point on which.

The students hold that wikipedia would be a special environment. This is only partly true. Wikipedia has some conventions, but conventions are not binding, and, which is my point, there is always the higher code of conduct of scientists.

Second summary

I reminded Student One of the proper procedure:

OK, what will happen now ? I noted that someone has suggested to delete the page on Borda fixed point. I removed that again since I suspect that it is you while I consider your reaction premature. Would it be possible for you (a) to read the text, (b) study the references when in doubt, (c) ask me questions if still in doubt, (d) only take any action after this, (e) and can you explain to me what is going in the mean time now that someone put that message there ? Please note that I wrote a book on voting theory so that I know what you have done, writing these pages. It is just that it is unsettling for a scientist like me to be suddenly confronted with 'deletion signs' that are wholly irrational. Colignatus 17:23, 5 March 2006 (UTC)
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Voting_system#Without_time_no_morality

Discussion of the points

(1) Student One edits a topic without properly studying the topic

One may suppose that Student One has studied the field of voting theory to some extent, since some of his edits seem valid. However, there is a certain rashness in his edits that suggests insufficient studying, and, more problematic, a resistance to suggestions by others that he should study some more.

Student One suffers from a serious misunderstanding about voting theory, since he makes the following statement:

==Math, not politics==

An anon[ymous] added the opinion that Arrow's theorem is "flawed" to the page, couched in weasel words ("criticized by many voting theorists" to mean "I don't like it").

This is an opinion that I have encountered before. It does not belong in Wikipedia, because not only is it expressing a point of view that favors certain voting methods over others, the statement is not even about Arrow's theorem.

Arrow's theorem is a "theorem", a mathematical statement that has been proven. Since the proof has undergone peer review, it is almost certainly not a flawed proof. So the "theorem", which states that no voting method satisfies a certain five or so criteria, is not flawed.

There is a certain popular, non-mathematical rephrasing of Arrow's theorem, which you will not find on Wikipedia: ""Every voting method is flawed."" This is what the anon was attacking, apparently, but it is not the subject of this article.

[[User:Rspeer|Rspeer]] 00:38, May 13, 2005 (UTC)
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Arrow%27s_impossibility_theorem#Math.2C_not_politics

(See that link where there is the discussion with that anonymous editor, which discussion however is not fully resolved.)

This misunderstanding is corrected by my entry in the article (Revision as of 01:55, 3 March 2006):

==Criticism==

The history of ideas shows that mankind has struggled with paradoxical concepts like zero and division by zero, the infinite and infinitesimals (Achilles and the hare), the liar paradox, the squaring of the circle, and the like. Arrow's impossibility theorem belongs to this category. It stands to note that his theorem thus is an important contribution. That said, however, the value of the theorem must be judged by itself.

The theorem is not merely a mathematical result but must also be judged from the viewpoint of rationality and morality, since humans must adopt a constitution for their society. Arrow claimed that these axioms would be 'rational' and 'morally desirable' (sometimes interpreted as 'fair'). The "Arrow axioms" however are not rational, since they cause an inconsistency and no rational person would adopt an inconsistency. The axioms only seem rational each considered by itself, but jointly they are irrational. The axioms also are morally unacceptable, since one cannot be asked to do something impossible. For example, for a bike one wishes round wheels to ride. And one wishes square wheels for parking. But square circles don't exist. Arrow concludes that rational and useful bikes don't exist. The proper conclusion is that one requires a standard.

Since 1950 researchers have not quite taken account of these aspects, and hence the theorem has generated much confusion and also a negative attitude towards democracy (since students are taught that it is 'impossible'). For the proper analysis (also of Sen's misguided theorem on liberalism), see these links:

- * [<http://www.dataweb.nl/~cool/Papers/VTFD/Index.html> Voting theory for democracy]
- * [<http://www.dataweb.nl/~cool/Papers/Drgtpe/Index.html> Definition & Reality in the General Theory of Political Economy]
- * [http://wikireason.org/wiki/Boycott_of_Holland The discussion page at wikireason]

http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Arrow%27s_impossibility_theorem&oldid=41989556#Criticism

It is really useful to read up on those links, notably [<http://www.dataweb.nl/~cool/Papers/Drgtpe/Index.html> Definition & Reality in the General Theory of Political Economy], since it shows that Arrow really made those claims.

In general, the study of axiomatic systems is not just "mathematics" but also deals with the intended area of application. It is always a serious question of design whether axioms correctly cover the intended application. This is a complex discussion, since it often only becomes fully clear what that intended application is by the very act of axiomatization. However, for voting theory, that discussion has been clarified now for the last 55 years, and thus for this area of application there is some clarity.

Student One is editing voting theory from a particular point of view (POV) that voting theory (wider than just Arrow's theorem) would be "mathematics" and that it would not concern an aspect in the design of democracy (as people would generally understand the issue, as voting within a dictatorship would be a ritual).

Note that "mathematicians of voting" often make it their job to list various properties of voting systems and then to check which system satisfies which property. This can be seen as providing the general public with more information for the selection of a system that these people may consider optimal for their use. It is very kind that these mathematicians do all this work (though it sometimes also gives the impression that they like to play around while still getting paid for it), but the major challenge for "voting theory for democracy" is to design a voting system that meets common objectives of democracy. Thus, as opposed to merely listing properties, the real scientific challenge is to advise the public on such design.

The original work by Kenneth Arrow was targeted at such design – where he came up with an impossibility.

My own work takes up the story from there. When entering my edits in wikipedia, I added references to my work. Had Student One read up on those references, he should have been able to understand the difference between his "mathematics" POV and the more general approach of "voting theory for democracy".

If he had studied the references, as a scientist would be obliged to do, he would also have noted that my work is being censored by the Dutch government.

As I wrote on the Approval Voting talk page:

I just entered a User talk page http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User_talk:Colignatus and, to check that it had been entered correctly, I did a search and also noted this page. Two Points: (1) It appears that there had been a link to a paper of mine, that R.H. however removed again. It appears that I have been quoted correctly that AV "basically" comes down to PV. But R.H. neglects this "basically" and gives an example where there is a small difference. My point however was that, granted that such exceptions exist, the rule is that $AV \sim PV$. I emphasize this point since my research shows that a Borda Fixed Point approach would be best, considering common conditions, so that all research into AV most likely is a dead end. (2) One question was whether my paper on AV has been peer-reviewed. No, my papers generally aren't, since I wait till the censorship of science by the Dutch government has been solved, and then I can start joining the usual scientific process again. In the mean time I put my work on the web so that people can see what the censorship is about. (1) + (2) I would enjoy if the reference is restored, though will not do so myself, not only for the above, but in particular since the issue of the Status Quo is important in that paper as well, which issues tends to be

overlooked in voting theory ("tends" is not "is"). Thanks for the good work.
Colignatus 21:38, 27 February 2006 (UTC)
Retrieved from "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Approval_voting"

PM. The discussion on that page was:

== Links ==

I removed the following "studies":

Thomas Colignatus (afaik his real name is Thomas Cool but he prefers Colignatus because he thinks it's cool)

[<http://econwpa.wustl.edu:8089/eps/get/papers/0503/0503014.pdf> PDF]:

"The normal state in the world is "strategic voting" (cheating) and then AV collapses to "Plurality Voting" (PV), where people basically vote for their first candidate."

Emile C. J. Sheng [<http://iir.nccu.edu.tw/ise/content/40/40-0304-7.pdf> PDF]:

"From a game theoretic standpoint, voters with ordinal preferences among the candidates are decreasing the influence of their ballots if they vote for multiple candidates; their votes are most decisive and influential when they concentrate their support on one candidate only."

Incorrect. Example: There are three candidates, A, B, C. A and B are well established. C is a complete newbie with almost no funding. I like C most, B almost as much and I despise A. If I am too proud to compromise so that I only vote for C, I give away the possibility to influence who wins. I will mark B. But making also a mark for C comes at 0 cost, so I will mark B AND C. --

[[User:R.H.|R.H.]] 01:22, 29 January 2006 (UTC)

* Those conclusions seem fairly dubious to me, yes, but the fact that you disagree with the studies is not a reason to remove them. Do you have a better reason? For example, have these papers not been peer reviewed and published?

[[User:Rspeer|rspeer"]] / [[User talk:Rspeer|

:: Thomas Colignatus says that the status quo should have privileged status in voting systems. In general, giving no option a privilege is viewed as a feature (Neutrality Criterion) and not a bug . One can alter any method to have a status quo bias though.

:::See also my comment below. On this point here: there is a difference between "technical" and "moral". Technically it is possible not to eat, but that does not mean that you should not eat. Technically you can present voting systems without the [[status quo]] given special position, and then it helps to see the features that

arise; but morally you would want the pre-condition of the selection of points that are at least as good as the [[status quo]], in order to protect minority rights. Thus, the term 'neutrality criterion' would be a technical phrase that can be misleading about its moral impact. Indeed, you can add tires to any car, but, it would be strange when car sales persons start selling cars without tires, since you can always add them yourself. Thus, voting theorists should think twice before presenting voting systems to the general public without the [[status quo]] pre-condition. Thus, I have always granted that 'technical neutrality' is a feature and that the [[status quo]] can be added, but my point was that from the angle of democratic theory, the issue is reversed. Thanks for referring to my work, but please refer accurately. [[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 22:59, 10 March 2006 (UTC)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Approval_voting#Links

(2) Student One edits a topic using bureaucratic arguments instead of reasoned arguments

(2.a) on “autobiography”

Wikipedia is hesitant about authors writing about themselves or referring to their own work. This is about the same as in science. Scientists resolve that issue by (a) concentrating on the topic, (b) provide references so that people can check up. Reference to one's own work allows a check upon bias.

Wikipedia uses the word “original” mostly in the sense that people enter new ideas on the spot (“hey, this would be a great idea”), and less in the sense that someone originated an idea (some years ago). When someone writes about an idea that he or she originated (some years) ago, then wikipedia would tend to call that autobiographical. An idea that someone originated some years ago but that didn't get around much, can be called “not notable”. At issue is the whether a reasoned argument must be judged by itself or must be rejected as “original”, “autobiographic” or “not notable” (or made by a hideous person).

On the [[Talk:Borda fixed point]] page I expressed my hesitation about “autobiography” and referring to my own work:

This is awkward. I included a link to this page at voting system, and then User:Rspeer got to idea to delete this page !

Well, it is my research, but it has been published, first as a working paper on EconWPA, then in a book at Dutch University Press, and now also at Project Gutenberg, so it is not 'original' in the somewhat unfortunate use of terms at the page that you referred to.

Please note that I have hesitated to include my own work, since I feel that I should not advertise my work (though I make it available on my website), but I was encouraged by the fact that another user of wikipedia originated the page on the Borda fixed point (referring to my work). Colignatus 17:04, 5 March 2006 (UTC)

Later on the [[Talk:Arrow's impossibility theorem]] page, I explained:

You all must distinguish me (1) as a scientist who for you is a third party and who provides sources, e.g. see me as the writer of VTFD in 2001, (b) as a scientist who helps you, just now, to get this article straight.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Arrow%27s_impossibility_theorem#Added_criticism

Student One is ambivalent / inconsistent to my reference to my own work. On the one hand he seems to accept it.

*Correcting the entry on Borda fixed point is acceptable, especially as you are one who would know about it.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Autobiography

* "Indeed, you've got more credentials behind you than the usual person who comes up with a voting system and posts it on Wikipedia."

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Dubious

On the other hand he is critical:

At the same time, though, you added advocacy for the method, and that's what I objected to - and the issue was muddled because I thought you had written the whole entry. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Autobiography

But there was no advocacy ! As a scientist I am hesitant to draw attention to my work. I only corrected a statement and provided proper reference.

Student One thus misrepresents my position with respect to my own work. And he keeps on doing that even though it has been explained to him.

(2.b) Doesn't accept reasoned argument 1

The advocacy that Student One thought to observe was apparently my statement:

In the Pareto-Borda version, first those points are selected that are better than the Status Quo and then the Borda fixed point method is applied. According to Cool / Colignatus this is the best interpretation of what people generally regard as a democratic vote. It respects minority rights, is sensitive to preference ranks, and hinders strategic voting.

15:32, 5 March 2006

http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Borda_fixed_point&oldid=42349129

His reaction:

This article shows the problem of writing about your own work on Wikipedia, because it is not written from the neutral point of view. Has anybody besides its creator claimed that the method is fairer to minorities? How do you quantify that mathematically? You should at least mention which criteria from the Voting system article your system satisfies.

rspeer / ɹ ədsɹ 16:31, 6 March 2006

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Dubious

This statement clearly shows (and showed at that time) that he didn't study the references and didn't think through the argument. His reaction was rather quick (within a day, if he had seen the revision immediately).

My reply was, obviously:

What I explained about the method is valid on logical grounds:

"protection of minority rights": by the Pareto pre-condition (they can veto what is bad to them)

"is sensitive to preference ranks": it's based upon Borda (a rank order system)

"hinders strategic voting": by the fixed point condition (see the definition)

So, it obviously satisfies what I stated, why is this not clear to you ?

It is a fallacy to hold that I should mark the method along the criteria on the voting system page. I am busy with other stuff now. Go ahead, do so yourself if you are interested. And explain why a Condorcet Loser would be an interesting criterion.

Please note that I introduced another criterion that the voting system page did not mention: temporal consistency, resistance to changes in the budget set. (Which is not the same as IIA.)

