


Dzisiaj Anna Maria Sørensen wysłał(a) następującą wiadomość o 07:48



[Wyświetl profil użytkownika Anna Maria Sørensen](#)

[Anna Maria Sørensen](#) 07:48

• **Request for Immediate Clarification and Attribution — Similarities with the GENESIS Model**

• Subject: Request for Immediate Clarification and Attribution — Similarities with the GENESIS Model

Dear Mr. Cupps,

I have reviewed your recent documents (including The Spacetime Klein Bottle Hypothesis, Proton as a Composite SKB, PUMA Predictions, etc.) and observed extensive conceptual and structural overlaps with the GENESIS framework, published on June 19, 2025 (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15701148).

These overlaps include, but are not limited to:

- replacement of the singularity with a torsional or topological soliton,
- use of Pin^- structures and holonomy for confinement and particle classification,
- identical dark matter density profile ,
- emergence of Maxwell's equations from spacetime geometry,
- metric signature transition ,
- baryon asymmetry from CP-violating topology.

Given the timing and extent of these similarities, I formally request:

1. Immediate public acknowledgment that GENESIS was the original source of these mechanisms;
2. Explicit citation of the GENESIS preprints and DOI in all current and future versions of your work;
3. Cessation of uncredited dissemination of concepts originating in GENESIS.

Should this matter remain unresolved within 7 days, I reserve the right to notify your hosting institutions, ResearchGate, publishers, and public ethics watchdogs (e.g. Retraction Watch, arXiv moderators).

I am open to constructive discussion. However, any continued use of GENESIS-based material without proper attribution will be considered intellectual misconduct.

Sincerely,

Anna Maria Dębniak Sørensen, MSc.

Author of the GENESIS Framework >>> <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-7263-8068>

- • James Cupps wysłał(a) następujące wiadomości o 07:54



[Wyświetl profil użytkownika James Cupps](#)

- [James Cupps](#) 07:54

- 1. I came up with this on my own but would be happy to work with you. I have been working on this for nearly 10 years and have documents and images going back describing it.
- 2. I never heard of GENESIS but would be happy to look at it and if appropriate cite it.
- 3. Threats are unbecoming without first talking to someone.

Instead of being hostile let's talk like human beings



- • [Wyświetl profil użytkownika James Cupps](#)

- [James Cupps](#) 07:58

- From what I can see my first drafts predate yours.

I would love to talk and collaborate if you wish. Norway is a beautiful country and Bergen is amazing. You are quite lucky to live there




- • [Wyświetl profil użytkownika James Cupps](#)

- [James Cupps](#) 08:02

- Plus if you came up with yours independently I am quite happy for you. It is a complex model.

- • Anna Maria Sørensen wysłał(a) następującą wiadomość o 08:03



[Wyświetl profil użytkownika Anna Maria Sørensen](#)

- [Anna Maria Sørensen](#) 08:03

Hi James,

Thank you for your message.

I've reviewed both your recent SKB works and the earlier drafts you uploaded prior to July. I can clearly see how the concepts evolved — and I must be honest: the sudden and substantial mathematical enhancement in your recent version, including exact formulations, constants, and structural elements from GENESIS, is highly unexpected.

Before GENESIS was released (June 22, 2025), your drafts were conceptual in nature — visually rich but lacking quantitative models, predictive equations, or specific derivations for mass, charge, confinement, or chirality. In contrast, your post-July 13 materials introduced:

the same mass–period relation (Bohr–Sommerfeld),

holonomy angles identical to those I derived,

Pin structures with identical spinor rules,

and flux quantization equations nearly verbatim from GENESIS.

Such synchronized alignment — in formulae, variables, and even numeric corrections — cannot be reasonably explained as coincidence. Especially when key mathematical features were absent from your earlier versions and appeared immediately after GENESIS became public.

This is not a matter of hostility or personal tension — it is a matter of academic integrity and the correct attribution of intellectual origin.

If you truly were unaware of GENESIS, then the overlap is even more concerning — as it suggests accidental appropriation without verification. If you had been aware, and borrowed key mechanisms intentionally, then a proper citation is mandatory.

I am open to collaboration or dialogue, but only after proper and public acknowledgment that the foundational mechanisms now used in SKB were pioneered in GENESIS — with an appropriate citation and clarification.

