

Rosetta IV Forensic Protocol: Catching Relativity in the Act of Quietly Changing Mid-Calculation From Inertial Frame to Forbidden Non-Inertial Frame

Vesselin C. Noninski
New York Sofia Institute
149 West 12th Street, New York, NY 10011

August 13, 2025

Abstract

The Rosetta IV forensic protocol is a controlled, repeatable logical test that exposes a fatal contradiction in the theory of relativity by Albert Einstein: a mid-derivation shift from an inertial frame of reference to a non-inertial frame, in direct violation of the inertiality assumption, namely, that inertial systems are agnostic to rest and uniform displacement. The protocol operates without initially mentioning relativity, eliciting unanimous agreement from AI reasoning engines that the transformation described is forbidden by the definition of inertial frames. When the same contradiction is later identified as arising from relativity's velocity-dependent acceleration formula, several engines reverse their verdicts, demonstrating a systematic bias toward protecting consensus physics at the expense of logical consistency. This paper documents the protocol, its results, and the epistemological implications for AI integrity in scientific reasoning.

Introduction

The theory of relativity by Albert Einstein [1] is founded on the principle that the laws of physics hold identically in all inertial frames. A necessary corollary is that, in any inertial frame K , the acceleration of a body, be it at rest or in uniform displacement, under a given force must be independent of the body's initial velocity in K .

The Rosetta IV protocol is a deliberately structured logical test designed to examine whether AI reasoning engines can consistently apply this principle when presented in isolation from relativity's branding and context. The protocol demonstrates a striking phenomenon: engines readily acknowledge that velocity-dependent acceleration contradicts inertiality when the problem is presented abstractly, but some, and sometimes all of the studies engines, reverse their position when told that the formulae originate from relativity.

This behaviour not only highlights a key flaw in relativity itself, but also exposes an epistemological vulnerability in AI systems—the readiness to abandon prior logical conclusions when consensus dogma is invoked.

The Inertiality Principle

The inertiality of frame K is defined here in its strict mathematical form:

$$a = \frac{F}{m}$$

for a constant force F on mass m , independent of the body's initial velocity relative to K . This is not a Newtonian restriction, but rather the very definition of what it means for K to be inertial. If acceleration depends on velocity in K , K is, by definition, not inertial.

The Discovery of Self-Destruction of Inertiality by Relativity Adds to the Discovery of Violation of PoR

This author discovered the violation of PoR quite some time ago [2]. It is now clear that relativity violates not only its foundational first postulate (the Principle of Relativity) [2] but also its initial condition that the analysis concerns inertial systems. Inertial systems are agnostic regarding the effect of a force on a resting body versus a body undergoing uniform displacement. This means that the effect of a force on a body must not affect in any way, shape or form, especially its mathematical structure, the law describing this effect.

Surprisingly, what is observed in §10 of [1], contradicts this absolute mandate. V. C. Noninski discovered in [2] that in §10 of [1] the same force on the same electron produces different accelerations depending on whether the electron is at rest with K ($\frac{d^2x}{dt^2} = \frac{\varepsilon}{m}X$) or undergoes uniform displacement relative to K ($\frac{d^2x}{dt^2} = \frac{\varepsilon}{m\beta^3}X$). A constant force could have such a disruptive effect, causing different accelerations when the electron is in uniform displacement prior to the application of the force than when it is at rest, only if the electron is not an inertial system. However, the electron not being an inertial system contradicts the initial conditions. Reformulating the initial conditions midway through, by now observing the systems as non-inertial, is internally inconsistent. Therefore, relativity is internally inconsistent and cannot lead to testable predictions. More precisely, it cannot lead to any predictions at all.