Do not say that I would not be objective. I am a scientist who works under the strong rule to be as objective as possible. I can make errors of course, but try to follow this rule on your part: (a) first think about the argument, instead of gut-feeling-deleting, (b) then ask questions, (c) only then reveal your bias.

While the properties of the method thus have been backed up, first in my book in 2001 and now again by this short reminder, Student One neglected the argument. (In the latest revision, March 18 2006, Student One vandalized the article by deleting the properties.)

PM. In the following quote Student One suggests that [[Colignatus]] took the criticism on edits as criticism on his person. However, this suggestion is unwarranted, and slanderous, as if [[Colignatus]] cannot distinguish a discussion on content from a discussion on his person:

I think that one moral to derive from the Colignatus conflict above is that you shouldn't add information about yourself or your research interests to Wikipedia. This is a corollary of the WP:AUTO policy. The problem is that when the edits are about you, it is easy to overreact by construing a criticism of that edit as a criticism of you. (Of course, this is not nearly the only thing that Colignatus did wrong, but this is where I believe the whole ugly issue started.)http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Voting_system#Autobiographical_edits

The history of this thus is: (1) Student One did not study the issue. (2) Student One's criticism was "Has anybody besides its creator claimed that the method is fairer to minorities? How do you quantify that mathematically?" (3) I provided a proper reply by explaining what the Pareto condition entails. (4) I also explained to Student One that he should not criticise a method and disinform the readers on the world wide web, without proper studying the issue. (5) Now, Student One holds that this is an overreaction, as if I see his criticism as a criticism of my own person. Now this is clearly nonsense, as my additional reaction was, not that I took it personal, but that he should study an issue before starting to criticize it.

(2.c) Googling for notability when that is not relevant

Student One doesn't study and doesn't accept the reasoned argument, but instead googles to see if something gets mentioned (One wonders, how many times would be enough?):

Searching for "Borda Fixed Point" on Google also gives the following types of results, and no others:

- Electowiki, Wikipedia, and Wikipedia mirrors
- Pages written by you
- Lists of publications
- Messages on the election-methods list

This implies that the method has had less of an effect on the voting theory world than a Mike Ossipoff criterion such as the favorite betrayal criterion, and lots of those just got deleted. rspeer / ɹ əədsɹ 16:31, 6 March 2006
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Dubious

My reply:

Thanks for googling this. I had never done that, and it is interesting to see that the idea gets some circulation.

In the end, I don't mind deletion of Borda Fixed Point, as long as my critical analysis on Arrow's Impossibility Theorem and e.g. Approval Voting is not censored. I designed the Borda Fixed Point to provide a positive answer to the otherwise negative critique of standard voting theory. If people don't like positive results, so be it.

(...)

Given the circulation of the paper (google also other key words in my analysis), be aware that some other person may enter the topic again. I now corrected Fahrenheit's explanation, don't keep on expecting me to help out.

(...)

It is a fallacy that this method should have an impact on students of voting via a citation index or so, before it can be listed in Wikipedia for people to see what it is. It is a new method that I had an idea about in 1990, formalised it in 2001, and that has been circulating a bit. Some Fahrenheit entered it, I corrected the explanation, and did you guys a favour by including a link on the voting system page (so that it finally gave the right analysis).

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Dubious

NB. The whole issue of notability is not relevant as I provided a reasoned argument, which one has to think through using the logical faculties.

(2.d) Doesn't accept reasoned argument 2

In the article on Arrow's impossibility theorem, I added criticism (see above), and the following discussion evolved on the talk page. First Student One said that I held an "opinion" only, and then it was "original research" or deficient in "verification". All this was irrelevant since I provided a reasoned argument.

==Added criticism==

Note that the page still states "Arrow's theorem states that there is no general way to aggregate preferences without running into some kind of irrationality or unfairness." This is nonsense, but I left it for the time being, to allow others to digest the criticism. [[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 01:58, 3 March 2006 (UTC)

* I agree that that statement is nonsense, so I removed it. Your additional section was written as an opinion, however, and I reverted it. The widely-held criticisms of Arrow's theorem already appear under "Interpretations of the theorem". It's better Wikipedia style to ensure that the whole article is neutral - separate "advocacy" and "criticisms" sections are a last resort for particularly contentious topics. [[User:Rspeer|rspeer"]] / [[User talk:Rspeer|

*No, the text that I entered is not an "opinion" but a reasoned statement. It is not an "interpretation" but a reasoned statement. It may be that you are right that there should not be a separate criticism section, but, given the first part of the article, this reasoned statement can be put here. My suggestion is that more people think through what the article would look like but including the reasoned statement in the main body of the article. It is useful to have the text available in the article

before the whole is re-edited, to prevent innocent readers to get a wrong impression. [[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 22:32, 10 March 2006 (UTC)

*I noticed that Rob now added a notification on original research or verification. This is better than simply removing the text, but there remains a confusion. You all must distinguish me (1) as a scientist who for you is a third party and who provides sources, e.g. see me as the writer of VTFD in 2001, (b) as a scientist who helps you, just now, to get this article straight. You should note that the [[verifiability]] condition concerns "facts" that need be checked by various sources. But the text that I provided (in the disputed criticism section) contains a "reasoned argument" that you can check by the logical faculties of your minds. Thus the condition does not apply in that sense. Also the reference to original research doesn't apply, since I didn't enter original research. The research originated in 1990 and was published in 2001. The only thing I do now is correct the misleading element in the article, and provide the reader (and you as editors) with a condensed reasoned statement, that you again can check by using the logical faculties of your minds. Also, the [[verifiability]] page mentions that the sources should be reliable. Well, again this is a non-issue for this paragraph. For, the point is that a reasoned argument is provided, so that it doesn't matter where it is from, and you have to use the faculties of your minds. If the washing lady says $1+1=2$ then this has the same value as when the bishop says so, even when the bishop doesn't know what he talks about. Which is exactly why I added the suggestion, above, that when the reasoned argument is understood, the criticism might perhaps best be included in the main text, revising the main article. I didn't do that myself, since all of you would be completely shocked, not having digested that reasoned statement. Some other comments: PM 1: I doubt whether you will find many other sources on criticism other than I already included in the list of literature in the links that I provided. If someone feels like unpacking those links and transferring those references into the main body, feel free to do so. PM 2: Now that Rob has eliminated that one sentence, that he agreed was nonsense, perhaps the header Criticism is too strong, and it may be perhaps Evaluation or something like that. PM 3: If the consensus is that this group of editors cannot take responsibility for using their logical faculties of minds on the reasoned argument, then you may also attribute it to me, see [http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Colignatus Colignatus at wikinfo], and perhaps research a bit how reliable I am. Simply a Google scholar is not enough, though. PM 4: If all this fails, I would like a comment from someone who follows the logic of the reasoned argument and have suggestions how it can remain available for readers, then in another format or place. [[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 20:22, 11 March 2006 (UTC)

(3) Student Two supports the basic error, doesn't notice the integrity issue

At some point in the discussion, Student Two interfered. He appears to be a Ph.D. student at SIMS, University of California at Berkeley, writing on the issue of voting. Thus he would be a scientist writing for the peer reviewed journals (in order to get the Ph. D.). (PM. See my position with respect to "peer review", elsewhere.)

It is not clear to me how much of the discussion Student Two had followed by this time, with the discussion on perhaps ten pages (Borda Fixed Point, Arrow's Theorem, Approval Voting, Voting System, my user page, plus their talk pages). I don't know whether Student Two had seen the proposed deletion by Student One, but, anyhow, he seemed not to mind that Student One didn't study the reasoned argument and the reference, and neither did he mind that the wikipedia article would give wrong information to the public. Student Two also expressed the idea that talking to one's professor would be out of the question.

:Colignatus, you need to decide if you are ready to resolve this issue. Rspeer has noted that he was probably a bit too aggressive. However, there are good reasons for certain rules on Wikipedia. Talking about Rspeer's professor at MIT has no basis whatsoever in Rspeer's behavior here on Wikipedia (it's not as if his contributions are on behalf of the professor, MIT or his research group). That should be dropped from the discussion. Mediation is a good thing which you should accept as it will involve knowledgeable third parties who can tone down the rhetoric... there are stronger methods of resolving conflict that are not as agreeable as mediation. Asking for an apology gets nobody nowhere. I think the largest gulf here is a cultural one... there is a certain culture at Wikipedia that you aren't familiar with. There can be gains on both fronts if both of you want to solve this... that is what mediation is intended to solve. Please consider putting aside the recent history. -- [[User:Joebeone|Joseph Lorenzo Hall]] 19:39, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

::Thanks for your attention. It seemed that only Rspeer is active, it is a relief to talk to another person. (1) Rspeer shouldn't hide behind wikipedia. This is a world stage where people should be decent with one-another. You don't know what I will write to Rspeer's professor, and you cannot judge whether I should or shouldn't write. I however have to deal with Rspeer's behaviour, and the damage he does to me in time and money, and in the contact between him and me, my question to him to give me the name and email of his professor at MIT makes a great deal of sense. (2) I agree that mediation is a wonderful scheme, but, Rspeer was too rash in flashing it on this page, as if there were some kind of big problem that needed to be solved. He admits now so himself. (3) Can you agree that there was no need to explain this on mediation to me ? Can you agree that there is no need to imply "stronger methods of resolving conflict that are not as agreeable as mediation" ? (4) Why do you suggest that I would not be ready to resolve this issue ? [[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 23:46, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

:::Now this is getting silly. What makes you think Rspeer's professor/dean/anyone is going to care one way or the other how he conducts

himself on Wikipedia? What do you think they will be able to do to affect his conduct? I urge you to enter into mediation where a neutral party can resolve your differences in private instead of airing all this on Talk pages. --
 [[User:Joebeone|Joseph Lorenzo Hall]] 03:58, 9 March 2006 (UTC)
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Colignatus_rejected_mediation

(4) Student One “does tend to be more aggressive” (quote of Student Two)

It is useful to note that Student Two at one time warned that Student One “does tend to be more aggressive than most wikipedians”.

Colignatus, a good rule of thumb that ensures you won't have problems such as this is if you just resign yourself to not write about your own work on Wikipedia. If others feel it fills a gap or need to reference it, then fine... it will happen. I don't think this article should be deleted basically because Colignatus did not created it (Fahrenheit did). Rspeer does tend to be more aggressive than most wikipedians, so just bear with all of us and we'll work it out. -- Joseph Lorenzo Hall 00:02, 8 March 2006 (UTC)
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Dubious

I can confirm that Student One “does tend to be more aggressive”.

My position is that requires correction – and not toleration – in particular with in mind that new editors can have unwelcome surprises.

PM: It is a fallacy that an author cannot refer to his own work. If a scientist sees an error or misunderstanding of an author, he kindly points it out, and provides references for additional study and back up. This reference may be to one's own work. To allow others to check whether a comment is biased, a reference to one's own work can be included.

Proofs of the aggressive behaviour are the following.

(4a.1) Student One put a premature “proposal to delete” on an article

Student One put a premature “proposal to delete” on the article on the Borda Fixed Point.

* Student One put a {{prod|Admitted original research. This isn't allowed on Wikipedia. [[User:Rspeer|rspeer]] / [[User talk:Rspeer|rspeer]] 16:41, 5 March 2006 (UTC)}} sign on the [[Borda Fixed Point]] page.
 See the revision:
http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Borda_fixed_point&oldid=42356561

This proposal for deletion was unwarranted. Student One hadn't checked the page history as he later admitted:

* "and the issue was muddled because I thought you had written the whole entry."
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Autobiography

* "Sorry, I was hasty about that. I hadn't checked your credentials; the fact that the article referred to you by your Wikipedia username was a red flag for me, as it sounded like the usual case of some random person thinking their random ideas deserve an article"
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Voting_system#Without_time_no_morality

See below for the history of the article, that had been created by others, was corrected by me, and now had been vandalized again by Student One.

PM. I reacted to the deletion as follows:

OK, what will happen now ? I noted that someone has suggested to delete the page on Borda fixed point. I removed that again since I suspect that it is you while I consider your reaction premature. Would it be possible for you (a) to read the text, (b) study the references when in doubt, (c) ask me questions if still in doubt, (d) only take any action after this, (e) and can you explain to me what is going in the mean time now that someone put that message there ? Please note that I wrote a book on voting theory so that I know what you have done, writing these pages. It is just that it is unsettling for a scientist like me to be suddenly confronted with 'deletion signs' that are wholly irrational. Colignatus 17:23, 5 March 2006 (UTC)
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Voting_system#Without_time_no_morality

(4a.2) Student One calls prematurely for “mediation”

Since Student One was clearly deficient in his dealings with voting theory, but was editing very actively in a negative way, I consulted his user page to see who he was and what his references were. It turned out that he was a student at MIT. This opened the possibility that he and his professor could look at the arguments on the wikipedia pages, so that he would benefit from a personal discussion which I couldn't provide.

Please give me the name and email address of your professor at MIT. I want him/her to see this. Colignatus 01:42, 7 March 2006 (UTC)
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Dubious

To this, student Student One reacted with a wikimedia call for “mediation”. I had never heard of this wikipedia procedure, and was distressed to see a big banner on the page as if something awful was the matter.

