

18 August 2005:

B) in my January 16, 2004 letter I said

It certainly is not my intention to win more than one Nobel Prize in medicine. In the spirit of cooperating with the Nobel system, all I need is for the Nobel Prize Committee to make an honest recognition of the value of my discoveries. In this way the Nobel Prize system would have not discriminated against me to mislead the world into thinking that my inventions are worthless.

Presumably each time I was turned down on the ground that there is still unfinished work having to be concluded before a prize is awarded. To me, this is fine.

But there is that matter of timing and fairness. That's because I already have on file more Nobel Prize worthy discoveries than for merely one Nobel Prize. By reason, I should have been awarded Nobel Prizes for them already. I didn't have to invent any more just to qualify for one or two. Nevertheless, since I am such a timid individual and do not run after vain glory, I have supported the Committee decision to include *emotions* in just one single Nobel Prize for me. But this should be considered an add-on, an extra effort that is not usually required for a candidate to win just one Nobel Prize. Because of this, it would be radically unfair to require me to finish this add-on before February 1 of this year to get a Nobel Prize this October. Nor should the real quality of this add-on be determinative of whether a prize can be given to me this October. It's something extra. If I could do it, I'll give it to you to be included as an integral part of my discoveries recognized by the Nobel system. Although I'm confident that I could do it within weeks, in terms of fairness I'm saying that I don't even have to do it to qualify for a Nobel Prize this coming October.

Actually, this line of argument brought up another possibility. If people insist that I should finish this *emotions* part before February 1 to qualify for a Nobel Prize this coming October, we must consider the prospect of awarding a separate Nobel Prize for *emotions*. Why? Because when I have already exceeded requirements for one single Nobel Prize, a prize should have been given to me already. To deny me a Nobel Prize simply because I could not or have not done what is unnecessary to win one is manifestly unfair. In order not to be unfair, the requirement to include *emotions* in my discoveries can be only a discretionary one to be fulfilled at my convenience provided my intelligence also goes that far. In this way, I would not be denied a Nobel Prize this coming October simply because I'm not talented enough or fast enough to finish the work on *emotions* as well.

In addition, if this *emotions* work is too extensive, too huge and not completed before February 1, and on completion it's a fantastic piece of scientific work; it certainly brings up the prospect of having to consider a separate Nobel Prize for it alone instead of including it in the one for earlier discoveries. That's because if we are to measure my discoveries in terms of earlier Nobel Prize works and what the scientific community might have otherwise anticipated, scientists confirming what *emotions* are certainly would have been given a Nobel Prize for their work, not sharing one single Nobel Prize with any other types of worthy

discoveries in medicine. This could be equally said of my earlier discoveries on your file. **One Nobel Prize could have been given for discovering and confirming that memory is the intaking, storage and retrieval of electromagnetic particles as the foundation for mental processes including telepathy, thinking and wilful behavior. Another Nobel Prize could have been given for my establishing the mechanisms for vision and color vision. Would you not agree that if three scholars jointly confirmed the trichromatic colour theory, they would have shared another Nobel Prize? In my case, of course, I overthrew the trichromatic colour theory and established what is the real mechanisms involved in colour vision. Comparatively, therefore, should I not be given one single Nobel Prize for that alone? Is there any need or justification for me to invent both memory and color vision to win just one Nobel Prize? I should be given two separate ones for these two separate inventions.** But as I emphasized, I don't chase after Nobel Prizes. If I'm given just one so as not to discriminate against the worth of my works, I'd be happy to become a part of the Nobel system.

The only concern I have is being unduly unfair to me in timing the award just because it sounds nice to make a Nobel Prize work as huge as possible. If the necessary inventions already exceed usual requirements, if a candidate cannot complete the extra inventions on time, and if such belated extra work deserves a separate Nobel Prize, she/he should be given a Nobel Prize this coming October, for the belated extra work to be considered for an additional future Nobel Prize. If someone has more than one Nobel Prize work, surely it would not be right to limit that he be given only one Nobel Prize in his lifetime. Like I said, I must reiterate that insofar as I'm concerned, I just want one right now, and forget about the whole thing. Never mind two or three or more. But it is a matter for the committee to consider the other alternative: to award more than one Nobel Prize to a single individual where warranted.

I'm doing my best to finish this work on *emotions*. But I cannot promise that it's going to take only two or three more weeks. Some areas are sticky, like *depression*. Basically almost all mechanisms are within my grasp. It now just takes time to sort them out, link them together and complete the whole thing. It would be done **way before** this October. A thorough and competent work is not always that easy to finish.

2005 (C)Kuan-Chyun Cheng 郑冠群

19 August 2005:

My September 7, 2004 letter significantly modified my January 16, 2004 letter=s rather obedient

response to the demand for me to finish and include in the first and only Nobel Prize my future work on *Emotions, a Cortical Repertoire*. Part A of the present thesis has adequately dealt with the reasons for this necessary September 7, 2004 reversal in my position.

In part B in the hereunder, I must demonstrate the rationale and substance of other vital points I made in my January 16, 2004 letter, namely why my completed work already deserves around 3 Nobel Prizes.

In order to demonstrate the truth, I have to be straight forward and factual in everything I say.

8 August 2005:

Forced into a corner to prove my point, I am denied that freedom to be polite or courteous, or sycophantic. Rather, I'm forced to bluntly speak the scientific truth. (18 August 2005:) There is no room for such social nicety or courtesy as being self-deprecating, overlooking other people=s shortcomings or hiding our own strength, or Chien hsu (谦虚). Instead, the only way to get to the truth is to do away with civility, tear away and not save people=s face(撕破脸皮讲真话). ADesperate times call for desperate measures.@