

## **The First Amendment Stand Against Anti-Science Zealots or Bigots**

For over twelve years, I have consistently encountered similar patterns of reaction—often laden with ridicule, humiliation, and ad hominem attacks—from hundreds, if not thousands, of individuals masquerading as scientists and researchers who, rather than engaging with objective truths, valid and reproducible evidence, or empirical realities, respond solely by resorting to malicious insinuations in their stubborn defence of entrenched dogmas (see Exhibits 1–4). These individuals act not as seekers of truth, but as defenders of pseudoscientific orthodoxy.

After enduring years of pain, humiliation, ridicule, ad hominem attacks, and malicious insinuations at the hands of such anti-scientific zealots, I was ultimately left with no other option but to file [this lawsuit](#) against the National Science Foundation (NSF), demanding that the two core material facts be scrutinized under the Daubert standards. It became clear that the systemic resistance to paradigm-shifting discoveries—particularly by institutions mandated to uphold scientific integrity—necessitated judicial intervention.

Each reviewer may never have previously encountered paradigm-challenging discoveries—or an individual like me, someone with unwavering determination to uphold the inconvenient truths of objective reality—who has spent decades fighting to defend iconoclastic truths by accumulating overwhelming amounts of valid, verifiable, and reproducible evidence, as well as objective empirical realities, against deeply entrenched and widely accepted dogmatic misconceptions. By contrast,

however, I am all too familiar with the malicious tactics employed by anti-scientific fanatics, having encountered hundreds since 2008, all determined to preserve their flawed dogmas against the encroachment of objective truth.

A reviewer is, by definition, acting as an anti-scientific zealot if he or she rejects this submission without providing any evidence to falsify *Material Fact 1*: I have publicly challenged hundreds of software engineering researchers to identify even a single significant work—whether a peer-reviewed research paper, a respected academic textbook, or a widely accepted software component model (such as those proposed by Grady Booch or implemented in tools like Rational Rose)—that is not rooted in pseudoscientific misconceptions. Despite their mainstream acceptance, none of these works have withstood scrutiny when subjected to objective scientific evaluation. No substantive rebuttal, falsification, or even attempted empirical defence has been offered in response.

The other core material fact is that Componentology is a valid hard science capable of effectively replacing the existing pseudoscientific dogma. Thus, the rejection of my work (i.e., <http://Componentology.org>)—backed by indisputable empirical evidence and validated through multiple patented inventions—without addressing or refuting Material Fact 1 is not merely an error of judgment; it constitutes a manifestation of anti-scientific fanaticism and a violation of the fundamental principles of the scientific method, peer review, and constitutional free inquiry that the First Amendment was intended to protect.