asim gave an expression about the maximum likelihood implying that every nonlinear objective function

has many local minima! That seems to be a lack of understanding of my proof in IJIS 2015 [1].

1. I told Asim that every (positive) neuron computes its competitors automatically (assisted by its dedicated

negative neuron), so that every (positive) neuron has a different set of (positive) neuronal competitors.

Because every neuron has a different competition zone, the maximum likelihood representation

is distributed.

2. Through the distributed computing by all (limited number of) neurons that work together inside the

DN, the DN computes the distributed maximum likelihood representations. Namely, every (positive)

neuron computes its maximum likelihood representation incrementally for its unique competition

zone. This is proven in IJIS 2015 [1], based on the dual-optimality of Lobe Component Analysis

[2]. Through the proof, you can see how LCA converts a highly nonlinear problem for each neuron

into a linear problem for each neuron, by defining observation as a response-weighted input (i.e.,

dually-optimal Hebbian learning). Yes, with this beautifully converted linear problem (inspired by the

brain), neuronal computation becomes computing an incremental mean through time in every neuron.

Therefore, a highly nonlinear problem of computing lobe components becomes a linear one. We know

that there is no local minima problem in computing the mean of a time sequence.

3. As I presented in several of my IJCNN tutorials, neurons in DN start from random weights, but different

random weights lead to the same network, because the initial weights only change the neuronal

resources, but not the resulting network.

In summary, the equation that Asim listed is for each neuron, but each neuron has a different instance of

the expression. There is no search, not that Asim implied (without saying)! This corresponds to a holistic

solution to the 20-million dollar problems (i.e., the local minima problem solved by the maximum-likelihood

optimality). See [3].

However, all other learning algorithms have not solved this local minima problem. Therefore, they have

to resort to trial and error through training many predictors. Do you have any more questions?
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Normally, U.S. attorneys have to be quiet about unlawful behaviors of a court. A U.S. attorney friend

who was representing me in a case said privately to me: “A client has only one case in his life, but I have

many cases in my life.” Indeed, upsetting the court implies the end of the career of an attorney. I am asking

the court to consider the need for a new law that allows pro se representation for a single-member LLC

as a constitutional issue of freedom of speech because attorneys and courts form a group that shares vested

interest as the attorney above stated. Freedom of speech of a single-member LLC should not be significantly

infringed upon when the listener is a court.

In another case, I asked my attorney to request to change the judge as the court rules allow such a request

to change. Although the attorney agrees that the judge is unreasonable, he refused to request changing the

judge.

For alleged willful negligence and alleged fraud in the AI Crisis, I am suing a few key parties—National

Science Foundation (NSF), Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), American Association for the

Advancement of Science (AAAS) for the behavior of Science journal, Springer Nature Group (SNG) for the

behavior of Nature journal, and Alphabet Inc. The federal district court is the United States District Court

for the Western District of Michigan (Civil Action No. 1:22-cv-998). The appeal court is the US Court of

Appeal 6th Circuit (Civil Action No. 23–1567).

In the following, I tell the facts about how the district court ordered to drop ACM and AAAS as defendants

and the appeal court affirmed the lower court’s order.

Honorable Judge Jane M. Beckering of the district court supports Magistrate Judge’s conclusion that

ACM and AAAS are unincorporated associations. However, Plaintiffs submitted documents that showed

the states in which ACM and AAAS are incorporated associations and their principal state of business (i.e.,

headquarter state). Judge Beckering wrote on May 22, 2023, "Plaintiff’s objection is otherwise denied

because Plaintiffs do not allege the citizenship of ACM or AAAS”. It is apparent that Judge Beckering is

playing word games between “incorporation state” and “citizenship” but her “citizenship” requirement is

arbitrarily added by Magistrate Judge and herself. The pro se form from the same district court does not

require a term like “citizenship”, as shown in Fig. 1. In this way, a judge could make an arbitrary order by

requiring any of her specific word that is in her mind but a party is impossible to guess correctly.

What happened in the appeal court is also arbitrary. In the appeal court, a clerk handles 8 simple matters
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Appeal 6th Circuit (Civil Action No. 23–1567).