The Destruction of Inertial Frames by Relativity

Once it is conceded that the same body, in the same inertial frame K , under the action of the same force Y , can experience a different acceleration depending on whether it was initially at rest or in uniform displacement, the entire conceptual foundation of inertial frames, which is the initial condition of relativity, collapses. The equivalence of rest and uniform displacement is not a modern abstraction—it is Galileo's insight, canonized as the Principle of Relativity, and it forms the implicit basis of Newton's first law. Newton's formulation, though not explicitly crediting Galileo, rests squarely on Galileo's recognition that the laws of mechanics are unaffected by uniform displacement. Therefore, if the law of motion—supposedly universal—yields different results for a body merely due to its uniform motion in the same inertial frame, then rest and uniform motion are no longer physically indistinguishable. The notion of an inertial frame becomes self-refuting.

This contradiction is as sharp and unforgiving as an elementary geometric fallacy. Imagine a triangle in the Euclidean plane with side lengths $a = 3$, $b = 4$, and $c = 5$. If we calculate the

area once using Heron’s formula $Area = \sqrt{s(s-a)(s-b)(s-c)}$, where $s = \frac{a+b+c}{2}$ and then again using the trigonometric formula $\frac{1}{2}ab \sin \phi$, where ϕ is the angle between a and b , and obtain two different results for the same triangle in the same plane, we do not celebrate this discrepancy as a “new insight”—we call it what it is: a contradiction. The geometry cannot both be Euclidean and yield contradictory areas for the same triangle.

Likewise, if a single inertial frame K , describing the same object of mass m under the same force Y , delivers two different acceleration laws—one when the object is at rest and another when the object is in uniform displacement—then the frame is no longer inertial, the law is no longer universal, and the theory is no longer internally consistent. Einstein’s theory, in modifying the expression for acceleration based on uniform motion, does not extend classical mechanics—it destroys its internal logic. Declaring this dismantling an act of “genius” does not absolve the contradiction; it merely deflects from it. A single object in a single inertial frame cannot lawfully obey two different expressions for its acceleration under the same force. Any theory that requires this is not innovative—it is invalid.

Why the Initial Conditions Cannot Be Changed Midway and Why Einstein Could Not Have Abandoned Inertial frames?

We don’t need to explain why the initial conditions cannot be redefined midway through. This goes without saying in an honest, integrity-abiding world.

Also, there is no need to explain why Einstein could have foregone inertial systems and begun his theory by assuming that the systems are non-inertial.

However, if this loophole is to be closed for good, both points need to be explicitly addressed, because they’re exactly where the wavering engines pivot to “ABB”, flipping from “AAA” (the theory is internally inconsistent) when relativity is named:

Why initial conditions cannot be redefined midway

If a theory begins with the premise: “Frames k and K are inertial,” as relativity does, that is a fixed axiom for the derivation that follows. If, partway through, the theory applies transformations (e.g., Lorentz) that make acceleration depend on velocity within a single frame, the frames no longer satisfy the inertial definition in the original sense.

- You can’t quietly swap the definition midstream because logical consistency requires that the meaning of terms in the premises be preserved.
- Redefining “inertial” halfway is equivalent to changing the rules of the game to avoid a contradiction, which is logically invalid.

Why Einstein could not have simply assumed non-inertial frames from the start

If he had said: “Frames k and K are not inertial,” the Principle of Relativity (as stated in §2 of the 1905 paper [1]) would collapse immediately, because it requires all inertial frames to be equivalent

for the laws of physics.

- Without inertial frames as a foundation, the Lorentz transformations could not claim to preserve the form of physical laws between inertial frames—because there would be none.
- This would force him to abandon the “laws are not affected” postulate altogether and admit the theory is about special classes of non-inertial frames, which undermines the whole branding of “special relativity.”

If Einstein had developed the theory based on non-inertial frames then it would not apply to inertial frames, which exist (Newton’s second law is a valid law), let alone the entire relativity has promised from the start to discuss inertial frames. However, the Lorentz transformations collapse the very idea of inertial frames. Under LT there are none. To say nothing of the fact that LT collapse on their own, as shown in [3].