== Issue taken to mediation ==

Since you have made a threat toward me along with many personal attacks, Colignatus, I have to bring this issue to dispute resolution. I have found [[WP:RFM|mediation]] to work well in the past. Mediation isn't any sort of punishment, and in fact it's a much friendlier process than alternatives such as [[Wikipedia:Requests for comment/User conduct|requests for comment on user conduct]] or [[WP:RFAr|requests for arbitration]], so I urge you to accept it. [[User:Rspeer|"rspeer"] / [[User talk:Rspeer|I ædsI]] 00:51, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

===Issues to be mediated===

* Should [[User:Colignatus]] write about his own research, such as [[Borda fixed point]] on Wikipedia?

After studying the mediation page, my reply was:

==Mediation is too early and too strong a measure now==

*The mediation link disappeared, and I had to recover my answer to Rspeer, so that this now is available now. [[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 17:18, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

*Disagree. (1) The request is done by Student One but he should have offered this to me first as a way to resolve the issue. He did not offer this, and he should first reply the the arguments and also explain first what he considers to be a "threat level". Once he has replied, there should also be the opportunity for the wikipedia voting group to judge the arguments. Student One seems to take a proprietary attitude to the issue of voting, but nobody can do so. (2) He now raises the chips by saying that this does not only concern the [[Borda fixed point]] but any work of my own (see his use of "such as". This is a totally unwarranted generalisation. Let people judge on the particular issue at hand. (3) It seems that Student One confuses writing on something outside of wikipedia with writing on something within wikipedia. He seems to think that only people who don't write outside of wikipedia should be allowed to write within wikipedia. However, it is a good exercise to write, often outside of wikipedia, with nobody to help you, to sharpen your mind. One shouldn't need mediation to tell this to Student One. Signed [[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 02:21, 8 March 2006 (UTC)
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Mediation_is_too_early_and_too_strong_a_measure_now

(One should note that my problem with Student One was that he didn't study the reasoned arguments and the references, which, combined with his activity level, caused a big negative impact. Student One formulated his problem differently. One would suppose that mediation would involve getting the clear what the unified problem definition would

be. But as such, I had no experience with mediation-wikipedia-style, and opted for the time-old method of writing to the student's professor.)

(If one considers the page at wikipedia for "resolving disputes" then "mediation" is only a later step, and there should be third parties and a "truce" before that. See <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/WP:DR>)

Student One replied to the above, with a reaction from someone else:

If you can calm down and be civil, then we can have a reasonable discussion.
rspeer / ɹ ædsɹ 03:05, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

I think you were a bit too quick on the trigger there starting a whole dispute resolution tract, rspeer. Colignatus just got here, so I think that Wikipedia:Please do not bite the newcomers applies before he has become more familiar with the workings of Wikipedia. -- Dissident (Talk) 03:25, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

You're right. I should take a bit of a break and let others try to sort this out. rspeer / ɹ ædsɹ 03:53, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

So, Student One agreed ("You're right.") that he was "too quick on the trigger".

(4a.3) Student One doesn't recognize science as a way for resolving issues

The most curious thing is that these students at MIT and SIMS, apparently, are fearful of their professors.

That is, when I asked student Student One for the name and email address of his professor, he didn't recognize that as a way to resolve his problem, but considered that a "threat".

At another point I clarified:

PM 4. Who hold that contacting a professor would be the same as contacting an employer, neglect my earlier comment that I approach the issue from the angle of the integrity of science. The proper reaction is not to neglect it but give the argument why this angle would be improper.

PM 5. On the RfC Joe Hall suggests that my objective would be to punish him or so. No, I only suggest that the professor and he discuss the situation from the angle of the integrity of science. Earlier I wrote that this would be very beneficial for him.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User_talk:Colignatus#Email_to_Seal_Black

Thus I replied also:

My reaction is, pointwise:

- *(1) You have not explained what the "threat" is. Are you afraid that your professor at MIT sees this, and discusses this with you ?
- *(2) If you haven't given me in the next 24 hours the name and email address of your professor at MIT, I will approach the dean there.
- *(3) Your suggestion that I rejected mediation is a political ploy, to suggest that I would be unreasonable. See however the reason that I gave that you are premature in this. In fact, you accept my reason ("take a bit of a break").
- *(4) There are no personal attacks. They are observations. You should apologize. Especially since you agree ("You're right. I should take a bit of a break"). Why is it, that you agree with one of the insiders, but don't offer the same to the newcomer ?
- *(5) Don't throw links at me, such as "civil", as if I were a barbarian. My language has always been polite. You have been insulting, first suggesting that I were someone not to be taken serious, then speaking down to me by telling me that I have credentials, then parading around as if you own the subject of voting systems and know all about it, etcetera.
- *(6) You still haven't replied to my points above, and your suggestion that my reply is "off-topic" is not sound. You suggested to the world: "Has anybody besides its creator claimed that the method is fairer to minorities? How do you quantify that mathematically?" and I replied to that on content. Did you apologize for being too rash and self-assuming ? No.

Please understand that I will not accept this behaviour of yours, that I don't accept your misleading treatment of the concept of democracy and voting systems, and that the only proper thing that you can do now is to apologize to your fellow wikipedians, and give me the name and email address of your professor at MIT.
[[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 18:34, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

PM. This was again confused with “autobiography”.

==Autobiography==

Colignatus, you seem to have gotten off on the wrong foot here. It's inevitable that a massive collaborative project like this will end up having its own culture and guidelines. May I suggest reading [[Wikipedia:Autobiography]]? It also pertains to subjects in which one is personally involved. -- [[User:Dissident|Dissident]] ([[User talk:Dissident|Talk]]) 03:25, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

:Thanks, and read it. This however is not the point. (1) The point at issue is whether wikipedia gives correct information or not. If wikipedia contains erroneous statements that are misleading to the readers, then as a scientist I call for a correction. You don't have to settle the issue, but you must at least understand what is at issue, and thus you understand the correction. (2) Fahrenheit's edit needed correction, you can verify that. (3) Whether the entry is maintained: check for yourself whether temporal consistency is an angle that belongs to the subject, that should be included in order to properly inform the

readers about its existence (while Borda Fixed Point has been designed to meet that criterion). (4) If you don't include it, then you mislead the readers by withholding important information about the concept of democracy. You may also want to check with the [[Fixed Point]] people. (Though lots of things can be formulated as a fixed point.) (5) Yes, go ahead, and adapt all sentences that suggest too much autobiography (which I don't like myself either). (6) In sum, my reason to join wikipedia these days is not "see what beautiful results I have" but "your texts needed correction". [[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 18:08, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

PM. Other people at wikipedia are also confused on the status of the integrity of science. At this talk page, they discuss whether it is an internal wikipedia problem or a mix of internal and external problem.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia_talk:Requests_for_comment/Colignatus

However, an issue of the integrity of science is an issue by itself and cannot be put into such terms of “internal” or “external”.

(4b) Student One talks down to the other user

Another aspect of the phenomenon that Student One “does tend to be more aggressive” is that he talks down to a person. I have not checked this for other people, just mention the cases when he was talking down to me.

* “Sorry, I was hasty about that. I hadn't checked your credentials; the fact that the article referred to you by your Wikipedia username was a red flag for me, as it sounded like the usual case of some random person thinking their random ideas deserve an article”

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Voting_system#Without_time_no_morality

There is no need to suggest to me that I would be the cause of his own red flag reactions, and there is no need to compare me, or say that he compares me, with what he considers “random” persons. It would have sufficed that he apologized for not studying and looking up the references.

Indeed, you've got more credentials behind you than the usual person who comes up with a voting system and posts it on Wikipedia.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Dubious

It is talking down to a person to say that he has credentials, as if you are the person to judge that. Just do your research, and then treat the topic by content. It would be an “ad hominem” fallacy to say to a baker that “you don’t know anything about voting since you are just a baker”. (Though sometimes it seems valid to say “you study at MIT, please go bother other people”.)

Anyway, I followed the references, and I'd like some evidence that they have been peer-reviewed. Project Gutenberg will accept just about any freely-available text,

so that doesn't count as a publication. The Dutch University Press publication seems more solid, but I don't know what its standards are, and I can't find anyone who has cited the book on Google Scholar.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Dubious

This is talking down again. (1) I don't have to provide any evidence. Student One assumes the position that he can demand all kind of stuff. (2) The term "publish" means to make available for the public. You talk down to people if you make that "peer reviewed", because that may not be what they said. (3) It is up to peers what they want to do, and they don't sit up to Student One's service. (4) The right procedure is that Project Gutenberg accepts books that have been published elsewhere, so that Student One should not suggest that it is presented as a separate publication.

This article shows the problem of writing about your own work on Wikipedia, because it is not written from the neutral point of view.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Dubious

It was written from a neutral point of view. A proper sentence could have been "I am sure that you explain it from a neutral point of view, but I get the impression that others might read it differently. For example ..."

Sorry to be harsh, but people have been complaining recently about inconsistent standards in voting theory articles. In applying these standards to your article, I can't see a way that it meets them. I won't push for deletion again just yet, because I'll give you the opportunity to respond. rspeer / □æds□ 16:31, 6 March 2006 (UTC)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Dubious

Student One is only a co-editor and puts himself in the position as if he can judge the topic. Instead of harsh, he is assuming. He applies inconsistent standards, and threatens to push for deletion if he is not obeyed. (While he didn't study the topic. Only googled. He wants others to do his education for him.)

A criticism made by one person should not be added, regardless of whether it is a good argument or not, because Wikipedia is intended to describe existing ideas, not promote new ones. rspeer / □æds□ 20:24, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

The above is talking down and insulting again, not caring about who reads it. Namely:

[You] provide a new insult again, by implying that I would promote a new idea. I merely said that an argument should best be backed up with references. If there are better references than my work, fine. (And show them.) Colignatus 01:56, 10 March 2006 (UTC)

Another example of talking down to a person is this statement:

Don't give yourself first billing over Borda and Condorcet.

It is entirely unnecessary to suggest to other people that I do so.

Much of your response is off-topic, dealing with the content of your research, instead of whether it is notable enough to be included in Wikipedia.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Colignatus_rejected_mediation

This is talking down to another person again, as if Student One would be the one who can judge, and can select the criteria for inclusion. My response is on the topic, the article concerned, and provides a reasoned argument. Notability is not the issue. I already replied to that, saying that one could remove the article but that there was a likelihood that someone else would enter it again, and then I might not be around to correct it. Perhaps Student One would like notability to be the issue, and the only issue, but he cannot decide that this is so, and thus he cannot say that my response is “off-topic”. Doing so suggests to others (and himself) that it’s no use to have this discussion with me, which is talking down to a person.

When I said that I wanted to contact his professor, Student One construed that as being a threat. This is not only a misrepresentation, but also talking down to a person, as if you are the one who can judge and correct this person. Even then, I explained the situation, but got no proper reply.

Student One holds that something is a threat, which it isn't. He abuses his position as an administrator to accuse me of something. Colignatus 01:29, 10 March 2006 (UTC)

I can add that my frame of mind here is the integrity of science. It is fully normal that scientists discuss the behaviour of others, colleagues and students, without implying what Student One here calls a threat. A proper scientist will never exert improper influence on another person, and we may assume that Student One's dean is a proper scientist. Colignatus 02:37, 10 March 2006 (UTC)

(5) Student One shows the symptoms of “bad faith” (as opposed to “good faith”)

On March 10, I was exasperated by the events and required time to write my email to the professor (s). I posted a request for a time out, and explained the situation.

==Time out==

I ask a time out, so that I can write my email(s) to the dean / professor (s). Please understand that I am very busy professionally, and this wikipedia-unprofessionalism consumes too much time to be able to combine much. But leave these points, and I'll return to them a.s.a.p.

Please understand too that I lost confidence in [Student One]. He acts as if he owns the subject and the wikipedia articles. He is not upright in his acts: he made a rash decision in the first instance, discovered that he had to back-track, and after that he is mainly interested in saving his face. He made comments on content, without studying the issue, and when the answers were provided, he did not react: but switched the topic of discussion. He said that he would take a rest from the discussion to give room to others, and then came back in full force, admitting that he was angry, apparently addicted to adrenaline. He talks down to the person, his statements are halftruths, with implications that are insulting. He throws links to people, as if they need education and civil training. He is rash in demanding mediation, then uses the political ploy to call to the world that the opponent rejected it (so that this opponent must be unreasonable); but then admits that he was rash, but then refuses to apologize (only admitting a little bit of error to other insiders) and refuses to adjust his behaviour.

Having lost confidence on [Student One], my position is that it is useless to talk with him. The saying is: if you teach a monkey to climb, you will get a coconut on your head. Thus I will not sell him my Economics Pack, with the voting routines programmed in Mathematica. And thus I will not let myself be forced to discuss voting issues with him.

The key point remains that a discussion of [Student One]'s behaviour is not the issue. The issue is the article. But this behaviour stands in the way of discussing the quality of the article. Thus the advice could well be to delete the voting system page from wikipedia for misleading statements.

My first objective now is to communicate these issues with the some real people, i.e. the dean / professor (s), and see where this gets me (and us). Colignatus 02:26, 10 March 2006 (UTC)
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Time_out

Student One didn't allow for that time out but started pushing for a block.

