

# letterstotheeditors

## **PICTURE IMPERFECT?**

*60 Minutes* will rerun its segment, "Was it Done With Mirrors?", on Sunday, August 3<sup>rd</sup>. The CBS producer and his staff went to considerable lengths to research the facts of that story with a variety of knowledgeable people, as well as to provide an appropriate balance of counter opinion in the form of an interview with Dr. Walter Liedtke, Curator of Western Paintings at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Especially considering the limitations of a 13-minute TV segment, CBS did an excellent job telling a complex story of image analysis that impacts our understanding of 600 years of Western art.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of the cover article you ran in the [June] issue of *Advanced Imaging* ["Optical Projection in Renaissance Art: Did the Great Masters Cheat?", Barry Mazor, p. 9]. Amazingly, your magazine printed David Stork's assertions as fact without even calling either David Hockney or me to comment on them. Had the writer done so, I easily could have pointed out the mixture of fundamental errors and irrelevancies that constitute the entirety of Stork's assertions. You then compounded this significant journalistic breach by your own editorial in that issue, in which you chastised CBS for their presumably sloppy background work. Further, the figures you used in your article are taken directly from a preprint that Stork submitted this spring to the upcoming 4<sup>th</sup> International Conference on 3-D Digital Imaging and Modeling. The papers accepted for that conference are now posted on the web, but Stork's name is nowhere to be found amongst the manuscripts the referees found acceptable. ([www.3dimconference.org/3dim03-prog.html](http://www.3dimconference.org/3dim03-prog.html))

Readers (and advertisers) would reasonably assume your magazine had done more than interview just one highly-biased person before printing his story as if it were fact, and thus I'm sure most readers assumed what you wrote about Hockney and me is correct. As a researcher in the field of image analysis, your cover-article coverage of Stork's assertions in a totally unbalanced story reflects negatively on me professionally, and this needs to be addressed. Once again, as I did when the [June] issue showed up in my mailbox, I urge you to promptly take appropriate remedial action in the form of an unambiguous '*Mea culpa*' editorial prominently featured on the cover. With that editorial, we can then put this matter completely behind us.

For more information on our recent work related to the *60 Minutes* story, see: [www.optics.arizona.edu/ssd/FAQ.html](http://www.optics.arizona.edu/ssd/FAQ.html).

Respectfully,  
Charles M. Falco  
Chair of Condensed Matter Physics  
and Professor of Optical Sciences  
University of Arizona