

Two Material Facts that are basis for the Lawsuit

The two vital material facts that are the basis for our lawsuit, which can be objectively validated and confirmed beyond doubt by any panel of three qualified scientists in the world, are as follows:

[1] The Body of Knowledge (BoK) for the existing paradigm used in the theoretical foundation for conducting applied research in software engineering and CBSE (Component-Based Software Engineering) comprises numerous theories, concepts, descriptions, and explanations about the nature and characteristics of components, the anatomy and structure of Component-Based Products (CBPs), and the methods and mechanisms of Component-Based Engineering (CBE). Almost every one of these theories, concepts, descriptions, and explanations (see below) **that matter and hold any real significance in the BoK and the paradigm** satisfy almost every objective criterion, standard, or requirement to be classified as pseudoscientific hokum.

[2] Plaintiff has developed a new branch of hard science called Componentology to replace the existing pseudoscientific hokum in the theoretical foundation. Componentology has accumulated a BoK comprising numerous theories, concepts, descriptions, mechanisms, and explanations regarding the nature and characteristics of physical components, the anatomy and structure of physical CBPs, and the methods and mechanisms of real CBE. This BoK for the new paradigm (i.e., Componentology, comprising theories, concepts, descriptions, and explanations) satisfies almost every

objective criterion, standard, or requirement to be classified as hard science:

<http://componentology.org>

Plaintiff has investigated several hundreds of pieces of evidence to support his conclusions (see <http://componentology.org/Fly/Booklet.pdf>) and following exhibits provide more than 1200 pieces of evidence to start investigating. The following three exhibits provide most popular and sample (or specimen) descriptions, concepts and explanations (*that are evidence for unscientific pseudoscientific hokum*) for Components and CBSE: **Exhibit-1:** <http://componentology.org/Ref/1>, **Exhibit-2:** <http://componentology.org/Ref/2>, **Exhibit-3:** <http://componentology.org/Ref/3> (one of the most popular textbook on software components), and **Exhibit-4:** <http://componentology.org/Ref/4>. The analysed 1231 research papers on CBSE, and Plaintiff has read many of them and each of them is pseudoscientific hokum.

Any such BoK (comprising numerous descriptions, concepts, and explanations) about fictitious entities (deceptively referred to as components) is pseudoscientific hokum. It is a tacitly acknowledged fact that existing knowledge is not science; no one is arguing that it is scientific. Such acknowledged facts do not require proof. But they claim there is no viable alternative. However, our patents demonstrate that our hard science of Componentology, which is currently unknown, is indeed a viable alternative.

Hard Science: A discipline or field can be classified as a hard scientific discipline if it acquires and accumulates a scientific Body of Knowledge (BoK)—including theories, concepts, descriptions, and explanations—about the objective reality of physical things, such as mechanisms, anatomy, or structure, while strictly adhering to and operating in

accordance with the principles of the scientific method. It is undeniable that **Componentology** falls under this category.

Pseudoscientific Hokum: A discipline promoted as a scientific field must be classified as pseudoscientific hokum if its Body of Knowledge (BoK)—comprising theories, concepts, descriptions, and explanations—describes or narrates fictitious or imaginary entities, along with their structure, anatomy, or mechanisms. When dealing with such fictitious entities, it is inherently impossible to adhere to or operate in accordance with the principles of the scientific method. It is undeniable that the **existing theoretical foundation for CBSE** falls under this category.

*The ultimate arbiter of truth is the modern scientific method, grounded in its principles and supported by objective, verifiable evidence. Developed in the 17th century, the scientific method was designed to study and understand **physical things/entities** within the world/universe and uncover their underlying realities, including their internal mechanisms. It was pioneered by great minds who played pivotal roles in the most transformative scientific revolution in history. Since its inception, the scientific method has been continually refined and perfected through the contributions of some of the greatest scientists and philosophers of science. Every field of hard science is a testament to the utility, functionality, and success of the scientific method.*

What is Componentology: Componentology is a new scientific field that studies (scientifically by strictly adhering to the principles of the scientific method) all aspects of the reality of ideal physical components and parts (e.g., their nature and essential properties); the anatomy, structure, design, and construction of ideal physical CBPs

(Component-Based Products); as well as the necessary methods and mechanisms of real CBE (Component-Based Engineering).

