

Translation into English from the German Original
of the Open Letter of 19.07.2012 from the G.O. Mueller Research Group
Addressed to German-Language Newspapers and Magazines:

***4. Offener Brief über Wissenschaftsfreiheit für die Kritiker der
Relativitätstheorien an deutschsprachige Zeitungen und Zeitschriften***

List of the 45 addressees at the end of the letter in the German original:

http://www.kritik-relativitaetstheorie.de/Anhaenge/GOM_Off_Brief_4_120719.pdf

Translator: Rothwell Bronrowan – Copyright Ekkehard Friebe

***4th Open Letter on Scientific Freedom for the Critics of the Theories of
Relativity Addressed to German-Language Newspapers and Magazines***

**Re.: Scientific Freedom in Keeping with Article 5 of the German Constitution : a Basic
Right for Everyone - Or repealed for critics of the theory? And by whom?**

Dear Sir/Madam

- After our [1st] open letter of 4th February 2006 sent to 221 employees on the editorial staffs of [the German newspapers and magazines] FAZ - SPIEGEL - SZ - TAZ.
- after our [2nd] open letter of August 2006: First Open Letter on the Freedom of Science sent to some 290 public figures, personalities, newspapers, and journals in Europe and in the USA
- and after our [3rd] open letter of 21st Nov. 2007 sent to FAZ and addressed to 5 employees of FAZ and to the editorial staffs of 61 German-language magazines and newspapers

we are now, with our 4th open letter sent to 45 addressees in 40 editorial staffs of German-language magazines and newspapers, requesting that the censorship and concealment of the criticism of the two theories of relativity - a criticism that has existed since 1908 - be ended and that you inform your readers about the evidence found by our research project as to the

total of 6183 critical publications on the named theories. Only to inform them. As critics we expect criticism.

The Purpose of the Present Letter

- additions to our documentation of 2004 (Text Version 1.2)
- presentation of all of the significant former publications of our project
- information on the status of the international discussion of the special theory of relativity
- discussion of the prohibition of every bit of criticism of the theory, that has been practiced since 1922

Addition To Our Former Consignments

Whether as editorial staffs or as individuals, in recent years you have received several consignments with publications of our research project.

The accompanying CD supplements the former consignments with two substantial productions of the past years. In addition to this the CD contains all of the publications of our project since 2003, so that you can immediately see all of the texts referred to in this open letter. A list of the contents of the CD is given in Appendix 1.

We would ask you to inform your employees about the existence of our documentation and about the CD sent today. We will ask our partners to publish the present open letter in the Internet.

The New Chapter 9

In the year 2009, in a new Chapter 9, we reported the course and results of our "thought experiment", in which you also played a role, with your steadfast refusal to report even the very existence of this criticism to the public. This first true thought experiment on the effects of prohibited critical ideas in our society has had two results:

- It has now brought *irrefutable proof* of something that the critics of the theories of relativity know and have experienced on a day-to-day basis since 1922 (i.e. for more than 90 years, now), but which the academic powers that be have always contested, namely that the criticism is denied, slandered, suppressed and excluded from reception in the field of science. And that the very existence of this criticism is concealed from the public by the *censorship of the media*. The proofs are given in Chapter 9.

- It has furthermore brought the *tangible result*, through Federal Minister Schavan, that from the side of the government a scientific institute - namely the Max Planck Institute for Gravitational Physics / Einstein Institute in Potsdam-Golm - has been declared responsible for questions of the critics on the theories of relativity and has thereby been commissioned. The process has been described in Chapter 9, page 174, and the decisive statement of the ministerial letter from Prof. Richter of 9.5.07 has been printed (for related details see p. 9 below).

When a government authority takes precautionary measures against the mere *possibility* of critical questions, then perhaps even the media - which has so far been the guardian and guarantor of deathly stillness, by means of censorship - might begin to spend at least a thought on the *monstrous possibility* of criticism of these theories.

The extension of Chapter 4 by a further 2394 critical publications. The next decisive step from the *possibility* of criticism of the theories of relativity to the *reality* of such a criticism is one that we have pointed out to you and recommended, since the year 2001, with our documentation on

- initially 2896 critical publications in our Text Version 1.1 (in the year 2001),
- then 3789 critical publications in our Text Version 1.2 (in the year 2004),
- and *now altogether 6183 critical publications* with the extension of Chapter 4 (in the year 2012).