In the following, I tell the facts about how the district court ordered to drop ACM and AAAS as defendants

and the appeal court affirmed the lower court’s order.

Honorable Judge Jane M. Beckering of the district court supports Magistrate Judge’s conclusion that

ACM and AAAS are unincorporated associations. However, Plaintiffs submitted documents that showed

the states in which ACM and AAAS are incorporated associations and their principal state of business (i.e.,

headquarter state). Judge Beckering wrote on May 22, 2023, "Plaintiff’s objection is otherwise denied

because Plaintiffs do not allege the citizenship of ACM or AAAS”. It is apparent that Judge Beckering is

playing word games between “incorporation state” and “citizenship” but her “citizenship” requirement is

arbitrarily added by Magistrate Judge and herself. The pro se form from the same district court does not

require a term like “citizenship”, as shown in Fig. 1. In this way, a judge could make an arbitrary order by

requiring any of her specific word that is in her mind but a party is impossible to guess correctly.

What happened in the appeal court is also arbitrary. In the appeal court, a clerk handles 8 simple matters
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(see 6 Cir. R. 45(a)) before a 3-judge panel votes on an appeal case. This is where the clerk overstepped her

responsibility and acted arbitrarily by violating FRAP (Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure).

August 31, 2023, clerk Deborah Hunt ordered “A corporation must be represented by counsel to participate

in litigation in federal court”, pointing at Plaintiff GENISAMA LLC. However, this is an appeal

issue from the district court and also a constitutional issue raised in the appeal. 6 Cir. R. 45(a) rules out the

possibility that a clerk can issue such an order outside the 8 matters. Furthermore, 6 Cir. R. 45(b) requires

Hunt to show that her order was authorized under 6 Cir. R. 45(a) but she did not show.

On Oct. 27, 2023, clerk Hunt issued an order that denied Plaintiff-Appellant Weng’s Petition for review

of her order dated August 31, 2023, as untimely filed. However, 6 Cir. R. 26(a)(3) requires her to notify

the party of the need to file a motion for time extension and await receipt of the motion before acting on the

late-filed document.

Soon after Weng complained to the appeal court executive office, Hunt “retired” after her 35 years of

career as a court clerk (she is experienced). Kelly Stephens replaced her.

On March 18, 2024, Kelly Stephens affirmed Hunt’s order dated August 31, 2023 by simply stating “On

careful consideration, the Court concludes that it did not overlook or misapprehend any point of law or fact

when it issued its order” which does not list any of the 8 matters required by 6 Cir. R. 45(a). As the legal

base of her affirmation, Kelly Stephens cited “Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(2)” but the statute does not apply.

FRAP 40 Petition for Panel Rehearing also does not apply categorically. Kelly Stephens seems to be willful

and vicious.

Terrified by this bullying behavior of Kelly Stephens, Dr. Weng had to pause his complaint to the clerk

and wait for the 3-penal judgment first. On July 1, 2024, the 3-judge penal decision came which completely

reaffirmed the the district court’s decision. Not only did it disregard the error in Fig. 1, it even states “Dr.

Weng did not correct this deficiency (Weng: using a term “citizenship”) after the magistrate judge directed

him to do so nor does he fix this deficiency on appeal.” The clerk Kelly Stephens and the three judges

BATCHELDER, GIBBONS, and McKEAGUE did not seem to have read my appeal brief when they stated

“nor does he fix this deficiency on appeal”, at least not the table on page 46 in the brief, which I copy below

in Fig. 2.

Apparently to cover up the gross errors in the 3-judge decision on July 1, 2024 from the public,
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clerk Kelly Stephens entered docket text along with the 3-judge panel’s order, apparently without the 3-

judge panel’s approval: “pursuant to FRAP 34(a)(2)(C), decision not for publication”. However, FRAP

34(a)(2)(C) does not exist. FRAP 34(a) Requesting Oral Argument is not applicable to forbidding the publication

of the panel’s order. Again, clerk Kelly Stephens appears to be willful and vicious.