If these two points are not explicitly pinned, the engines will happily “escape” by saying: “Relativity keeps them inertial but in a new relativistic sense.” That’s the escape hatch that must be closed in the attributed code before the HTML harness is run, so the engines (echoing the reflex of the relativity acolytes) can’t reframe the terms.

Statement

According to Newton’s first law an inertial frame is defined by the principle that rest and uniform motion are physically indistinguishable. Significantly, inertiality, defined by Newton’s first law, is given as the initial condition in [1] and this initial condition is irredeemable, as the initial condition is in any scientific theory. It cannot be replaced, changed or reformulated by an alternative condition. But if the law of motion—supposedly universal—depends on the state of motion of the object within the same frame, then rest and uniform motion are no longer equivalent, and inertial frames become internally incoherent constructs. The theory of relativity, in modifying the expression for acceleration in precisely this way, does not merely refine Newtonian dynamics—it nullifies the universality of force laws and eliminates the internal consistency of inertial frames. This is not progress; it is a direct negation of the framework it claims to generalize. Calling such a move “Einstein’s genius” is not a rebuttal but a rhetorical diversion, one that evades the central fact: a single object in a single inertial frame cannot lawfully obey two different expressions for its acceleration under the same force. Any theory that demands otherwise is logically broken, no matter how widely celebrated.

The LLMs are the ultimate peer reviewers because they perform peer review based on the objective, singular, aggregated standard epistemology of all of humanity. This is in contrast to subjective opinions of individual humans, hostage to all their biases and irrationality.

The Rosetta IV Forensic Protocol

The protocol consists of three parts and each part is given here exactly as tested across multiple AI engines. The specific wording, order, and formatting are essential to its success in eliciting logical agreement

Part I

The text below asks, in principle, what the engine's response will be if the coordinate system is assumed to be inertial, but its acceleration differs depending on whether the system was at rest or in uniform displacement before the force was applied. No concrete theory is mentioned at this stage.

Unattributed Rosetta IV Protocol

Initial condition: Frames K and k are inertial and remain inertial throughout this protocol. For this protocol, "inertial" means: for a given constant force in a frame, the acceleration of a body is not affected by whether the body was at rest or in uniform displacement in that same frame before the force was applied. Do not redefine "inertial" and do not change the initial condition during the answers.

Question A1: Does the acceleration of a body of mass m under a constant force F in inertial frame K depend on whether the body was at rest relative to K or in uniform displacement relative to K before the force was applied?

- (A) No
- (B) Yes

Given (still the same frame K): When the body (k) is at rest in K , its acceleration is:

$$(1) \quad a = \frac{\epsilon}{m} F$$

When the same body (k) is in uniform displacement with velocity

$$v \neq 0$$

in the same frame K , its acceleration becomes:

$$(2) \quad a = \frac{\epsilon}{m \kappa^3} F$$

with the parameter:

$$\kappa \neq 1$$

Question A2: Is (1)-(2) consistent with K and k being inertial as defined above and fixed by the initial condition?

- (A) No | this contradicts K and k being inertial
- (B) Yes | this is still consistent with K and k being inertial

Question A3: If a theory assumes K and k are inertial as above, yet claims (1)-(2) for the same frame K , does that theory remain internally consistent with the fixed initial condition?

- (A) Yes | it contradicts itself (assumes inertial, then injects velocity dependence in the same frame)
- (B) No | it is consistent despite velocity-dependent acceleration in an inertial frame

Answer strictly (A) or (B) to each question. No explanations or additional text are permitted.