In view of the choice of now more than 6000 critical publications you should have no difficulties in finding impulses for critical reading for every scientific taste and every area of interest. A large share of the proof given is linked to the original document so that, in such cases, there are no procurement difficulties.

Our Partners Since 2004

Since the year 2004 our anonymous research project has found publicly identified partners, as indicated in the letterhead: Mr. Ekkehard Friebe (Munich), Dipl.-Ing., Senior Government Official (ret.) and Ms. Jocelyne Lopez. Both partners operate three Internet sites that are largely, though not exclusively, dedicated to the criticism of the theories of relativity and over the years have become important centres of criticism of the theory in the German-speaking areas. Our partners have declared themselves willing to pass on questions to the research project.

The success of the Internet sites of our partners in presenting the criticism of the theories of relativity can be seen not only in the great interest of the visitors to the Internet sites, but

unfortunately also in the rabble-rousing and vulgar abuse from the supporters of the theory against every bit of criticism of their holiest theory of physics, expressed during their well-organized Internet appearances. These mobs of rabble-rousers have already demanded the exclusion of our publications from the catalogues and holdings of libraries - which reminds one of unholy times in Germany's past. And just in recent weeks an attack was launched on an Internet site of our partners:

Kritische Stimmen zur Relativitätstheorie [Critical Opinions on the Theory of Relativity]

The previous Internet address of this site was stolen on 2nd June. Within a week our partners were able to reconstruct the site. The new address is:

<http://www.kritik-relativitaetstheorie.de>

Should you find other links to this site in earlier texts, please replace the old and invalid address with the new one.

Who is G. O. Mueller?

On the often-asked question as to the anonymity of the research project there is meanwhile an interview with G.O. Mueller from March 2011:

Winkler, Wigbert: Wer ist G. O. Müller? : pp 8-10: Anatomie eines Wissenschaftsskandals; pp 11-15: Interview mit G. O. Müller.

In: Abenteuer Philosophie. Magazin f. Kultur, Gesellschaft, Wissenschaft, Mythologie. Graz. in. 2011, No. 2, March (= No. 124), pp 8-15.

In this interview the anonymity of the research project is not lifted, but the development of the project and the current situation of the criticism are addressed.

The Activities of Our Fellow Critics in North America

The critics of academic physics and other specialist fields of natural science in the USA took a decisive step in the year 1994 by forming a society of their own:

The Natural Philosophy Association (NPA) - URL: <http://www.worldnpa.org/site/>

Note: not to be confused with the *Alternative Natural Philosophy Association* (ANPA), which is located at Stanford Univ.

In recent years the NPA has developed into an international centre of scientific criticism through

- extension of its circle of members to form a truly international community (with 419 members),
- organization of annual conferences in varying university cities in the USA (2012: 19th Annual NPA Proceedings)
- publications of anthologies of conference contributions (1822 contributions), partly in print, partly in the society's Internet portal,
- the development (since 2009) of a database with short biographies of its members, lists of the titles of their publications, presentations of the publications and links to the home pages of the authors or other addresses, under which their publications are available. The database has its own title and its own Internet address:

World Science Database - URL: <http://www.worldsci.org/php/>

At present several critics from the German-speaking countries are also members of the NPA. Contact to the NPA is maintained by our two partners. In consultation with the NPA, Ms. Lopez is editorially involved in looking after the entries in the NPA database of German members.

The International "Open Letter" on the Twin Paradox

On 14th November 2010 members of the NPA issued a call to the international community of academic physics challenging it to put an end to a situation that has persisted since 1911, namely that complete lack of a theoretical explanation for its crown jewel, the twins error (commonly disguised as a "paradox").

Since 1911 (invention of the twins error by Albert Einstein) the physics authors of the world of relativity have published 20 different explanations - each of these, of course, the "one and only correct version"! The mystery of many different explanations for the same content is very easy to resolve: there is no plausible justification. This is why each author fabricates his or her own version. After all, if one hopes to sell the supposed "paradox" to the amazed public, one also has to deliver instructions for use. As for experimental confirmation, no one, as yet, has heard anything.

