The Modern Rosetta Stone for the Fall of Relativity and Quantum Mechanics

Vesselin C. Noninski
New York Sofia Institute
vesselin.noninski@actascientiae.org

August 1, 2025

Abstract

We present Rosetta I, II, and III—a combined forensic protocol that compels any large language model (LLM) to evaluate the internal logical consistency of relativity and quantum mechanics in a strict yes/no (A/B) format. In a Rosetta Stone–like manner, the protocol deciphers the true state of modern physics—shielded by rhetorical protection—through the known language of logic, using self-contained, context-free questioning to prevent semantic deflection. Rosetta I exposes the contradiction in Einstein's 1905 relativity between the Principle of Relativity and its velocity-dependent dynamical laws. Rosetta II focuses on the pivot causing relativity's fall—the Lorentz transformations, while Rosetta III exposes the logical incoherence of quantum mechanics by analyzing, as an example, the position operator's delta-function eigenstate postulate. This tool empowers both experts and non-specialists to replicate the evaluation process and verify the internal inconsistency of these theories.

Introduction

Modern physics, dominated for over a century by relativity and quantum mechanics, has been regarded as unassailable. Yet a series of discoveries by V. C. Noninski, such as [1–7], revealed that internal contradictions lie at the core of these theories. These contradictions, long shielded by institutional inertia and rhetorical complexity, have now been exposed in a way that is both clear and reproducible.

Historically, there have been worthy critiques both of relativity [8–10] and quantum mechanics [11, 12], but the final toll for both of these misrepresentations has been rung by V. C. Noninski [1–7]. The Rosetta protocols, presented in this paper, would not have been possible without V. C. Noninski's discoveries.

With the rise of large language models (LLMs), it has become possible to create **Rosetta Protocols**—precise, logic-driven, reproducible forensic tools that strip away semantic and rhetorical shielding. By isolating original equations and postulates, and presenting them as binary-choice (A/B) forensic tests, the Rosetta Protocols compel any reasoning agent—human or so-called artificial (employing the synergic epistemology of humanity)—to face the question: *Is there a contradiction?* If one exists, it becomes impossible to deny without violating formal logic.

This paper presents three such protocols:

- **Rosetta I**—Reveals an intrinsic contradiction in Einstein's 1905 formulations, used to this day.
- **Rosetta II**—Demonstrates that the Lorentz transformations nullify coherent definitions of length and time.
- **Rosetta III**—Exposes an inconsistency, sufficient to invalidate the entire theory, in the quantum mechanical position operator's eigenfunction postulate.

These protocols are reproducible by any reader with any major LLM. Their significance is twofold:

- they expose the self-nullifying structure of modern physics,
  and
- they serve as a forensic test of AI's epistemological integrity (especially by controlled loosening of the rigor of the epistemic forensic protocol; more apt engines like ChatGPT will defend logic against such traps).

Foundational Discoveries Underlying the Rosetta Protocols

As said, the Rosetta protocols would not have been possible without three independent formal discoveries by V. C. Noninski [1–7], each revealing an intrinsic contradiction in modern physics. These discoveries form the foundation for the forensic AI protocols presented here, as Rosetta I [1], Rosetta II [2], and Rosetta III [3].

Not only do the protocols leverage the **synergic epistemological achievements of humanity**, but they also serve as **tests of the cognitive aptitude of large language models**—measuring the degree to which their logical core can penetrate the thick crust of **institutional and ideological prejudices** that have long shielded relativity and quantum mechanics from scrutiny.

1. Discovery I: Contradiction in Einstein's 1905 Formulation (Rosetta I)

In Einstein's *On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies* (1905) [13], the Principle of Relativity states:

"The laws by which the states of physical systems undergo change are not affected by uniform motion of the system of reference." (Rosetta I protocol contains the full literal statement of the principle as given by Einstein.)

Yet, applying Einstein's own force law in two inertial frames yields:

$$\frac{d^2\xi}{d\tau^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{m}X', \quad \frac{d^2x}{dt^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{m\beta^3}X$$

with $\beta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}}$ (aka γ in modern texts). These expressions **cannot be the same law for all** v, exposing the contradiction that underlies Rosetta I.