It gets you blocked from Wikipedia for making threats, making personal attacks, and refusing to follow Wikipedia policies, that's what it gets you. I have made many concessions as an attempt at compromise, but instead of compromising you used these concessions as ammunition for more personal attacks. As you have done exactly the things that I told you would get you blocked, there's no need for compromise anymore, and soon we will all be able to continue improving voting system articles in

peace, without your attacks and threats being involved. rspeer / □æds□
04:53, 10 March 2006 (UTC)
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Time_out

By expressing that I lost confidence, I indicated that Student One showed the symptoms of someone in “bad faith”. Such a person doesn’t react anymore to what one says, but has his or her own agenda. My impression was and is that Student One was trying to “save his face”, for reacting too fast on proposed deletion and not checking up and considering the references. Regardless of what was said, he appeared only interested in removing my edits on voting from wikipedia.

Symptoms of bad faith are:

- (i) neglects that answers have been given
- (ii) switches to other arguments
- (iii) misrepresents arguments
- (iv) gives false accusations
- (v) calls something a “threat” which is no threat
- (vi) uses meta-methods to remove a person from the scene

(i) neglects that answers have been given

As shown above, Student One made comments on the properties of the Borda Fixed Point. These comments were replied to. Student One however neglects this reply. (In the latest edit, the properties have been removed from the article.)

(ii) switches to other arguments

When one argument to remove a revision is replied to, then Student One can be observed to switch to another argument. E.g. at Borda Fixed Point, it was first argued that the article would be “advocacy”, and when that was replied to, then the method would not be “notable”. At Arrow’s impossibility theorem, first it was said that it was an “opinion” and then it was said that it was “original” or “unverifiable”.

A good example of “switching” is that Student One on the one hand seems to accept the Borda Fixed Point method as a voting system, but then doesn’t want it to be mentioned on the voting system page. In the following he talks down again, speaking about a “more neutral” version as if the text would not be neutral, and then shows his inconsistency:

As I've described above, I would find a short, more neutral version of this article to be acceptable as an article, because then there would at least be no harm in the article existing. I don't think it should be linked from [[Voting system]], though.
[[User:Rspeer|"rspeer"]] / [[User talk:Rspeer|□æds□]] 20:46, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

:: So it would be a voting system, but not a voting system.
:: Rspeer has a two track mind. One the one hand content, on the other hand notability. My only argument during this whole ordeal has been content. And, I did not introduce original research. This is a false accusation, worthy of Rspeer. The internet cafe says that I have to log off, so I leave it here now.
[[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 23:51, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

::: The argument should not be about content at all, and I have never intended it to be about content. It should also not involve personal attacks. Just because I let "previous" attacks slide is not a license to make more. [[User:Rspeer|rspeer"]] / [[User talk:Rspeer|□æds□]] 03:15, 9 March 2006 (UTC)

:::I have more time now to better explain what I said. By having two tracks, I meant that Rob's reaction lacks balance. An article in an encyclopedia should not just contain "what people think" but also be consistent in its logic and presentation. It must be balanced. Thus it is proper to comment on an article on content and say that it lacks consistency and quality. And it detracts from that argument to start a discussion on "notability". I never claimed "notability" for the entry on the Borda fixed point, just corrected the text by Fahrenheit451, and then this whole insulting and time consuming ordeal started.
[[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 01:59, 10 March 2006 (UTC)
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#One_other_thing_that_worries_me

(iii) Misrepresents arguments

The following is an example how an argument on fallacious reasoning is misrepresented as if wikipedia is abused to present "new ideas".

=== One other thing that worries me ===

Your comment: ""It is a fallacy that this method should have an impact on students of voting via a citation index or so, before it can be listed in wikipedia for people to see what it is.""

Wikipedia is not intended to promote new ideas; see [[WP:NOT|what Wikipedia is not]]. Your comment is one reason I am dubious about notability. Fortunately, Wikipedia has not entirely taken over the world yet, and it's possible for people to learn about things from other sources besides Wikipedia. As soon as an idea reaches even a small but noticeable amount of acceptance, it tends to be okay to include in Wikipedia.

(...)

rspeer / □æds□ 20:46, 8 March 2006

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#One_other_thing_that_worries_me

The phrase “promote new ideas” again is talking down to a person, who already has explained that this is not at issue. The Borda Fixed Point article had been created by Fahrenheit451 and edited upon by others, before I corrected it (see the history below).

(iv) gives false accusations

The following is an example of a false accusation. Student One is not interested in studying the argument but immediately seizes upon the opportunity for an accusation.

The current version of Borda fixed point shows the problem with writing about your own work on Wikipedia - it is not at all written from the neutral point of view, as it simply advocates the method. I'll discuss more on Talk:Borda fixed point. rspeer / ɹ ədsɹ 16:06, 6 March 2006 (UTC)
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Voting_system#Without_time_no_morality

This article shows the problem of writing about your own work on Wikipedia, because it is not written from the neutral point of view. Has anybody besides its creator claimed that the method is fairer to minorities? How do you quantify that mathematically? You should at least mention which criteria from the Voting system article your system satisfies.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Dubious

One can note that the answer was easy:

:What I explained about the method is valid on logical grounds:
::"protection of minority rights": by the Pareto pre-condition (they can veto what is bad to them)
::"is sensitive to preference ranks": it's based upon Borda (a rank order system)
::"hinders strategic voting": by the fixed point condition (see the definition)
::So, it obviously satisfies what I stated, why is this not clear to you ?
:It is a fallacy to hold that I should mark the method along the criteria on the [[voting system]] page. I am busy with other stuff now. Go ahead, do so yourself if you are interested. And explain why a Condorcet Loser would be an interesting criterion.
(...)
[[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 01:42, 7 March 2006 (UTC)
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Dubious

(v) calls something a “threat” which is no threat

When I asked Student One for the name and email address of his professor, he called this a threat. One might consider that he thought so in good faith, that he really thought this a threat. But he may also have acted in bad faith, seeing an opportunity to accuse someone of a deed that would cause that person to be blocked from wikipedia.

== Issue taken to mediation ==

Colignatus has escalated the issue to the level of threats. It would be harmful to Wikipedia to try to continue this discussion without mediation.

[[User:Rspeer|"rspeer"]] / [[User talk:Rspeer|ɹ ædsɹ]] 00:35, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

{{RFMF}}

== Issue taken to mediation ==

Since you have made a threat toward me along with many personal attacks, Colignatus, I have to bring this issue to dispute resolution. I have found [[WP:RFM|mediation]] to work well in the past. Mediation isn't any sort of punishment, and in fact it's a much friendlier process than alternatives such as [[Wikipedia:Requests for comment/User conduct|requests for comment on user conduct]] or [[WP:RFAR|requests for arbitration]], so I urge you to accept it. [[User:Rspeer|"rspeer"]] / [[User talk:Rspeer|ɹ ædsɹ]] 00:51, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

===Issues to be mediated===

* Should [[User:Colignatus]] write about his own research, such as [[Borda fixed point]] on Wikipedia?

==Mediation is too early and too strong a measure now==

*The mediation link disappeared, and I had to recover my answer to Rspeer, so that this now is available now. [[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 17:18, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

*Disagree. (1) The request is done by Student One but he should have offered this to me first as a way to resolve the issue. He did not offer this, and he should first reply the the arguments and also explain first what he considers to be a "'threat level'". Once he has replied, there should also be the opportunity for the wikipedia voting group to judge the arguments. Student One seems to take a proprietary attitude to the issue of voting, but nobody can do so. (2) He now raises the chips by saying that this does not only concern the [[Borda fixed point]] but any work of my own (see his use of "'such as'". This is a totally unwarranted generalisation.

Let people judge on the particular issue at hand. (3) It seems that Student One confuses writing on something outside of wikipedia with writing on something within wikipedia. He seems to think that only people who don't write outside of wikipedia should be allowed to write within wikipedia. However, it is a good exercise to write, often outside of wikipedia, with nobody to help you, to sharpen your mind. One shouldn't need mediation to tell this to Student One. Signed [[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 02:21, 8 March 2006 (UTC)
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point#Mediation_is_too_early_and_too_strong_a_measure_now

Student One calls something a threat, while, at the same time he holds that it cannot be a threat “because he will not reach anyone at MIT who cares about what happens on Wikipedia”:

After many warnings on [[User talk:Colignatus|his talk page]], Colignatus has persisted in his threats, claiming that they are not threats because I should be happy to discuss this with a professor
[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Borda_fixed_point&diff=42881457&oldid=42859372]. I am certain that no discussion will occur, because he will not reach anyone at MIT who cares about what happens on Wikipedia, but I still find the attempt to interfere in my academic life unacceptable.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia_talk:Requests_for_comment/Colignatus

Student One **does not explain why** he finds “the attempt to interfere in my academic life unacceptable”. Of course, if he acts in bad faith, it is a good method to remove someone from the scene.

At another point, also Student Two mentioned that writing to the schools would be ineffective (see the reference elsewhere).

Thus, talking to a professor is beneficial, it is ineffective, and according to the Chancellor of MIT an important issue – but still a threat ?

(vi) uses meta-methods to remove a person from the scene

Instead of studying the argument and the references provided, Student One proceeded to the meta level, first removing edits, then removing the person.

The person whom he removed had “more credentials” than the “random” person – in his terms. Yet, this didn’t cause the impulse to study the argument.

Conclusions

Institutes of science and learning, in particularly MIT and SIMS, are advised to spend more time on the scientific attitude.

The wikipedia community is advised to invite the professors of the two students to have a chat with their students on their attitude towards science and scientific integrity.

The students are requested to pay the stated sums to my bank account.

I would welcome the removal from wikipedia of all false accusations about me. I suppose such pages will remain in the history files but there is no need to have them on top.

I won't ask to be "unblocked" – the wikipedia community is free to do whatever it wants.

Wikipedia contains inaccurate and scientifically unwarranted information on voting theory, misleading its readers. That is, this only concerns the topics that I know something about, as observed on March 11 2006.

Appendices

(1) Development of the case

How it started

The [[Voting System]] article

After editing the [[Borda Fixed Point]] article, I added a link to that article on the [[voting system]] article.

In the [[voting system]] article I added the following passage (16:47, 5 March 2006):

===The candidates===

With only two candidates (the [[Status Quo]] and a single alternative), the discussion could concentrate on rules about when the Status Quo is to be replaced. The decision problem becomes much more complex when more alternatives are added since the preferences disperse over the candidates. The list of candidates can be seen as the [[budget set]], and the most important voting paradoxes arise when that budget set changes over time. Admittedly, there are also paradoxes when voting districts are rearranged, but assuming that the constituency is given at the time of the vote, then the crucial paradoxes concern the list of candidates, changes therein, and the consistency of the moral choice over time. The Dutch economist [[Colignatus]] developed the [[Borda fixed point]] system for this, see his discussion [http://www.gutenberg.org/files/15939/15939-h/15939-h.htm#_h3_35 Without time, no morality].

The [[Talk:Voting_system]] page

On the [[Talk:Voting_system]] page I added the following comment:

Will add my analysis and suggestion of the Borda fixed point method. Colignatus
16:19, 5 March 2006 (UTC)

Borda Fixed Point

Original 19:33, 23 April 2005

This page was created by [[User:Fahrenheit451]], and edited by some other users. At Revision as of 13:46, 29 January 2006 the text was:

"Borda fixed point" (also known as "Pareto-Borda fixed point") is a [[voting system]] that was devised by economist Thomas Cool in 2001. It is based on the [[Borda count]] but employs a mathematical method to maintain the status quo, if there is one, without a compelling voter consensus for a different outcome.

==External links==

* [<http://econwpa.wustl.edu:8089/eps/get/papers/0503/0503014.pdf> A comparison of Approval Voting to Borda Fixed Point Rule and Borda count] Article by Thomas Cool.

* [<http://econwpa.wustl.edu:8089/eps/get/papers/0202/0202003.html> An introduction to the Borda Fixed Point rule] Article by Thomas Cool.

[[Category:Voting systems]]

[[Category:Fixed points]]

(cur) (last) 13:46, 29 January 2006 Fredrik m (use term voting system, wikified)

(cur) (last) 10:53, 27 January 2006 Charles Matthews m (+cat)

(cur) (last) 17:32, 1 August 2005 R.H. m (→External links - Colignatus = Cool)

(cur) (last) 23:43, 19 May 2005 Michael Hardy

(cur) (last) 19:33, 23 April 2005 71.98.149.61 (started article)

My Revision as of 15:32, 5 March 2006

"Borda fixed point" is a [[voting system]] that was devised by economist Thomas Cool in 2001 (a.k.a. [[Colignatus]]). It is based on the [[Borda count]] and adds the condition that the winner should also win in a dual contest with the runner up, which alternative winner is determined by the Borda election when the winner does not partake (requiring a recalculation of the rank orders).

In the Pareto-Borda version, first those points are selected that are better than the [[Status Quo]] and then the Borda fixed point method is applied. According to Cool / Colignatus this is the best interpretation of what people generally regard as a democratic vote. It respects minority rights, is sensitive to preference ranks, and hinders strategic voting.