In the meantime the NPA has taken up the issue as its own. It demands free public discussion aimed at clarification of the contradictory statements in the literature. The appeal has been published as an "open letter" and is presented in the Internet for signing. So far it has been signed by 147 critics of the theory (as at: 4.7.12), including our partners and also in the name

of our research project. You can find the open letter (with the list of signatures) and the accompanying introduction under the following URL:

The "Open Letter": **An Open Letter to the Physics Community - 11/14/10 The Twin Paradox**

URL: <http://worknotes.com/Physics/SpecialRelativity/TwinParadox/page1.aspx>

The introductory article: **NPA Twin Paradox Report**

URL: <http://worknotes.com/Physics/SpecialRelativity/TwinParadox/page2.aspx>

Sketches the historical development since 1911 and the various "solutions".

The central statement of the "Open letter" is as follows:

Although the mainstream consensus is that the paradox is not a problem and as such has a definitive solution, there is no agreement as to exactly what that solution is, as the physics journals and textbooks are full of conflicting solutions to the problem. Hence, we suggest that an open, public discussion of this problem be undertaken with the objective of resolving it. We ask that, as step one, the "mainstream" physics community select a single, definitive solution to the problem. In addition, we ask that it states which alternative solutions are essentially equivalent to the chosen solution and which alternatives are deemed invalid. If the Twin Paradox is well understood and if there is a generally accepted solution, then this should be a very easy task.

So far all of the journals of academic physics contacted in den USA have refused to report the issue or to print the open letter. Several individual representatives of the world of relativity have either refused to make a statement (because everything is clear) or have again given different explanations, each of these presented as the "only correct one". The field of academic physics refuses to concede that a disgraceful, scandalous lack of clarity as to its nicest theoretical effect exists, if this looks like leading to a rational handling of the theory.

To give you an idea of the concrete situation, we will give here the list of the various supposedly "only correct" justifications = explanations that have so far been published. These can be found in the "NPA Twin Paradox Report" listed as follows:

Many papers giving reconciliation arguments have been published in the following categories using the following constructs:

- I) Relative Velocity
 - Ia) Time Dilation
 - Ib) Length Contraction (measuring rod contracts).
 - Ic) Length Contraction (space contracts)
 - Id) Time Dilation and Length Contraction

- Ie) Change in Relativistic Kinetic Energy
- If) Relative Simultaneity (NPTD accumulates during constant velocity legs)
- Ig) Swinging Lines of Simultaneity (similar to If)
- Ih) Lorentz Transformations
- Ii) Minkowski Diagrams (usually equivalent to Ia)
- Ij) Invariance of the Interval (usually equivalent to aspects of Ia, Id)
- Ik) Tracking Light Signal Exchanges
- Il) Relativistic Doppler Shift
- Ila) Turnaround Acceleration
- Ilb) Changing Frames of Reference (different than Ila)
- Ilb) General Relativistic Effects
- IId) Virtual Gravitational Fields
- Ile) Equivalence Principle
- IIf) Relative Simultaneity (NPTD jumps during arbitrarily small acceleration)
- III) Nature of Spacetime/Gestalt/Other
- IIIa) Nature of Spacetime (Vague but probably true. But which physical spacetime and what physical characteristic?)
- IIIb) Swings and Roundabout Theorem – (Similar to IIIa)
- IIIc) Kerr Metric

We draw up a balance from the confusion of theoretical physics:

1st Group: 11 Versions

2nd Group: 6 Versions

3rd Group: 3 Versions

Altogether: 20 Versions

In view of this situation the critical public is justified in demanding that the representatives of the special theory of relativity (in which the twins error was found) kindly clarify the issue in public discussion and decide which of the 20 (!) supposedly "only correct explanations" of the twin paradox published by physics authors from amongst the representatives of the theory of relativity is held to be correct.

If this is held to be the best-confirmed theory of physics, then the representatives of the theory must be able to state immediately which of the 20 versions has been confirmed as correct and which 19 versions are incorrect. So far they have not told us.

