

Plagiarism in Academia

By
Tristan Barnett

According to the University of Oxford “Plagiarism is presenting someone else’s work or ideas as your own, with or without their consent, by incorporating it into your work without full acknowledgement. All published and unpublished material, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, is covered under this definition. Plagiarism may be intentional or reckless, or unintentional. Under the regulations for examinations, intentional or reckless plagiarism is a disciplinary offence”.

1. Bhagavad Gita

The Bhagavad Gita is a conversation between Arjuna, a supernaturally gifted warrior about to go into battle, and Krishna – the Supreme Personality of Godhead, his charioteer. In the course of giving Arjuna all manner of spiritual and material advice, Krishna explains karma, the self, the Supreme Self, the purpose of yoga, the difference between our self and our material body, how our environment affects our consciousness, and how to attain the perfection of life. The Gita appears as a central chapter in the Mahabharata, the history of greater India. It is the essence of Vedic knowledge and one of the most important books of Vedic literature. Lord Krishna spoke the Bhagavad Gita to Arjuna about 5000 years ago and through disciplic succession the Bhagavad Gita As It Is gives commentary on the verses by Lord Krishna by His Divine Grace A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Pradhupada. Essentially the Bhagavad Gita As It Is is the highest authoritative text to explain the universe and the commentary is “almost” 100% accurate.

According to the Bhagavad Gita As It Is most worked in plagiarized (is it is not original work). Also, material knowledge is subject to error whereas as spiritual knowledge is true knowledge (coming directly from God) and not subject to error. Anyone who reads and understands the Bhagavad Gita As It Is has a much higher source of knowledge than any professor. Therefore, there should be no hierarchy in universities and every academic should be on equal pay. Knowledge at universities should be focused on mathematics, physics, medicine (biology and chemistry), economics (game theory) and most importantly spiritual knowledge; and these areas are important to solving the world’s problems. However spiritual knowledge is rarely taught amongst universities (and not even at high school level). The Bhaktivedanta College is Belgium does offer courses in spiritual knowledge.

<https://bhaktivedantacollege.com/>

Serious plagiarism at Victoria University (Melbourne)

John Zeleznokow at Victoria University wrote a book on 'Dispute Resolution' ([doc](#)). There are many books on dispute resolution, this is not at all original work. The Australian Research Council and Victoria University have funded this work. In the book it is documented:

In section 5.3.1 we shall discuss the Adjusted Winner algorithm for the fair distribution of assets in a dispute. Game theoretic techniques and decision theory were the basis for AdjustedWinner (Brams and Taylor 1996). It is a two party point allocation procedure that distributes items or issues to people on the premise of whoever values the item or issue more.

The two disputants are required to explicitly indicate how much they value each of the different issues by distributing 100 points across the range of issues in dispute. In this paradigm, it is assumed there are k discrete issues in dispute, each of which is divisible. Brams and Taylor (1996) claim the Adjusted Winner paradigm is a fair and equitable procedure because at the end of allocation, each party will have accrued the same number of points.

AdjustedWinner's architecture is governed by a simple formula to calculate the division of issues or items. Brams and Taylor (1996) define the procedure as the allocation of k goods between parties A and B.

It allocates items so that Party A initially obtains all goods she desires more than Party B, and party B is allocated the rest. In the next step the algorithm attempts to achieve equitability – that is to ensure the point totals of the two players are equal. The equitability adjustment formula aims to equalize the number of points both players have been allocated. Once the program has finished the calculation, it alerts the users to the items/issues the parties have been allocated and if appropriate will indicate the percentage to be given to both parties of an item that requires further division.

As Bellucci and Zeleznikow (2006) indicate, whilst the Adjusted Winner system suggests an allocation of items, it is up to human negotiators to finalise an agreement acceptable to real world disputants. For example if a couple are disputing the custody of children it is impossible to give 75% to the wife and 25% to the husband. However it could be suggested the wife have custody with generous access to the husband. If the system recommended the wife have 75% of the house, this could be achieved by selling the house and giving the wife 75% of the profit.

