



*A recent post sharing the Pan-Mammalian Co-Evolution Hypothesis was removed from r/evolution and r/speculativeevolution. Rather than let the moderators' justifications stand unanswered, I walked through each one — AI psychosis, AI slop, pseudoscience, drug abuse, misrepresentation of epigenetics, IP concerns, convincing yourself of a made-up illness — with the calm precision of someone who has been documenting this for thirty years, speaks with complete honesty and openness, and built a distributed archive across Nostr, IPFS, YouTube, Odysee, Substack, Medium, Spotify, hashtree, and redactedchat.com specifically because he knew this day would come.*

## **Redacted Science: On Suppression, Dismissal, and the Inconvenience of Evidence**

### **A Rebuttal to Those Who Didn't Do the Reading**

**20260311**

Recent posts sharing the Pan-Mammalian Co-Evolution Hypothesis were removed from Reddit. I then hand-wrote (over 50 minutes on my phone) a contemporaneous response, which was also removed as AI. The moderators were kind enough to leave a trail of justifications. Let's walk through them — not defensively, but with the calm precision of someone who has been documenting this for thirty years and has no intention of stopping.

We'll start with the most creative one.

### **"AI Psychosis"**

This is my favorite.

The suggestion is that I have been driven to delusional thinking by excessive interaction with artificial intelligence. That I've fallen into a feedback loop where the machine tells me what I want to hear, and I've lost the ability to distinguish its output from reality.

Here's the problem with that theory: I acquired this condition in 1995. I read the article that changed my life in a mental institution. I already had the preliminary condition necessary for the next step — it was keeping me from sleeping at all. Two weeks, no sleep. Your pupils constantly fully dilate in that situation. Shine a light in; they contract, remove it, and immediately they turn back into saucers. I'm telling you that voluntarily — it's in the book, do the reading — because the willingness to say so without flinching should make my point clearer than any argument I could construct. I do not hold back on the truth of my history, my experiences, the science, or my objectives. Not for optics. Not for social comfort. Not for anyone.

I have known what I have for three decades. I have watched it progress through every phase described in that article — the phases I documented in my book, on video, in daily logs, across eight platforms built specifically to resist the kind of removal that just occurred on Reddit.

*[For the record, I didn't even own a smartphone until well into this journey. My early documentation was handwritten. But sure — AI psychosis.]*

AI didn't give me this condition. AI gave me the first conversational partner capable of engaging with the framework without flinching. That's a different thing entirely.

### **"AI Slop"**

Let's talk about this term, because it has become the "antisemitism" of the technology discourse — a word designed to shut down conversation by conflating all AI-assisted work with the lowest-quality AI output.

Yes, AI slop exists. Auto-generated content farms churning out garbage optimized for search engines. That's real. But applying that label to every piece of AI-assisted writing is like calling every photograph "fake" because Photoshop exists.

Here's what actually happened with my article: I have thirty years of lived experience, a chemical engineering degree, a career in medical informatics, and a daily documentation practice. I bring the knowledge, the narrative, and the analytical framework. AI helps me structure, expand, and cross-reference that material at a speed and depth that would otherwise require a research team I don't have and couldn't fund.

This is not compression. This is the opposite of compression.

When I wrote my employee performance evaluations this year — for a major university healthcare system, where I manage a development team — I narrated each person's year verbally, described their contributions and growth areas conversationally, and used AI to expand that into the

structured format the university requires. Every fact was mine. Every judgment was mine. The efficiency gain was enormous. That is the future of professional work, and if you're not using AI this way, you are falling behind.

*[The irony, of course, is that the very subreddit that removed my post for being "AI slop" has its entire content scraped and fed into AI training data. They're contributing to the machine while condemning anyone who uses it consciously. But I digress.]*

The future is AI-assisted everything. Research. Writing. Analysis. Medicine. The question isn't whether text will be AI-assisted — it already is, and the people pretending otherwise are either naive or performing. If you aren't using AI in your research, you are a **dinosaur** waiting for the after-effects of that *bright light* in the sky to take hold. The question is whether the human behind the AI has anything worth saying. I'll put my thirty years against an anonymous moderator's five-second assessment any day of the week.

### **"Pseudoscience"**

The word means "a collection of beliefs or practices mistakenly regarded as being based on scientific method."

The key word is *mistakenly*.

I am not mistaken. The science existed. It was published. I read it. I saw the photographs. I heard the subliminal exasperation of the author — a clinician documenting a condition that was, even then, being reclassified as something pathologically unrelated. The article described the phases. I have lived the phases. Every one of them. For thirty years.

The science was redacted. That is not the same as it never existing. The difference between those two things is a chasm wide enough to build a career of documentation inside, which is exactly what I've done.

My book presents the documented science as documented science. My theoretical extensions — the co-evolution hypothesis, the methylation flywheel, the pan-mammalian framework — are clearly presented as theories. I made a deliberate, conscious choice throughout my writing to distinguish between observed phenomena and theoretical inference. That is the scientific method. The open exchange of ideas, including speculative ones built on real observation, is not pseudoscience. It is how science is supposed to work.

*[Unless, of course, the foundational research has been removed from the literature, in which case anyone referencing it looks like they're making it up. Which is, I suspect, rather the point.]*

### **"Drug Abuse"**

I use THC under a medical license. It is legal, and I am very open about it. It has aided me — and millions of others — in managing symptoms that conventional medicine either cannot explain or treats with pharmaceuticals that I would argue are far more disruptive to the very ecological balance my framework describes.

THC is low-cost, effective, and big pharma despises it precisely because it replaces expensive drugs that, in my model, amount to disturbing your symbiotic ecology without regard for the

organism that is obviously part of your physiology but is completely ignored by medicine. It also acts on the same endocannabinoid system (ECS), which I theorize Candida uses to manipulate its ecosystem [that's you].