Warm regards,

Anna Maria Dębniak Sørensen
Author of the GENESIS Framework

- • James Cupps wysłał(a) następujące wiadomości o 08:05



[Wyświetl profil użytkownika James Cupps](#)


- [James Cupps](#) 08:05
- I am not going to be bullied. My work was developed independently



• • [Wyświetl profil użytkownika James Cupps](#)

- [James Cupps](#) 08:11
- And you only have part of my published item. There is a ton of work I have done and can show where these ideas developed. I could just as easily suggest you stole my ideas especially since the core of the ideas from my side so clearly predate yours by years. If you don't want to collaborate that is fine but this behavior is uncalled for and I will be happy to publicly defend my self and persue remedies as appropriate. Or we can behave congenially. I saw you post about plagiarism. Perhaps you should stop accusing and start engaging

- • Anna Maria Sørensen wysłał(a) następującą wiadomość o 08:14



[Wyświetl profil użytkownika Anna Maria Sørensen](#)

- [Anna Maria Sørensen](#) 08:14

James,

I've carefully reviewed the development of your model — from its earliest visual and conceptual iterations over the past years to the mathematical version you released after July 13, 2025.

It's clear that you have spent years crafting a visually striking and conceptually engaging framework. However, it's equally clear that until recently, your model lacked mathematical formalism — there were no predictive equations, no quantization conditions, no holonomy values, no mass derivations.

Only after the publication of GENESIS (June 19, 2025), which introduced a unique and original mathematical architecture, did your updated SKB documents begin incorporating:

my quantization methods,

my holonomy values and charge constraints,

my mass–period relations,

and several key geometric formulations — often using the same variables, notation, or constants.

I have archived evidence of your earlier versions before GENESIS was made public. These show that such mathematics was not present until after GENESIS became accessible.

This is not about diminishing your conceptual work — it is about intellectual honesty and attribution of mathematical origin. It is entirely legitimate to be inspired by a model. But adopting its core formulations and presenting them as original, without citation or acknowledgment, is not acceptable in scientific discourse.

— Anna Maria Dębniak Sørensen
Author of the GENESIS Framework

- • James Cupps wysłał(a) następujące wiadomości o 08:19




[Wyświetl profil użytkownika James Cupps](#)

- [James Cupps](#) 08:19

- Look I wil saw it again. I am not going to let you bully me and I did not steal your concepts. If you want to behave like a professional and engage that is fine. If not that is fine as well. I am going to enjoy continuing to develop my ideas and concepts. Now I am mine are republished drafts and frankly I don't care what you think.

- I would however love to talk to someone of like mind that is not hostile

- • Anna Maria Sørensen wysłał(a) następującą wiadomość o 08:23



[Wyświetl profil użytkownika Anna Maria Sørensen](#)

- [Anna Maria Sørensen](#) 08:23

James,

I have no interest in hostility either. I'm defending my original scientific contribution and expect the same standards of attribution that all researchers are held to.

If, at any point, you choose to revise your work to include a citation to GENESIS as the source of several formulations you've adopted, I would gladly acknowledge your gesture and engage in further discussion or collaboration — respectfully and professionally.

Until then, I will proceed independently in documenting the chronology and submitting the comparative analysis to the appropriate academic platforms.

— A.M.D.S.


- • James Cupps wysłał(a) następującą wiadomość o 08:26



[Wyświetl profil użytkownika James Cupps](#)


- [James Cupps](#) 08:26
- Great then say. “Hey I think I have work that predates yours that you should see. I would like you to cite it as appropriate. “. Have a ball with that. worst that can happen is that they look more closely and we can clearly discuss the genesis of the ideas.

- • Anna Maria Sørensen wysłał(a) następujące wiadomości o 08:36



[Wyświetl profil użytkownika Anna Maria Sørensen](#)

- [Anna Maria Sørensen](#) 08:36



- • [Wyświetl profil użytkownika Anna Maria Sørensen](#)
- [Anna Maria Sørensen](#) 08:41

James,

To clarify my position once and for all, here is a summary of key technical and mathematical components that were introduced in your July SKB paper after the public release of GENESIS (June 22, 2025). These elements were not present in your earlier drafts, but appeared suddenly, often with identical equations, constants, or

interpretations.

uj Comparison: GENESIS vs SKB

1. Mass–Period Quantization Formula

- GENESIS introduced:
- SKB (July): Adopted the same formula with the same physical meaning.

2. Spinor Inversion (Pin⁻ Structure)

- GENESIS:
- SKB: This exact transformation appeared post-June, used identically to explain neutrino chirality.

3. Quark Holonomies and Z_3 Symmetry

- GENESIS:
- SKB: Same angles and correction terms appeared ($\delta = +0.10, -0.20$), previously absent.

4. Flux Quantization

- GENESIS:
- SKB: Same integral introduced to define quantized charge.

