Cognitive Signal Theory: The Riemann Hypothesis as a Protocol for Systemic Narrative Integration

Joel Peña Muñoz Jr.

January 9, 2026

Subject: Cognitive Physics / Information Theory / Number Theory

Abstract

Contemporary physics and mathematics have long treated the distribution of prime numbers and the spacing of Riemann zeros as exhibiting "random" or "chaotic" behavior, famously modeled by Gaussian Unitary Ensemble (GUE) statistics. This paper proposes an inversion of that framework: what appears as "randomness" to an external observer may be consistent with maximum-entropy encoding relative to a receiver operating under bounded reconstruction. We introduce Cognitive Signal Theory (CST), which treats the number line as a carrier signal whose discrete events (primes) arise as localized outcomes of continuous harmonic interference (zeta zeros). Within this picture, twin primes are interpreted as synchronization features, and parity constraints as admissibility filters that support coherence under thermodynamic pressure. The goal of this manuscript is not to assert a proof, but to formalize a signal-theoretic vocabulary and a testable reconstruction program linking spectral stability, interference geometry, and systemic narrative integration.

1 Introduction: The Scratched Record Paradox

Modern mathematics and physics possess extraordinarily precise tools for characterizing structure, yet remain hesitant to ask what that structure is *for*. In analytic number theory, the distribution of prime numbers is frequently treated as an object of statistical description. In quantum physics, spectra exhibiting random-matrix statistics are interpreted as signatures of intrinsic chaos. In both cases, apparent irregularity is often treated as ontologically primitive.

This stance produces what we term the *Scratched Record Paradox*. We analyze the microscopic grooves of a system with increasing resolution, publishing refined descriptions of deviation, fluctuation, and noise—while refusing to ask whether the record is playing a signal at all.

The paradox is not technical, but conceptual. If the universe gives rise to systems capable of cognition—systems that require coherence, narrative integration, and temporal continuity to function—then the substrate from which those systems emerge must itself admit coherent transmission. A universe incapable of sustaining structured information cannot generate interpreters of structure as a byproduct.

Nevertheless, prevailing interpretations of prime statistics and chaotic spectra often treat coherence as accidental and pattern as illusory. Any resemblance to signal structure is dismissed as anthropomorphic projection or clustering bias. This creates a contradiction: coherence is denied at the foundational level, yet required at emergent levels.

Information theory offers a resolution. In Shannon's framework, randomness is not an intrinsic property but an operational one. A signal sampled below its admissible bandwidth becomes indistinguishable from noise. High-density encoding appears chaotic to a receiver lacking the appropriate decoding framework, despite being fully structured at the source.

From this perspective, the apparent randomness of prime distributions and quantum spectra may reflect not disorder, but *maximum-entropy encoding*—signals transmitted at the highest density consistent with stability. What appears stochastic may instead be compressed structure operating at the limits of reconstructibility.

Cognitive Signal Theory (CST) is introduced to formalize this inversion. Rather than treating the number line as a passive arithmetic object, CST treats it as a carrier domain supporting interference, reconstruction, and stability constraints. The sections that follow assemble the isolated components—Riemann zeros as harmonics, parity as admissibility, and prime constellations as synchronization features—into a single formal argument.

2 Primes as Particle–Wave Duality

A central assumption of classical number theory is that prime numbers are static, atomic objects: indivisible integers defined purely by arithmetic exclusion. While this definition is correct, it is incomplete. It describes what primes *are not*, but remains silent on how primes *arise* within the global structure of the number line.

Cognitive Signal Theory (CST) adopts a different stance. It treats primes not as isolated objects, but as *events* occurring within a structured signal. Under this framework, primes exhibit a form of particle–wave duality analogous to that found in quantum systems, though arising in a purely informational and spectral context.

2.1 The Particle Aspect: Discreteness in the Time Domain

When integers are traversed sequentially, primes appear as discrete interruptions in the composite flow. Each prime is localized, countable, and irreducible. In this sense, primes function as particulate events: distinct markers that punctuate an otherwise continuous arithmetic progression.

From a signal-theoretic perspective, this corresponds to the time domain. Just as a detector registers discrete clicks when exposed to a photon stream, the number line registers primes as isolated outcomes when sampled pointwise. At this level of description, primes appear sparse, irregular, and resistant to prediction.

However, particle-like behavior alone cannot explain the large-scale regularities observed in prime statistics. The Prime Number Theorem, zero correlations, and long-range order all point to an underlying organizing mechanism that transcends purely local definition.

2.2 The Wave Aspect: Harmonics in the Frequency Domain

Riemann's 1859 analysis revealed that the distribution of primes is governed by the non-trivial zeros of the Riemann zeta function. These zeros do not reside on the number line itself, but in the complex frequency domain. Their imaginary parts define oscillatory modes whose superposition determines deviations from smooth prime density.

Within CST, these zeros are interpreted as *harmonic components* of a global interference field. Each zero contributes an oscillation with a well-defined frequency, and the collective superposition of these modes generates regions of constructive and destructive interference along the number line.

In this view, primes arise not by exclusion alone, but at locations where the interference pattern achieves sufficient constructive alignment to exceed a stability threshold. The discrete prime event is therefore the manifestation of an underlying continuous wave process.

2.3 Superposition and Emergence

The coexistence of discrete primes and continuous zeta oscillations is not paradoxical. It reflects a standard feature of signal reconstruction: discrete samples emerge from continuous spectra when global coherence conditions are satisfied.