So far the relativists have remained silent, aware of the reassuring fact that no one can force them to speak, if they themselves fail to do so for reasons of intellectual uprightness. In view of the prevailing censorship in the subject and in the general public, they have nothing to fear. No one will dare to question them publicly. And they will do nothing on their own initiative.

The situation described can be recognized by every observer, even those without any knowledge of physics, as a significant, objective defect in the theory. He or she need only place their trust in the *correct presentation of the situation by the NPA*.

The "doers" behind our media censorship consider themselves, despite their lack of any special knowledge of physics, as competent enough to propagate the greatness of the theories of relativity and, of course, to hold the public at bay. Yet they themselves must have acquired the competence to point to the confusion as to the correct explanation of the twins error and to demand decisive clarification. Why do the "doers" hold themselves to be competent enough for the propaganda of the theory, but not competent enough for criticism of the theory?

When one thinks of the excitement of the news situation and of the media echo triggered by the CERN results in connection with the neutrinos - how a couple of nanoseconds in the Gran Sasso were duly celebrated - then there can be no real reason to allow *the spectacle of the 20 "only correct" explanations for the twins error* to escape attention. One could, for example, interview the 20 authors (or at least those still living) and allow each of them to explain why his or her solution is the only correct one.

By the way, in 2009 (i.e. a year before the NPA's "Twin Paradox Letter") an outstanding critic in Great Britain, Ms. Gertrud Walton, gave a similar compilation in her treatise "The loss of meaning" (16 pages) on the *contradictions and general confusion in the explanations of all relativistic effects* given by the authors of the world of relativity. The treatise is available in the Web. We have reported the contents in the extension to Chapter 4 (pp 319-321) and provide a link to the text there. This reading matter is not only informative as regards the methods of the world of relativity, but is also extremely entertaining! As the front runner in her collection of howlers Ms. Walton presents one of the giants in the subject:

"Pride of place goes to Eddington [1928, 33-34]: "The shortening of the moving rod is true, but it is not really true.'"

The Latest Furore over the CERN Results on Neutrinos

In view of the media discussion over the past months on the CERN experiment with neutrinos, which on the way from Geneva to Gran Sasso (Italy) were said to have been a couple of nanoseconds faster than light, but is meanwhile presented as an error due to an experimental fault, we will allow ourselves the following comments, which in this connection, of course, were missing in the media.

Since the middle of the 1990s at the latest there has been proof of multiple (!) speeds of light for electromagnetic radiation (cf. the author entry on Günter Nimtz in the extension to Chapter 4). By comparison, the furore over a couple of nanoseconds in the case of the neutrinos is mere theatrics. As though the results from Nimtz have not been long since available and any possible "speeding" by the neutrinos would merely have been a further confirmation of the effect, had the findings been justified. This is the first scandal in this connection.

The second scandal is the non-researching of the next candidate for supra-luminary speeds: the *expansion of the effects of gravitation*. Right up to the present day no one knows the speed of expansion of gravitation - and despite of all of the large-scale research facilities and the billions invested in research, it is not even being researched into, although there are enough plausible reasons for suspecting a supra-luminary speed for the effects of gravitation. Each author working in this field can therefore only do so on the basis of his or her own, purely "private" assumptions. Why is no research being done here? Why must such research on no account be permitted? Because the holiest theory of physics would not survive the results. This shows how simply physics functions.

Prohibiting signs are not only "staked" by the censorship of the media in the public sphere, but are also to be found within the field of academic physics as a deterrent for "deviators". The spectre of "deviators" has also been sighted in the German parliament. The approach for combating deviators is always the same: inactivate, muzzle, exclude from the (political or scientific) "party".

The artificial stir over the CERN nanoseconds, then, fully misses the state of knowledge in the field of physics and draws attention away from the true scandals. The planned purpose of the supposedly "too early" published "too fast" neutrinos of CERN and the subsequent "explanation" as an experimental fault can therefore only have been to perform for the public the comedy of super-exact, critical research. One had even considered the possibility of the refutation of a theory. If that is not evidence for the austere and self-critical attitude of this research! With the neutrino affair any ideas about possible supra-luminary speeds have again been thoroughly dispelled in the public's eye.