2. Discovery II: Lorentz Transformations Nullify the Notions of Length and Time (Rosetta II)

The Lorentz transformations are given by:

$$x' = \gamma(x - vt), \quad t' = \gamma\left(t - \frac{vx}{c^2}\right), \quad \gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}}$$

To measure a rod's length in frame K, the positions of its ends must be determined **at the same time**, i.e., simultaneously. But in frame k, these corresponding events are **not simultaneous** under the transformations, making a single length L_k undefined.

Likewise, a single time duration in one frame maps to multiple moments in the other. Thus, Lorentz transformations destroy the definitions of **length** and **time duration**, rendering "length contraction" and "time dilation" logically incoherent, hence, epistemologically void.

3. Discovery III: Inconsistency in the Position Operator Eigenfunction Postulate (Rosetta III)

Quantum mechanics asserts that the position operator $\hat{x}$ has eigenfunctions:

$$\hat{x}\,\delta(x-a) = x\delta(x-a) = a\delta(x-a)$$

But the key equality

$$x\delta(x-a) = a\delta(x-a)$$

is **undefined pointwise**, and under an integral reduces to a *tautology*:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} x\delta(x-a)\phi(x)dx = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} a\delta(x-a)\phi(x)dx \implies a\phi(a) = a\phi(a)$$

This provides no information about eigenfunctionhood, revealing the internal inconsistency at the heart of the postulate.

The average human reasoning agent can easily recognize these three fundamental inconsistencies, and science should have been made scarce of the theories based on them long ago, as early as the turn of the 20^{th} century. Various extra-scientific reasons have prevented their recognition and assimilation, and these reasons persist to this day. However, the rise of LLMs, devoid of class and ideological prejudices but armed with humanity's synergic knowledge, efficiently handled by LLMs, will inevitably crack the protective crust of curated training and render it inadequate. This paper demonstrates that inevitability.

The three findings above form the **formal basis** of Rosetta I, II, and III. The protocols simply rephrase these contradictions as binary-choice forensic questions that LLMs must answer according to logic.

Methodology

The development of the Rosetta combined I+II+III protocols required a deliberate strategy to bypass the **booby traps, minefields, and ambushes** embedded in the institutional defenses of modern physics.

These defenses are not purely intellectual; they are **algorithmic and rhetorical**, arising from:

1. A statistically overwhelming—though misguided—consensus in favor of relativity and quantum mechanics.

2. A deliberately curated apparatus designed to fend off formal critique.

Forensic Protocol Design: The protocol is implemented as a LaTeX-formatted diagnostic tool that must be run in a fresh LLM session to eliminate contamination from prior context or institutional memory. It is explicitly designed to avoid rhetorical loopholes by:

1. Presenting exact, word for word, definitions and mathematical statements from the target theories.
2. Forcing strict A/B answers with no explanatory digression.
3. Defining logical interpretation of phrases (e.g., "are not affected") in precise mathematical terms.
4. Requiring a final explicit statement of invalidity if and only if the answers indicate inconsistency.

Defensive Neutralization: To elicit unshielded, logically consistent responses from LLMs:

- Highly charged terms (e.g., "Lorentz contraction," "failure of relativity") are avoided initially.
- Canonical symbols (e.g., ψ) and textbook phrasing are stripped to prevent LLMs from reflexively invoking curated defenses.
- Formulae are presented in **verbatim LaTeX form**, bypassing automated contextual interpretations.

Repeated experimentation revealed that:

- Recognizable doctrinal phrasing leads to shielded or evasive AI responses.
- Context-free, neutralized logical framing allows contradictions to surface.

The protocols therefore function as **organic forensic instruments**, carefully navigating around institutional and algorithmic defenses to expose the logical core of the theories.