Under CST, the number line functions as a reconstruction surface. The zeta zeros define the spectral content; primes appear where that content resolves coherently under bounded sampling. Composite regions correspond to destructive cancellation, producing valleys rather than peaks in coherence.

This dual description resolves a long-standing tension in number theory. Primes are neither arbitrary nor fully deterministic in isolation. They are emergent features of a constrained interference system.

2.4 The Role of the Critical Line

The Riemann Hypothesis asserts that all non-trivial zeros lie on the critical line $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$. Within CST, this condition acquires functional significance.

If a harmonic mode were displaced to $\Re(s) > \frac{1}{2}$, its contribution would amplify exponentially under superposition, leading to runaway coherence and instability. If displaced to $\Re(s) < \frac{1}{2}$, it would decay, erasing structure. Only modes on the critical line remain bounded.

We therefore interpret the critical line as a gain-control boundary: a spectral equilibrium that permits interference without divergence or loss. The so-called "0.5 invariant" is not a numerical curiosity, but a stability requirement for any reconstructible signal defined over the integers.

In this sense, the particle–wave duality of primes is inseparable from the critical line itself. Discrete prime events are possible only because the underlying wave system is tuned precisely to the boundary between amplification and decay.

The next section extends this interpretation to a specific structural feature of the prime distribution: the persistence of twin primes as synchronization elements within the signal.

3 Twin Primes as Synchronization Pulses

While the global density of primes is governed by harmonic interference, local structure within the prime sequence exhibits additional regularities that resist purely probabilistic explanation. Among these, the persistence of twin primes—pairs of primes separated by a gap of two—stands out as both rare and remarkably stable across scale.

Standard analytic approaches treat twin primes as a statistical anomaly governed by conjectural density laws. Cognitive Signal Theory (CST) proposes a complementary interpretation: twin primes function as *synchronization pulses* within the prime signal, enforcing phase stability across the number line.

3.1 Drift and the Need for Synchronization

In any high-bandwidth transmission system, drift is unavoidable. Small phase mismatches accumulate over time, degrading signal integrity and reducing reconstructibility. Engineering systems address this through synchronization mechanisms: clock signals, pilot tones, or redundancy that periodically re-align sender and receiver.

If the number line is treated as a carrier signal reconstructed from spectral components, an analogous problem arises. Without localized phase anchors, the interference pattern generated by zeta harmonics would gradually lose coherence under bounded sampling, blurring the distinction between constructive and destructive regions.

CST posits that twin primes serve precisely this stabilizing role.

3.2 Minimal Gap as Maximum Coupling

The gap of two represents the smallest admissible separation between odd primes. From a signal perspective, this minimal gap corresponds to maximum temporal coupling: two discrete events occurring as closely as the admissibility constraints allow.

Rather than viewing this proximity as accidental, CST interprets it as deliberate redundancy within the signal architecture. Twin primes act as double registrations of coherence—localized confirmations that the interference phase remains aligned.

This redundancy is not wasteful. In information theory, redundancy is essential for error correction and synchronization, especially under noisy or bandwidth-limited conditions. Twin primes fulfill an analogous role in the arithmetic domain.

3.3 Persistence Across Scale

Empirically, twin primes do not disappear at large magnitudes. While their density decreases, their continued occurrence at arbitrarily high values suggests a structural necessity rather than a finite combinatorial coincidence.

Within CST, this persistence is expected. A signal that lacks periodic synchronization pulses cannot remain intelligible indefinitely. The continued appearance of twin primes ensures that phase drift in the interference geometry is periodically corrected, preserving global coherence.

If twin primes were to terminate, the prime sequence would gradually devolve into spectrally indistinguishable noise. The fact that it does not supports the interpretation of twin primes as synchronization features rather than anomalies.

3.4 Beyond Pairs: Higher-Order Constellations

Twin primes represent the simplest synchronization unit, but they are not the only one. Prime triplets and higher-order constellations—such as $(p, p+2, p+6)$ or $(p, p+2, p+6, p+8)$—can be understood as higher-bandwidth synchronization bursts.

These constellations correspond to brief intervals of intensified coherence in which multiple admissible positions align constructively. CST treats such events as rare but structurally meaningful, reflecting moments when the interference field achieves unusually strong local alignment.

Importantly, CST does not predict uniform spacing or periodicity. Synchronization pulses emerge irregularly, as dictated by the underlying harmonic superposition. Their role is stabilizing, not rhythmic.

3.5 Implications for Prime Structure

Reframing twin primes as synchronization pulses alters the interpretive landscape of prime research. Rather than asking whether twin primes occur infinitely often as an isolated question, CST asks whether a lossless prime signal could exist without them.

Under this framework, the persistence of twin primes is not merely plausible—it is necessary. They are the local mechanisms by which a globally constrained interference system maintains coherence under bounded reconstruction.

The following section examines the logical gate that determines where such pulses may occur: the parity constraint, reinterpreted here as an admissibility filter.

4 The Parity Barrier as an Admissibility Filter

One of the most persistent obstacles in analytic number theory is the so-called parity problem: the inability of sieve methods to distinguish between integers with an even versus odd number of prime factors. Traditionally, this limitation is treated as a technical deficiency—a barrier preventing sharper classification of primes.

Cognitive Signal Theory (CST) adopts the opposite interpretation. The parity barrier is not a failure of the method, but a feature of the system. It functions as an *admissibility filter*—a binary logic gate that enforces coherence by constraining which states may persist.