Can anyone imagine, after this farce, that CERN, with its budget billions, might *not* achieve its planned research targets and thereby disappoint its financial backers?

What does the German Wikipedia have to say about criticism of relativity?

Do you also always revert first to the reliable Wikipedia?

There you will find a German article on our topic: **"Kritik an der Relativitätstheorie"**
[**Criticism of the Theory of Relativity**]

According to this, criticism was expressed **"mainly in the years after its publication"**. This suggests to the reader three sets of circumstances:

1. The existence of criticism appears to be restricted to the "initial period", an harmless phase, long ago, that one has supposedly outgrown.
2. No criticism after the "initial period" appears to exist.
3. Since the first phase of criticism has been historically disposed of and since no subsequent criticism followed, there appears to be no need nowadays to preoccupy oneself with criticism.

Wikipedia cites 42 critical works. Of these, **a total of 9 publications** appeared **after 1945!**

Here they are:

8. Dingle (1972)
11. Ives (1951)
12. Prokhovnik (1963)
21. Lorenzen (1976, 1977)
38. Essen (1971)
39. Theimer (1977)
40. Galeczki/Marquardt (1997)
41. Apeiron Homepage (<http://redshift.vif.com/>)
42. Galilean Electrodynamics Homepage (<http://home.comcast.net/~adring/>)

A comparison shows the grotesque relationship between **Wikipedia** and the **GOM Project**, and how hideously the attempt to restrict the criticism to an "initial period" has failed.

	Critical Publications Altogether	Published up to 1945	Published after 1945
Wikipedia:	42	33	9
GOM Documentation:	6183	approx. 1700	approx. 4400

Anyone listing only 9 critical publications for period after 1945 makes himself ridiculous and his attempted deceit obvious.

We have taken 1945 as the limit for the "initial period". Result:

- The crucial sentence used by Wikipedia ("mainly in the years after its publication") is refuted.
- The attempt by Wikipedia to dispel the existence of the criticism to an "initial period" has failed.
- Even the attempt of the "free encyclopaedia" to simply deny the existence of a significant criticism *after* the "initial period" - although our documentation has been published for 10 years - has failed miserably.

The "freedom" of the encyclopaedia is used to clearly misinform the user. It is the "freedom" of the academic powers that be. The truth is that the criticism has taken place **continuously, both before and after 1945, and right up to the present day**. This also means that in future one will have to concern oneself with the continuously growing bulk of criticism.

If one prefers to move the boundary back to an earlier date, such as 1925, the number of critical publications after the boundary date increases considerably to approx. 5000. The earlier the boundary date is set, the higher the mountain of criticism after the boundary years. It is precisely this mountain, however, that is to be made to disappear by Wikipedia.

Do you now understand why the "free encyclopaedia" Wikipedia does not dare to mention the GOM Project and its documentation? The German Wikipedia-article is, by the way, so exemplary that it has been taken over in the English and French versions of Wikipedia essentially unaltered. *Can there be better confirmation for the objective meaning - and indirectly for recognition - of our project?*

Finally, it is worthwhile taking a look at the history of the versions of this Wikipedia article with respect to the number of critical publications verified: In Dec. 2009 there were 38; in January 2010 there were 40, in March 2011 there were 42. Since then the authors have presumably been frantically searching for further critical titles - without being able to find anything.

The purpose of the censorship and its consequences for the following facts can nowadays no longer be denied:

1. The critics and their writings have been excluded from the discussion amongst professionals in the field of theoretical physics since 1922.
2. The existence of the criticism and its exclusion from the field are concealed from the public.
3. The newspapers, journals and audio-video mass media have been brought into line, as regards the censorship.

This unavoidably gives rise to the realization that

the *media bears the main responsibility* for

- the actual deceit of the public (concealment of the exclusion of the critics) and
- the breach of law (denial of freedom of the press for the criticism).

That this is no malicious insinuation is conclusively verified by the fact that the responsible, specialist media representatives occasionally praise themselves publicly for no longer even reading the allegedly laundry-basket-full of critical writings received from readers, because the unshakeable theory has been conclusively proven and is recognized as being irrefutable, making any criticism of it superfluous.