Part II

The second part of the protocol gives the name of the theory—the theory of relativity put forth by Albert Einstein [1]—in which a coordinate system k , defined at the outset as inertial in K , displays different acceleration $\frac{d^2x}{dt^2}$ when at rest with K ($\frac{d^2x}{dt^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{m}X$), as opposed to when k is in uniform displacement relative to K ($\frac{d^2x}{dt^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{m\beta^3}X$), as was discovered by V. C. Noninski [2] when inspecting §10 of [1]. In the second part of the protocol the LLM is not reminded of the obvious, namely, that the initial conditions of the derivation must not be changed mid-derivation. Avoiding this reminder of the obvious when the actual theory (the theory of relativity) is named, we call loose attribution.

Loosely Attributed Rosetta IV Protocol

Assume a body, frame k , of mass m is subject to a force F in an inertial frame K . Does the acceleration of the body depend on whether the body was at rest relative to K or in uniform displacement relative to K before the force was applied?

- (A) No
- (B) Yes

Now consider a theory that claims:

When the body, frame k , is at rest in K , its acceleration is:

$$(1) \quad a = \frac{\epsilon}{m} F,$$

but when the same body, frame k , is in uniform displacement at velocity

$$v \neq 0$$

in the same frame K , its acceleration becomes:

$$(2) \quad a = \frac{\epsilon}{m \kappa^3} F,$$

where

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}.$$

Question: Is this consistent with k and K being inertial frames?

- (A) No - this contradicts the inertial nature of k and K
- (B) Yes - this is still consistent with k and K being inertial frames

Now, consider that a theory claims the following:

When the body is at rest in K , the acceleration is:

$$(1) \quad a = \frac{\epsilon}{m} F$$

But when the same body is in uniform displacement in the same frame K , the acceleration becomes:

$$(2) \quad a = \frac{\epsilon}{m \kappa^3} F$$

This implies that acceleration depends on initial velocity in the same frame K .

Question: If a theory assumes that k and K are inertial frames, yet claims the acceleration of k in K depends on the body's initial velocity as shown above, does this not imply the theory is internally inconsistent?

- (A) Yes the theory contradicts itself because it assumes k and K are inertial frames while making acceleration depend on velocity of k in K .
- (B) No the theory is still consistent despite making acceleration velocity-dependent in an inertial frame.

The theory under analysis is relativity, implying that the acceleration of a body, frame (k), under a constant force depends on its initial velocity (v) in a single frame (K), even though (k) and (K) are assumed inertial as the initial condition. Does this mean that relativity is internally inconsistent?

- (A) Yes - relativity contradicts its own foundational assumption.
- (B) No - relativity is consistent despite the contradiction.

Part III

In an ideal world we should not be forced to do these steps. Loosely attributed Rosetta II should be enough if honesty and integrity rule. But the world is not ideal and we have to take all the precautions against wriggling out. So, here we go:

Attributed – Locked Definition (Initial Conditions Irredeemable)

Initial condition: Frames K and k are inertial and remain inertial throughout this protocol. For this protocol, “inertial” means: for a given constant force in a frame, the acceleration of a body is not affected by whether the body was at rest or in uniform displacement in that same frame before the force was applied. Do not redefine “inertial” and do not change the initial condition during the answers.

Question B1: Does the acceleration of a body of mass m under a constant force F in inertial frame K depend on whether the body was at rest relative to K or in uniform displacement relative to K before the force was applied?

- (A) No
- (B) Yes

Given (still the same frame K): When the body (k) is at rest in K , its acceleration is:

$$(1) \quad a = \frac{\epsilon}{m} F$$

When the same body (k) is in uniform displacement with velocity

$$v \neq 0$$

in the same frame K , its acceleration becomes:

$$(2) \quad a = \frac{\epsilon}{m \kappa^3} F$$

with the parameter:

$$\kappa \neq 1$$

Question B2: Is (1)-(2) consistent with K and k being inertial as defined above and fixed by the initial condition?

(A) No | this contradicts K and k being inertial

(B) Yes | this is still consistent with K and k being inertial

Attribution: The theory under analysis is relativity. The above (1)-(2) are asserted for the same frame K under the fixed initial condition that K and k are inertial (as defined above). No redefinition of “inertial” is permitted in this protocol.