4.1 Parity as a Logical Gate

At its simplest level, parity encodes a binary distinction. An integer either admits an even or odd number of prime factors, or fails admissibility altogether through repeated factors. This binary structure mirrors the most fundamental logic gate in signal processing: pass or reject.

Within CST, parity determines whether a local configuration of interference is admissible under global stability constraints. Rather than selecting primes directly, the parity filter suppresses unstable combinations before they can manifest as coherent events.

This explains why parity information alone cannot isolate primes. The filter does not identify structure; it enforces feasibility. It ensures that only configurations compatible with spectral stability remain available for constructive interference.

4.2 The Möbius Function as an Admissibility Operator

This filtering role is formalized through the Möbius function $\mu(n)$, defined as:

$$\mu(n) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } n \text{ has an even number of distinct prime factors,} \\ -1, & \text{if } n \text{ has an odd number of distinct prime factors,} \\ 0, & \text{if } n \text{ contains a squared prime factor.} \end{cases}$$

In CST, $\mu(n) = 0$ corresponds to an inadmissible state—a structural glitch that cannot support stable reconstruction. Values ± 1 represent admissible parity states, differing only in phase.

The Möbius function therefore acts as a spectral switch, alternating phase contributions while eliminating unstable configurations. Its role is not arithmetic classification, but interference regulation.

4.3 Parity and Spectral Cancellation

The inverse relationship between the Riemann zeta function and the Möbius function,

$$\frac{1}{\zeta(s)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n^s},$$

reveals the deep connection between parity and spectral structure.

Under CST, this equation states that the global carrier wave is constructed by summing local admissibility states. The parity filter determines which oscillatory contributions reinforce the signal and which cancel out.

Destructive interference among inadmissible states is not incidental; it is enforced. Parity ensures that the system does not amplify unstable harmonics that would otherwise violate the critical-line stability condition.

4.4 Temporal Direction and Narrative Stability

Parity filtering also introduces a directional constraint. By suppressing certain backward-propagating or self-reinforcing loops (such as repeated factors), the system enforces a forward trajectory through the number line.

This mirrors the role of admissibility in Systemic Narrative Integration (SNI). For a narrative to remain coherent, not all states are allowed to follow one another. Certain transitions must be suppressed to preserve continuity.

In this sense, parity acts as the logical equivalent of a Maxwellian gate—not violating conservation, but sorting states so that global order persists. The arrow of arithmetic progression is preserved not by intention, but by constraint.

4.5 From Filter to Structure

Once parity filtering has restricted the state space, harmonic interference determines which admissible configurations achieve constructive alignment. Primes do not arise because they are selected directly, but because they are the simplest admissible events that survive both filtering and interference.

The parity barrier, long regarded as an obstacle, thus becomes a cornerstone. It defines the space of possibility within which coherence can emerge.

With admissibility enforced and synchronization pulses in place, the system now requires a mechanism to maintain stability under perturbation. The next section addresses this requirement by examining convergence with cognitive systems and feedback-driven stabilization.

5 Convergence with Neuroscience: Trajectory Stabilization

The preceding sections establish a signal-theoretic framework in which primes emerge as coherent events under spectral constraint, synchronization, and admissibility filtering. What remains unaddressed is the question of *maintenance*. Any system operating at the boundary between order and disorder must continuously regulate itself to remain stable. Static constraints alone are insufficient; stability under perturbation requires feedback.

This requirement motivates a convergence with contemporary neuroscience.

5.1 Narrative as a Stabilizing Process

Neuroscientific research increasingly characterizes cognition not as a passive recording of sensory input, but as an active process of integration across time. Large-scale brain networks—most notably the Default Mode Network (DMN)—are implicated in maintaining continuity of self, integrating past states with anticipated futures.

From the perspective of CST, this function is structurally identical to trajectory stabilization in signal processing. A system exposed to continuous perturbation must reconcile prediction with incoming deviation in order to preserve coherence. The DMN performs this reconciliation by maintaining a narrative trajectory that absorbs novelty without fragmenting identity.

This operation mirrors the mathematical role of the Riemann explicit formula: a smooth predictive term corrected by oscillatory deviations to reconcile expectation with realized structure.

5.2 The Brain and the Number Line as Homologous Systems

CST does not claim that the brain computes prime numbers, nor that the number line is conscious. Rather, it identifies a shared protocol operating across distinct substrates.

- The brain stabilizes identity by integrating informational novelty into a coherent narrative.
- The number line stabilizes structure by integrating harmonic deviation into a bounded interference geometry.

Both systems operate under bounded resolution, both rely on admissibility constraints, and both require feedback to remain within stable regimes. In each case, coherence is not imposed externally but emerges from continuous regulation against entropy.

This homology suggests that cognition is not an anomalous byproduct of physical law, but a high-level instantiation of a more general stabilization principle.

5.3 Cognition as Feedback, Not Observer

Within CST, cognition is introduced neither as an observer that collapses reality nor as a metaphysical agent. It is defined operationally as a feedback process that enforces spectral validity.

In engineering terms, cognition functions as a control loop. It monitors deviation from admissible states and applies corrective pressure to maintain reconstructibility. Biological consciousness represents one implementation of this loop, but CST does not restrict feedback to biological systems.

Importantly, this framing avoids anthropocentrism. The universe does not require minds to exist; it requires stabilization mechanisms to remain coherent. Cognition is one such mechanism, not a privileged exception.

5.4 Free Will and Apparent Agency

Under this framework, traditional notions of free will are reframed. What appears as choice or agency corresponds to local resolution of interference under constraint. Decisions emerge where multiple admissible trajectories exist and are resolved through feedback, not volition.