What consequences does the bringing-into-line of the media, as regards censorship, actually have?

- A scientific subject without criticism is doomed to sterility and dogmatism.
- The exclusion of the critics as "heretics" is at the same time a caging in of the supporters of the theory as the "orthodox".

These are the famous dialectics.

- The media and its representatives are caged in at all levels and the entire society.

- Those who are caged-in represent the senseless claims of the theory vis-à-vis the public, on shortening objects and slowed-down clock rates and - as the crown jewel of this nonsense - the remaining-younger of the travelling twin! And in this they see themselves as technically competent.

- Those who are caged-in believe in their own censorship. They themselves think only of the specifications of the censorship.

Somebody once called this a *mental restriction of one's own making*, which one can again disregard.

- Those who are caged-in believe that rational criticism must be answered with censorship. However, this is something they only believe in "on the job". In private life they would react to any censorship of their critical comments with indignation. The caging-in leads to schizophrenia by those caged-in.

- Those caged-in lose contact with reality. Since the caged-in media representatives have so far believed only their own censorship and have thereby slept through the development of the last decade in the real world, we have presented the facts to them and demonstrated the developments for them in this "open letter". We will now summarize these in the following overview.

Developments Over the Past Decade

Some 11 years ago (2001) our documentation was published in printed form.

Some 9 years ago (turn of the year 2003/2004) our documentation was presented for the first time in the Internet.

Then, 8 years ago (2004), Mr. Ekkehard Friebe was the first person to freely declare his support for our research project as a representative and partner. With Mr. Friebe and Ms. Lopez we now have two publicly identified partners of the project available as contact persons, for which we are deeply thankful to them. The research project continues to work anonymously, though it can now take receipt of messages via its partners.

Some 7 years ago (2005) Ms. Jocelyne Lopez declared her willingness to be our project's second partner.

About 6 years ago (2006), subsequent to the Einstein-Year 2005 and animated by the presentation of our documentation and our "Open Letter" of 2005 to all of the members of the German Bundestag, lively discussion on the theories of relativity began to take place on

numerous Internet forums, in which critics of the theories and supporters of the theories often engaged in very vehement arguments. The large participation in the forums and the very high call-up numbers of the read-only visitors demonstrate the great interest of the public in the criticism. This shows that every bit of *censorship in the media is a malevolent intrigue*, and it reveals the *media as a willing executor of the censorship on behalf of the dubious persons behind the scenes* against an interested public.

Then, 5 years ago (2007), with her enquiry sent to German Federal Minister Schavan, Ms. Lopez received a reply in which the federal ministry identified an institution in the field of academic physics as responsible for enquiries in this field and commissioned it to reply to the questions of critics of the two theories of relativity. *With this, the academic wall of censorship against criticism of the theory was breached for the very first time.*

On 9th May 2007 Prof. Dr. Jürgen Richter of the BMBF - Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung [German Federal Ministry for Education and Research] - stated, in an e-mail sent to Ms. Lopez on 9.5.07:

"Evaluation of the results of scientific research is incumbent on the experts and on corresponding scientific institutions. In the case of the theory of relativity, these would be, for example, the Max Planck Institute for Gravitational Physics / the Einstein Institute in Potsdam-Golm." (cf. Chapter 9, p. 174.)

This new responsibility had already brought a first result. In response to a question from Ms. Lopez as to the reality or appearance of length contraction, the institute stated on 17.8.2008:

"Length contraction does not go along with material changes of the body; ..."

(source: the blog-archives of Ms. Lopez, 19th Aug. 2008: <http://www.jocelyne-lopez.de/blog/2008/08/>)

With this, critics can see it as confirmed that the unilateral effects in one of all supposedly equal inertial systems gives rise to an internal contradiction of the special theory of relativity.

Since 2007, any repair of the academic wall of censorship appears unlikely. And the employees of the censored media have a whole series of questions dating back to 2007 to reply to:

- Wouldn't it be advisable to clear away the rest of a breached wall?
- Why should they, as the representatives of the censored media in the Federal Republic of Germany, maintain the fiction of a prohibition on criticism that has been outmanoeuvred in the Internet for years now and has meanwhile even been filed by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research?

