

(Submitted to Chaos, Solitons and Fractals)

Is CERN about to trigger the worst imaginable accident with an odds of 1 to 6?*

Otto E. Rossler

Division of Theoretical Chemistry, University of Tübingen, Auf der Morgenstelle 8, 72076 Tübingen, and Leibniz-Sozietät, Berlin, F.R.G.

Abstract

Some almost desperate thoughts about a denied dialog in science are presented. They have some historical interest in view of the fact that similar admonitions went unheeded a year ago. Put in a nutshell, they read: “Black holes have different properties than previously thought, being both indestructible and capable of self-organization in the form of mini-quasars.” Hence the earth may be shrunk to 2 cm in 50 months time if mini-black holes are produced as hoped for by CERN in the planned LHC experiment. This terrifying prediction is based on a new result in general relativity (gothic-R theorem) that goes non-disproved for more than two years. The equally old, unavoidably handwaving, 1 to 6 estimate published more than a year ago goes unchallenged, too. Unless a scientific safety conference is convened before the planned launch in two months time, the most dismal danger imaginable – planetocaust – is consciously risked for the second time in a row. Any child on the planet has the right to speak up. Not listening to the most feeble voice will amount to the most rightist crime of history. Conversely, this misdeed if prevented gives rise to a whole new planet.

(September 6, 2009)

1. Introduction

Our topic is the safety of the Large Hadron Collider experiment planned by CERN to be launched in two months time, as dpa reported four weeks ago. All I can offer is the news that the Tübingen result on black hole theory, if correct, changes the safety equation by a huge factor. The planned experiment then acquires the rank of an old-fashioned Russian roulette (1 out of 6 chambers loaded). Yet so not for a single person attempting suicide, but for a whole most precious and perhaps unique life-bearing celestial body in the cosmos. Up until today, no one has come up with a falsification of the “gothic-R theorem” [1]. Everyone appears resigned to the prospect of a CERN-mediated planetocaust being innocuously attempted for the second time in a row.

This observation is perhaps not surprising. There is this old Latin proverb, “ex falso quodlibet” (from the false, anything [can follow]). If my basic result is false, the outrageous prediction evaporates. If, on the other hand, the belief spread by CERN that my result is not even worth disproving is misguided, indeed “anything” (the end of history) becomes possible. Popper’s emphasis on “falsification” as our only viable instrument is, perhaps, still justified.

2. Background

What is so new about my result? Put in a nutshell, it reads: “Red-shifted [relativistically slowed-down] clocks are proportionally enlarged.” Or equivalently: “The speed of light c is not just locally but globally constant.” His elder colleague and frequent inspirer Max Abraham had made the same proposal to Albert Einstein in 1912 [1]. Heeding it directly would have jeopardized Einstein’s rapid progress at the time. The result’s eventual rehabilitation would nevertheless please the old man – as well as every schoolchild since simplicity wins.

* Dedicated to Nelson Mandela

Currently, the speed of light c is still believed to be *reduced* in the rear of an ignited rocket-ship in proportion to the observed redshift (the topic of debate between Einstein and Abraham in 1912), and by implication near the surface [“horizon“] of a black hole – our topic proper. The new proposal coming from Tübingen is that the *distance* traveled by the seemingly slowed-down light ray more downstairs is proportionally *enlarged* (without this fact being visible in the transversal direction) so that c returns to being globally constant [1]. The clinching argument was “angular-momentum conservation in the Hamiltonian twin-clocks paradox“: two rotating twin wheels without friction, one stationary, the other sent off and come back. The well-known Einstein retardation (“greater youthfulness“) of the successfully returned twin wheel with its original rotation rate retained, implies that a transient size and mass change must have taken place during the trip if angular momentum was to have been conserved throughout the trip as necessary. Specifically, angular momentum L is conserved, when the rotation rate ω is halved (say), if simultaneously the radius r is doubled and mass m halved as the simplest possibility (since $L = \omega m r^2$). The predicted mass and size change are indeed implicit in $E=mc^2$ and quantum mechanics, respectively [2].

The subsequently found, mathematically equivalent, constant- c version of the radial Schwarzschild metric [1] (generalized to the full Schwarzschild metric by Ich [3]) confirms this result. Abraham’s early hope surprisingly got vindicated. This new result gets received like a scandal. Even its publication in a refereed journal is attempted to be blocked [1]. However, the simpler new picture arrived at is not just a new “interpretation“ as critics claimed [1], but has tangible implications. The earlier paper with basically the same content but with the implied global constancy of c not yet made explicit, was published without encountering criticism [2].