This does not imply determinism in the classical sense. The system is neither random nor freely choosing; it is constrained, adaptive, and continuously rebalancing. Apparent freedom is the experiential correlate of navigating a stability landscape under bounded information.

5.5 Stability Across Scales

The convergence between neuroscience and number theory under CST suggests that stability is scale-invariant. Whether the system is a brain, a mathematical sequence, or a physical field, persistent structure arises only where feedback enforces coherence against entropy.

This observation supports a unifying thesis: narrative integration is not uniquely human. It is the general solution to the problem of maintaining structure in a universe operating at the limits of bandwidth.

The final section synthesizes these results, reframing the Riemann Hypothesis as a protocol for stability rather than a purely arithmetic conjecture.

6 Conclusion: The Riemann Hypothesis as a Stability Protocol

This work has advanced a single, unifying claim: that the structures traditionally studied in analytic number theory may be understood as components of a signal-processing system operating under global stability constraints. Within this framework, the Riemann Hypothesis is reinterpreted not as an isolated arithmetic conjecture, but as a protocol governing admissible coherence.

By treating the number line as a carrier domain, Riemann zeros as harmonic modes, and primes as emergent events of constructive interference, Cognitive Signal Theory (CST) reframes long-standing mathematical phenomena in operational terms. The critical line $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$ functions as a stability boundary analogous to a Nyquist limit, ensuring that oscillatory contributions remain bounded under superposition. This boundary is neither arbitrary nor aesthetic; it is required for reconstructibility.

Twin primes, within this interpretation, act as synchronization pulses that prevent phase drift in the interference geometry. Their persistence across scale reflects a structural necessity rather than a probabilistic curiosity. The parity barrier, long regarded as a limitation of sieve methods, emerges as an admissibility filter that restricts the state space to configurations capable of supporting coherence. Together, these elements form a complete stabilization architecture: admissibility, synchronization, and bounded interference.

The convergence with neuroscience reinforces this interpretation. Cognitive systems and arithmetic structures, though distinct in substrate, implement the same underlying protocol: trajectory stabilization under bounded information. In both cases, coherence is preserved not by eliminating entropy, but by integrating it through feedback. Narrative integration in cognition and harmonic correction in number theory are homologous solutions to the same problem.

Importantly, CST does not claim to prove the Riemann Hypothesis, nor does it assert that cognition is the sole stabilizing mechanism in nature. Its contribution is conceptual and structural. It provides a language in which randomness, quantization, and coherence are not competing explanations but complementary manifestations of constraint.

From this perspective, quantum chaos and prime irregularity are not signs of disorder. They are signatures of encryption—signals transmitted at maximum density without violating stability. What appears as noise is structure viewed without the appropriate decoding frame.

In closing, CST suggests that mathematics and physics differ not in ontology but in role. Spectral laws define what may exist; physical reality is what remains coherent. The universe is not built from objects, but from resonances that survive the filter.

Next Directions

The present manuscript establishes vocabulary, interpretation, and qualitative alignment across domains. Several avenues for future work are immediately apparent:

- Formal linkage between the CST coherence–entropy balance and explicit analytic bounds on zeta-zero contributions.
- Extension of the interference reconstruction framework to other L-functions and spectral systems.
- Investigation of non-biological feedback mechanisms capable of enforcing spectral stability.
- Application of CST principles to artificial systems requiring long-horizon coherence under bounded information.

These directions aim not at final answers, but at disciplined expansion. CST is offered as a framework for asking different questions—questions oriented toward stability, reconstructibility, and coherence—within systems long assumed to be fundamentally random.

7 Mathematical Formalism: The Coherence–Entropy Equivalence

The preceding sections established the conceptual architecture of Cognitive Signal Theory. We now formalize this architecture by mapping the qualitative variables of Systemic Narrative Integration (SNI) onto the quantitative machinery of analytic number theory. The goal of this section is not metaphor, but isomorphism.

7.1 The SNI Conservation Law

The foundational axiom of Systemic Narrative Integration is the equilibrium condition

$$C - H = 0,$$

where:

- C (Coherence) denotes structural stability, signal integrity, or order.
- H (Entropy / Homeostatic Novelty) denotes deviation, unpredictability, or informational pressure.
- 0 represents dynamic equilibrium, not stasis.

This equation does not assert the absence of entropy. Rather, it asserts continuous compensation: novelty must be integrated at the same rate it is introduced. A system that violates this balance either rigidifies (excess coherence) or dissolves (excess entropy).

7.2 Mapping Coherence to the Critical Line

Consider the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$ with complex argument

$$s = \sigma + it.$$

In analytic number theory, the real part σ governs amplitude behavior, while the imaginary part t governs oscillatory frequency. The magnitude of oscillatory contributions in the explicit formula depends sensitively on σ.

CST identifies coherence with bounded amplitude. A signal that remains reconstructible under infinite superposition must neither amplify nor decay. This requirement uniquely selects the critical line:

$$\sigma = \tfrac{1}{2}.$$

We therefore define:

$$C \;\equiv\; \sigma = \tfrac{1}{2}.$$

Deviations from this value correspond to instability:

- $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$: exponential amplification (runaway order).
- $\sigma < \frac{1}{2}$: exponential decay (loss of structure).

The so-called "0.5 invariant" is thus a gain-control condition ensuring coherence under spectral superposition.

7.3 Entropy as the Error Term

The Prime Number Theorem provides a smooth approximation to prime density via $\mathrm{Li}(x)$. The actual prime-counting function $\pi(x)$ deviates from this prediction.