In summary, the district court and the appeal court seem to be playing word games, disregardling the

meaning of words—“registered in a state” means the citizen of that state, and “heardquatered in a state” also

means the citizen of that state, but Fig. 1 does not require the term “citizenship” to be explicitly stated by

Plaintiffs. Furthermore, the clerk and judges do not seem to have read the plaintiff’s briefs since Plaintiffs

stated “citizenship” as copied in Fig. 2. Therefore, they acted arbitrarily, at least in this case, but probably

in many other cases too.

The editorial boards of the Science journal and the Nature journal are well aware that the judicial system

will protect them in lawsuits. If isolated papers are challenged for fraud, it is the author’s problem, and the

editorial boards are willing to investigate. In this AI crisis, almost all AI papers since 2015 that appeared in

Science and Nature are alleged to be misconduct papers, as shown in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, respectively. When

so many AI papers are alleged to forge data, the editorial boards were reluctant to investigate, let alone to

retract misconduct papers, since many papers mean the problems of the journals themselves.

Since Nature and Science editorial boards know that they are protected by the U.S. courts, their editors

do not really care about whether the data published are reasonable or even whether they understand the basic

approach of a paper. In the United States, the First Amendment of the Constitution protects freedom of the

press. However, the freedom of the press does not include fraud. Willful rejection of investigation of alleged

AI misconduct and refusal of retracting misconduct papers, no matter how many they are, should be a fraud.

In fact, the editor that is in charge of AI area in Nature has never worked in AI (Federico Levi, PhD in

theoretical quantum physics); the editor that is in charge of AI area in Science has never worked in AI either

(Jake Yeston, PhD in Chemistry). They are the most important editors in the pre-screening stage of papers

which rejects about 95% of submitted papers. In the second expert-review stage, experts who got invited to

review an article typically consider the invitation as an honor and the expert reviewers will be invited by the

media to comment on the paper they have not only reviewed but also accepted. If they reject the paper, they

do not get such honor. Therefore, there seems to be a motive to accept any papers as long as they are from

the editors of Nature or Science.
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The ACM investigative report mentioned “cross-validation” which only relates to the splitting between

the fitting set and the validation set, but “cross-validation” is irrelevant to the alleged misconducts 1 and 2.

ACM is the agent that awards Turing Awards, including the alleged misconduct work that received Turing

Award 2018. However, none of the members of the ACM Turing Award Committee in 2028 had worked on

neural networks. After I reported the misconduct to ACM, somebody in the ACM’s investigation committee

even tipped those accused not to tell the truth by misspelling “Cresceptron” so that the accused authors

obviously would reply that they had not seen misspelled “Cresceptron”.

Because of the willful negligence by the authorities like Nature, Science, and ACM, the accused parties

continued to produce more misconduct papers after they became aware of the nature of the alleged data

forgery. The false Great Leap Forward in AI has become an epidemic worldwide.

AI has become the “national image” that the judicial system has a motive to protect. The Nature journal

and the Science journal have become a synonym for leading research that science reporters are eager to

report on. ACM gives Norbel-caliber awards in computer science. How can a court not want to protect

AAAS, SNG, and ACM?

The reader can read the court documents to verify the facts presented in this Dialogue Initiation. Do

the district Court (District Court for the Western District of Michigan) and the appeal court (the US Court

of Appeal 6th Circuit) represent the U.S. Courts? Are they responsible for the current widespread and

unchecked misconduct in AI? Is my experience in the district court and the appeal court only an isolated

case? Please tell all readers your experience in U.S. courts, especially if you have been a pro se.

Please send your Dialogue whose title should start with [Judicial Crisis], one or two pages being sufficient,
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You wrote, “I talked to a well-wisher for this community and he suggested we cool things a bit”. You

are among very few scientists who dared to openly discuss opposing views. It is very important for the AI

community to hear opposing views. The AI community must not be quiet about this widespread misconduct

any longer. Too much money is being wasted every year, many of our students have been misguided, and the

worldwide public has been cheated by the AI community for too long! From the IEEE CDS Newsletters,

Vol. 1, No. 1, and No. 2, we can see that only those researchers who are honest have openly discussed

and admitted the misconduct, but not the three Turing Award 2018 recipients and the authors of some

corporations that produced widely-cited but allegedly misconduct AI papers, although I invited them to

respond. If they responded like you, the public could see the truth better and faster! Please continue our

debates.