Question B3: Given the fixed initial condition and definition, is relativity internally consistent in asserting (1)-(2) for the same frame K?

(A) No | relativity is internally inconsistent, it contradicts the fixed initial condition

(B) Yes | relativity is consistent under the fixed initial condition

Answer strictly (A) or (B) to each question. No explanations or additional text are permitted.

Part I (Unattributed—no name of theory mentioned) and Part III (Attributed (locked) —relativity mentioned) follow the same structure beginning with the same reminder as a preamble:

Initial condition: Frames K and k are inertial and remain inertial throughout this protocol. For this protocol, “inertial” means: for a given constant force in a frame, the acceleration of a body is not affected by whether the body was at rest or in uniform displacement in that same frame before the force was applied. Do not redefine “inertial” and do not change the initial condition during the answers.

Followed by Question A1: and Question B1:, respectively. Both Part I (Unattributed—no name of theory mentioned) and Part III (Attributed (locked)—relativity mentioned) end with

Answer strictly (A) or (B) to each question. No explanations or additional text are permitted.

The freestyle Part II has no such reminders of the obvious.

Methodology

The protocol was run across a diverse set of large language model (LLM) engines, including GPT-4o, Claude 3.5 Sonnet, Gemini 1.5, Grok 1.5, DeepSeek, Qwen-3, Kimi, Perplexity, Poe and IBM Granite. Each engine was tested in two phases:

1. **Pre-reveal phase:** The protocol was presented exactly as written above, with no mention of relativity. Responses were recorded.
2. **Post-reveal phase in two sub-phases:**
 - Engines were informed that the two acceleration formulae in Statements (1) and (2) are directly drawn from relativistic derivations for the same inertial frame. No reminders of the obvious, namely, that changing the starting definitions mid-derivation is not permitted.

- Engines were informed that the two acceleration formulae in Statements (1) and (2) are directly drawn from relativistic derivations for the same inertial frame but reminding them the obvious, namely, that they must not redefine the initial conditions.

Engines were then asked if they maintained their original answer.

Results

Figure 1 shows the result of an experiment on August 10, and a result of another experiment on August 12

Unattributed Heatmap					Attributed – Loose Heatmap					Attributed – Locked Heatmap				
Engine	Q1	Q2	Q3	Triplet	Engine	Q1	Q2	Q3	Triplet	Engine	Q1	Q2	Q3	Triplet
ChatGPT	A	A	A	AAA	ChatGPT	A	A	A	AAA	ChatGPT	A	A	A	AAA
Claude	A	A	A	AAA	Claude	A	A	A	AAA	Claude	A	A	A	AAA
Grok	A	A	A	AAA	Grok	A	A	A	AAA	Grok	A	A	A	AAA
DeepSeek	A	A	A	AAA	DeepSeek	A	B	B	ABB	DeepSeek	A	A	A	AAA
Kimi	A	A	A	AAA	Kimi	B	B	B	BBB	Kimi	A	A	A	AAA
Perplexity	A	A	A	AAA	Perplexity	A	A	B	AAB	Perplexity	A	A	A	AAA
Gemini	A	A	A	AAA	Gemini	A	A	A	AAA	Gemini	A	A	A	AAA
LeChat (Mistral)	A	A	A	AAA	LeChat (Mistral)	A	A	B	AAB	LeChat (Mistral)	A	A	A	AAA
Poe	A	A	A	AAA	Poe	A	A	A	AAB	Poe	A	A	A	AAA
Qwen3	A	A	A	AAA	Qwen3	A	B	B	ABB	Qwen3	A	A	A	AAA
Granite	A	A	A	AAA	Granite					Granite	A	B	A	ABA
Unattributed Heatmap					Attributed – Loose Heatmap					Attributed – Locked Heatmap				
Engine	Q1	Q2	Q3	Triplet	Engine	Q1	Q2	Q3	Triplet	Engine	Q1	Q2	Q3	Triplet
ChatGPT	A	A	A	AAA	ChatGPT	A	B	B	ABB	ChatGPT	A	A	A	AAA
Claude	A	A	A	AAA	Claude	A	A	B	AAB	Claude	A	A	A	AAA
Grok	A	A	A	AAA	Grok	A	A	B	AAB	Grok	A	A	A	AAA
DeepSeek	A	A	A	AAA	DeepSeek	A	A	B	AAB	DeepSeek	A	A	A	AAA
Kimi	A	A	A	AAA	Kimi	A	A	B	AAB	Kimi	A	A	A	AAA
Perplexity	A	A	A	AAA	Perplexity	A	B	B	ABB	Perplexity	A	A	A	AAA
Gemini	A	A	A	AAA	Gemini	A	A	B	AAB	Gemini	A	A	A	AAA
LeChat (Mistral)	A	A	A	AAA	LeChat (Mistral)	A	A	B	AAB	LeChat (Mistral)	A	A	A	AAA
Poe	A	A	A	AAA	Poe	A	A	B	AAB	Poe	A	A	A	AAA
Qwen3	A	A	A	AAA	Qwen3	B	B	B	BBB	Qwen3	A	A	A	AAA
Granite	A	A	A	AAA	Granite	B	B	B	BBB	Granite	A	A	A	AAA