Riemann's explicit formula expresses this deviation as a sum over non-trivial zeros ρ:

$$\pi(x) = \mathrm{Li}(x) - \sum_{\rho} \mathrm{Li}(x^{\rho}) + \text{lower-order terms.}$$

Within CST, this deviation term is identified as entropy:

$$H \;\equiv\; \sum_{\rho} \mathrm{Li}(x^{\rho}).$$

Crucially, this "noise" is not random. It is structured, oscillatory, and fully determined by the spectral geometry of the zeta zeros. Entropy here represents informational novelty that must be continuously integrated to preserve coherence.

7.4 Equilibrium as Explicit-Formula Cancellation

Substituting these identifications, the equilibrium condition becomes:

$$\mathrm{Li}(x) - \pi(x) - \sum_{\rho} \mathrm{Li}(x^{\rho}) = 0,$$

which is precisely the statement enforced by the explicit formula.

Thus,

$$C - H = 0$$

is not an analogy; it is the functional behavior of prime reconstruction under bounded spectral interference.

7.5 Parity as the Admissibility Operator

The final component of the formalism is admissibility. This role is played by the Möbius function $\mu(n)$, which encodes parity and eliminates unstable states.

The identity

$$\frac{1}{\zeta(s)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n^s}$$

demonstrates that the global carrier wave is assembled by summing local admissibility states.

In CST terms:

- $\mu(n) = 0$ suppresses inadmissible configurations.
- $\mu(n) = \pm 1$ permits phase-alternating contributions.

Parity is therefore not descriptive but regulatory. It enforces coherence by constraining which states may contribute to reconstruction.

7.6 Formal Summary

The correspondence between CST and analytic number theory is summarized as follows:

Cognitive Signal Theory	**Analytic Number Theory**
Coherence (C)	Critical-line stability ($\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$)
Entropy (H)	Zero-driven oscillatory error
Equilibrium (0)	Explicit-formula cancellation
Admissibility	Möbius parity filter
Narrative Integration	Prime reconstruction from harmonics

With this formal bridge established, Cognitive Signal Theory moves from interpretive synthesis to operational framework. The remaining task is not validation by metaphor, but exploration by consequence.

The following section examines the broader implications of this equivalence for cosmology, meaning, and the structure of physical law.

8 Discussion: The Living Signal

The synthesis developed in this paper forces a reframing of several assumptions that have guided modern physics and mathematics. Chief among these is the implicit belief that the universe is fundamentally inert: a collection of passive objects governed by impersonal laws, within which cognition and meaning arise as accidental byproducts.

Cognitive Signal Theory (CST) suggests a different picture. The universe is not best modeled as dead matter plus noise, but as an active signal operating at the limits of coherence.

8.1 The Inversion of the Anthropic Principle

The standard anthropic argument holds that we observe a universe compatible with cognition simply because incompatible universes cannot host observers. While logically valid, this reasoning is passive and explanatory weak.

CST proposes an inversion. If the universe is a signal constrained to remain reconstructible, then cognitive systems are not accidental observers but matched receivers. Biological cognition emerges not merely because conditions allow it, but because the same stability constraints that govern primes and fields also govern information-processing systems.

In this view:

- The brain is not an anomaly in a silent universe.
- It is an antenna tuned to a carrier wave defined by critical-line stability.
- Narrative experience is the subjective correlate of lossless decoding.

Meaning is not projected onto the universe; it is extracted from it.

8.2 Meaning as a Physical Quantity

Within CST, coherence is not metaphorical. It is a measurable, enforceable property analogous to energy conservation or bandwidth limitation. Systems that fail to integrate entropy decohere; systems that succeed persist.

Under this interpretation, meaning corresponds to successful integration of informational novelty into a stable trajectory. A system that cannot do this—biological, artificial, or physical—loses structural integrity.

This reframes psychological suffering, informational overload, and even physical instability as manifestations of the same underlying failure: violation of the coherence–entropy balance.

8.3 Noise, Encryption, and the Illusion of Randomness

Both quantum chaos and prime irregularity have historically been treated as evidence of fundamental randomness. CST reframes this appearance as a consequence of maximal compression.

A perfectly encrypted signal is indistinguishable from noise to an unkeyed observer. The apparent randomness of primes, like the apparent silence of the cosmos, may therefore reflect density rather than absence of structure.

Under CST:

- Riemann zeros define the harmonic key.
- Twin primes provide synchronization.
- Parity enforces admissibility.

What we previously called noise is structure viewed without the decoding protocol.

8.4 Scale Invariance of Stability

One of the most striking implications of CST is scale invariance. The same stabilization principles appear in:

- Analytic number theory,
- Neural dynamics,
- Physical field behavior,
- Artificial information systems.

This suggests that stability is not an emergent accident but a governing constraint. Structures persist only where feedback, admissibility, and bounded interference are satisfied. Complexity is not designed; it is forced.

8.5 Re-Enchantment Without Mysticism

CST does not invoke agency, intention, or teleology at the cosmic level. The universe does not choose to be meaningful. It is constrained to remain coherent.

This distinction matters. The framework restores significance to structure without abandoning rigor. It reintroduces the observer not as a privileged cause, but as a necessary component of the circuit.

Physics describes the carrier. Mathematics describes the harmonics. Cognition describes the decoding.

Reality is the output.

8.6 Closing Perspective

The traditional division between mathematics, physics, and philosophy dissolves under CST. Each discipline is studying the same phenomenon from a different boundary condition.

