

How Preconceived Notions and Entrenched Dogma Prevent Fanatics from Recognizing or Accepting the Truth and Reality?

Imagine a world where everyone “knows” that dolphins are fish and that they lay eggs. This belief is so deeply entrenched that it’s taught in schools, reinforced by textbooks, and accepted without question. Now, suppose you take these people to the ocean and show them—undeniably—100 examples of dolphins giving birth to live young and nursing them with milk. Instead of revising their belief, they argue that the dolphins must be doing it wrong—or worse, that these creatures cannot possibly be dolphins—because, in their fanatic minds, “real” dolphins lay eggs.

This is the insidious power of deeply entrenched dogma: when facts contradict long-held beliefs, people often reject the facts rather than question their assumptions. For such fanatics, no amount of evidence is ever enough. Ironically, they become angry and resort to ad hominem attacks when asked to do the simplest thing: show just one dolphin laying eggs to support their conviction. Instead of responding with evidence, they fall back on the argument from authority—a classic logical fallacy—as if citing credentials or institutional consensus can override objective reality.

For nearly 16 years, the hard scientific facts and reality of Componentology have encountered this very phenomenon as I have worked to challenge the prevailing pseudoscientific misconceptions by presenting the scientifically valid and verifiable truths of Componentology—objective truths concerning the inherent nature and essential properties of real components; the anatomy, construction, and structure of physical Component-Based Products (CBPs); and the indispensable methods and mechanisms underpinning true Component-Based Engineering (CBE).

Despite presenting clear, reproducible evidence—comparable to watching multiple dolphins give birth—fanatic software experts continue to fiercely defend baseless, flawed myths, refusing even to re-examine their dogmatic misconceptions.

In the context of a flawed paradigm, entire communities of researchers and experts often fiercely defend deeply entrenched beliefs—even when those beliefs are rooted in demonstrably false myths, such as the blind beliefs that dolphins lay eggs. When presented with observable, irrefutable facts—like the reality that dolphins give birth to live young and nurse them with milk—such individuals frequently react with offense, defensiveness, hostility, or ridicule. This behaviour exemplifies the cognitive rigidity and ideological dogmatism that obstruct genuine scientific inquiry, that is vital for advancement of [Neuronology](#) & [Componentology](#).

A comparable dynamic is evident in today's software research community. Most software researchers and experts tend to feel personally attacked and respond defensively—or even with hostility or ridicule—when asked to identify a single authoritative source (e.g., peer-reviewed research paper, academic textbook, or widely accepted component model such as those by Grady Booch or implemented in tools like Rational Rose) that is not fundamentally rooted in pseudoscientific misconceptions. This resistance persists despite the availability of clear, objective, and reproducible evidence to the contrary. Please refer to [Exhibits 1 through 4](#) supporting the first material fact in the document that summarizes two core facts.

Furthermore, most software researchers and experts also tend to respond with similar negativity—offense, defensiveness, hostility, or ridicule—when confronted with valid and verifiable evidence supporting the second material fact in the above document that summarizes two core material facts. Specifically, they react adversely when presented with scientifically grounded answers to basic research questions (as outlined in [Research Questions](#)) or when introduced to self-evident factual insights compiled in [Important Facts](#). These well-supported conclusions challenge longstanding, unexamined assumptions and are frequently misinterpreted as arrogant or disrespectful simply because they contradict the prevailing orthodoxy.