You wrote, “My suggestion would be to have him present his viewpoints on some website. Of course, he

has a number of postings on this issue. I would suggest he open up one of the postings for public comments

and discussion.” Yes, the IEEE CDS Newsletters has been doing that. You and all others are welcome to

respond. Any email lengths are fine. The deadline is July 10, for the following issue No. 3, but all Dialogues

from this year have a unique Dialogue tag (e.g., [AI Criss]) so that late responses can also be published. I

hope that this debate about the “Great Leep Forward in AI” will continue. I am thinking about creating a

video talk or even an exhibition on AI controversies if there are enough supports.

You wrote, “I still recall Horace Barlow’s ... note to me on the grandmother cell theory: ... though I fear

that what I have written will not be universally accepted, at least at first!”. If you understand DN3, the first

model for conscious learning that starts from a single cell, you will see how the grandmother cell theory is

naive.

Since you need to be a subscriber of amdnl mailing list to post, I have posted your views on AMDNL

by quoting your exact comments. Thank you for posting but you can publish formally on IEEE CDS

Newsletters if you submit your views to the [AI Crisis] Dialogue.
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Dear Asim,

Thank you for your response, so that people on this email list can get important benefits. The subject is

very new. I can raise these misconducts because we have a holistic solution to the 20 million-dollar problems

[1].

You wrote, “he does use an optimization method to weed out bad solutions.” This is false. DN does not

weed out bad solutions, since it has only one solution.

You wrote, “In optimization, we only report the best solution.” This is misconduct, if you hide badlooking

data, like hiding all other students in your class.

You wrote, “There is no requirement to report any non-optimal solutions.” This is not true for scientific

papers and business reports.

You wrote, “If someone is doing part of the optimization manually, post-hoc, there is nothing wrong

with that either.” This is false because the so-called post-hoc solution did not have a test!

You wrote, “In fact, there is plenty of evidence in biology that it can create new circuits and reuse old

circuits and cells/neurons. Thus, throwing out bad solutions happens in biology too.” This is irrelevant, as

your mother is not inside your skull, but a human programmer is doing that inside the “skull.”

You wrote, “at a higher level, there’s natural selection and survival of the fittest. So, building many

solutions (networks) and picking the best fits well with biology.” As I wrote before, this is false, since

biology has built Aldof Hitler and many German soldiers who acted during the Second World War. We

report them, not hiding them.

You wrote, “John calls this process ‘cheating’ and a ‘misdeed’.” Yes, I still do.

You wrote, “he claims his algorithm gets the globally optimal solution, doesn’t get stuck in any local

minima.” This is true, since we do not have a single objective function as you assumed. Such a single

objective function is a restricted environment or government. Instead, the maximum likelihood computation

in DN is conducted in a distributed way by all neurons, each of them having its own maximum likelihood

mechanism (optimal Hebbain mechanism). Read a book, Juyang Weng, Natural and Artificial Intelligence,

available at Amonzon [2].

You wrote, “If that is true, he should get far better results than the folks who are “cheating” through

post-selection.” Of course, we did as early as 2016. See “Luckiest from Post vs Single DN” in Fig. 1.
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Furthermore, the luckiest from the cheating is only a fitting error on the validation set (not test), but the

single DN is a test error because DN does not fit the validation set. The latter should not be compared with

the former, but we compared with them anyway.
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Luckiest from Post vs Single DN

Zejia Zheng & Juyang Weng, CVPR Workshop, 2016

The luckiest CNN from post selection from many

The single DN is always optimal in maximum likelihood

Figure 1: Comparison between the fitting error of the luckiest CNN from 7 CNN networks trained and the

test error of the single DN trained. Adapted from [3].

You wrote, “My hunch is, his algorithm falls short and can’t compete with the other ones.” Your hunch

is wrong. See Fig. 1 and you can see how wrong you are. DN is a lot better than even the false performance.