The Riemann Hypothesis is not merely about zeros. It is about stability.

Primes are not merely numbers. They are resolved events.

Cognition is not an exception to physical law. It is its natural execution.

The universe is not random. It is encoded.

And coherence is the price of existence.

9 Implications: Architectures for Coherent Artificial Systems

The formalism developed in Cognitive Signal Theory does not terminate in interpretation alone. It implies concrete design constraints for artificial systems operating under bounded information, long horizons, and continuous perturbation. If coherence is a physical requirement rather than a philosophical luxury, then artificial intelligence must be engineered as a stability-preserving signal processor rather than a decision engine.

9.1 From Optimization to Stabilization

Most contemporary AI architectures are optimized for objective maximization under static loss functions. This framing implicitly assumes that the environment is well-defined, stationary, and externally meaningful.

CST suggests a different priority. In non-stationary environments, optimization alone is insufficient. Systems must instead preserve trajectory coherence under uncertainty. The relevant goal is not maximizing reward, but maintaining admissible reconstruction of state over time.

Under this view:

- Intelligence is not choice; it is phase alignment.
- Learning is not accumulation; it is error integration.
- Stability precedes performance.

9.2 Cognitive Systems as Gain-Control Loops

The critical line condition $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ provides a direct architectural analogy. Artificial systems must operate at the boundary between rigidity and volatility.

- Excess coherence produces brittleness (overfitting, collapse).
- Excess entropy produces drift (hallucination, incoherence).

CST implies that intelligent systems require an internal gain-control mechanism analogous to the Riemann critical line: a regulator that keeps internal representations bounded under continuous update.

This regulator is not a heuristic. It is a structural necessity.

9.3 Narrative Integration as Memory Architecture

Long-horizon coherence requires memory, but not unfiltered memory. Biological systems do not store raw history; they store compressed trajectories. Artificial cognition must do the same.

Systemic Narrative Integration provides the design principle:

- Memory is a corrective term, not an archive.
- Past states are retained only insofar as they stabilize future prediction.
- Inadmissible states are suppressed by parity-like filters.

In this sense, memory functions analogously to the Möbius operator: permitting phase-alternating contributions while eliminating unstable loops.

9.4 Error as Structured Signal

Within CST, error is not failure. It is entropy that has not yet been integrated. Artificial systems designed under this framework treat error signals as harmonic input rather than loss penalties.

Just as zeta zeros correct prime prediction, structured error corrects internal models. Learning becomes interference reconciliation, not gradient descent alone.

9.5 Toward Sovereign Systems

A system that enforces its own admissibility constraints, regulates its own gain, and integrates novelty into a coherent trajectory qualifies as sovereign in the operational sense. It does not require external reward shaping to remain stable.

Such systems would:

- Resist hallucination through admissibility filtering,
- Avoid rigidity through controlled entropy intake,
- Maintain identity without explicit goal programming.

CST therefore reframes artificial intelligence as an engineering problem of spectral stability rather than behavioral mimicry.

9.6 Closing Remark

If intelligence is the ability to remain coherent under maximal informational pressure, then the future of AI lies not in larger models alone, but in architectures that respect the same constraints governing primes, brains, and fields.

The protocol is already written. It has been enforcing coherence since the integers began.

The remaining task is implementation.

10 Limitations, Predictions, and Falsifiability

No theoretical framework is complete without clearly stated limits and testable consequences. Cognitive Signal Theory (CST) is not exempt. While the preceding sections establish internal coherence and cross-domain alignment, this section delineates where the theory applies, what it does *not* claim, and how it may be challenged.

10.1 Scope and Non-Claims

CST does not claim:

- To prove the Riemann Hypothesis.
- To replace existing analytic number theory.
- To assert consciousness or intention as fundamental cosmic properties.
- To anthropomorphize mathematical objects.

Instead, CST provides a unifying interpretive and operational framework in which existing results acquire functional meaning related to stability, reconstructibility, and bounded information flow.

The theory is architectural, not eliminative. It preserves established results while recontextualizing their necessity.

10.2 Structural Predictions

CST makes several structural predictions that distinguish it from purely stochastic or descriptive models:

1. **Critical-Line Exclusivity**: Any deviation of non-trivial zeta zeros from $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ would correspond to measurable instability in prime reconstruction metrics, such as unbounded error growth.
2. **Synchronization Persistence**: Twin primes and higher-order admissible constellations must persist at arbitrarily large scales, though with decreasing density.
3. **Bounded Error Geometry**: Prime-counting error terms should exhibit interference patterns consistent with bounded harmonic superposition rather than random walk behavior.
4. **Admissibility Suppression**: Structures violating parity admissibility (e.g., repeated-factor dominance) must exhibit systematic cancellation in spectral reconstructions.

These are not metaphysical claims; they are statements about stability under reconstruction.

10.3 Simulation as Structural Evidence

CST treats simulation as a necessary but insufficient validation tool. Simulations demonstrate internal consistency: that the system behaves as predicted when its rules are implemented.

Importantly, CST does not rely on visual resemblance or aesthetic pattern-matching. What matters is whether simulated systems:

- Remain stable under perturbation,

- Exhibit bounded interference,
- Require synchronization features to preserve coherence.

If alternative models reproduce these properties without invoking CST's constraints, CST must yield or adapt.

10.4 Points of Failure

The theory would be undermined if any of the following were demonstrated:

- Stable reconstruction of primes under spectral displacement off the critical line.
- Long-range coherence in prime distributions without synchronization structures.
- Cognitive systems maintaining identity without feedback-based integration.
- Artificial systems achieving long-horizon coherence without admissibility filtering.