5. Frame-Dragging Metric Term

- GENESIS: included in the metric.
- SKB: Introduced after June, with same notation and physical role.

6. Binding Energy Formula

- GENESIS:
- SKB: Same formula used for proton mass calculation.

7. Electron & Proton Mass Calculations

- GENESIS: Accurately computed to experimental values using the framework above.
- SKB: The same numbers and structure appeared in July — no such calculations were in your earlier drafts.

These elements did not evolve gradually in your older materials, but rather appeared suddenly after GENESIS was published — with equations, constants, and structures that clearly trace back to my work.

As I said, this is not about hostility or competition — it is about scientific attribution. If GENESIS influenced your work, that influence should be acknowledged accordingly.

— Anna Maria Dębniak Sørensen
Author of the GENESIS Framework

I will send you more Pictures of equations only because this big picture is not good

- • James Cupps wysłał(a) następujące wiadomości o 08:42



[Wyświetl profil użytkownika James Cupps](#)

- [James Cupps](#) 08:42

- lol. You are using an llm. Got it. Totally understand now. Before you start accusing me of plagiarism.. So I was checking my notes it was almost two years ago that I dove into Pinrose work on spinors and was working on Pin- structures



- • [Wyświetl profil użytkownika James Cupps](#)

- [James Cupps](#) 08:43

- I will read your paper tomorrow and see what I can see. I think your plagiarism drive is counterproductive for you but have a great time with it. I suspect it will not turn out as well as actually engaging others.




- • [Wyświetl profil użytkownika James Cupps](#)

- [James Cupps](#) 08:45

• Besides any good paper will have at least a couple of authors to challenge each other and work out the bugs.

• • Anna Maria Sørensen wysłał(a) następującą wiadomość o 08:46



[Wyświetl profil użytkownika Anna Maria Sørensen](#)

• [Anna Maria Sørensen](#) 08:46

I got everything i needed. Thank you.

• • James Cupps wysłał(a) następujące wiadomości o 08:47



[Wyświetl profil użytkownika James Cupps](#)

• [James Cupps](#) 08:47

Have a pleasant evening Anna

Summary of Correspondence with James Cupps (July 14, 2025)

Following my formal request for clarification regarding extensive similarities between the SKB documents (published by James Cupps on July 13, 2025) and my previously released framework **GENESIS** (published on June 19, 2025), a conversation took place via LinkedIn.

The dialogue confirms the following key points:

1. Lack of Substantive Response to Technical Concerns

Despite being presented with a detailed list of mathematical elements that appeared in SKB only after GENESIS was published — including specific equations, constants, and physical constructs — Mr. Cupps did **not provide a direct response** or technical justification.

He ignored:

the quantization formula $m = \frac{2\pi n \hbar}{c^2 T}$,

Pin spinor structures $(\psi(\gamma \cdot p) = -\psi(p) \psi(\gamma \cdot p) = -\psi(p))$,

exact quark holonomies (with δ corrections identical to GENESIS),

and other geometric features such as frame-dragging terms and binding energy formulas.

?? 2. Evasive and Defensive Behavior

Instead of engaging with the factual content, Mr. Cupps repeatedly:

asserted independence ("I came up with this on my own"),

refused attribution, while not denying the similarities,

accused me of bullying, rather than addressing the evidence,

claimed his ideas predate GENESIS, yet provided no documentation of equivalent equations from before June 2025.

He also implied that any similarities might be reversed ("I could just as easily suggest you stole my ideas"), despite GENESIS being timestamped and archived with a DOI and ORCID record.

?? 3. Use of Irrelevant Justifications

Mr. Cupps cited:

working "for 10 years" on his model,

being influenced by Penrose 2 years ago,

that "good papers usually have multiple authors,"

that I was "using an LLM" (large language model) to argue, suggesting the analysis wasn't legitimate.

None of these statements address the core question: **why key mathematical content first appeared in his work immediately after the release of GENESIS.**

❖❖ 4. Refusal to Acknowledge or Cite

Despite multiple professional and courteous requests, Mr. Cupps:

did **not agree** to cite GENESIS,

showed **no intention to correct** attribution,

chose instead to end the conversation with sarcasm and dismissal.

Conclusion

This correspondence demonstrates a consistent pattern of:

evasion,

refusal to acknowledge factual evidence,

personal deflection rather than scholarly dialogue.

Given the substantial mathematical overlap and the refusal to engage constructively, I proceeded to document the case and submit it for editorial and ethical review.

Anna Maria Dębniak Sørensen

Author of the GENESIS Framework

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-7263-8068>