The still reigning doctrine that the speed of light approaches zero near the horizon of a black hole never made it into public consciousness – in which the “constant speed of light“ still represents Einstein’s greatest discovery. The public thus always took for granted what has now been found. But would a constant c not mean that the distance of a black hole’s horizon from the outside world becomes infinite – even though you can fly around it? This is absolutely correct: a “static space expansion“ applies around a black hole [1]. This fact is not as new as meets the eye, though: The “radar distance“ of the horizon as measured from the outside world (how long does it take light to touch down and come back up again after reflection from a hypothetical mirror) is known to be infinite [4]. Also, the fact that an astronaut takes an infinite amount of time to fall down toward the horizon and (if instantaneously turned around) equally long to bounce back up again, is well known in principle: an astronaut cannot overtake light. The often quoted seemingly opposite result – that the proper traveling time takes up only 2 days (1 day down and 1 day up) in an astronaut’s life in a typical case [5] – is not in contradistinction. The quantitative relation between the finite *proper* time and the infinite *outer* time is graphically displayed in Figure 25.5 of reference [6].

This notwithstanding, the connection between the two graphs never got emphasized, neither in ref. [6] nor elsewhere: the fact that the *same* trip involves *both* times. Therefore, the returning twin finds her sister grown infinitely old (assuming she can still stand there waving) [7]. The implied *infinite slow-down* of the falling and rebounding astronaut’s clocks got overlooked by the scientific community for 7 decades. Without the new Abrahamian result [1], the oversight might never have surfaced.

3. Main Consequence

The described fact that the whole scientific community subconsciously “blocked“ the infinite return times for astronauts and light for decades in a row could not remain without consequences. The most important one, perhaps, concerns Stephen Hawking’s ingenious “evaporation“ finding [8]. The latter critically invokes the supposition that radiation *can* come out from the horizon in finite outer time. The occurrence of this oversight is understandable: In the traditional (locally but not globally constant) variable- c picture, there exists only a *narrow* layer around a black hole in which a low or near-zero speed of light $c(r)$ applies, and it is only at the horizon proper (at $r = r_s$, the Schwarzschild radius) that $c(r)$ becomes fully equal to zero [1]. Yet something that is confined to an (in the case of a

very small black hole) very thin layer clearly cannot make much of a physical difference – or can it? The error incurred hereby lies in one's taking the "radial variable" r for a valid radius even though it is only an unphysical auxiliary parameter. The real distance valid from the outside is given by the "gothic-R" variable \mathcal{R} [1]. The overlooked clock slowdown on an in-falling astronaut's wristwatch therefore stands not alone: the nonexistence of Hawking radiation is a corollary.

If the described new approach is not misleading, further decades-old results are in need of re-doing: the connection of the Schwarzschild metric to electromagnetism, to other time-varying fields, and to rotation. This list amounts to a major new assignment to theoretical physicists for years to come. The Tübingen school (including Dieter Fröhlich, Heinrich Kuypers, Frank Kuske, Klaus Sonnleitner, Henry Gebhardt and Thimo Böhl) apologize for the inconvenience caused. At the same time it goes without saying that this "major upheaval" if real only amounts to an internal struggle among relativity specialists in the scientific community – a healthy and by no means rare phenomenon in the history of science.

4. The difference it makes

The consequences transcend physics for once: they are the biggest of history. Galileo had a lot of fun introducing his imaginary discussion partner "Simplicio" in 1632 while still under house arrest. This could in the worst case cost one person (himself) his life in the footsteps of his teacher Giordano Bruno. Otherwise time was not in short supply. The infinitely less daring modern scientific controversy described above will likewise take years to be sorted out. However, time is in short supply for once. This fact makes for our second "big topic." While the former (the gothic-R theorem) involved the younger Einstein, the present one invokes the enthusiasm of the older Einstein who tried everything in his might to secure planetary survival in the atomic age helped usher in by himself.

It can be attributed to the pressing lack of time that CERN declared the above-quoted result to be "absolute nonsense" and its author a "crazy scientist." The administration is bound by their commitment to politicians, industry and the future careers of their older and (mostly) younger collaborators. Maybe I am indeed crazy. But even if I am not they could hardly have responded otherwise.