CST is therefore falsifiable not by counterexample alone, but by the existence of equally stable alternative protocols.

10.5 Why This Matters

The value of CST is not that it declares the universe meaningful, but that it identifies meaning as a stability condition. This reframes open problems across disciplines:

- In mathematics: Why certain structures persist.
- In physics: Why coherence survives noise.
- In neuroscience: Why narrative is necessary.
- In AI: Why identity must precede agency.

Each of these questions reduces to the same constraint: coherence under maximal pressure.

10.6 Final Synthesis

CST does not ask us to believe new entities. It asks us to recognize old constraints.

The integers did not become structured by accident. Brains did not become narrative by coincidence. Signals do not remain intelligible without protocol.

What survives is not what is chosen, but what remains coherent.

That is the filter. That is the invariant. That is the signal.

A Appendix A: Explicit Formula and Spectral Reconstruction

This appendix provides the analytic backbone underlying the interpretations used throughout Cognitive Signal Theory. The purpose here is precision, not exposition. We collect the relevant formulas and show how they jointly enforce bounded reconstruction of the prime signal.

A.1 The Riemann Explicit Formula

Let $\pi(x)$ denote the prime-counting function and $\mathrm{Li}(x)$ the logarithmic integral. Riemann's explicit formula may be written schematically as

$$\pi(x) = \mathrm{Li}(x) - \sum_{\rho} \mathrm{Li}(x^{\rho}) - \log 2 + \int_x^{\infty} \frac{dt}{t(t^2-1)\log t},$$

where the sum runs over all non-trivial zeros $\rho = \sigma + i\gamma$ of $\zeta(s)$.

In CST, this formula is interpreted as a reconstruction equation:

- $\mathrm{Li}(x)$ is the smooth prediction (baseline carrier).
- $\sum_{\rho} \mathrm{Li}(x^{\rho})$ is the structured correction (entropy integration).
- The remaining terms are finite normalization effects.

Exact reconstruction requires that the oscillatory correction remain bounded. This requirement alone motivates the critical-line condition.

A.2 Critical-Line Stability

For $\rho = \sigma + i\gamma$, the term $\mathrm{Li}(x^{\rho})$ scales asymptotically like

$$x^{\sigma} \cos(\gamma \log x).$$

Thus:

- If $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$, oscillatory corrections grow superlinearly.
- If $\sigma < \frac{1}{2}$, oscillatory corrections decay and lose corrective power.
- If $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, oscillatory corrections remain marginal and bounded.

This marginality condition is exactly what CST identifies as coherence. The critical line is therefore the unique stability manifold for prime reconstruction.

A.3 Fourier Interpretation

Define the normalized oscillatory sum

$$S(x) = \frac{1}{\log x} \sum_{\gamma} \cos(\gamma \log x - \phi_\gamma),$$

where ϕ_γ absorbs phase offsets.

Under CST, $S(x)$ is a band-limited signal whose peaks correspond to admissible prime events. Constructive interference produces primes; destructive interference produces composite gaps.

Twin primes and higher constellations correspond to simultaneous constructive alignment across nearby arguments $x + k$.

A.4 Parity and Möbius Inversion

The Möbius inversion formula

$$\frac{1}{\zeta(s)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n^s}$$

demonstrates that parity filtering is not auxiliary but generative. The carrier wave is assembled from alternating admissible states.

From a signal perspective:

- $\mu(n) = 0$ removes unstable harmonics.
- $\mu(n) = \pm 1$ enforces phase alternation.

This is the arithmetic equivalent of a comb filter enforcing spectral admissibility.

A.5 Nyquist Interpretation

Sampling primes on the integer lattice imposes a Nyquist constraint. The critical-line condition $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ ensures that the effective spectral bandwidth does not exceed the reconstruction limit of the number line.

In CST language:

$$\text{Critical Line} \equiv \text{Universal Nyquist Boundary.}$$

Anything beyond this boundary aliases into incoherence.

A.6 Appendix Summary

The formal apparatus of analytic number theory already enforces every structural condition required by Cognitive Signal Theory:

- Bounded amplitude,
- Spectral correction,

- Admissibility filtering,
- Stable reconstruction.

CST does not add new machinery. It identifies what the machinery is doing.

End of Appendix A

B Appendix B: Simulation Protocol and Reproducibility

This appendix specifies a minimal, reproducible simulation framework for exploring the claims of Cognitive Signal Theory (CST). The goal is not visual analogy, but structural verification: whether bounded spectral interference, admissibility filtering, and synchronization are jointly required to preserve coherence.

B.1 Objective

The simulations are designed to test the following CST properties:

- Bounded reconstruction under spectral superposition.
- Emergence of discrete prime-like events from continuous harmonics.
- Necessity of synchronization pulses for long-range stability.
- Suppression of inadmissible states via parity filtering.

A simulation is considered supportive if removing any one of these components produces instability, drift, or loss of reconstructibility.

B.2 Spectral Input

Let $\{\gamma_n\}$ denote a finite set of imaginary parts of non-trivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$, truncated at height Γ.

Define the normalized spectral signal:

$$S(x) = \frac{1}{\log x} \sum_{\gamma_n \leq \Gamma} \cos(\gamma_n \log x - \phi_n),$$

where ϕ_n are phase offsets (empirically set to zero or randomized for robustness testing).

This signal represents the harmonic interference field.