==External links==

* [<http://econwpa.wustl.edu:8089/eps/get/papers/0503/0503014.pdf> A comparison of Approval Voting to Borda Fixed Point Rule and Borda count] Article by Thomas Cool

* [<http://econwpa.wustl.edu:8089/eps/get/papers/0202/0202003.html> An introduction to the Borda Fixed Point rule] Article by Thomas Cool

* [http://www.gutenberg.org/files/15939/15939-h/15939-h.htm#_h3_35 Without time no morality], the improved chapter in DRGTPE (Project Gutenberg version)

* [<http://www.dataweb.nl/~cool/Papers/VTFD/Index.html> Voting Theory for Democracy], book by Thomas Cool

[[Category:Welfare economics]]
[[Category:Voting systems]]
[[Category:Fixed points]]

Talk page of [[voting system]]

Part of the discussion took place on the talk page of [[voting system]]:

==Without time no morality==

Will add my analysis and suggestion of the [[Borda fixed point]] method.
[[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 16:19, 5 March 2006 (UTC)

* Moved to the bottom. And I think that article should be deleted, as it is clearly your [[WP:NOR|original research]]. [[User:Rspeer|"r>speer"]] / [[User talk:Rspeer|>␣ æds>␣]] 16:38, 5 March 2006 (UTC)

* Thanks for helping to find the right place for this. Well, it is my research, but it has been published, first as a working paper on EconWPA, then in a book at Dutch University Press, and now also at Project Gutenberg, so it is not 'original' in the somewhat unfortunate use of terms at the page that you referred to. Please note that I have hesitated to include my own work, since I feel that I should not advertise my work (though I make it available on my website), but I was encouraged by the fact that another user of wikipedia originated the page on the [[Borda fixed point]] (referring to my work). [[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 16:59, 5 March 2006 (UTC)

* OK, what will happen now ? I noted that someone has suggested to delete the page on [[Borda fixed point]]. I removed that again since I suspect that it is you while I consider your reaction premature. Would it be possible for you (a) to read the text, (b) study the references when in doubt, (c) ask me questions if still in doubt, (d) only take any action after this, (e) and can you explain to me what is going in the mean time now that someone put that message there ? Please note that I wrote a book on voting theory so that I know what you have done, writing these pages. It is just that it is unsettling for a scientist like me to be suddenly confronted with 'deletion signs' that are wholly irrational.
[[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 17:23, 5 March 2006 (UTC)

:: Sorry, I was hasty about that. I hadn't checked your credentials; the fact that the article referred to you by your Wikipedia username was a red flag for me, as it sounded like the usual case of some random person thinking their random ideas deserve an article.

::The current version of [[Borda fixed point]] shows the problem with writing about your own work on Wikipedia - it is not at all written from the [[WP:NPOV|neutral point of view]], as it simply advocates the method. I'll discuss more on [[Talk:Borda fixed point]]. [[User:Rspeer|"rspeer"] / [[User talk:Rspeer|ɹ ædsɹ]] 16:06, 6 March 2006 (UTC)

:::That the article only advocates the method is not true. See the talk page, where the criticism that Rspeer gave is shown to be false. Now, it may be that someone else would reformulate the explanation in a different way, such that such criticism and its refutation is included in the article. That is fine. Go ahead. I don't mind such a re-edit. But the fact that you don't understand the method does not mean that you can imply that the text is a mere advocacy.

:::Also, Rspeer included a request for mediation, see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Requests_for_mediation#Parties.27_agreement_to_mediate. See my explanation why this is too early.

:::Now, I will restore the paragraph on the list of candidates, the budget set, and the need for temporal consistency. For Rspeer's piece of mind I will not mention the solution of the Borda Fixed Point, and leave it up to you to figure out whether that method should be mentioned and, if so, where. As I said: Have fun. If you are interested in voting systems, you should have that. [[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 02:34, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

The Borda Fixed Point article as it is now

Last Revision 13:01, 18 March 2006

My edit was changed into what it now:

"Borda fixed point" is a [[voting system]] that was devised by economist Thomas Cool in 2001. It is based on the [[Borda count]] and adds the condition that the winner should also win in a dual contest with the runner up, which alternative winner is determined by the Borda election when the winner does not partake (requiring a recalculation of the rank orders). In the Pareto-Borda version, first those points are selected that are better than the [[status quo]] and then the Borda fixed point method is applied.

==External links==

* [<http://econwpa.wustl.edu:8089/eps/get/papers/0503/0503014.pdf> A comparison of Approval Voting to Borda Fixed Point Rule and Borda count] Article by Thomas Cool

* [<http://econwpa.wustl.edu:8089/eps/get/papers/0202/0202003.html> An introduction to the Borda Fixed Point rule] Article by Thomas Cool

* [http://www.gutenberg.org/files/15939/15939-h/15939-h.htm#_h3_35 Without time no morality], the improved chapter in DRGTPE (Project Gutenberg version)
* [<http://www.dataweb.nl/~cool/Papers/VTFD/Index.html> Voting Theory for Democracy], book by Thomas Cool

[[Category:Welfare economics]]

[[Category:Voting systems]]

[[Category:Fixed points]]

Curious deletions in these last revisions

- “Colignatus” is not the same as “User:Colignatus”. Colignatus is the “name in science” of Thomas Cool – see for comparison Desiderius Erasmus whose real name was Geert Geertszoon (and he “translated” Dutch “begeren” (to desire) to both Latin (Desiderius) and Greek (Erasmus)).
- The piece of information is deleted that Colignatus suggests that this would be, according to him, “the best interpretation of what people generally regard as a democratic vote.” Of course, you don’t have to believe Colignatus, but he has studied the matter, and it is informative that he does that conjecture.
- The information about what properties the method satisfies is deleted – “It respects minority rights, is sensitive to preference ranks, and hinders strategic voting.” Why has the mention of these useful properties been deleted ?

(2) A recent contribution by Student One

While [[Colignatus]] was banned, Student One added a comment on the [[Talk:Voting system]] page:

At http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Voting_system#Autobiographical_edits

05:55, 13 March 2006:

== Autobiographical edits ==

I think that one moral to derive from the Colignatus conflict above is that you shouldn't add information about yourself or your research interests to Wikipedia. This is a corollary of the [[WP:AUTO]] policy. The problem is that when the edits are about you, it is easy to overreact by construing a criticism of that edit as a criticism of "you". (Of course, this is not nearly the only thing that Colignatus did wrong, but this is where I believe the whole ugly issue started.)

I've just reverted a link that [[User:Polytope|Craig Carey]] posted to his own advocacy site. Craig, looking at your contributions, it looks like you've been a helpful Wikipedia editor, even discovering some libel posted in Wikipedia and

fixing it. Your contributions are very much appreciated. However, I have to revert your link here, both because it doesn't meet the standards of notability I think links on this article need to meet, and because your adding of it creates an autobiographical conflict of interest.

I do this so that everyone doesn't just link to a site expressing their own view -- and there are just about as many views in election methods as there are people.

I feel that I'm inviting more comments that I'm "taking ownership" of this article. It's a tough balance, because I care about this article and want to keep it in the best state possible, while recognizing that some contributions may start out looking bad but evolve to become a useful part of the article. So I always welcome feedback on my edits to this article.

As long as that feedback doesn't consist of [[Wikipedia:Requests for comment/Colignatus|incoherent ranting threats]], that is.

[[User:Rspeer|"rspeer"/]] / [[User talk:Rspeer|"rspeer addsr"/]] 05:55, 13 March 2006 (UTC)

- (a) He talks down to [[Colignatus]] of being wrong on autobiographical entries
- (b) He admits about being in danger about “ownership”
- (c) He sneers at “incoherent ranting threats”

(3) The Request for Comments page – with my comments added

At wikikpedia there is a “Request for Comments” page at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Requests_for_comment/Colignatus

It is not clear how long this page will exist and what its further function is.

I will include comments here. These comments however cannot be seen as separate from the main body of the text, and they cannot be listed as such.

In order to remain listed at [[Wikipedia:Requests for comment]], at least two people need to show that they tried to resolve a dispute with this user and have failed. This must involve the "same" dispute with a "single" user, not different disputes or multiple users. The persons complaining must provide evidence of their efforts, and each of them must certify it by signing this page with <nowiki>~~~~</nowiki>. If this does not happen within 48 hours of the creation of this dispute page (which was: 05:13, 11 March 2006 (UTC)), the page will be deleted. The current date and time is: <tt>{{CURRENTTIME}}},

{{CURRENTDAY}} {{CURRENTMONTHNAME}} {{CURRENTYEAR}}
(UTC)</tt>.

I suppose that “failing to resolve a dispute” may also mean that the person who started the “RfC” caused the problem himself or herself. I clarified above that Student One may be in “bad faith”.

*([[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]]) | [[User talk:Colignatus|talk]]) |
[[Special:contributions/Colignatus|contributions]])

"Users should only edit one summary or view, other than to endorse."
==Statement of the dispute==
Colignatus is editing articles related to [[voting system]]s to express his original research and his opinions, and retaliates against editors who revert or question his contributions with personal attacks and personal threats.

"This is a summary written by users who dispute this user's conduct. Users signing other sections ("Response" or "Outside views") should not edit the "Statement of the dispute" section."

This is a false accusation.

I entered reasoned arguments that clarified how the existing articles could be improved upon, and I provided proper references to check upon those arguments.

I did not “retaliate”.

I did no “personal attack” or “threat”.

=== Description ===
"{Add summary here, but you must use the section below to certify or endorse it. Users who edit or endorse this summary should not edit the other summaries, other than to endorse them.}"

;Statement by [[User:Rspeer|Rspeer]]
[[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] has been engaging in personal attacks against me, [[User:Rspeer|Rspeer]], ever since I questioned the notability[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Borda_fixed_point&diff=42496778&oldid=42358742] of Colignatus' voting system, called [[Borda fixed point]], on [[Talk:Borda fixed point]].

I said that wikipedia could remove the [[Borda Fixed Point]] method if they wished so. I did not create the article, only corrected the text.

I never have expressed any opinion on “notability”. This is not for me to judge upon.

My position has only been that I provided reasoned arguments, since one may suppose that wikipedia articles have a backbone of reason and don't just tally google scores.

In addition, he has repeatedly demanded me to "provide the name and e-mail address of your MIT professor"
[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Borda_fixed_point&diff=42573728&oldid=42496778], attempting to use the real-world identity I provide on my user page against me. After I told him that I doubt any of my professors would care, he has asked instead for my dean. He has not withdrawn this threat, saying that he is right now working on a message to some dean or professor at MIT. Although I am sure this will amount to nothing, this is a personal threat in an attempt to chill on-Wikipedia discussion.

The issue of a "threat" is discussed in the main body of the text.

At this point, one can observe that Student One considers this "threat" to be no real "threat" since he is "sure" that "this will amount to nothing". So, the only value of protesting against this "threat" lies in the fact that the other user can be removed from the scene.

The text "After I told him that I doubt any of my professors would care, he has asked instead for my dean." is inaccurate. Student One refused to give the name and email address of his professor, and thus I had to explain that I would have to contact the dean instead.

Colignatus has made no attempt to learn Wikipedia policies; when I have brought them up on his talk page, he responded "Don't throw links at me".

This is a false accusation. I have read up on wikipedia policies. Clearly, I cannot read up as quickly as one perhaps might desire, since there are a lot of such policies, especially when someone – likely too aggressive or in bad faith – starts all kinds of procedures which then appear hasty or premature. I do have a day time job that also requires attention.

When Student One brought up such links, it was done in such a way as "talking down" to a person, as if this person would not be [[civil]] and such.

I requested mediation as a response to his original threatening message, but another user said that it was too soon for mediation and I shouldn't bite the newbies. Colignatus rejected the mediation. I backed off a bit, conceding that mediation was probably not appropriate, and tried to take a break from the issue. Colignatus claimed this as a victory and made more personal attacks against me as well as an ultimatum
[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Borda_fixed_point&diff=42841932&oldid=42838734], so I did not take that break.

It is misleading to say that I rejected mediation. In a technical sense I did. But I noted that it was too early for that step, and Student One later admitted that he had been too rash.

I never “claimed this as a victory”. Student One should provide a link where I did so. I only stated that he had been too rash, should study the reasoned argument, and give me the name and email address of his professor. I did not make “personal attacks”.

I did not present an “ultimatum”: merely stated the logistics that if he didn’t provide name and email within 24 hours that I would proceed on my own data.

After many warnings on [[User talk:Colignatus|his talk page]], Colignatus has persisted in his threats, claiming that they are not threats because I should be happy to discuss this with a professor [http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Borda_fixed_point&diff=42881457&oldid=42859372]. I am certain that no discussion will occur, because he will not reach anyone at MIT who cares about what happens on Wikipedia, but I still find the attempt to interfere in my academic life unacceptable. I [[Wikipedia:Administrators' noticeboard/Incidents#Repeated threats from User:Colignatus|consulted other admins]] on the issue -- [[User:Stifle|Stifle]] and [[User:Sean Black|Sean Black]] responded -- and they decided that Colignatus should not be blocked yet. Stifle encouraged me to start an RfC instead.

Student One does not explain that his “warnings” are instances of “talking down” to a person, are an harassment of an editing process, and that he doesn’t listen to the explanation about the “threat” that he perceives but that is no “threat”.

He may consider this “interference with this academic life” unacceptable, but, he should not hide behind the back of wikipedia. He should know that wikipedia is on the world wide web, that everyone has access to his dealings there, and that scientists live by the rules of the integrity of science that apply everywhere.

