some of the mathematicians cited in Ralston's article, we need more mathematicians with good judgment to speak out on this matter of national urgency.

Where are they?

—*Richard H. Escobales Jr.*
Canisius College
escobalr@canisius.edu

(Received April 9, 2004)

Geometry Texts for Teachers

Hung-Hsi Wu, in his review of Audun Holme's *Geometry: Our Cultural Heritage*, laments the lack of the fostering of geometric intuition in geometry texts and offers his own work with B. Braxton (available on the Web) as one way to achieve that goal. There are at least two other published geometry texts I know of that pay careful attention to that goal. One, meant for high school students but easily adaptable for future teachers, is EDC's (Education Development Center's) *Connected Geometry*, one of the NSF curriculum projects of the 1990s. The other is David Henderson's *Experiencing Geometry*, which has gone through various iterations (distinguishable by their subtitles), gradually becoming more and more comprehensive. Both books have high standards of mathematical correctness, mathematical depth, and careful attention to how students actually learn, and both are written with remarkable clarity. In fact, years ago while I was reviewing a draft of part of *Connected Geometry*, my seatmate on the airplane, who identified herself as someone ordinarily not interested in mathematics, got so intrigued while reading over my shoulder that she asked if it was available as a Christmas gift.

—*Judy Roitman*
University of Kansas
roitman@math.ukans.edu

(Received April 15, 2004)

Prisoner's Dilemma

Regarding the Prisoner's Dilemma, Steven E. Landsburg ("Quantum game theory", April 2004, page 395) says, "Rational selfish prisoners always choose the one strategy pair [i.e., the Nash equilibrium (D,D)] that both can agree is undesirable—in the sense that they would both prefer (C,C)." (Strategy D is to defect and C is to cooperate.)

Rational selfish prisoners should not choose the Nash equilibrium. Because the game is symmetrical for the two players and because both players are rational, then whichever strategy Player 1 decides is best, Player 2 will also decide is best. Thus, the only possibilities are (D,D) and (C,C). Since (C,C) is better for each player than (D,D), rational selfish prisoners should choose (C,C). The reason the Nash equilibrium is not relevant is that its definition considers pairs of strategies which are impossible if both players are rational, i.e., (C,D) and (D,C).

This is discussed in detail in Chapter 30 of *Metamagical Themas: Questing for the Essence of Mind and Pattern,* by Douglas R. Hofstadter (Basic Books, March 1996, ISBN 0-465-04566-9). Hofstadter notes that most people when presented with the above argument still say they would choose D.

—*David Marcus, Ph.D.*
Northrop Grumman Information Technology
Reading, MA

(Received April 19, 2004)

Work of Morozov, Weisfeiler, and Borel

Regarding the article on Armand Borel in the May 2004 issue of *Notices*, I would like to comment on the related important earlier contributions of Vladimir V. Morozov and Boris Weisfeiler, two eminent Russian mathematicians who are not with us anymore.

Comment 1 (cf. p. 510 of May 2004 issue): The conjugacy of maximal solvable subalgebras of a complex finite-dimensional Lie algebra was proved by Vladimir V. Morozov in the paper "On a nilpotent element in a semisimple Lie algebra", *Doklady USSR* **36**:3 (1942), 83–86 (in English).

Comment 2 (cf. pp. 517–8 of May 2004 issue): Let G be a semisimple algebraic group over an arbitrary field, let U be a unipotent subgroup of G, and let N be the normalizer of U in G. If U coincides with the unipotent radical of N, then N is a parabolic subgroup of G. This theorem was proved by Boris Weisfeiler in the paper "On a class of unipotent subgroups of semisimple algebraic groups", *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* 21:2 (1966), 222–3 (in Russian). For an English translation of Weisfeiler's paper and related comments, see the arXiv: http://www.arxiv.org/math.AG/0005149.

—*Victor Kac*
MIT

(Received April 29, 2004)

The *Notices* invites readers to submit letters and opinion pieces on topics related to mathematics. Electronic submissions are preferred (notices-letters@ams.org); see the masthead for postal mail addresses. Opinion pieces are usually one printed page in length (about 800 words). Letters are normally less than one page long, and shorter letters are preferred.