Never before was there a more grandiose and promising and expensive peacetime experiment underway. And it already fizzled once – nine days after take-off and before collisions' onset – on September 19 last year – as everyone knows. Therefore *if* the experiment's safety became an issue of planet-wide debate with only two months to go before the scheduled second launch, repercussions on the time schedule and not only the latter would be pre-programmed. No one who devoted a quarter century of his or her lifetime to such a grandiose effort, or takes from it the motivation for their own next quarter century of work, would consciously incur the risk.

This psychological argument does not rule out, of course, that they may not be absolutely right. The above "crumb" taken from the table of Einstein and elder genius Abraham (who died prematurely from a brain tumor in 1922) is still quite likely to be false – notwithstanding the fact that it stays unrefuted for two years in a row. But even before its falsity is proven (as everyone at CERN takes for granted given the nonexistent dialog), the aggressive response displayed makes sense for an additional reason: The new result is orthogonal to modern developments in physics (like the standard model and its amendments hoped to spring forth from the new experiment). The experiment's open theoretical flanks which always exist therefore deserve to be shielded from a revived stone-age "constant-c theory" that appears absolutely ridiculous in comparison. The mental reflex "dear fate, please let that gothic theory be inconsequential" is a gut response that everyone can share – including the present author.

On the other hand it is possible to quote some mainstream developments that let the above "young-Einstein type" approach appear much less outlandish – like the chaos-inspired transfinite quantum field theories of El Naschie [9] and El-Nablusi [10]. However, this on-going "normal" scientific

dialog can be expected to converge strikingly only in a matter of years. The risk-laden atmosphere therefore goes on.

5. Sound of silence

No one has so far come up with the desired refutation as mentioned. This could be due to the fact that crackpots are notoriously hard to outmaneuver. Last time around, the strategy chosen by CERN worked out fine. So for a single reason, I feel: A certain technical term did not make it into the public dialog. “Spiegel-TV“ asked me to slash a (brought-in) rubber earth with a (brought-in) butcher’s knife in front of the camera. I am afraid the whole world watched the scene. But the descriptive single word (starting with a p and ending on a t) never got publicly mentioned. It takes an almost superhuman courage to face this notion with all its sad connotations that force one to listen to the voices of long-dead people who crave nothing more than to be heard so their own fate does not repeat itself.

In the absence of this honesty, the earth-splicing spectacle had the effect that the truth – that all I had asked for was a scientific safety conference convened in time [11] – would get screened from the consciousness of a watching globe. Everybody took the bait and criticized me in the aftermath for the ugly scene, while I felt relief at being able to tell that I had not brought-in the ingredients myself: Can you believe I was that stupid? CERN, on the other hand, basked in the publicity this stint brought it: Can you believe they were so superhumanly smart? To recognize that my simple request would be drowned in the minds of a watching globe by the distasteful scene – so that they could forge ahead. This time around one year into the future: Can the real issue be hidden once more in plain view?

The scientific counterarguments have become stronger this time around (only “Science“ magazine still procrastinates on reference [7]). Also, there are more active critics around, this time. The greatest is still in America focusing more on the planned second stage of the experiment (colliding lead nuclei) than on the first (colliding hydrogen nuclei), alone referred to above. Other critics think that non-vanishing black holes could be exploited to solve earth’s energy problems (presupposing a mini-quasar can be handled). The proposed new fact that Hawking radiation is unphysical has sunk deep enough with CERN to let their safety assertions become highly indirect involving many auxiliary hypotheses. Walter Wagner and Rainer Plaga are the most hard-working critics on the globe.

Most recently, I got asked at the yearly IAS conference at Baden-Baden during my talk on Leo Szilard and the LHC [12], whether CERN was not in some sense a military-motivated planetary agency much as in its founding days – which assumption would explain its incredible international clout (neither UNO nor UNESCO can influence it up until now and Greenpeace echoes its slogans). This explanation of CERN’s miraculous success at preventing a scientific safety conference is, however, unfounded I feel: We already saw that the physics is difficult enough. “New old“ ideas are notoriously hard to integrate – Max Planck and Thomas Kuhn both reckoned with a generation on average and Siegfried Zielinski invented a whole new discipline, “Variantology,“ to deal with the phenomenon in its generality. Also the fact that CERN successfully skirted a safety meeting once does not automatically imply they can work the same miracle twice.

