Follow-up to my open letter of 8 October to Aurélien Barrau

The context of my approach

Copy sent to the editorial team of Philosophie Magazine

---

23 October 2026

Dear Mr Barrau,

You have probably received my letter of 8 October, accompanied by my two latest books, “Paradox of the Invariance of the Speed of Light” and “Conceptual Foundations of a Theory of the Universe”, together with the text “Causality and Physical Existence”. I can identify no logical way around this reasoning. This is why I continue to seek to have it examined by physicists with expertise in relativity.

I am attaching the text “Why My Objection May Go Unnoticed within the Relativistic Framework”. How can scientific validation be obtained if the objection risks being regarded as already resolved before the precise logical point it raises has even been examined? You will understand why, coming from a philosophical background, I found it particularly difficult to begin directly with an article intended for a peer-reviewed journal.

Another difficulty concerns the very status of the speed of light. A great many theoretical and experimental results lead us to regard it as a fundamental physical constant. To state outright that its one-way value might not be physically invariant across all inertial frames of reference therefore risks immediately placing oneself at odds with the generally accepted scientific framework.

The introduction to my latest book is built around this question: “Will you get ahead of history, or will history catch up with you?” Initially addressed to Étienne Klein in reference to his “taste for truth”, this question also became a personal one when I was diagnosed with cancer, now in remission. It also concerns our society, confronted with the denial of truth and a destructive logic. Ultimately, it is this same question that I put to you today.

It was in this context that I completed my latest book in an exceptionally short time, with the help of artificial intelligence: twelve days for the writing, layout, cover and publication. I am aware of the limitations that such speed entails: particular care was devoted to the first part, while some discussions in the second would have benefited from more time. Nevertheless, the overall structure and the ideas put forward seem to me sufficiently established to provide a basis for further work.

Above all, this book is intended to support further progress, to expose my proposals to critical examination and, potentially, to enable others to pursue this line of inquiry. It also provides a lasting, organised record of work developed over many years on my website, whose continued availability cannot be guaranteed in the same way as that of a printed book.

In my view, what is at stake extends beyond the question of relativity alone. In this respect, the subtitle of my latest book, “A Relational Approach to Space and Motion and Its Metaphysical Framework”, is as important as its title: it clarifies the book’s content and fundamental orientation. This relational dimension seems to me to connect with one of the concerns of your research in loop quantum gravity: conceiving space in terms of relations rather than as a container independent of physical realities. This connection could offer another starting point for examining my work.

The critique of relativity is only the tip of the iceberg. Behind it lie the question of the motive principle of the physical world, that of our own nature, and the consequences of an entirely relational conception of space and motion. Ultimately, what is at stake is a particular understanding of the world and of our place within it.

These are also the reasons why I wanted Philosophie Magazine to be aware of my open letter. A question at the intersection of physics, epistemology and philosophy can be opened to discussion even before its specifically physical implications have been settled by the scientific community.

For my part, I have sought, through the means available to me, to bring this objection to the attention of people with the expertise to examine it and, where appropriate, identify the error in it. I therefore consider that I have fulfilled my own responsibility. It is now for those with the necessary expertise and opportunity to decide how to take it forward: either to show precisely where the reasoning fails or, if no error can be identified, to accept that the question should be genuinely opened to discussion. It is at this level, it seems to me, that each person’s responsibility now lies.

Yours sincerely,

Philippe de Bellescize