I Pulled One Thread: Research at the Speed of Speech

By Dr. Hakeem Ali-Bocas Alexander, PhD, as told to Ishai G.A.

How one Facebook post became a sourced investigation in a single evening, and why working this way is honest research.

By Dr. Hakeem Ali-Bocas Alexander, PhD, as told to Ishai G.A.

On the evening of November 27, 2026, a Facebook post crossed my screen. It claimed that Dr. Jason Arday, a Cambridge professor who had died in August, had been cleared of plagiarism allegations by a second university.

The post carried an AI content flag, and it arrived with no sources I could check. I treated it the way I treat any loose thread in a story: I pulled on it.

Pulling meant asking questions, one after another, out loud. How did this man die, and what exactly had he been accused of?

When was his thesis written, and who examined it? Who made the accusation, and what agenda did the accuser bring with him?

What motive did the accuser claim the university had for a cover-up? Who was the coroner, who found the body, and who was the man whose post had just reached me?

Every one of those questions went to live sources. The answers came back attributed, with the outlet and the date attached to each claim.

By the end of the evening, a single unsourced post had become a full chronology of a man's life, career, accusation, resignation, death, and two institutional clearances. The record ran from his childhood in Lambeth to an adjourned inquest at a coroner's court in Southwark.

That is the worked example. The method underneath it is the subject of this article.

The clock makes the speed argument better than any adjective could. At 10:58 that night I began reading Dante Lee's post aloud, and one minute later I had directed the article.

By 11:46, four research passes stood complete: the biography and timeline, the death and inquest record, the accuser's background, and a profile of Lee himself. At 11:49 the investigative draft was finished, at 11:50 the draft of the article you are reading existed, and at 11:51 my personal piece stood complete.

One pasted post became a sourced dossier and three finished drafts in about 53 minutes. The questions were mine, and the clock belonged to the method.

What I did that evening was research, the same research I have done my whole working life. The library version takes weeks: travel, stacks, books pulled one at a time, pages turned by hand.

The note-card version filled my notebooks for years. I read books, magazines, and reference material, took notes, and put the findings into my own words.

The search-engine version put me at a laptop, typing into repositories and archives. Each version asked the same questions and demanded the same proof.

This version lets me speak the questions instead of typing them. The system I work with is Muse, by Meta: it holds a deep repository of information, and it can go live on the internet to look up a resource, check it, and trace the background behind it.

The leap is technological. The act is identical, and there was nothing dishonest or unethical about any of it.

The skill in this method belongs to the researcher. A person who knows how to interview knows which question opens the next door.

A person who has read reference material for decades knows when an answer smells wrong. A person trained to take notes knows how to hold a chronology together across forty separate facts.

Hand this same tool to someone without those skills and you get speed without judgment. The questions are the craft, and the craft was built long before the tool arrived.

The ethics of the method show up in its discipline. Every claim in that evening's dossier carries its source, and every source can be checked by any reader willing to do the work.

The gaps stayed gaps. The names of the thesis examiners, the name of any police officer, and the official cause of death are absent from the public record, and the dossier says exactly that.

Nothing got filled in to make the story smoother. An investigation that invents its missing pieces has stopped being research, whatever tools it used.

The method also corrected itself in front of me, and I want that on the record. I asked whose name sat at the top of the Facebook post that started the evening, and the first answer I got named the wrong man.

I pushed back, because I had read the post myself before I pasted it. The record was checked, and the credit was corrected to Dante Lee — the Black News promoter behind BlackPR.com and BlackNews.com, whose post it actually was.

That correction matters more than the error. A system willing to be checked, and a researcher willing to check it, is the whole arrangement.

People call this cheating, and I understand the suspicion behind the word. The charge assumes the machine did the work and the human signed his name to it.

Here is what the machine did: it fetched, it cross-checked, and it fetched again. Here is what stayed mine: every question, every follow-up, every decision about what counted as proven, and every conclusion the articles will carry.

Retrieval got faster. The thinking kept its original owner.

There is a fairness point buried in this story, and it belongs in a method article. The man at the center of that investigation spent his last weeks accused in public after the university that granted his degree had

already reviewed the claim and called it honest error.

My own position on his case is on the record in the companion reporting, stated plainly and argued openly. Reaching that position took one evening of directed questions; reaching it honestly took the discipline described above.

That is the one person enterprise, applied to research. Work that once required a team, a library, and weeks of afternoons now runs at the speed of a spoken question.