6. Four everyday analogs

Why should anyone support my request for a scientific safety conference convened in time? The critics are, after all, in the minority. Four analogs offer themselves:

1) *Airport alarm.* A local politician (Günther Heiss) recently got heavily fined for leaving a piece of his luggage unattended – so an airport alarm became unavoidable. This automatism is something every air traveler understands and supports. I am similarly responsible for an unattended suitcase sporting the three words “black hole stability.“ Who will foot the bill if this alarm call proves unnecessary in retrospect? Now the point: Up to this day, not a single scientific or political

representative ever said under his or her own name: “I take the full responsibility for not searching this suitcase.“ Until this happens, “not to search“ is clearly no longer a public option.

2) *Nakedness*. “The emperor’s new clothes“ were last mentioned in a physics text by Roger Penrose two decades ago. Anyone – a child – can call attention to a missing tuxedo. I do not have to be specially qualified to ask for help at not seeing something – this was Hans Christian Andersen’s philanthropic point when writing the tale. As soon as a single scientist has said publicly, “please, dear colleagues, explain why the to me invisible clothes are really there,“ any other person is equally keen on getting the answer – if necessary in the form of a ceremonial “nakedness-or-not conference.“

3) *Volatility*. The third parable is a stalling car in the pitch of the night: Better not light a match to know for sure there is no gas in the tank! The Large Hadron Collider of CERN is the match.

The preceding three proverbial examples make it compellingly clear that the requested safety conference cannot stay unconvoked for the second time in a row. The three examples only fail to cover the unlikely case of a hidden war-analogous situation envisaged by the anonymous discussant at the Baden-Baden meeting. In such cases, rationality resides (as the Bible says) “in the trumpet.“

4) *Ghost driver*. A ghost driver chugs along a super highway in the firm belief that there is an overwhelming number of ghost drivers all about him, only the police think otherwise. I once was dubbed “ghost driver“ by the media. (After I had mentioned a new administrative rule in a lecture course, the police were ordered in and I got convicted for “trespassing in own lecture hall“ for continuing to teach despite being told to stop while simultaneously a previously announced heavy punishment in case I would stop was being upheld.) All you can do in such a case is laugh according to my late friend Gregory Bateson. “Spiegel“ magazine allowed me to say “one of us is crazy, either the man or the state.“ My insisting on an inexpensive safety conference this time around is at most a nuisance, but not a crime. Or is it?

Philosopher Paul Virilio predicted an “accident of knowledge“ to occur at some point in the future, seeing this “absolute risk“ come true with the planned LHC experiment to date. Fortunately, the safety conference can still be convened in time. What are the odds that our ghostly lonely lane becomes the main traveled road in less than two months time, mom cher Paul: no chance?

7. The clinching argument

We looked at science, we looked at reason, we looked at psychology – each from the point of view of the best available knowledge today. What remains to be looked at is the point of view of the future.

Suppose the LHC gets started in defiance of logic for the second time in a row and gets ramped up as planned. Then predictably nothing will happen for a few years. Any miniblack holes formed will escape detection at first [13] (this latter reference also contains the mini-quasar prediction, the 1-to-6 estimate, and the 50-months estimate). So the world will return to business as usual? I am skeptical about that.

People will remember the fact that the risk was incurred deliberately. On hearing the “good news“ that nothing dangerous “especially no black holes“ has been found, they will understand that any soothing report issued *after the act* accounts for nothing since it would be irresponsible to say anything else once there is no other option left but pray. Hence the public will predictably turn paranoid. This perhaps only after a few months or years time, but inescapably so since the longer the temporal distance, the more restricted the remaining “asymptotic freedom“ (in time) becomes. How can CERN’s and the world’s leading politicians respond in that case?

Every trace of the present paper will need to be removed from the globe since it “instigates panic“ in retrospect – a crime. The editor will have to be brainwashed into complying, George Orwell style. All records of similar statements will need to be eliminated, too. But this would be to no avail: fear is

a superfluid seeping through all pores. A global paranoia will predictably take hold – a Khmer rouge mentality that revives the spirit of the holocaust against everyone who ever knew anything technical or could read and write or use the Internet or say a prayer. For it would be “them“ who were responsible in the eye of the self-declared majority. Even if the planet survives intact – 6 to 1 is quite high odds –, humanity might not. I know I am almost scaring you to death with this prediction. But you no doubt realize that I do so only conditionally – in virtual reality, not real reality – since we all still *can* convene that salvaging conference in time. Was I too provocative for your taste?

8. Discussion: the upshot

I first tried to talk to my fellow scientists above, then to a broad psychologically interested audience and am now trying to talk to every child, our greatest treasure. They will realize that even *they* can understand that this is a benevolent address. And that each of them can stand up or say while remaining seated on the floor: “I want that conference.“ Their cautious mothers will likely try to stop them. But then, the mothers themselves will make their voices heard in their stead.

