

WILL RG — Open Research & YouTube Strategy Plan

Structured from brainstorming session — April 2026

1. Current State Assessment

What Has Been Established

- The Mercury-Sun derivation chain is **internally self-consistent** and does not visibly import from GR or Newtonian mechanics at any examined step
- The three previously flagged concerns (z_{sun} formula, β_p^2 derivation, $(1-e^2)$ normalization) are all **resolved** — either derived within WILL RG or geometrically self-evident
- The methodology claim — parameterization closed using only direct observables without G or M — **holds under scrutiny**
- **16 quantitative falsifiable predictions** across cosmology, gravitation, and quantum mechanics, all from single closure condition $\kappa^2=2\beta^2$
- **4+ months of adversarial public scrutiny** (421 comments, scienceforums.net) — no successful falsification found
- **~1 year of weekly video content** already available from existing results in the trilogy

What Remains to Be Done

- Domain expert engagement (GR specialists, CMB specialists, QM specialists)
 - YouTube channel development
 - Broader discoverability
-

2. The Open Research Model

Why Open Research (Not Journal Submission)

- Institutional affiliation bias in journals is a documented systemic problem
- Paywalled publication costs create barriers for independent researchers
- Reviewer selection from within paradigms creates structural resistance to foundational challenges
- Teacher-student dynamic of unsolicited expert validation requests is epistemically biased

What Open Research Solves

- **Transparency:** Every step of the derivation chain is publicly auditable
- **Accessibility:** Interactive tools lower the entry bar for anyone
- **Adversarial testing:** Public forums provide distributed peer review
- **Speed:** No 18-month journal lag
- **Independence:** Free from institutional incentive structures

What Open Research Does Not Yet Fully Solve

- Domain expert attention is self-selected — qualified specialists have no institutional incentive to engage with work outside journals
- This is a **visibility and incentive problem**, not a methodological problem

Infrastructure Already in Place

Asset	Purpose
willrg.com	Full derivation chains, papers, foundations
Logos Map	Navigation of the derivation chain
Galactic Dynamics Lab	Interactive SPARC rotation curve tool
ROM Tool	Interactive orbital mechanics calculator
GitHub repo	All notebooks, data, code — fully open
Colab notebooks	Reproducible numerical verification
WILL-AI	Trained Q&A on the framework

3. Domain Expert Engagement Strategy

Option 1 — Direct Contact (Use With Caution)

Problem: Unsolicited emails from independent researchers are reflexively filtered as crackpot, regardless of content quality. This creates a teacher-student dynamic that is epistemically biased and personally uncomfortable.

If used: Frame as issuing a **specific technical challenge**, not requesting validation.

- "Here is a derivation that produces X. I cannot find an error. Can you?"
- This positions the expert as collaborator in falsification, not judge

- Some researchers respond differently to this framing

Option 2 — Social Traction (Primary Strategy)

Build enough visibility that domain experts come to the work naturally. This is the stronger long-term play.

Option 3 — Target Paradigm-Dissatisfied Researchers

Researchers already publishing on MOND alternatives, relational quantum gravity, measurement-theoretic foundations — they have both technical background and motivation to engage. The social dynamic is much closer to colleagues than teacher-student.

4. YouTube Strategy

Core Division of Labor

Platform	Content	Why
Website	Foundations, full derivations, rigor, interactive tools	Deep engagement, reference material
YouTube	Results, demonstrations, empirical predictions	Discovery, shareability, reach

This plays to each medium's strengths. The website already has the infrastructure for depth. YouTube rewards immediate payoff.