[[User:Rspeer|rspeer]] / [[User talk:Rspeer| > æds]] 05:02, 11 March 2006 (UTC)

;Statement by [[User:Joebeone|Joseph Lorenzo Hall]]

A few of us have attempted to intervene in this matter and try to work things out. I interjected at two points: one to explain why mediation was a good thing and then again to try and explain that contacting someone outside of Wikipedia was inappropriate and would be ineffective

Yes, Student Two was interfering in an unhelpful way. Mediation was started by Student One too rashly, and apparently Student Two doesn’t understand integrity of science either.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk%3ABorda_fixed_point&diff=42724106&oldid=42574050]

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk%3ABorda_fixed_point&diff=42850332&oldid=42845134]. At first I just thought this is case of a new wikipedia community member who has found the vast myriad of rules to be completely obscure. However, when explained certain rules, Colignatus seemed only interested in saving face in the dispute and getting at Rspeer. --
[[User:Joebeone|Joseph Lorenzo Hall]] 16:31, 11 March 2006 (UTC)

Explain “vast myriad of rules” to Student One, who suggested that I didn’t try to look.

It is a false accusation that I was only interested in saving face. I only presented a reasoned argument, and when I noted that Student One didn’t care, I wanted to write to his professor. Now, Student Two suggests that it “seems” that I only was interested in saving face. My suggestion is that others track the argument, and see whether it is correct that one can suggest that this seems so. If not, Student Two also misconstrues the evidence. Interestingly, I was the first one to mention that I lost confidence in Student One because I got the impression that he was in bad faith – and my observation now is mirrored.

:Also, Colignatus has used (in the past 24-36 hours) the excuse that he needs a "time out" to author emails to Rspeer's "professor" and "dean" at MIT in order to revert substantive comments on this dispute
[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Borda_fixed_point&diff=prev&oldid=43224366]. Also, Colignatus has also threatened to write my former dean, [[Hal Varian]]
[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk%3AVoting_system&diff=43062273&oldid=42917165]. -- [[User:Joebeone|Joseph Lorenzo Hall]] 16:43, 11 March 2006 (UTC)

Why would that be an “excuse” ?

I can now confirm that Colignatus has sent the
[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=User_talk:Colignatus&diff=43339869&oldid=43334631 text of the email] that he has threatened to send. I received this email along with an elaborate nine-page appendix detailing his position on Sun, 12 Mar 2006 01:47:55 GMT. This correspondence was also sent to the president of [[MIT]], Professor [[Susan Hockfield]], as well as the current Dean, [[AnnaLee Saxenian]], of my school, the [[UC Berkeley School of Information]]. I have considered posting the appendix which makes Colignatus' argument on this page below in the Response area; I will refrain from doing so until Colignatus has had a chance to exercise his right to request that an admin post it per [[User:Stifle|Stifle]]'s comment below. I've encouraged my Dean to not to respond. I'm quite upset that Colignatus actually went out of his way to bother one of the busiest people that I work with on a daily basis. (Moments later: the text of his appendix has now been added to his Talk page

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=User_talk%3AColignatus&diff=43375272&oldid=43349633].) -- [[User:Joebeone|Joebeone]] ([[User talk:Joebeone|Talk]]) 02:32, 12 March 2006 (UTC)

I am sorry that Student Two is upset. 800 million people are starving, that is sad too. Perhaps I can explain that I am probably twice as busy as his dean – though everyone only has 24 hours a day. It is a pity that he has misinformed his dean.

;Statement by [[User:Bunchofgrapes|Bunchofgrapes]]
I made

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Voting_system&diff=42883220&oldid=42879884 an attempt] to enter into discussion with Colignatus about the intention behind his stated goal of contacting RSpeer's professors or dean, pointing out that such action appeared to be a threat and ran contrary to Wikipedia culture. This was met with

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Voting_system&diff=next&oldid=42917165 this response] (Colignatus was not signed in when he made it, but returned under his account to re-sign it

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Voting_system&diff=next&oldid=43062273]). His response was ""What I try to accomplish: see that email. Don't judge before you read it. And if culture is baked in stone, would you really like that ? Did you ever hear about the world wide web so that different cultures meet ?"" I found this to be a cryptic response, since it was unclear how I would ever see an email that Colignatus was to write to RSpeer's academic superiors.

This is not cryptic. It is a basic attitude to observe facts. If you don't know (or ever will know) what a letter is about, don't judge on it.

Anyway, it didn't matter what the content of such a letter might be; I think it is clear despite Colignatus' denials that the letter itself constitutes a threat and that the writing of such a letter should play "no part" in settling the related content disputes that precipitated all this.

The letter “itself” does not constitute a threat.

There was no discussion with Student One on content, since he evaded that issue, by not studying and by not replying on answers on content.

If Colignatus cannot or will not understand this, there will come a point where he cannot or will not be welcomed as a Wikipedia editor.

—[[User:Bunchofgrapes|Bunchofgrapes]] ([[User talk:Bunchofgrapes|talk]]) 21:05, 11 March 2006 (UTC)

:Having now seen a draft of

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=User_talk:Colignatus&diff=43339869&oldid=43334631 the letter] I can only say it appears RSpeer was right all along ; we didn't block him soon enough. I now unhesitatingly endorse Sean Black's

indefinite block. —[[User:Bunchofgrapes|Bunchofgrapes]] ([[User talk:Bunchofgrapes|talk]]) 22:20, 11 March 2006 (UTC)

You didn't explain why you conclude this. "Having seen the letter" does not explain anything (and interferes with the earlier remark that the content wouldn't matter).

=== Evidence of disputed behavior ===

(Provide diffs. Links to entire articles aren't helpful unless the editor created the entire article. Edit histories also aren't helpful as they change as new edits are performed.)

:#

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Borda_fixed_point&diff=42573728&oldid=42496778 Colignatus' original response], while not logged in

:#* Attack: "Give me a reasoned argument instead of your present bias and insult."

Quoted out of context. There was bias and "talking down", such as a premature proposal to delete, and one can check that Student One didn't look up the history.

:#* Attack: "I don't think that you have the balanced mind to come up with a serious reaction, and you are likely to tell people biased and insulting stuff."

Quoted out of context. This is not an attack but my observation. Student One should include the context where I observed this, and not just an uninformative link. This line followed the one where I explained that I would not sell him a copy of my Economics Pack where the Borda Fixed Point is implemented. As I observed that Student One was rash, in proposing deletion and such, and was talking down to me (see the relevant paragraphs above), I decided that I would not have to do with him. Perhaps his professor could straighten things out, but for now the Economics Pack is off limits.

:#* Admission of original research: "It is a fallacy that this method should have an impact on students of voting via a citation index or so, before it can be listed in wikipedia for people to see what it is. It is a new method that I had an idea about in 1990, formalised it in 2001, and that has been circulating a bit."

Quoted out of context. Misconstruction of "original research". I did not create the article, someone else did. My contribution was only a reasoned argument. In this quote, I only provide information on the history of my research, not on the article.

:#* Threat: "Please give me the name and email address of your professor at MIT. I want him/her to see this."

Silly. See the discussion in the main body of the text.

:#

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Borda_fixed_point&diff=42841932&oldid=42838734]

:#* Threat: "If haven't given me in the next 24 hours the name and email address of your professor at MIT, I will approach the dean there."

:#* Refusal to read Wikipedia policies: "Don't throw links at me, such as "civil", as if I were a barbarian. My language has always been polite."

Quoted out of context. It is a false accusation that I didn't read up on wikipedia policies as far as doable. Student One was throwing a link, and not being helpful at all.

:#* Personal attack: "Did you apologize for being too rash and self-assuming ? No."

Quoted out of context. Student One was rash and self-assuming. He did not apologize. He admitted to other wikipedia insiders that he was too fast on the trigger, but he did not apologize for the harassment and loss of time and money that he invoked on me.

:#

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Borda_fixed_point&diff=42881457&oldid=42859372]

:#* Threat: "You still have about 19 hours before I contact the dean. I presume I can write an email text so that he or she will take notice. And you haven't explained why you consider this a threat. If the dean reacts as I hope, you will benefit from it."

Silly again. And he still did not explain, never explained, why this would be a threat.

:#* Threat to disrupt Wikipedia to make a point: "So, you hold that this [[voting system]] page is based about notability ONLY, and that logic and reasoning are not important ? In that case, I can propose to delete this page."

Quoted out of context. First of all, this was a "reductio ad absurdum" argument to clarify that articles also rely on logic and reasoning, so that Student One's reference to notability was deficient. Secondly, it remains a general point that bad articles should be removed from wikipedia, and such an observation cannot be a "threat to disrupt".

:# Personal attack:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Borda_fixed_point&diff=42885307&oldid=42884595 "This is a false accusation, worthy of Rspeer."]

Quoted out of context. It was a false accusation. The full line is: "And, I did not introduce original research. This is a false accusation, worthy of Rspeer." I had explained the situation, but to no avail. By that point, I had started to expect this. See my discussion on good faith versus bad faith, above. Perhaps I shouldn't have formulated the sentence like that, but it fits the occasion.

:# Personal attack:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Borda_fixed_point&diff=43070059&oldid=43069847 "Having lost confidence on Rspeer, my position is that it is useless to talk with him. The saying is: if you teach a monkey to climb, you will get a coconut on your head."]

Quoted out of context. The lines are taken from the full section where I explain my position. This is not a personal attack but an explanation on my position, clarifying that I first want to write my email to the professors and don't want to have anything to do with Student One.

PM. At some place, someone remarked that I compared Student One to a monkey. No, I just recalled the saying about a monkey, to explain the mechanism. Don't give the keys of your car to a ten year old.

:# Continued threat:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Voting_system&diff=43063476&oldid=43063302 "Please be aware that I will be busy now writing the emails to the professors, so give me some time off on this convoluted reasoning of these students."]

Quoted out of context. A proper quote would include evidence of the convoluted reasoning.

:# Threat to contact Joseph's former dean:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk%3AVoting_system&diff=43062273&oldid=42917165 "I noticed that you are at SIMS, so now I have to write to Hal Varian, if he's still there. Why don't you behave decently, it would have saved us all a great deal ?"]

:# Sent Joebeone (Joseph) an email that Colignatus claims he will send to Joebeone's former dean:

[<http://josephhall.org/nqb2/index.php/2006/03/11/wikidisp> "Dear professors Hockfield and Varian, I have a problem on the integrity of science with two of your students, ..."]

I did sent both students a draft of the email to the professors, allowing them a chance to make comments and do suggestions.

=== Applicable policies ===

{list the policies that apply to the disputed conduct}

:# [[WP:NPA]], including its policy on threats

:# [[WP:CIVIL]]

:# [[WP:NOR]]

:# [[WP:AUTO]]

=== Evidence of trying and failing to resolve the dispute ===

(provide diffs and links)

:#

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Requests_for_mediation&diff=prev&oldid=42730696 My request for mediation], which

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wikipedia:Requests_for_mediation&diff=next&oldid=42730696 Colignatus rejected]

:#

[http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=User_talk:Colignatus&diff=prev&oldid=42984459 Warning on Colignatus' talk page]

See the discussion on this in the body of the text above. The proposal for mediation was premature and ill-conceived. Student One jumped this on me without first consulting. He later admitted to being too quick on the trigger. Thus this does not constitute a proper effort of “trying and failing to resolve the dispute”.

The warning he put on my user page was an effort at intimidation, to withhold a scientist from properly contacting a fellow scientist on the behaviour of his student.

There was no threat and no personal attack – so the warning was only a ploy in getting me removed, and not a proper effort at “trying and failing to resolve the dispute”.

=== Users certifying the basis for this dispute ===

"{Users who tried and failed to resolve the dispute}"

<!-- Please note: If you did not try and fail to resolve the dispute, but agree with the summary's presentation of events, please sign in the next section. Please notify the user, via his talk page, that a conduct dispute has been raised. -->

(sign with <nowiki>~~~~</nowiki>)

:# [[User:Rspeer|"r">speer"] / [[User talk:Rspeer|"">□æds">□]] 05:10, 11 March 2006 (UTC)

:# [[User:Joebeone|Joseph Lorenzo Hall]] 16:23, 11 March 2006 (UTC)

:# [[User:Stifle|Stifle]] 00:03, 12 March 2006 (UTC)

It still is not clear to me whether Student Two really knew about the earlier history of premature proposal to delete and the talking down by Student One.

I don't know whether Stifle is aware of the situation as described in the body of the text above.

=== Other users who endorse this summary ===

<!-- If you agree with the summary's presentation of events but did not try and fail to resolve the dispute, please sign in this section. -->

(sign with <nowiki>~~~~</nowiki>)

:#—[[User:Bunchofgrapes|Bunchofgrapes]] ([[User talk:Bunchofgrapes|talk]]) 20:51, 11 March 2006 (UTC)
:#[[User Talk:JzG|Just zis Guy you know?]] 20:29, 12 March 2006 (UTC)
:##--[[User:FloNight|"FloNight"]] [[User talk:FloNight|^{"talk"}]] [[Image:Small_shamrock.png|18px]] 04:36, 15 March 2006 (UTC)

==Response==

"This is a summary written by the user whose conduct is disputed, or by other users who think that the dispute is unjustified and that the above summary is biased or incomplete. Users signing other sections ("Statement of the dispute" and "Outside Views") should not edit the "Response" section."
"

{Add summary here, but you must use the endorsement section below to sign.
Users who edit or endorse this summary should not edit the other summaries.}

"Comment": As Colignatus is currently indefinitely blocked, he should email me or some other admin with text he wishes to add, if desired. [[User:Stifle|Stifle]] 00:07, 12 March 2006 (UTC)

Colignatus emailed me the following:

On the one hand: I dislike to get involved in this, not only since I have to familiarize me first with what this procedure involves, but also since the above is a biased report and trying to restore this report into a balanced account will take a lot of time. In my view it would have been proper that these students first had the desired discussion with their professors, before they created this page. It is also curious that, while I had asked for a "time out" to write the letter to the professors, there suddenly is this 48 hour limit with a block after say 10 hours. Please note that I gave Rob Speer 24 hours to merely provide the name and email address of his professor, which is much simpler to do than replying to the above biased report. So, on this hand, I would tend to wait it all out, let the professors talk to their students, so that they see the point, and can withdraw all this. (It would have been wiser for Joe Hall not to suggest to his professor to disregard the case, but leave the decision to her.)