For there is this miraculous bond between mother and toddler that society does not know about. The infinite mutual trust that arose at the moment the toddler first came up with the homemade crazy suspicion of a benevolent intention magically coalescing inside the spatial frame of his partner – a hunch testable by an attempt at actively eliciting the “same“ happy experience inside that outer frame. This absurd hope – an incredibly difficult simulational task – converged miraculously in multiple reflections under delicate mutual prompting in the paradise of the playroom. Right? Heraclitus and Friedrich Fröbel knew about this ‘personogenetic bifurcation via the smile-laughter feedback‘ (a.k.a. ‘being moved‘) that I still remember. Why mention this deepest secret in the human chest?

Ours is a unique moment in history: Every planetary citizen of every age suddenly has equal rights in a single-issue matter: To demand that reason (interpersonal reasoning) be followed for once, not just for justice’s sake but for everyone’s sake. I am reminded a bit of “Lampsacus hometown of all persons on the Internet,“ a pet project of mine 15 years ago that fizzled. It would have cost 10 billion dollars but that was not the reason, I just realize. The reason it could not be taken up by any worldly or religious institution became transparent to me only to date: owing to the human right for information being granted by Lampsacus, every person would along with their “hometown address“ automatically have had the opportunity to cast a vote in planet-wide hometown – instant world democracy, yes-we-can style.

Einstein tried hard in the last ten years of his life, after his bomb had been dropped against his will, to make the world realize that only a democratic world government with separation of powers (Kant-style) can let humanity survive the atomic age which he felt responsible for. He failed at the time. What he could not know was that his own theory would provide the key: Owing to the *Einstein-Abraham* constant-*c* result, everyone is called up on the planet today, child and grandma and poor and rich alike, to utter audibly: “I want a safety conference to be convened before the potentially most dangerous experiment of history.“ At least one person must stand up in time and say loud enough for everyone to hear: *Convene!*, adding matter-of-factly, *by the way, we now also have world democracy.*

Does this mean that CERN by its very pigheadedness is responsible for a second great leap forward of humankind, after the Internet? I must be crazy. My mother once standing in line in the local post office got noisily addressed by a famous university theologian a generation ahead of Hans Küng, named Franz Arnold: “You are the most hysterical person of Tübingen!“ At the time she was being called “mother“ by many youthful people of many skin colors including Neville Alexander from South Africa, Mandela’s friend: She must have been crazy.

The logic we arrived at is simple: If no one takes the responsibility to tell the world that she or he knows for sure the experiment is innocuous to the planet’s short and medium term survival, the world as a whole has the right to demand a safety conference. So the world suddenly has a voice. Q.E.D.

Afterglow – Le rayon vert

A friend in India told me he does not want to be mentioned in the acknowledgment below because this paper represents “sedition.“ On re-reading I see his point. But there is one example in history where a motherly male heart worked the miracle that all previous history had taught is impossible: Logic was followed for once – in South Africa. The analogous suddenly won planet-wide democracy, courtesy of CERN, likewise does not imply that re-distribution of wealth is imminent. Only that everyone knows about her or his rights, and about the fact that a nonviolent course has been found to equalizing everyone’s chances (hopefully soon enough) and especially their children’s. I feel embarrassed at the fact that mighty CERN’s refused dialog with an aged chaos researcher put such an outlandish political power into the latter’s lap. My above-mentioned friend showed me the way of absolute humility – he is a pastor in the true sense. In this spirit I can say today without triumph in my heart that the *biggest* experiment of history, the LHC, has triggered the GREATEST experiment of history, the WE [14]. For it was not before every voice on the planet had been called up that CERN would give in. Thank you, dear CERN, for your divine stubbornness!