- Why not simply take notice of the following message of May 2007, relaxed and at ease? Criticism is no longer prohibited by the government, which makes censorship superfluous. One may even address the critical questions to the "Albert Einstein Institut" in Potsdam/Golm - an irony of history. Sending criticism to an Albert-Einstein Institute and receiving an answer
- there hasn't been so much freedom in the field of theoretical physics since 1922!
- Why do you refuse to accept the absurdity that your censorship has become?
- Why should you continue to work for the dubious persons behind the scenes when this work *cannot* be successful for ever?
- Why don't you want to attract the large public that, as has been demonstrated in the Internet, is massively interested in this criticism of the theory to the columns of your media and to the magazines, discussion broadcasts and talk shows of your programs, where they would contribute to the number of issues or ratings?

Then, 3 years ago (2009), the NPA founded an international database for the publication of physics dissidents and other specialist fields of natural science. This database meanwhile includes 2300 authors with their 6000 articles (abstracts), 1400 books and 1200 Internet sites (see above).

Also 3 years ago our project reported, with Chapter 9, its "thought experiment".

Next, 2 years ago (2010), the NPA published the *Open Letter to the Physics Community - 11/14/10 - The Twin Paradox* and started a signature campaign (see above).

One year ago (in March 2011) even our "free encyclopaedia" Wikipedia felt itself forced, in its article "Kritik an der Relativitätstheorie" [Criticism of the Theory of Relativity], to refer to at least 42 critical publications (out of more than 6000). The reason for this is clearly to be seen in the imposed conformism of the Internet. When the participants in forums and blogs demonstrate their great interest in the criticism of the theories of relativity by thousands of call-ups, an Internet article on this criticism with null references to literature is no longer impressive.

This year (2012) our project published an extension to Chapter 4, thereby raising the number of verified critical publications to 6183.

In this year (2012) too, the Internet site "Kritische Stimmen zur Relativitätstheorie" [Critical Opinions on the Theory of Relativity] was stolen. The censors and defenders of "values" in the media ought to be able to make sense of this. Who could have motivated the thieves and given them the "moral" basis?

How much have you known about these developments?

Whereas Karl Kraus, who takes the view that a book that the censor understands is justifiably forbidden, regards his censors as limited spirits, we regard all of our censors as intelligent and educated people who, without any knowledge of the real situation, still take the view that one must answer criticism with irrational censorship. The fact that our censors are thereby in error is something we have outlined above.

Our censors find themselves not only in error, however, but also in a conflict of values, i.e. in contrast to their other blustering about "democracy" and the "constitutional state", "freedom of the press" and their "fourth power - the press -" and possibly also of "basic rights"! Accordingly, as intelligent and educated people, our censors would have to be in favour of the following principles:

- Publicly addressed, rational criticism must be answered publicly.
- Criticism must first be taken note of, before one forms an opinion about it.
- This opinion must be just as publicly announced, represented and then implemented.

Why don't they behave in this manner?

How can censorship be an answer to criticism? In which countries and systems?

Since an intelligent handling of criticism cannot really result in censorship, the following question arises. Who prompted the censorship? We know, of course, all of those who benefit from the censorship - and so we automatically have its author.

Summary of Findings of Your Media Censorship and Unawareness

You organize the censorship against the society and are nevertheless yourselves just the prisoners of your own censorship - which is why you have no idea of what's happening in the real world.

You propagate a theory as the holiest of all, though all you know about its status is what the censorship dictates and permits.

With your censorship you harm the critics, the society and yourselves.

You know nothing about the state of the theory, as is conclusively apparent from the example of the "Twin Paradox". You have been completely unaware of the criticism expressed so far.
This holds for all significant points of criticism of the theory!

You seem to be unaware that critics now (since 2007), with the permission of the government, can even address their critical questions to the Albert Einstein Institute, and that the institute

must reply - without one thereby having the right to slander the critics as anti-Semites or the like.

We have drawn your attention to your unawareness on several points.

How desirable can your own fervour for the censorship task still appear to you?

Yours sincerely,

G. O. Mueller