The quintessential definition of a scientific revolution involves replacing a flawed or Pseudoscientific dominant paradigm with a more accurate, robust, and rigorous hard scientific paradigm. Plaintiff is ready to face Rule 11 sanctions or criminal prosecution if anyone can prove that the mainstream orthodoxies in the existing theoretical foundations of CBSE are not pseudoscientific hokum/trash, or that the proposed new branch of science, Componentology, does not meet all the criteria to be recognized as hard science.

This webpage provides nine different descriptions of components, which are inconsistent with one another Exhibit-1: <https://wiki.c2.com/?ComponentDefinition>. The first definition of components describes a type of fictitious entity, misleadingly and deceptively referring to these entities as components. Similarly, the second definition describes a different type of fictitious entity, again misleadingly and deceptively referring to these distinct entities as components. In the same way, the third definition describes yet another type of fictitious entity, once more deceptively referring to these distinct entities as components — and so on with subsequent definitions.

How can this kind of ideological discourse <http://componentology.org/Ref/2> (at Exhibit-2) about preferred/biased properties and wishful narratives of characteristics, lacking any objective evidence or concrete references, be considered scientific? Do scientists in hard sciences engage in this kind of ideological discourse and narrative building about the characteristics of animals, chemicals, or trees? Aren't these thought

leaders in software instead creating a narration about fictitious or imaginary entities that are misleadingly referred to as components?

It is essential to develop a scientific understanding of **ideal physical components**, **ideal physical CBPs and methods and mechanisms of CBE** to invent the necessary tools and technologies for creating **ideal virtual components** for software. These virtual components are crucial for constructing each software product as an **ideal virtual CBP**, a solution indispensable for effectively addressing the infamous software crisis.

The infamous software crisis can be addressed effectively by constructing each large software product as an **ideal virtual CBP** in software. An ideal virtual CBP refers to a software product assembled by plugging in multiple optimally sized virtual software components. Every known physical functional component in the world uniquely and universally shares certain essential properties. A software part qualifies as a **virtual software component** if and only if it possesses these essential properties: <http://real-software-components.com/raju/Briefs/ExecSummaryOfInvention.pdf>.

This pseudoscientific hokum in the existing theoretical foundation for CBSE has a profound effect on our consciousness such as how we think, act, react, behave, and make decisions: <http://componentology.org/Fly/TwoLayers.pdf>. The root cause of the development or evolution of pseudoscientific hokum (and, its manifestation, the infamous software crisis) lies in preparadigmatic false foundational assumptions (also known as first principles) made during the 1960s, particularly those from the most influential 1968 and 1969 NATO Software Engineering Conferences: <http://componentology.org/Ref/ModifiedKuhnBlackHolePhase.pdf>.

Without a comprehensive scientific understanding and deeper insights into all aspects of the reality of physical components and parts (e.g., their nature and essential properties), the anatomy, structure, design, and construction of physical CBPs (Component-Based Products), as well as the methods and mechanisms of real CBE, it is impossible to make the necessary inventions required to create and utilize virtual equivalents in software of ideal physical components, which are essential for building large software products as virtual Component-Based Products.

Although providing a precise summary of the specific benefits is challenging (and difficult to predict with certainty), it is indisputable that a scientific paradigm, such as Neuronology.org, offers immense benefits. However, we can provide a compelling list of specific benefits for Componentology to those willing to spend a few hours examining the evidence with an open mind and viewing presentations based on our patented inventions.

To justify their irrational scepticism, resistance and hostile opposition to replacing the flawed dominant paradigm of the day with a new, valid scientific paradigm, only dishonest scientists lacking scientific integrity and ethics would refuse to recognize the potential benefits that heliocentrism could offer over the prevailing paradigm, or the advantages that Germ Theory provides over the flawed prevailing model.

In both cases, irrational opposition and hostile resistance stemmed from the ignorance, inability or unwillingness to acknowledge the profound implications of adopting valid scientific paradigms in place of fundamentally flawed ones. Resistance is rooted in dogma, ignorance, dishonesty, lack of ethics and integrity, or self-interest, rather than objective evaluation of evidence from the nature and history of science.