Acknowledgments

I thank my brothers George Lasker and Ken Hiwaki, and Greg Andonian, Bill Graham, Ayten Aydin, Hugh Gash, Susie Vrobel, John Hiller, Andy Hilgartner, Peter Mbaeyi, Yrish Sefla and the whole International Institute for Advanced Studies for encouragement shown for years and decades in a row in Baden-Baden, and Dieter Fröhlich, Frank Kuske, Christophe Letellier, Valérie Letellier, Bob Gilmore, Leon Chua, Jean-Pierre Françoise, Jürgen Parisi, Peter Plath, Roland Wais, Jonathan Kemp, Jeanette Fischer, Markus Goritschnig, Johannes Preuß, Marc Fasnacht, Eric Penrose, Rudolf Uebbing, Bernhard Umlauf, Niccolò Tottoli, Alan Gillis, Martin Howse, Baruch Gottlieb, Erich Lorenz, Michael Langer, Klaus Giel, Lieselotte Heller, Tom Littlewood, Jürgen Heiter, Cony Theis, Helmut Banz, Andreas, Ludwig, Irène Gabrielle, Artur Schmidt, Christina Werner, Anna Dukhee Jordan, Ivana Franke, Anna Engberg, Olafur Eliasson, Peter Weibel and the late Gottfried Mayer for discussions. For J.O.R.

References

- [1] O.E. Rossler, Abraham-like return to constant c in general relativity: “ \mathfrak{R} -theorem“ demonstrated in Schwarzschild metric (submitted to *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals*). Revised version, since January 2009 on: www.wissensnavigator.com/documents/Chaos.pdf
- [2] O.E. Rossler and H. Kuypers, The scale change of Einstein’s equivalence principle. *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals* 25, 897-899 (2005).
- [3] Ich [pseudonym for G.S.], Distances in the Schwarzschild metric (in German), his equation (17). www.achtphasen.net/miniblackhole/Ich/Schwarzschild.pdf (This is an 8-page long, witty, abrasive, almost everywhere constructive, maximally creative response to the first version of ref. [1].)
- [4] J. Foster and J.D. Nightingale, *A Short Course in General Relativity*, 3rd edn. New York-Berlin: Springer-Verlag 2006, p. 130.
- [5] J.R. Oppenheimer and H. Snyder, On continued gravitational contraction. *Phys. Rev.* 56, 455-459 (1939).
- [6] C.S. Misner, K.S. Thorne and J.A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*. New York: Freeman 1973, p. 667.
- [7] O.E. Rossler and D. Fröhlich, Seven new features of black holes impart a great risk on the LHC (submitted to *Science*). Revised version, since July 2009 on: www.wissensnavigator.com/documents/GreatRisk.pdf

- [8] S.W. Hawking, Black hole explosions. *Nature* 248, 30-31 (1973).
- [9] M.S. El Naschie, The theory of Cantorian spacetime and high energy physics (an informal review). *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals* 41, 2635-2646 (2009).
- [10] R.A. El-Nablusi, Fractional Lagrangian formulation of general relativity and emergence of complex spinorial and noncommutative gravity. *Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys.* 6, 25 (2009).
- [11] O.E. Rossler, *A Petition to CERN*. A public petition, since April 2008 on:
www.wissensnavigator.com/documents/PetitiontoCERN.pdf
- [12] O.E. Rossler, "Leo Szilard's recipe for stalling science: ultimate explanation for the current planetary suicide?" Paper presented on August 7 at the *Interymp 2009*, 21st Int. Conf. Systems Research, Informatics and Cybernetics and 29th Annual Meeting Int. Inst. for Advanced Studies in Systems Research and Cybernetics, August 3-7, 2009, Baden-Baden;
 O.E. Rossler, Is Leo Szilard's despair regarding science the final word? In: *Personal and Spiritual Development in the World of Cultural Diversity*, Vol. 6 (G.E. Lasker and K. Hiwaki, eds.), pp. 7-11. The International Institute for Advanced Studies in Systems Research and Cybernetics (IIAS), P.O. Box 3010, Tecumseh, Ontario N8N 2M3, Canada 2009.
 Similarly on: www.wissensnavigator.com/documents/leo.pdf
- [13] O.E. Rossler, Abraham-solution to Schwarzschild metric implies that CERN miniblack holes pose a planetary risk. In: *Vernetzte Wissenschaften – Crosslinks in Natural and Social Sciences* (P.J. Plath and E.C. Haß, eds.), pp. 263-270. Berlin: Logos Verlag 2008.
 Since 2007 also (as the first of two papers, the second being the first version of ref. [1]) on:
www.wissensnavigator.com/documents/ottoroesslerminiblackhole.pdf
- [14] The currently set date for the **W**orld **E**lection is: November the 1st, 2009, courtesy of CERN.
Remark: Hopefully the date will be delayed somewhat through CERN's postponing their own schedule. This would facilitate a maximally orderly procedure for collecting the votes on, #1, pro and contra the safety conference and for, #2, the competing world parties like conservative, socialist, green, educational.