On the other hand: I had intended to join wikipedia and I realize that various people are considering the situation, so that there is a lot of work involved for more people. It may also be a good learning experience for wikipedia that talking to your professor is not a threat and that

when a scientist invokes the "integrity of science" clause then you shouldn't reply with a block.

In balance: allow me the next week, say till Monday March 20th, to state a reply. I really am busy, probably more so than what Joe Hall suggests about his professor AnnaLee Saxenian, and thus I can't make it earlier.

Given this extra work involved: I'll also ask Rob Speer to start saving \$300 and Joe Hall to start saving \$150, in order to be able to pay me this symbolic repayment when all this is over.

[[User:Colignatus]]

Users who endorse this summary (sign with <nowiki>~~~~</nowiki>):
#

==Outside view by Mangojuice==

"This is a summary written by users not directly involved with the dispute but who would like to add an outside view of the dispute. Users editing other sections ("Statement of the dispute" and "Response") should not edit the "Outside Views" section, except to endorse an outside view."

Rspeer should be more careful in dealing with newbies, while being gentle in educating them about wikipedia culture, especially as an admin.

Colignatus has violated a wide range of wikipedia policies of which he was apparently unaware. However, it is impossible to escape the conclusion that he meant to contact rspeer's professor or dean in order to cause rspeer to be disciplined or at least embarrassed in his academic life,

This is clear nonsense. While I think that it would be helpful for Student One to be sent to boot camp, however, the only position that I wish to defend is that his professor should have a chat with him on the issue explained in this text. What his professor and he decide will be up to them. My only position is that I have done my best in reporting a case of integrity of science – and further it is up to MIT and SIMS.

therefore implying that he will do so is a threat and actually doing so is [[Wikipedia:Harassment|harassment]]. Furthermore, Colignatus cannot deny that he made disparaging comments about rspeer: these were [[WP:NPA|personal attacks]] whether Colignatus feels they were founded in observation or not. Ignorance of these policies is no excuse: threats, harassment, and personal attacks are unacceptable in any community, not just on Wikipedia. Until Colignatus at least apologizes for these infractions and agrees to attempt to follow wikipedia guidelines and rules, he can have no place here.

Explain “disparaging”.

This text was constructed before “my side” had been presented. It is based upon a one-sided and wholly biased report, constructed by Student One and Student Two, who are both accusers and judges.

The content dispute should be solveable by mediation.

This is a misunderstanding. As Student One shows symptoms of bad faith, it is no use talking to him on content.

Users who endorse this summary (sign with <nowiki>~~~~</nowiki>):
[[User:Mangojuice|Mangojuice]] 19:02, 14 March 2006 (UTC)
-- [[User:Joebeone|Joebeone]] ([[User talk:Joebeone|Talk]]) 21:49, 14 March 2006 (UTC)
[[User:Rspeer|r]] / [[User talk:Rspeer|speer]] / [[User talk:Rspeer|æds]] 22:35, 14 March 2006 (UTC)
--[[User:FloNight|FloNight]] [[User talk:FloNight|suptalk]] [[Image:Small_shamrock.png|18px]] 04:39, 15 March 2006 (UTC) (hope it can be solved with mediation)
--[[User:Atari2600tim|Atari2600tim]] ([[User talk:Atari2600tim|talk]]) • [[Special:Contributions/Atari2600tim|contribs]] 10:21, 18 March 2006 (UTC)
[[User:Stifle|Stifle]] 01:24, 20 March 2006 (UTC)

On March 15, Student One did this edit: “I’m moving the informally-presented outside views to the discussion page, so that it is possible to respond without breaking the RfC format.” In this manner, he removed his comment by Fahrenheit451:

(moved from project page -- [[User:Rspeer|r]] / [[User talk:Rspeer|speer]] / [[User talk:Rspeer|æds]] 03:35, 15 March 2006 (UTC))

This is the most complex and convoluted dispute I have ever witnessed on wikipedia. After reading it over, it appears to me that mutual buttons (personally sensitive points) have been pushed and it has escalated out of control. It is possible for a editor to say something in such a way that it is perceived to be a personal attack when it in fact is not. I would recommend that a mutually acceptable third party between Rob Speer and Tom Cool be solicited to act as a mediator. I am confident this situation can get sorted out without an indefinite block on Colignatus.--[[User:Fahrenheit451|Fahrenheit451]] 05:28, 13 March 2006 (UTC)

==Discussion==

"All" signed comments and talk not related to an endorsement should be directed to [[Wikipedia talk:{{PAGENAME}}|this page's discussion page]]. Discussion should not be added below. Discussion should be posted on the talk page. Threaded replies to another user's vote, endorsement, evidence, response, or comment should be posted to the talk page.

(4) Letter to MIT and SIMS, March 11 2006

To the president of MIT
Professor Susan Hockfield
<http://web.mit.edu/hockfield/>
hockfield@mit.edu

To the dean of SIMS, University of California at Berkeley
Professor AnnaLee Saxenian
<http://www.sims.berkeley.edu/~anno/>
anno@sims.berkeley.edu

March 11, 2006

Dear professor Hockfield and professor Saxenian,

I have a problem on the integrity of science with two of your students, Rob Speer at MIT who started the problem, and Joseph Lorenzo Hall at SIMS who is interfering in an unhelpful way. The problem is summarized in the appendix.

Obviously, the integrity of science is a difficult subject even for academics so there must be a great deal of tolerance with students. With students, they certainly cannot be held accountable as scientists can, and they are only learning the trade. Yet, students e.g. know that one cannot cheat a test and that one must study a topic before one gives conclusions on it. When issues of integrity arise, it can be very educational for them to have the issue discussed. In this case, these two students would learn a lot about scientific conduct and scientific integrity.

In the present case, the issue is on the behaviour of these students on the internet, in particular wikipedia. It appears that communication with these students is greatly hindered by that environment, which does not allow the quality of deliberation provided by a personal chat with a person that they respect. My reason to contact you is to ask you to find a teacher or counselor at your school to have that chat.

It is to be considered whether the activity of those students within wikipedia is related to their life as students at your schools. My impression is that this relation exists. Firstly, they present themselves on their wikipedia pages as students of MIT and SIMS, thus partly referring to those institutions and their education there, implying their relation to you. Secondly, they are active in editing work, where they refer to learned books and where they use difficult words. Their behaviour thus cannot be strictly separated from their education and prospective position as scientists. This is most clearly so with Joseph Lorenzo Hall who is already a Ph.D. student who thus must write scientific papers for the journals. For Rob Speer, who started the problem, it can be observed that his education on computing science is relevant for the topic where the problem arose.

In the end, it is with students similar as with academics: An academic can still be a good academic “professionally” even if he or she steals roses from the neighbours or tells gossips to friends in church, but, the expectation would be that that behaviour would not occur. The expectation would be decent behaviour, worthy of an intended graduate or doctor, especially when the integrity of science is involved.

The relation to your school also arises directly from the nature of their misconduct. When a student behaves badly in an area that he sees as distinct from his education, it can be educational to him or her to be reminded that this behaviour does not fit a graduate, for which the very education is intended. As said, I kindly ask you to find a teacher or counselor within your institution to discuss matters on a personal level with those students. I already tried to explain it to them via the contact that is provided by the internet, but this didn’t help, and my hope is that such a talk on a personal level would help them to see the problem.

Unfortunately, the student Rob Speer only provided the co-ordinate “a senior at MIT studying computer science and music” (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User:Rspeer>) and explicitly refused to give a name and email address of his professor. There appear different organizations dealing with computer science at MIT, so I can only write to the President, professor Hockfield, with the polite request to forward this issue to the appropriate person. To my relief, though, I noted a speech by professor Hockfield where she discussed academic integrity, in the case of two scientists at Lincoln Laboratory, so I have been confirmed that integrity has her attention.

The Ph. D. student Joseph Lorenzo Hall can be identified via <http://josephhall.org/> and <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User:Joebeone>, joehall@berkeley.edu. At the present, SIMS is smaller than MIT, so I suppose that professor Varian can identify this student with some ease.

Both students have been informed of this letter, via the email addresses on their webpages.

For your information: in the past I have had brief contact with professor Blanchard (MIT) and Varian (SIMS) as fellow economists. This was only a brief contact, I don’t mean to imply any recommendation on their part, yet this information might be to your assistance.

Respectfully yours,

Thomas Cool / Thomas Colignatus
<http://www.dataweb.nl/~cool>
cool@dataweb.nl
c/o Hotel Mira Punda
Van den Brandhof straat 12
Willemstad, Curaçao
The Netherlands Antilles

Description of the case

“Unethical behaviour by Rob Speer (student MIT) and the failure to observe that behaviour, even when it is pointed out, by Joseph Lorenzo Hall (SIMS), on Arrow’s Impossibility Theorem, voting systems in general and the Borda Fixed Point method in particular.”

Author: Thomas Colignatus, March 11 2006

Introduction

The basic point is that Rob Speer didn’t study the references that I gave him, but stuck to the wikipedia policy that references don’t have to be read. Thus he applied wikipedia policy rules in a rather bureaucratic manner, and didn’t adopt the critical scientific attitude. This attitude implies that he is instrumental in creating false information to the general public, while actually suggesting to the public that the information would be sound.

When confronted with this point, he didn’t reply to this with rational conversation, but became very defensive of his position. Normal comments were called “threats”.

The problem with Joseph Hall is that he didn’t recognize this behaviour, even when this was pointed out to him. He tried to mediate, but didn’t see the point on which.

The students hold that wikipedia would be a special environment. This is only partly true. Wikipedia has some conventions, but conventions are not binding, and, which is my point, there is always the higher code of conduct of scientists.

In addition, while I was writing this case report & letter, in order to arrive at common scientific ground, it turned out that the situation at wikipedia developed further. I was given a notice (“Request for comments”) with a 48 hours horizon; but then within 10 hours there followed a complete block from wikipedia.

The new blocking complicates the issue but on the other hand makes it simpler, since it shows even more clearly that **wikipedia** and **science** are on difficult terms.

It appears that some wikipedians don’t like any interaction of the internal wikipedia environment with people from the outside. One can understand this to an extent. What is amazing for a scientist is that wikipedians don’t make a distinction between issues on the integrity of science and other cases. Clearly, contacting a professor to encourage the education of a student is different from contacting a professor to fire his secretary. In the case when a scientist at wikipedia would show scientific misconduct within wikipedia, an alternative route would be to contact the professional organization, rather than the university. But in case of students, that is impossible.

The key point

The key point is that Rob Speer holds wikipedia policy rules above the critical scientific attitude. This can be shown by this discussion on Arrow's impossibility theorem.

I entered the following criticism to the existing article (for the readers):

Criticism

The history of ideas shows that mankind has struggled with paradoxical concepts like zero and division by zero, the infinite and infinitesimals (Achilles and the hare), the liar paradox, the squaring of the circle, and the like. Arrow's impossibility theorem belongs to this category. It stands to note that his theorem thus is an important contribution. That said, however, the value of the theorem must be judged by itself.

The theorem is not merely a mathematical result but must also be judged from the viewpoint of rationality and morality, since humans must adopt a constitution for their society. Arrow claimed that these axioms would be 'rational' and 'morally desirable' (sometimes interpreted as 'fair'). The "Arrow axioms" however are not rational, since they cause an inconsistency and no rational person would adopt an inconsistency. The axioms only seem rational each considered by itself, but jointly they are irrational. The axioms also are morally unacceptable, since one cannot be asked to do something impossible. For example, for a bike one wishes round wheels to ride. And one wishes square wheels for parking. But square circles don't exist. Arrow concludes that rational and useful bikes don't exist. The proper conclusion is that one requires a standard.

Since 1950 researchers have not quite taken account of these aspects, and hence the theorem has generated much confusion and also a negative attitude towards democracy (since students are taught that it is 'impossible'). For the proper analysis (also of Sen's misguided theorem on liberalism), see these links:

- [Voting theory for democracy](#)
- [Definition & Reality in the General Theory of Political Economy](#)
- [The discussion page at wikireason](#)

Retrieved from "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arrow%27s_impossibility_theorem"

Next to the "article" page there is a "talk" page for the editors. There evolved the following discussion, where Rob Speer first deleted the criticism and, after a revert by me, then said that the text would be either original research or un-verifiable or both. The discussion was:

Added criticism

Note that the page still states "Arrow's theorem states that there is no general way to aggregate preferences without running into some kind of irrationality or unfairness." This is nonsense, but I left it for the time being, to allow others to digest the criticism.

