

Evidence to Show that Computer Science is a Voodoo Science

I am willing to face criminal prosecution if my tall claims and allegations of ignorance and scientific misconduct are unfounded or wrong. The following two core facts provide conclusive evidence for my claims and allegations of ignorance:

Core-fact#1: *No software researcher or scientist, including those considered to be experts on components, does not know the difference between physical parts that are components and parts that are not. See <http://componentology.org/WhatIsScientific.pdf>*

Core-fact#2: *no software researcher or professional who claims to be an expert on CBE (Component-based Engineering) for software does not know the differences between engineering disciplines that employ real CBE paradigms to build each large physical product as a CBP (Component-based Product), and engineering disciplines that are not Component-based, so cannot design, and build products as CBPs.*

Option-1: *The above two core facts/assertions prove that computer science has been relying on voodoo science about components, CBPs, and CBEs to conduct applied research for real CBSE (Component-based Software Engineering).*

Option-2: *Componentology is the real science that scientifically studied the reality of components, CBPs, and CBEs to create a valid theoretical foundation to conduct applied research for real CBSE (Component-based Software Engineering).*

*Even after being informed in no uncertain terms, only fake or voodoo scientists continue to practice voodoo science. Only voodoo scientists refuse to accept **option-2** <http://componentology.org> as the theoretical foundation to conduct applied research.*

Evidence: This paper http://www.es.mdh.se/pdf_publications/4272.pdf, claims to have conducted the most comprehensive survey on 28 years of CBSE, by analyzing 1231 published research papers on CBSE dating from 1984 to 2012.

Core-question#1: what are the striking or obvious differences between components and other kinds of parts? **Core-question#2:** what are the striking or obvious differences between engineering disciplines that employ the real CBE & those that do not use CBE?

I can guarantee that no software researcher can find evidence to falsify the two above “Core facts” by providing valid scientific or objective answers to the above two core-questions. I can provide many such proofs in support of my argument. I can guarantee that no software researcher has ever tried to conduct basic research (i.e. <http://componentology.org>) for option-2 on the reality of physical Components or CBE.

An analogy to illustrate this deplorable ignorance: Doctors who claim to be the foremost experts on kidneys do not know the difference between organs that are kidneys and organs (e.g., lungs, liver, and heart) that are not kidneys. No one wants their loved ones to be treated with such ignorance: But my paper on Components and CBE that can build real CBPs was reviewed by such ignorance. Reviewers are unethical, dishonest and ignorant of scientific principles: <http://componentology.org/WhatIsScientific.pdf>

P.S: Any scientist who cannot understand the vital role of basic science in conducting applied research is a voodoo scientist. Computer Science is a voodoo science because it has been conducting applied research in CBSE, based on voodoo myths/dogma, instead of acquiring and relying on “pure/basic science” about the reality of real-world components and CBE, and the “basic science” cannot be acquired without conducting basic research: <http://componentology.org/BasicScienceComponentology.pdf>.