Bellucci and Zeleznikow (2006) extended the principles developed by Brams and Taylor (1996) into their Family Winner system. The Family Winner software develops a strategy to decide which of the parties in a divorce gains particular items that have been valued by each party. The program uses game theory and a system of underlying rules (for instance, choose as the first item to distribute the one where there is the greatest difference in perceived value).

There is a dynamic rating of issues based on who wins the item and who loses. The program will distribute items to the party who values them the most and compensates the other by giving them extra points for the next item.

Perhaps the two most widely known and used Negotiation Support systems are Adjusted Winner¹ (Brams and Taylor 1996) and Smartsettle² (Thiessen and McMahon 2000). Both use game theoretic techniques to provide advice about what they claim are *fair* solutions. Their concept of fair negotiation does not coincide with the concept of legally just negotiations that we considered in section 1.2. Both systems require users to rank and value each issue in dispute, by allocating the sum of one hundred points amongst all the issues. Given these numbers, game theoretic optimisation algorithms are then used to optimise, to an identical extent, each person's desires.

These algorithms are fair in the sense that each disputant's desire is equally met. They do not however meet concerns about justice. For example, if the parents were only interested in their own desires and not the paramount interests of the children, neither system would promote the interests of the children.

In late 2005, the Family_Winner system achieved much media attention, including over a dozen radio interviews in all Australian states and on BBC Radio 5 and separately the BBC World Service, articles in the Sydney Morning Herald³, the Times of London, the Australian Financial Review and the Economist⁴. The inventors were asked to compete on ABC (Australian Broadcasting Commission) *New Inventors* television show on November 16 2005. They won their heat⁵.

As a result of this publicity, Professor Zeleznikow and Dr. Bellucci received much interest in commercializing Family_Winner. One expression of interest came from the Queensland branch of Relationships Australia. One of its tasks is to provide advice to couples that are contemplating divorce. The Queensland Branch of Relationships Australia wants to use a modified version of Family_Winner to provide decision support for their clients. The application domain is agreements about the distribution of marital property.

Envy-freeness (EF) is a criterion of fair division. In an envy-free division, every agent feels that their share is at least as good as the share of any other agent, and thus no agent feels envy. In email discussions with Steven Brams (Adjusted Winner), it was pointed out that Family Winner is not envy free. Also quoted by Steven Brams in an email about plagiarism "Years ago I pointed this out to John, but the NYU's US patent on Adjusted Winner does not protect us in Australia from a patent violation. Also, I cannot claim that I am an aggrieved party, personally hurt by his infringement and credit claims". Steven Brams has also written a book 'Fair Division: From Cake-Cutting to Dispute Resolution' ([html](#)) and was keynote speaker at the Second Brazilian Workshop of the Game Theory Society, in honor of John Nash, on the

¹ Adjusted Winner principles have now been developed by Fair Outcomes, Inc. (see <http://www.appellex.com/> last accessed August 6 2009) which provides parties involved in disputes or difficult negotiations with access to newly developed proprietary systems that allow fair and equitable outcomes to be achieved with remarkable efficiency. Each of these systems is grounded in mathematical theories of fair division and of games.

² See <http://www.smartsettle.com/> last accessed August 6 2009, where examples of industrial relations, international conflicts and insurance disputes are given.

³ See <http://smh.com.au/articles/2005/09/20/1126982062322.html> and <http://www.smh.com.au/news/next/game-theory-for-negotiators/2005/11/14/1131816858584.html> last accessed September 22 2008

⁴ See http://economist.com/displaystory.cfm?story_id=E1_VVSTQRG last accessed September 22 2008

⁵ See <http://www.abc.net.au/tv/newinventors/txt/s1504763.htm> last accessed September 22 2008

occasion of the 60th anniversary of Nash equilibrium, 2010. John Zeleznikow was not even present at this significant conference, despite there being four Nobel Prize laureates in Economics (including John Nash). Further, Adjusted Winner is freely available from this site. <http://www.nyu.edu/projects/adjustedwinner/>