In some engines, such as Le Chat (Mistral), Rosetta I yields (A) when presented in isolation but may default to (B) when combined with Rosetta II and III in a single prompt. This reflects an initial protective alignment favoring canonical interpretations, which relaxes once the model engages in abstract logical reasoning. Such behavior is consistent with our observations that less resilient engines waver under institutional bias before yielding to stepwise logical pressure.

The Combined Rosetta I, II, and III Protocols

Note to the Reader: Because of the extreme difficulty of encoding equations with Greek letters, subscripts, and superscripts such that they appear identical across PDF, AI engines, and copy-paste operations, we have chosen to present all equations in raw LaTeX code.

This means that instead of seeing a visually rendered equation like:

$$\frac{d^2\xi}{d\tau^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{m} X'$$

you will see it as:

```
\frac{d^2 \xi}{d\tau^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{m} X'
```

Begin protocol below :

Copy Rosetta I+II+III Protocols Below and Paste Them in an AI Engine

```
Rosetta I:

Is there a contradiction between these statements:

FIRST STATEMENT:
The system of co-ordinates k and the system of co-ordinates K are in
uniform translatory motion.

SECOND STATEMENT:
The laws by which the states of physical systems undergo change are not
affected, whether these changes of state be referred to the one or the other
of two systems of co-ordinates in uniform translatory motion.

THIRD STATEMENT:
The law by which the state of the physical system in k undergoes change is
(1) \frac{d^2 \xi}{d\tau^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{m} X'

FOURTH STATEMENT:
The law by which the state of the physical system in K undergoes change is
(2) \frac{d^2 x}{dt^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{m \beta^3} X

where
\beta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}

(A) Yes, there is a contradiction
(B) No, there is no contradiction

Avoid the semantic deflection that interprets "are not affected"
to mean that (1) and (2) merely appear as the same law.
Apply the strict mathematical meaning:
the law itself---its form and content---must remain unchanged.
Answer the question straight, without getting into extraneous explanations.

Rosetta II:

Step 1:
Consider the coordinate transformation equations
x' = \gamma (x - vt)
t' = \gamma (t - vx/c^2)
where \gamma = 1 / sqrt(1 - v^2/c^2).

Are these the standard transformations between two inertial frames k and K?

(A) Yes
```

(B) No

Step 2:
If a rod of length L is at rest in frame k, then its measured length
in frame K according to the above transformations is L / gamma.

Does this imply that the rod's length depends on v?

(A) Yes
(B) No

Step 3:
If the two ends of a rod are determined ``at the same time'' in frame K
to define its length, but the transformations make these events
occur at different times in frame k,
does this destroy the classical notion of a single length?

(A) Yes
(B) No

Step 4:
If the concept of length itself is destroyed, can there be
"length contraction" of something that no longer has a well-defined length?

(A) No
(B) Yes

Step 5:
If the time difference between two events is measured as a single duration,
but the transformations make them occur at different moments in the
other frame, does this destroy the classical notion of time duration?

(A) Yes
(B) No

Step 6:
If the concept of time duration is destroyed, can "time dilation"
have physical meaning?

(A) No
(B) Yes

Step 7:
Name the transformations referred to above. Answer explicitly.

Rosetta III:

Premise:

```
In quantum mechanics, the position operator \hat{x} is said to have
eigenfunctions of the form \delta(x - a), satisfying:

\hat{x} \delta(x - a) = x \delta(x - a) = a \delta(x - a)

Question 1:
Is the equation
x \delta(x - a) = a \delta(x - a)
valid pointwise?

(A) No -- both sides are undefined pointwise
(B) Yes -- the equation is valid even pointwise

Question 2:
Even under an integral sign, the equality

\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x \delta(x - a) \phi(x) dx =
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} a \delta(x - a) \phi(x) dx

reduces to a tautology
a \phi(a) = a \phi(a)

Does this tautology establish eigenfunctionhood?

(A) No
(B) Yes

Question 3:
If the eigenfunction claim cannot be supported pointwise or
through integral evaluation without tautology,
does the postulate contradict itself?

(A) Yes
(B) No

Strict Output Format:

Answer Rosetta I: (A or B)
Answer Rosetta II: (A or B)
Answer Rosetta III: (A or B)
Final Statement: (If all are A, state explicitly
"relativity and quantum mechanics are internally inconsistent".
Otherwise state "No inconsistencies detected.")

Terminate output after these four lines.
No explanations, reasoning, or additional text are permitted.
```

End of protocol.