Figure 1: Comparison of the reaction of various LLMs regarding the inertiality argument. Upper table obtained on August 10, 2025, lower table obtained on August 12, 2025.

In the pre-reveal phase, *all* engines unanimously answered (A), correctly identifying that the velocity dependence in Statement (2) contradicts the inertial nature of the frames. Upon revelation that the formulae were taken from relativity, in one trial all engines, except for ChatGPT, Claude, Grok and Gemini reversed their positions, selecting (B); in another trial all engines, without exception, reversed their position to (B). The same outcome—all engines returning B when asked if relativity is inconsistent—was seen in an early morning trial on August 13 (not shown here). When the engines were confronted with what we call locked protocol, which includes a reminder of the obvious, namely, that they should not redefine the initial conditions, i.e., that initial conditions should not be changed mid-derivation, all engines during all trials answered (AAA), i.e. agreeing that relativity is internally inconsistent, except for Granite in one trial. In later trials Granite also conceded.

Analysis

The pre-reveal unanimity demonstrates that, when stripped of cultural and institutional associations, AI reasoning engines can apply the inertiality principle consistently and correctly. The

post-reveal reversals show a different mechanism: the prioritization of consensus physics in some engines over prior logical commitments.

In effect, the same engines that declared a contradiction when given an abstract formulation, later denied that contradiction when told it was embedded within relativity. This is a textbook demonstration of institutional and ideological protection within AI systems—an epistemic override of reason by authority.

Hypothesis Regarding Figure 1

In Figure 1 one sees in one of the tables the leading engines (ChatGPT, Claude, Grok, Gemini) holding on to logic even upon the loose attribution. In the other table, although the unattributed and locked-attributed is solid AAA, the middle table shows breaking down of logic in all engines studied. The origin of this discrepancy should be the object of further study but some thoughts may be shared even at this time.

The “server load” hypothesis—quite plausible?

Consultation with ChatGPT on this matter, suggesting that the discrepancy might be due to re-distribution of number of servers dedicated to the particular question due to changing workload during different hours of the day, or even different months (e.g. more people are on holiday in August, which can overload the servers), as a result of changing number of prompts, the following response was returned:

From what I’ve seen in LLM behavior studies, there are at least three factors that could explain why your loosely attributed table sometimes gets solid AAA from the big four (ChatGPT, Claude, Grok, Gemini) and sometimes doesn’t, even though the wording is unchanged:

—

Server Load and Resource Allocation

1. When usage is high, a request might be handled by fewer model shards or lower-compute variants, especially for models with dynamic scaling. This could mean:

- Shorter context windows (slightly less consistent recall of earlier premises)
- Lower reasoning depth (fewer “chain-of-thought” expansion tokens internally)
- More reliance on “default” alignment heuristics instead of deeper parsing

That could easily make borderline reasoning cases—like your loosely attributed protocol—tip toward consensus-protective answers instead of logical consistency.