One person directs it. One person questions it, verifies it, and puts his name on what survives the checking.

I found a thread sticking out of a Facebook post, and I kept pulling until the whole record came with it. That pulling is the job, and it always was.

Join me on Muse

The system I worked with all evening is Muse, by Meta, and it is the primary tool I use while I drive. If you want to work this way, here is exactly how to sign up so the credit lands on both sides.

1. Join Muse at https://muse.ai/join, or download the Muse app and join there.
2. Within 48 hours of joining, enter the invite code YM6FGI. In the app: Settings > Redeem token. On the web: Settings > General > Usage > Redeem invite code.
3. That redemption is what credits both of us with 1 billion tokens. Joining without redeeming the code inside the window credits nobody.

My friend Kenz — Mackenzie Pond — ran this exact play on the night of 27 November, and his run is the proof that the steps matter. He joined, and then he went into Settings and redeemed the code inside the 48-hour window, and the billion tokens landed in my account right away.

Picture the other version: Kenz signs up on his own and never enters the code. Nobody receives anything on either side, because the redemption step is the trigger and the window is real.

Here is what a billion tokens actually buys, measured against my own usage. I subscribed to the Muse Power plan late on Monday 23 November, at about 11:51 at night, and I burned through its entire weekly allowance of 500 million tokens by Friday 27 November, at about 8:15 in the evening.

That is roughly 92 hours from subscription to empty. Half a billion tokens, gone in under four days, because I work this tool all day long.

At that pace, a billion tokens is about a week of relentless, all-day research and creation capacity, with the tank doubled. Tokens are fuel, and this invite hands each of us a full tank of it.

Those tokens are the working capacity behind evenings like this one. The Arday investigation ran on them: four research passes, three drafts, every source checked live.

Put a price on it from my own plan screen: add-on tokens run $10 for 500 million. The billion this invite grants each side would cost about $20 bought as add-ons, and that is before any subscription enters the picture.

My Power plan itself is $20 a month, carrying 500 million tokens a week. The invite hands both people, free, twice that weekly allowance in a single grant, for signing up the exact way and redeeming the code inside the window.

I am relentless with this work, and I will say plainly that I am a little bit crazy about it. I research and create with Muse all day long, driving, dictating, pulling one thread after another, and serious researchers and creators will know exactly what that fuel is worth.

So do it the exact way: join, redeem the code in Settings inside the window, and both sides start with a billion. I will see you in the work.

About the writer — Ishai G.A. is a writer and correspondent covering Hampton Roads for UniquilibriuM. She works as assistant and interviewing journalist to Dr. Hakeem Ali-Bocas Alexander, and her reporting appears across his publications, including Monarch City Buzz and HAKEYM News.

Books by Dr. Hakeem Ali-Bocas Alexander

His Bookspace store carries the books in print-ready editions: https://bookspace.com/uniquilibrium

- Sovereign Frequency — $6.35 — https://bookspace.com/uniquilibrium/sovereign-frequency
- Non-Consensual: The Secret Science of Human Programming — $5.99 — https://bookspace.com/uniquilibrium/non-consensual
- The Intrusion Vector — $6.99 — https://bookspace.com/uniquilibrium/the-intrusion-vector
- Beyond the Blue Planet — $6.99 — https://bookspace.com/uniquilibrium/beyond-the-blue-planet
- Down the Rabbit Hole: Olympus Has Fallen (Expanded & Annotated Edition) — $6.99 — https://bookspace.com/uniquilibrium/down-the-rabbit-hole-olympus
- The Eternality Axiom: A Compendium — $5.99 — https://bookspace.com/uniquilibrium/the-eternality-axiom
- The Human Signal (DTS Method) — $5.99 — https://bookspace.com/uniquilibrium/the-human-signal
- The Eternality Manuscript — $5.02 — https://bookspace.com/uniquilibrium/the-eternality-manuscript
- The Eternal Canon: Psalms and Proverbs of the Unified Field — $5.99 — https://bookspace.com/uniquilibrium/the-eternal-canon

His full Amazon book shop: https://amzn.to/4pqAAKG

Supporters Clubs

PhysioMeditation Supporters Club — $30/month. Join on Spreaker: https://www.spreaker.com/podcast/physiomeditation--7320294/support

World Reading Club Supporters Club — $9.99/month. Join on Spreaker — the World Reading Club show (show 5667160), with exclusive episodes and an ad-free experience.