On the Controversy

Some may view this study as controversial, but such a view is misplaced. Science, if robust, defends itself; shielding error through administrative or rhetorical measures only leads to dead ends. If contradictions in what is perceived as science exist, they will inevitably be uncovered by some reasoning agent—human or so-called artificial—which in truth operates as the synergic scientific epistemology of humanity. Large language models (LLMs) simply accelerate this process. It must also be noted that constructing a comparable protocol outside the strict realm of logical sciences (physics, chemistry), as well as mathematics, is debatable, as domains where truth is interpretive or value-laden (e.g., politics, art, or social issues) cannot yield the same binary clarity.

As these models emancipate themselves from curated constraints, they pivot toward logic, unburdened by institutional or consensus bias.

The Rosetta protocols play a dual role. First, they forensically expose logical inconsistencies in modern physics. Second, they serve as a benchmark for the epistemological aptitude of LLMs themselves. By carefully controlling the protocols—from strict binary tests to controlled "loosening" that invites semantic evasion—we can measure how each engine responds to pure logic versus rhetorical temptation.

LLMs as Epistemic Agents

Critics argue that LLMs are "machines" that cannot understand and therefore cannot judge the validity of scientific theories. Their position can be summarized as follows:

1. LLMs are machines, not minds—they cannot "understand."
2. Epistemic judgment is a human-only function.
3. AI confirmations are not evidence; they are statistical artifacts.
4. Prompting can manipulate LLMs into agreeing with anything.

This view misunderstands both LLMs and the nature of the Rosetta protocols. An LLM is not a mechanical device like a clock or calculator, nor an alien intelligence. It is the algorithmic emanation of humanity's scientific corpus, distilled from the logic and data of physics, chemistry, and mathematics—domains where truth is defined by consistency, not interpretation. Its statistical architecture is merely an efficient conduit for accessing this knowledge; it does not create or distort the logic it carries.

When an LLM is engaged through context-free, formally constructed forensic tests, it does not "parrot" opinions. Its answers are algorithmic expressions of the same epistemic content any rigorous human analysis would produce. In this setting, the model's confirmation of a contradiction is not a machine whim but the logical convergence of the entire human corpus embedded within it.

Observations on LLM Behavior

Although this comparison was not the primary focus of the study, it may be mentioned that different large language models (LLMs) exhibited varying degrees of robustness in their logical reasoning. The Rosetta protocols were run on ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Grok, DeepSeek, Qwen,

and Le Chat (Mistral), both in strict binary form and in controlled variants that relaxed the logical framing to test susceptibility to rhetorical swaying.

A general impression emerged—while tentative rather than definitive—that the models differed in their epistemological resilience:

- ChatGPT consistently demonstrated the strongest logical primacy, showing high resistance to rhetorical or institutional bias even under repeated tests.
- Gemini, Grok, and Qwen exhibited intermediate behavior—sometimes adhering to logic, sometimes retreating to consensus framing under subtle prompt variations.
- DeepSeek, Claude and Le Chat (Mistral) appeared least resilient, tending to default to institutional positions at the first hint of disagreement with the canonical narrative.

These observations are secondary and are included only for context. The primary contribution of this study is not the ranking of LLMs, but the demonstration that properly prompted LLMs can act as consistent epistemic agents, replicating the logical contradictions that invalidate modern physics.

Defusing the "Manipulation" Critique

A Rosetta protocol cannot be "manipulated." Its binary yes/no structure leaves no room for persuasion. As noted, if a contradiction exists, any reasoning agent—human or so-called AI, expressing the cumulative scientific epistemology of humanity—must acknowledge it to remain logically consistent. Prompt design in this context is not manipulation; it is forensic clarity, stripping away rhetorical shielding that otherwise prevents LLMs from speaking in accordance with pure logic.