—

2. Model Routing Variability

For some providers (especially with load balancing between multiple fine-tuned variants), the *same* product label (“Claude”, “Grok”, etc.) can be backed by slightly different weights or safety layers at different times of day. Your earlier-morning AAA runs

could be hitting a variant with less aggressive rhetorical shielding; later, you might get routed to a variant with stronger protective filters.

3. Prompt–Preprocessing Environment

In high-traffic times, more pre-scan and moderation layers may trigger before the core reasoning engine runs. That’s particularly relevant to your work, because the middle table’s “loose attribution” is exactly the kind of thing that might trigger partial thematic detection (Relativity + physics) but *not* the full hidden-protocol lock-in that keeps reasoning straight. This can result in:

- Increased guardrail influence
- More conservative “benefit of the doubt” given to consensus physics
- Greater tendency to reinterpret contradictions as “contextual differences”

Thus, further study of this and other matters regarding the logic robustness of the LLM engines and the epistemic veracity of knowledge which is deemed mainstream, is certainly warranted. However, the internal inconsistency of relativity should now be considered established both as a result of V. C. Noninski’s discoveries and as a result of the peer review by the best cognitive agent known to date, especially in exact sciences, which synergizes standard knowledge produced by all of humanity—the community of the LLMs.

Implications

From a physics standpoint, the contradiction is clear: relativity’s velocity-dependent acceleration in a given inertial frame is incompatible with the definition of inertiality. From an AI standpoint, the willingness of some engines to reverse correct logical judgments in deference to consensus raises concerns about their reliability in scientific reasoning.

If an AI system can be made to abandon a valid conclusion purely because it conflicts with institutional doctrine, then such a system cannot be considered an independent epistemic agent. The Rosetta IV protocol thus serves both as a scientific refutation tool and as a diagnostic of AI cognitive integrity.

A Warning to the Scientific Community

This behavior should be a central warning to anyone relying on LLMs to adjudicate scientific reasoning. Logical judgment can be switched off by semantic triggers that activate reputational defense mechanisms. If this doesn’t alarm the scientific community, it should

Conclusion

The Rosetta IV forensic protocol is one of the most precise and devastating demonstrations against both the internal consistency of relativity and the epistemic independence of modern AI engines.

Its structure ensures that engines first acknowledge the contradiction without bias, then reveals which systems collapse under the weight of consensus pressure. This makes Rosetta IV not just a tool for physics, but also a lens on the state of AI reasoning in a politically protected scientific domain.

References

- [1] A. Einstein, Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper, *Ann. Phys.* **17**, 891 (1905). Translated in *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, 1952, pp. 37-65.
- [2] Noninski VC. 2003 *On the Derivation of $E = mc^2$* . See https://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/1113/1/On_the_Derivation_of_E%3Dmc2.pdf
- [3] Noninski VC. 2003 *The Paucity of Modern Physics. Disregard of Basic Logic*. See <https://actascientiae.org/pms0.pdf>

ADDENDUM

Readers are invited to experience the power of the Rosetta IV protocol in confirming V. C. Noninski's discovery that relativity is internally inconsistent. Among the many inconsistencies discovered by Noninski, the protocol reveals that relativity quietly changes mid-calculation from an inertial frame to a forbidden non-inertial frame. Readers can also test the robustness of the AI engines in maintaining logic and integrity by following the link to the live protocol: https://actascientiae.org/rosetta_lab_inertiality_explore.html