

**Subject: Complaint to Report Scientific Misconduct,
Negligence & Racial Discrimination at NSF.gov**

Dear Honorable Inspector General, NSF.gov,

I am making this complaint of negligence and scientific misconduct under sworn oath. Kindly acknowledge the receipt of this report, even if OIG chooses to ignore or suppress this report on scientific misconduct & racism at NSF.gov.

I have reported many times a fatal defect that has killed or injured thousands of people. Ignoring or suppressing such reports of any fatal defect is a violation of the Consumer Product Safety Act, and criminal negligence and misconduct.

I have overwhelming evidence (parts of it are attached to my online report), which can conclusively prove the fact that most of the theoretical knowledge such as concepts, theories, and descriptions in Computer Science that provides theoretical foundations for software engineering is voodoo science.

I am willing to face prosecution and fines if my defect report that is based on the assertion that most of the theoretical knowledge such as concepts, theories, and descriptions about so-called components, CBPs (Component-based Products), and CBE (Component-based Engineering) is voodoo science.

The defect (i.e., voodoo science) also has been costing trillions to the global economy each year and would cost irreparable damage to the US economy if unfriendly competitors such as China or Russia create a new valid software

engineering paradigm by relying on the valid basic science foundation and exploiting the new valid basic science for conducting applied research that can create next-generation technologies that can increase productivity and quality by ten times.

The existing dominant paradigm for software engineering is based on a fundamentally flawed theoretical foundation, which is voodoo science. Today, educational institutions across the USA causing irreparable harm by forcefully indoctrinating unsuspecting and impressionable software and computer science students (who are going to be future software researchers or professionals) into the geocentric paradox of the software (i.e., flawed software engineering paradigm). The students certainly get Fail-grade if they question the lies about components or CBE.

If software students are indoctrinated into the flawed paradigm, it will cause irreparable harm to their careers if they take up the software engineering profession or research. They likely become unemployable zombies when the prevalent voodoo science is exposed, or the flawed paradigm is subverted. It is criminal negligence to indoctrinate unsuspecting and impressionable software students, even after being informed clearly in no certain terms under sworn oath.

I have reported the defect (i.e., voodoo science) many times by e-mail and faxes during the past few years. I also reported formally about five times by submitting my report as a proposal to NSFSBIR. Every time I begged for 45 minutes Zoom meeting to present the scientific evidence and observations that can conclusively expose the prevalent voodoo science.

The racists at NSF.gov refuse to talk to me or allow me to present conclusive scientific evidence. I have challenged the racists in many open forums to prosecute

me if my allegations of negligence, academic dishonesty, or scientific misconduct are wrong in many open forums such as <https://twitter.com/Componentology>. One of the objectives of this Twitter account is publicly exposing NSF's scientific misconduct and negligence.

I also created a website <http://componentology.org> dedicated to exposing the prevalent pseudoscience, academic misconduct, and racism in academic organizations, particularly NSF.gov and NITRD.gov.

It is not difficult to prove that the fact that theoretical foundation for software engineering and CBSE to conduct applied research is pseudoscience, which is rooted in flawed first principles. It is not difficult to create a valid basic science Componentology for using it as a valid theoretical foundation to conduct applied research in software engineering and CBSE.

More than enough evidence that can expose voodoo science can be found in my papers sent privately in the online report, which is only a small fraction of the scientific knowledge and empirical evidence we have accumulated during our research spanning more than two decades: <http://componentology.org/BasicScienceComponentology.pdf>

Only real scientists are fit to review my recommendation of replacing existing pseudoscience with real science Componentology: Any scientist who tolerates flawed beliefs (e.g., lies about components or CBE) as first principles is a fake scientist. Any scientist who justifies scientific knowledge (e.g., any theory or concept about the reality of components or CBE) that is contrary to evidence or observations is a fake scientist.

It is scientific misconduct to tolerate violations of such basic scientific principles and proven rules of the scientific method. It is impossible to create a valid basic science Componentology by violating the basic principles of science. Any scientist who resists replacing fake science with real science (in theoretical foundations) is a moron, or fraud, and unfit to review my submission: <http://componentology.org/GoodOrBadScience.pdf>

I first reported the defect in the year 2006 in my research proposal submitted to NSF/CISE. At that time my proposal was rejected, and I continued self-funded research and accumulated overwhelming evidence and facts. If NSF.gov acted on the report, many lives would have been saved. The blood stains are there on the hands of NSF.gov, as NSF has been sabotaging my efforts to expose pseudoscience, scientific misconduct, and racism.

I insist that most of the existing knowledge comprising of theories, concepts, and descriptions for components is fundamentally flawed. If anyone disagrees, he can prove me wrong by falsifying the core assertion#1 or this elementary question: What are the essential or basic differences between true components and other kinds of parts that are certainly not components? A similar argument can be made for proving other things such as the existing knowledge of CBE and CBPs is voodoo science.

Scientific nomenclature or jargon is an integral part of every large scientific and applied scientific discipline. It is impossible to create a new branch of science and a new engineering paradigm without creating scientific and technical jargon comprising precisely and unambiguously defined terminology. It is scientific

misconduct and fraud to make impossible demands to present Componentology that can cross a very high bar of scientific rigor set to be acceptable, without using new scientific nomenclature and jargon.

I am not saying that Componentology can't satisfy the high bar of scientific rigor that it deserves, but I am only saying that it is impossible to satisfy the high bar of scientific rigor without precisely defined nomenclature or jargon, and taxonomic classification.

Summary: The purpose of software engineering is to build software products. It is impossible to build software products without creating and using various kinds of software parts and components. This process of building products is software engineering, which is in crisis since the existing scientific understanding and knowledge of various kinds of software parts and components is unproven, flawed, and pure illusions: <http://componentology.org/VoodooScience.pdf>

The existing voodoo science and voodoo scientists are ignorant and cannot even answer simple questions that are vital for the invention of real software components for real CBSE such as (1) what are the essential differences between components and other kinds of parts that are not components? and (2) what are the essential differences between the CBE paradigm and the engineering paradigm that is not CBE?

It is impossible to address the crisis without creating a new valid basic science Componentology <http://componentology.org> by scientifically studying not just components, but also all kinds of useful parts, and it must also organize and document the valid scientific knowledge for consumption such as relying on it for

conducting applied research in software engineering and CBSE (Component-Based Software Engineering).

This report does not seek funding. The goal is to force NSF.gov to comply with the laws such as the Consumer Product Safety Act, which needs to investigate reports of deadly defects, safeguard the national economy, and academic integrity as required by law. I will try my best to make sure that voodoo scientists are held liable for negligence and violating laws and to make them pay for damages that can be prevented by acting on my report as required by the laws.

P.S: It is vital to accumulate valid and trustworthy academic knowledge of all aspects of the reality of real-world components and parts (e.g., 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 (Component-Based Engineering). To acquire any valid knowledge (such as a theory, concept, or description) to support any academic research, it is essential to determine which academic discipline has a proven track record to test and validate (or falsify, if flawed) the theory, concept, or description. This academic knowledge certainly falls outside the realm and competence of mathematics, since mathematical methods have no proven track record to test and validate (or falsify if any theory, concept, or description is flawed). This academic knowledge certainly falls within the realm and competence of science, since the scientific method has a proven track record to test and validate (or falsify if any theory, concept, or description is flawed).

Best Regards,

Raju