

# The Scientist's Job

I am not here to sell answers.

I am here to demonstrate the search.

For three decades, I have pursued a question that cannot be asked within the current framework of science:

## **What if the foundations are wrong?**

What if the mathematics we inherited is broken?

What if space is not Euclidean, time is not linear, and the genetic code is not a string?

What if biology is not chemistry, but computation?

This is not speculation. I've built physical models, symbolic languages, and recursive machines to show what life is actually doing.

Not metaphorically. Mechanically.

And yet, no one will review the work.

Not because it is incoherent.

Because if it is coherent, everything must change.

## **I Do Not Deny Science**

I deny that science is being practiced.

Neil deGrasse Tyson said it himself: the job of the scientist is to test radical ideas against the known.

To engage. To challenge. To critique.

Not to ignore.

But when Terrence Howard submitted his wave-based model of physics, they dismissed him.

When I submitted my information-based model of biology, they ghosted me.

Not one peer-reviewed rebuttal. Not one formal debate.

Only silence.

That silence is my evidence.

I am not anti-science.

I am anti-gatekeeping.

If you will not do your job, then say so clearly.

Say, "We don't debate outsiders."

Say, “We are not interested in whether we’re wrong.”

Say, “The gate is closed.”

But do not pretend the system is working.

### **You Say This Takes Decades**

Why?

When Alfred Wegener proposed continental drift, it was correct, novel, and demonstrably useful.

And it was ignored for half a century.

Not because of insufficient evidence—because of professional comfort.

Tyson says this is how science works.

I say: that is not a defense. That is a confession.

A system that rewards delay over discovery is not rigorous. It is decadent.

### **I Know What This Looks Like**

Yes, I know how this sounds.

I know that you assume, since I cannot get peer review, I must be wrong.

But here’s the problem:

I **cannot** get peer reviewed.

And that is not a reflection on my work.

That is a reflection on yours.

I am offering a testable system.

I am offering money to anyone who can prove me wrong.

I am building machines and symbols and books and models.

No one will engage.

That is not science. That is cowardice dressed as consensus.

### **Terrence Howard and I Do Not Work the Same Way**

He comes at it from waves. I come at it from code.

He begins below, with matter. I begin above, with information.

But we have the same diagnosis:

The math is wrong.

The structure is wrong.  
The assumptions are wrong.  
We are not cranks.  
We are not gurus.  
We are explorers.  
And we are what science was supposed to be.

### **A Final Word**

I do not believe I will solve this.  
I believe I am showing how one searches for something that science has forgotten how to look for.  
The search for new foundations is not a matter of prestige.  
It is not a career.  
It is a duty.  
If you are a scientist, your job is not to defend the orthodoxy.  
Your job is to test it.  
If you will not do that—then I will.  
And I will prove, scientifically, that you abandoned your post.