I also take fluconazole, obtained through alternative foreign sources. Does that invalidate my science? Is it even pertinent? No. If the system were not redacted — if I could walk into a doctor's office and say "I have this condition, here is the literature, here is the treatment protocol" — I might have other options. I do not. The system that could have helped me was dismantled before I got there.

My body, my choice. And for the record, the choice I'm making is to treat a condition that medicine refuses to acknowledge with the tools available to me. That's not drug abuse. That's survival with limited options.

### **"Misrepresentation of Epigenetics"**

I'm not sure what specific misrepresentation was identified, but the core of my epigenetic framework is the methylation flywheel — the concept that ligand exposure (cannabinoids, terpenes, fungal compounds) drives epigenetic changes in gene expression, and that these methylated changes can be inherited transgenerationally.

This is *not* controversial. The older scientific consensus held that epigenetic modifications were fully reset between generations. That view has been **revised**. Transgenerational epigenetic inheritance in mammals — including through methylation patterns — is now documented in peer-reviewed literature. The flywheel concept — exposure driving methylation driving reinforced adaptation driving further exposure — is a logical extension of established mechanisms.

If there's a specific claim someone believes I've gotten wrong, I welcome the conversation. That's what the comment section is for. Or was, before the post was removed.

### **"Intellectual Property Concerns"**

That ship sailed. For everyone. The entire internet is being ingested by AI systems. Every Reddit post, every comment, every moderator action — all of it is training data. The people worried about IP on Reddit are worried about a barn door that was removed from its hinges three years ago.

But more importantly: all of my work is published under Creative Commons BY 4.0. My science is free and open because science should be free and open. I'm not protecting IP. I'm trying to give it away. The fact that a platform built on user-generated content — content it monetizes and feeds to AI — removed my freely-licensed scientific framework is an irony I could not have written better myself.

*[And by guardrailing what AI can learn from their platform, they're not protecting creators. They're shaping the future of knowledge. He who controls the indexes controls the future. But that's a longer conversation.]*

### **"Convincing Yourself of a Made-Up Illness"**

This is the one that should concern you, reader, because it reveals the assumption underneath all the others.

The assumption is: if it's not in the current literature, it doesn't exist. If your doctor hasn't heard of it, you imagined it. If the tests come back normal, you're fine.

I read the science. I recognized my condition. I replicated the process described in the article. My body physiologically changed — visibly, measurably, documentably. I have suffered through every phase described in that original paper and documented my journey across thirty years, ninety-plus videos, a published book, daily Nostr logs, and a distributed archive spanning eight platforms.

The condition is redacted, not made-up. The difference is a chasm. One means the science never existed. The other means it existed and was removed. I know which one happened because I was there. I held the book. I read the pages. I saw the photographs of patients in various stages of the condition I was just beginning to experience.

Therapists told me to manage my anxiety. The anxiety was caused by an overridden endocrine system. Doctors told me my tests were normal. The tests were designed to miss this — they don't look under the right rocks because the right rocks were removed from the geological survey.

### **An Invitation**

I didn't write this to complain about Reddit. Reddit is a platform with moderators who made a judgment call based on surface-level pattern matching. I understand the pattern they matched: AI-generated text + unconventional medical claims + references to substances = remove. It's a reasonable heuristic if you don't do the reading. The problem is that they didn't do the reading.

### **So here's what I'm actually offering:**

To evolutionary biologists, mycologists, and anyone with the credentials and/or capabilities and curiosity to engage — because credentials are not required, an intellect is: The Redacted Science Bitcoin Challenge is linked on my homepage at [redactedscience.org](https://redactedscience.org). I am offering 0.1 BTC to the first person who proves my core thesis in a peer-reviewed scientific journal. That offer is denominated in Bitcoin deliberately. The value of that incentive is not fixed — it is designed to grow over time, presenting an increasing reward to researchers willing to do the work years or decades from now, when the tools and the courage to look may finally align. The challenge will be held by my family in effective escrow, because I expect it will take years — possibly after my death — before this science is reproven and accepted. That's fine. I planned for that.

The diagnostic manual I read exists. It was published sometime in the 1970s or 1980s. Within the Article, it described the condition being reclassified in the near future into something pathologically unrelated, and the author's frustration was palpable even through clinical prose. If you find it, you find everything. The condition was called Terminal Onset Diabetes Insipidus with Candidiasis Majeure. Don't bother with online resources [*Redacted*]. You'll need to find the book or the research.

To the doubters: You're welcome to **contact me**. I log daily on Nostr. My videos (~100) are on Odysee. My book is published, stored on IPFS, my website, Hashtree, research.org, and more [*I've even been recording it personally with asides as an audiobook on both Spotify and Substack*]. My code is on GitHub. I have articles on Nostr, Substack, Twitter, and Medium. I created a Retrieval Augmented Chatbot that can search either my book or my Nostr posts at [redactedchat.com](https://redactedchat.com), my

website links all my medical tests results as well as my prior two attempts to get this documented. My academic citations are indexed on ResearchGate, Google Scholar, and ORCID. Everything is timestamped, distributed, and designed to outlast any single platform's moderation policy.

My conviction is high. The science is real, just *redacted* [*until now*].

To the suppressors: You can delete the post, but you cannot delete the science. The archive exists. The documentation continues. And every act of suppression becomes, itself, part of the evidentiary record.

[*Besides — you're feeding all of this to AI anyway. At least I'm using it on purpose.*]

Document, record, preserve. Time reveals all.

[www.redactedscience.org](http://www.redactedscience.org)

CC BY 4.0 — Because science should be free and open.

Jim Craddock

#TheArchitect