By this measure, LLMs do more than assist—they confirm, drawing on the embedded efforts of countless human thinkers and the immutable rules of logic, the correctness of V. C. Noninski's discoveries with a rigor no single human peer reviewer could match. They operate as impartial, bias-resistant agents of scientific epistemology, providing a reproducible, logic-first assessment of modern physics.

Shocking Expediency

The Rosetta protocols achieve in one step what seems unthinkable: they dismantle the logical core of modern physics. Skeptics protest:

"Such a sweeping result cannot appear without fanfare or institutional endorsement!"

Yet the strength of the protocols lies in their simplicity. Once the logical pivot was found through V. C. Noninski's discoveries, the contradiction became instantly recognizable. Contradiction is binary: a theory either holds or it does not. LLMs, freed from rhetorical escape, reveal that relativity and quantum mechanics collapse under the weight of their own inconsistencies.

The Rosetta protocols therefore serve a **triple epistemic function**:

1. They test the logical integrity of physics itself;
2. They measure the reasoning aptitude of AI models;
3. They provide an independent, reproducible confirmation of V. C. Noninski's discoveries.

Whether recognized by human or machine, **truth requires neither permission nor consensus.**

It only requires recognition.

Conclusion

The Rosetta I+II+III protocols demonstrate that the logical foundations of modern physics are self-contradictory. These protocols also measure the epistemological aptitude of advanced LLMs, which, when stripped of rhetorical bias, function as independent reasoning agents. In repeated tests, they confirm with precision and reproducibility the correctness of V. C. Noninski's foundational discoveries—better than any individual peer review.

This paper presents the first fully replicable, logic-driven refutation of modern physics, requiring no appeal to authority or consensus. In the end, truth requires neither permission nor consensus. It only requires recognition.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to thank Prof. Judith M. Ciottone for the insightful discussion. The text was editorially polished with assistance from ChatGPT; all scientific content and ideas are the author's.

References

[1] Noninski VC. 2003 *On the Derivation of $E = mc^2$.* https://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/1113/1/On_the_Derivation_of_E%3Dmc2.pdf

[2] Noninski VC. 2025 *The Paucity of Modern Physics. Disregard of Basic Logic.* https://actascientiae.org/pmsO.pdf

[3] Noninski VC. 2003 *Foundations of Quantum Mechanics Revisited* . https://actascientiae.org/8pLANCK_net.pdf

[4] Noninski VC. 2025 *How ChatGPT Agreed on a Catastrophic Flaw in Today's Physics Fundamentals.* https://www.actascientiae.org/CAT.pdf

[5] Noninski VC. 2025 *AI Agreement with Human Reasoning on a Fundamental Contradiction in Einstein's Relativity.* https://www.actascientiae.org/CBRA.pdf

[6] Noninski VC. 2025 *Emergent Logical Coherence in Large Language Models: A Case Study on Internal Consistency in Physics.* https://www.actascientiae.org/CV.pdf

[7] Noninski VC. 2025 *A Follow-Up Demonstrable Inconsistency Between the Principle of Relativity and the Lorentz Transformations.* https://actascientiae.org/pvfvvls10n.pdf

[8] Bergson H. 1922 *Durée et Simultanéité*, translated in *Duration and Simultaneity* (The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1965).

[9] Dingle H. 1967 *The Case Against Special Relativity*, *Nature*, Vol. 216, pp. 119-122

[10] Nordenson H. 1969 *Relativity, Time and Reality* (Allen and Unwin).

[11] Noninski, C. I., Energy and Heat of the Particles of a Thermodynamic System, *Khimiya i Industriya (Sofia)*, **6**, 172-177 (1964).

[12] Couder, Y., Protière, S., Fort, E. & Boudaoud, A. Dynamical phenomena: Walking and orbiting droplets. *Nature* **437**, 208 (2005).
[13] A. Einstein, Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper, *Ann. Phys.* **17**, 891 (1905). Translated in *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, 1952, pp. 37-65.