[Colignatus](#) 01:58, 3 March 2006 (UTC)

I agree that that statement is nonsense, so I removed it. Your additional section was written as an opinion, however, and I reverted it. The widely-held criticisms of Arrow's theorem already appear under "Interpretations of the theorem". It's better Wikipedia style to ensure that the whole article is neutral - separate "advocacy" and "criticisms" sections are a last resort for particularly contentious topics. [rspeer](#) / [I æads](#) 03:38, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

No, the text that I entered is not an *opinion* but a reasoned statement. It is not an *interpretation* but a reasoned statement. It may be that you are right that there should not be a separate criticism section, but, given the first part of the article, this reasoned statement can be put here. My suggestion is that more people think through what the article would look like but including the reasoned statement in the main body of the article. It is useful to have the text available in the article before the whole is re-edited, to prevent innocent readers to get a wrong impression. [Colignatus](#) 22:32, 10 March 2006 (UTC)

I noticed that Rob now added a notification on original research or verification. This is better than simply removing the text, but there remains a confusion. You all must distinguish me (1) as a scientist who for you is a third party and who provides sources, e.g. see me as the writer of VTFD in 2001, (b) as a scientist who helps you, just now, to get this article straight. You should note that the [verifiability](#) condition concerns **facts** that need be checked by various sources. But the text that I provided (in the disputed criticism section) contains a **reasoned argument** that you can check by the logical faculties of your minds. Thus the condition does not apply in that sense. Also the reference to original research doesn't apply, since I didn't enter original research. The research originated in 1990 and was published in 2001. The only thing I do now is correct the misleading element in the article, and provide the reader (and you as editors) with a condensed reasoned statement, that you again can check by using the logical faculties of your minds. Also, the [verifiability](#) page mentions that the sources should be reliable. Well, again this is a non-issue for this paragraph. For, the point is that a reasoned argument is provided, so that it doesn't matter where it is from, and you have to use the faculties of your minds. If the washing lady says $1+1=2$ then this has the same value as when the bishop says so, even when the bishop doesn't know what he talks about. Which is exactly why I added the suggestion, above, that when the reasoned argument is understood, the criticism might perhaps best be included in the main text, revising the main article. I didn't do that myself, since all of you would be completely shocked, not having digested that reasoned statement. Some other comments: PM 1: I doubt whether you will find many other sources on criticism other than I already included in the list of literature in the links that I provided. If someone feels like unpacking those links and transferring those references into the main body, feel free to do so. PM 2: Now that Rob

has eliminated that one sentence, that he agreed was nonsense, perhaps the header Criticism is too strong, and it may be perhaps Evaluation or something like that. PM 3: If the consensus is that this group of editors cannot take responsibility for using their logical faculties of minds on the reasoned argument, then you may also attribute it to me, see [Colignatus at wikinfo](#), and perhaps research a bit how reliable I am. Simply a Google scholar is not enough, though. PM 4: If all this fails, I would like a comment from someone who follows the logic of the reasoned argument and have suggestions how it can remain available for readers, then in another format or place. [Colignatus](#) 20:22, 11 March 2006 (UTC)

Retrieved from "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Arrow%27s_impossibility_theorem"

A communication to the professor of a student is called a “threat”

Before the above exchange on Arrow’s impossibility theorem, there was another exchange, where basically the same happened. This was on the Borda Fixed Point method that I introduced. The discussion on that is more convoluted, so I won’t quote it here. The text is available at wikipedia. But, in that exchange I already concluded that I needed to contact Rob Speer’s professor, so I asked him to provide his name and email address. However, instead of being happy that a scientific colleague was called into the scene, Rob Speer called this a “threat”.

Other people at wikipedia joined in:

What's this about talking to Rspeer's professor or dean? Why do you want to do that? What are you hoping to accomplish? I must tell you that it does sound like a threat, and like completely inappropriate behavior within the Wikipedia culture.
—[[User:Bunchofgrapes|Bunchofgrapes]] ([[User talk:Bunchofgrapes|talk]])
23:36, 8 March 2006 (UTC)

-

-What I try to accomplish: see that email. Don't judge before you read it. And if culture is baked in stone, would you really like that ? Did you ever hear about the world wide web so that different cultures meet ?
[[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 01:35, 10 March 2006 (UTC)

-

-That is definitely a threat and ultimatum and completely and totally inappropriate. What's next short of arbitration? Colignatus, Rspeer has given a bit, it's your turn. --
[[User:Joebeone|Joseph Lorenzo Hall]] 03:54, 9 March 2006 (UTC)

.....(a) Explain why this is a threat. (b) It is not so, that you can hold that Rspeer gives some and then the other person must too. If Rspeer was out of order, this needs correction. (c) I noticed that you are at SIMS, so now I have to write to Hal Varian, if he's still there. Why don't you behave decently, it would have saved us all a great deal ? [[User:Colignatus|Colignatus]] 01:35, 10 March 2006 (UTC)

+

+ :::::::::::We are behaving decently. We have attempted to reach a civil resolution with you. Now you have threatened me by saying that you now have to write a professor at my school, Hal Varian (he's our former Dean). What are you going to say to him? That I tried to find a civil solution to a dispute that has been blown out of proportion? Not only can I pretty much guarantee that he won't read your email, I can guarantee that he won't care either way. The OED defines threaten as "to declare one's intention of injuring or punishing in order to influence." You have declared your intention to write emails to superiors of ours in the hope that they will punish us or otherwise influence our actions. That's a threat. -- [[User:Joebeone|Joseph Lorenzo Hall]] 16:51, 11 March 2006 (UTC)

(Obviously, I never said or implied that they needed punishment or to be influenced. Only correction, as an educator or scientific colleague is able to do. / TC.)

(It is a bit strange that Joseph Hall assumes that SIMS, so interested in the information society, would not be interested in wikipedia. / TC.)

Part of the problem is the official guideline on wikipedia

Part of the problem is the official guideline. But, again the students put this guideline above the age-old practice of scientific consultation.

A quote of Rob Speer:

I quote the policy on threats at [WP:NPA](#):

Threats or actions which expose other Wikipedia editors to political, religious or other persecution by government, their employer or any others. Violations of this sort may result in a block for an extended period of time which may be applied immediately by any sysop upon discovery. Sysops applying such sanctions should confidentially notify the members of the Wikipedia:Arbitration Committee and Jimbo Wales of what they have done and why.

Yes, the situation does fall under both "other" clauses. Editors have been banned for threatening to contact employers in the past, though, and I think contacting academic superiors falls along the same lines. [rspeer](#) / [J æədsJ](#) 18:00, 11 March 2006 (UTC)

Other points to consider

In the discussion above on Arrow's impossibility theorem, I already showed how Rob Speer didn't use his critical faculties but worked more operationally. I still don't know whether this is because he is no real student of voting theory, has done any exams in the subject or not, and perhaps is more an operational engineer than an academic scientist. However, such aspects are less relevant compared to the way how one reacts to criticism.

In the discussion on the Borda Fixed Point method I concluded in an early stage that it was useless to discuss issues with him, and that I needed to contact his professor.

I tried to explain to him that a discussion with him was useless, and I tried to clarify the situation by saying: “If you teach a monkey to climb, you will get a coconut on your head.”

His reaction was that I had compared him with a monkey, and that he considered this a personal attack.

However, I explained, and I still hold that this is clear from the context and clear from who has studied the references that I gave, that I did not compare him with a monkey, but only invoked the saying. This saying clarifies the mechanism: that it was useless to go into a discussion with him since it would only lead to more problems. From which it followed that I needed to contact his professor.

However, this explanation was rejected.

There are more examples where a clarification of the situation was not properly listened to but translated into personal attacks.

A nice other example (taken from the “Request for Comments”) is: “Threat to disrupt Wikipedia to make a point: “So, you hold that this voting system page is based about notability ONLY, and that logic and reasoning are not important ? In that case, I can propose to delete this page.”” This reaction means that a “reductio ad absurdum” argument is wholly misinterpreted.

In the appendices there are links and some prints of exchanges, that show that there is no respect for a person who explicitly refers to the integrity of science and who invokes the rules of scientific conduct.

Conclusions

It may also be mentioned that, though I am quite at home in editing scientifically warranted reviews, the wikipedia syntax and all the procedures they have were new to me, so that I undoubtedly have been less effective in my reaction.

Nevertheless it amazes me that a decent scientist who wants to correct erroneous statements in a public and open-access encyclopedia is elbowed out of the situation by some students who may well know less of the matter, who don’t read and study, and who hold the rules of scientific research and conduct to be less relevant than the local conventions.

The prime conclusion remains that it would be useful that the schools discuss these events with these students.

The events also cause two hypotheses on the general situation.

- (1) Perhaps this is an indication to review the general attitude of students, as more students are involved in the wikipedia project.
- (2) Scientists would have a task to critically evaluate wikipedia, not only the result but also the rules of conduct.

References and Appendices

Basic links

While the list of links originally was much shorter, there now is a longer list with various statements on blocking that I have had no influence on.

The case thus is documented at:

- (a) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Deletion_review#Colignatus
- (b) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User_talk:Colignatus
- (c) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point
- (d) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Arrow%27s_impossibility_theorem#Added_criticism
- (e) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arrow%27s_impossibility_theorem#Criticism
- (f) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Requests_for_comment/Colignatus
(though within the time limit I was blocked from entering a reply)
- (g) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Voting_system

Wikipedia also stores histories of pages.

PM. It may be that pages are deleted over time, but one might ask a recovery on the above mentioned “deletion review” page.

General information is provided at

- (a) <http://www.wikinfo.org/wiki.php?title=Colignatus>
- (b) http://wikireason.net/wiki/Boycott_of_Holland
- (c) <http://www.dataweb.nl/~cool>

A request for a time out is not respected

Wikipedia has various mechanisms for conflict resolution. However, the proof is in eating the pudding. It turns out for example that a basic mechanism for a “time out” is not respected.

Time out

I ask a time out, so that I can write my email(s) to the dean / professor (s). Please understand that I am very busy professionally, and this wikipedia environment consumes too much time to be able to combine much. But leave these points, and I'll return to them a.s.a.p.

This is a re-edit of an earlier explanation, please respect this request for this time out. Writing carefully on issues of the integrity of science does require time. Colignatus 01:07, 11 March 2006 (UTC)

This is totally ridiculous, Colignatus. There is no basis for contacting someone who has nothing to do with this dispute and could do nothing about it. We'll have to explore other alternatives since you didn't accept mediation. -- Joseph Lorenzo Hall 16:15, 11 March 2006 (UTC)

Retrieved from "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Borda_fixed_point"

Accusations from someone who probably doesn't know much about voting theory

A quote from Sean Black who did the blocking:

This behaviour is increasingly distressing. As I cannot find any edits of Colignatus' that are not either self promotion or personal attacks, despite several warnings, I've blocked him indefinitely. If he is able to demonstrate to me or any other admin that he will not engage in this behaviour further, he may be unblocked, but if the behaviour *does* continue after being unblocked, then I expect that he will be blocked again.--[Sean Black](#) ^(talk) 20:48, 11 March 2006 (UTC)

However, I my edits are not self-promoting and are no personal attacks.

In an appeal to rethink matter, I sent Black the draft letter to MIT and SIMS, but he apparantly did not read it, and replied simply:

That you have attempted to gain the personal information of Wikipedia editors proves to me that my block was a good thing.

Sean

Colignatus, escalated

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/WP:ANI#Colignatus.2C_escalated

I asked earlier for [Colignatus](#) ([talk](#) • [contribs](#)) to be blocked for making personal threats against me, when he was threatening to contact my MIT dean to try to intimidate me into

allowing his POV original research on [voting system](#) articles. Other admins weren't willing to block him at the time, encouraging [an RfC](#) instead.

[Joseph Lorenzo Hall](#), who has come to my defense in the discussion and endorsed the RfC, is now the target of personal threats himself:

["I noticed that you are at SIMS, so now I have to write to Hal Varian, if he's still there. Why don't you behave decently, it would have saved us all a great deal ?"](#) -- [Colignatus](#)

Colignatus has been warned several times that he can be blocked for such threats. Since he is not actually being blocked, however, he has the opportunity to extend his threats to more people. Every day that this RfC goes on, as well as the RfAr that would probably have to follow it, is an opportunity for Colignatus to make more threats against diligent Wikipedia contributors. I maintain that he should be blocked now, indefinitely, by an uninvolved admin.

I quote the policy on threats at [WP:NPA](#):

Threats or actions which expose other Wikipedia editors to political, religious or other persecution by government, their employer or any others. Violations of this sort may result in a block for an extended period of time which may be applied immediately by any sysop upon discovery. Sysops applying such sanctions should confidentially notify the members of the Wikipedia:Arbitration Committee and Jimbo Wales of what they have done and why.

Yes, the situation does fall under both "other" clauses. Editors have been banned for threatening to contact employers in the past, though, and I think contacting academic superiors falls along the same lines. [rspeer](#) / [J æəpsɪ](#) 18:00, 11 March 2006 (UTC)

This behaviour is increasingly distressing. As I cannot find any edits of Colignatus' that are not either self promotion or personal attacks, despite several warnings, I've blocked him indefinitely. If he is able to demonstrate to me or any other admin that he will not engage in this behaviour further, he may be unblocked, but if the behaviour *does* continue after being unblocked, then I expect that he will be blocked again.--[Sean Black](#) ^(talk) 20:48, 11 March 2006 (UTC)