Content Format Per Video

Three-layer presentation for every equation shown:

1. **Mathematical form** — the equation itself
2. **Physical meaning** — what each parameter measures operationally
3. **Philosophical meaning** — what ontological commitments are or are not made

Example:

- Math: $\beta^2 + \beta_Y^2 = 1$
- Physical: external change budget + internal change budget = total relational resource
- Philosophical: Minkowski interval, stripped of anthropocentric coordinates, is this identity

Production Workflow (In Development)

- Whiteboard derivation (establishes credibility, shows real understanding)
- Clean animation of the derivation steps
- On-camera presentation with slides

- Keep each video under 15 minutes
- No real-time self-corrections — pre-planned whiteboard, then animated clean version

Critical production note: Audio quality first. Viewers tolerate mediocre video but abandon bad audio. Solve this cheaply with a decent USB microphone before anything else.

Content Sequencing Strategy

Lead with results, not foundations.

The Mercury precession result — 43 arcseconds/century from four raw observables, no G, no M, under 15 minutes — is a standalone hook. Someone genuinely surprised by that result will seek out the foundations themselves.

Starting with foundations (SPACETIME \equiv ENERGY \rightarrow S¹ \rightarrow SR) is logically correct but strategically backwards. The viewer has not yet seen what the foundations produce.

Planned original sequence (reconsider):

1. Deriving SPACETIME \equiv ENERGY, S¹, SR
2. Deriving S², GR, Q and $\tau_Y, \kappa^2=2\beta^2$
3. Eccentricity, precession, Mercury-Sun from 4 inputs

Recommended reordering:

1. **Mercury result first** — four inputs, one derivation chain, 43"/century (the hook)
2. **Galactic rotation curves** — 175 galaxies, zero free parameters (second strong hook)
3. **Then foundations** — now the audience is asking "how is this possible?"

Foundations become the answer to the question the results raise.

Content Volume

- Approximately **1 year of weekly content** from existing trilogy results alone
- Each video self-contained around one specific result
- Independent shareability — each video reaches different audiences
- No prerequisite barrier — viewers enter at whichever result interests them
- Compounding discoverability over time via YouTube algorithm

Audience Targeting

YouTube physics has a bifurcation:

- Large audiences want accessible wonder (Veritasium style)
- Technically capable audiences who can engage with WILL RG are smaller but more valuable initially

Target: Technically literate viewers dissatisfied with "just trust the math" explanations, actively interested in foundational alternatives. PBS Spacetime has demonstrated this audience exists and responds to genuinely technical content.

Strongest Differentiator

Nobody else is doing live algebraic derivations of GR results from four raw observables. Even rough production value is forgivable when the content is irreplaceable. The whiteboard derivations are the unique asset — lead with them.

Communication Tone

- **Never:** "physicists are philosophically ignorant" — activates defensiveness before the mathematics is seen
- **Always:** "here is what the standard formalism is silently assuming, and here is what happens when you remove those assumptions"

The same critique delivered as invitation rather than accusation reaches the target audience. The math stands on its own. Let the audience notice the ontological excess themselves — they will, if the contrast is shown cleanly.

5. Falsification Standard

Non-negotiable methodological principle

Only results that have either been falsified (and corrected) or scrutinized to confidence level go into videos. No weak links. This is both epistemically correct and strategically important — one successful public falsification of a claimed result would damage credibility disproportionately.

6. Immediate Next Actions

Priority	Action
1	Finalize production workflow (camera, audio, editing pipeline)
2	Produce Mercury precession video as first release
3	Produce galactic rotation curves video as second release
4	Establish weekly release cadence
5	Identify paradigm-dissatisfied researchers as potential early expert engagers

7. The Larger Question

The evidence currently supports: *"this warrants serious expert scrutiny"* — which is meaningfully different from where the assessment started.

The paradigm shift question cannot be answered yet. It requires:

1. Unique predictions that GR does not make — tested and confirmed
2. Survived falsification attempts across all regimes where GR is tested
3. Independent domain expert scrutiny (not just adversarial public forums)
4. Clear differentiation from prior relational geometry approaches (Mach, Barbour, Rovelli)

None of this negates the current work. It defines what comes next.

"It doesn't matter how right you are if you can't deliver your truth on the terms of the listener." —
A. Rize