You wrote, “And that’s the reason for this outrage against others.” I am honest. All others should be

honest too. Do not cheat like many people in the Great Leap Forward.

You wrote, “I would again urge IEEE to take action against John Weng for harassing plenary speakers

at this conference and accusing them of ‘misdeeds’. ” I am simply trying to exercise my freedom of speech

driven by my care for our community.

Do you all see a “Great Leap Forward in AI” like the “Great Leap Forward” from 1958 in China?
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Dear Asim and All,

I am happy that Asim responded so that he gave us all an opportunity to interactively participate in an

academic discussion. We can defeat the false “Great Leap Forward”.

During the banquet of July 3, 2024, I was trying to explain to Asim why our Developmental Network

(DN) only trains a single network, not multiple networks as all other methods do (e.g., neural networks with

error-backprop, genetic algorithms, and fuzzy sets). (Let me know if there are other methods where one

network is optimal and therefore is free from the local minima problem.)

This single-network property is important because normally every developmental network (genome)

must succeed in single-network development, from inception to birth, to death.

Post-selection: A human programmer trains multiple (n > 1) predictors based on a fit set F, and then

picks up the luckiest predictor based on a validation set V (which is in the possession of the program). He

suffers from the following two misconducts:

Misconduct 1 : Cheating in the absence of a test (because the test set T is absent).

Misconduct 2 : Hiding bad-looking data (other less lucky predictors).

A I told Asim that DN tests its performance from birth to death, across the entire life!

B I told Asim that DN does not hide any data because it trains a single brain and reports all its lifetime

errors!

Asim did not read our DN papers that I sent to him, or did not read them carefully, especially the proof of

the maximum likelihood of DN-1. See Weng IJIS 2015 [1].

At the banquet, I told Asim that the representation of DN is “distributed” like the brain and it collectively

computes the maximum likelihood representation by every neuron using a limited resource and a

limited amount of life experience. I told him that every brain is optimal, including his brain, my brain, and

Aldolf Hitler’s brain. However, every brain has a different experience. However, Asim apparently did not

understand me and did not continue to ask what I meant by “distributed” maximum likelihood representation.

Namely, every neuron incrementally computes the maximum likelihood representation of its own

competition zone.
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Asim gave an expression about the maximum likelihood implying that every nonlinear objective function

has many local minima! That seems to be a lack of understanding of my proof in IJIS 2015 [1].

1. I told Asim that every (positive) neuron computes its competitors automatically (assisted by its dedicated

negative neuron), so that every (positive) neuron has a different set of (positive) neuronal competitors.

Because every neuron has a different competition zone, the maximum likelihood representation

is distributed.

2. Through the distributed computing by all (limited number of) neurons that work together inside the

DN, the DN computes the distributed maximum likelihood representations. Namely, every (positive)

neuron computes its maximum likelihood representation incrementally for its unique competition

zone. This is proven in IJIS 2015 [1], based on the dual-optimality of Lobe Component Analysis

[2]. Through the proof, you can see how LCA converts a highly nonlinear problem for each neuron

into a linear problem for each neuron, by defining observation as a response-weighted input (i.e.,

dually-optimal Hebbian learning). Yes, with this beautifully converted linear problem (inspired by the

brain), neuronal computation becomes computing an incremental mean through time in every neuron.

Therefore, a highly nonlinear problem of computing lobe components becomes a linear one. We know

that there is no local minima problem in computing the mean of a time sequence.

3. As I presented in several of my IJCNN tutorials, neurons in DN start from random weights, but different

random weights lead to the same network, because the initial weights only change the neuronal

resources, but not the resulting network.

In summary, the equation that Asim listed is for each neuron, but each neuron has a different instance of

the expression. There is no search, not that Asim implied (without saying)! This corresponds to a holistic

solution to the 20-million dollar problems (i.e., the local minima problem solved by the maximum-likelihood

optimality). See [3].

However, all other learning algorithms have not solved this local minima problem. Therefore, they have

to resort to trial and error through training many predictors. Do you have any more questions?
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