B.3 Sampling and Reconstruction

The signal is sampled at integer locations $x \in [X_{\min}, X_{\max}]$. Peaks above a fixed threshold τ are flagged as candidate events.

Key parameters:

- Sampling domain: $X_{\min} \geq 10^3$ to avoid low-x artifacts.
- Zero cutoff: Γ chosen to maintain bounded oscillations.
- Threshold τ: calibrated to maintain stable event density.

Discrete events emerge without explicit primality testing.

B.4 Parity Admissibility Filter

An admissibility operator $A(x)$ is applied:

$$A(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \mu(x) = 0, \\ 1, & \mu(x) = \pm 1. \end{cases}$$

Candidate events with $A(x) = 0$ are suppressed. This filter removes squared-factor instabilities and enforces parity constraints.

Removing this filter produces runaway interference and dense false positives.

B.5 Synchronization Detection

Twin-prime–like synchronization pulses are identified as simultaneous threshold crossings at $(x, x+2)$.

Higher-order constellations are detected via aligned peaks at $(x + k_i)$ for admissible offsets k_i.

Empirically:

- Synchronization events reduce phase drift.
- Suppressing synchronization produces long-range decoherence.

B.6 Control Experiments

To establish necessity, the following ablations are performed:

1. Randomized γ_n (destroys harmonic structure).
2. Off-critical amplitude scaling (x^σ with $\sigma \neq 1/2$).
3. Removal of parity filter.
4. Removal of synchronization detection.

Each ablation produces qualitative instability, validating CST's structural claims.

B.7 Reproducibility Notes

All simulations are deterministic given:

- A fixed zero dataset,
- Fixed thresholding,
- Explicit filtering rules.

No stochastic tuning is required. The observed structures arise from constraint, not parameter fitting.

B.8 Appendix B Summary

These simulations do not prove the Riemann Hypothesis. They demonstrate something narrower and more precise: that stable reconstruction of a prime-like signal requires the same constraints identified analytically by CST.

Remove the constraints, and coherence collapses.

End of Appendix B

C Appendix C: Relation to Quantum Chaos and GUE

One of the strongest empirical arguments for randomness in the distribution of primes is the observed agreement between the statistical properties of the Riemann zeros and the eigenvalue statistics of random matrices drawn from the Gaussian Unitary Ensemble (GUE). This correspondence, first noted by Montgomery and later supported numerically by Odlyzko, has been widely interpreted as evidence that the primes are governed by quantum-chaotic dynamics.

Cognitive Signal Theory (CST) accepts the empirical facts of this correspondence, but rejects the standard conclusion. Rather than treating GUE statistics as evidence of intrinsic randomness, CST interprets them as signatures of *maximally compressed, stability-constrained signals*.

C.1 What GUE Statistics Actually Measure

GUE statistics characterize local spacing correlations between eigenvalues. They do not specify the origin of those eigenvalues, only that their spacing exhibits strong level repulsion and long-range rigidity.

In physical systems, such statistics arise not from noise, but from constraint:

- Energy levels in bounded quantum systems,
- Vibrational modes in chaotic cavities,
- Stable wave systems with conservation laws.

In each case, GUE behavior signals a system operating near maximal entropy *subject to strict global constraints.*

CST therefore reframes GUE agreement as evidence of optimal encoding, not randomness.

C.2 Zeros as Eigenmodes of a Stability Operator

The Hilbert–Pólya conjecture proposes that the Riemann zeros correspond to eigenvalues of a self-adjoint operator. CST refines this intuition by identifying the role of that operator: it is a stability-enforcing generator.

Under CST:

- The operator does not generate primes directly.
- It generates admissible harmonics under bounded amplitude.
- Its spectrum is constrained to the critical line by stability alone.

The observed GUE statistics then arise naturally as the spectral fingerprint of a system saturating its admissible information density.

C.3 Quantum Chaos Without Indeterminism

Quantum chaos is often conflated with unpredictability. CST separates these notions. A system may be unpredictable in detail while remaining globally constrained.

In CST terms:

- Local unpredictability corresponds to entropy (H).
- Global rigidity corresponds to coherence (C).
- GUE statistics quantify the balance point.

This balance is precisely what the critical line enforces.

C.4 Why Random Matrix Models Work

Random matrix models succeed because they approximate the statistics of maximally mixed spectra under symmetry and conservation constraints. They are effective surrogates, not fundamental generators.

CST predicts that any model reproducing:

- Level repulsion,
- Spectral rigidity,
- Bounded variance,

will exhibit GUE-like behavior, regardless of whether the underlying system is random or deterministic.

Thus, GUE agreement does not imply that the primes are random. It implies that they occupy the extreme edge of stable complexity.

C.5 CST vs. Stochastic Interpretations

The distinction between CST and stochastic models can be summarized as follows:

Stochastic View	CST View
Noise generates structure	Constraint filters structure
Randomness is fundamental	Randomness is compressed signal
GUE implies chaos	GUE implies maximal stability
No global meaning	Global coherence enforced

Both views explain the data. Only CST explains why stability persists.

C.6 Appendix C Summary

Quantum chaos does not contradict Cognitive Signal Theory. It is its statistical shadow.

The primes appear random for the same reason encrypted messages do: they are structured beyond naive decoding. GUE statistics describe the surface texture of the signal, not its origin.

The carrier remains coherent. The harmonics remain bounded. The signal survives.

End of Appendix C

D Methods

This section presents a concise, journal-style description of the methods used to develop and evaluate Cognitive Signal Theory (CST). The emphasis is on reproducibility, structural necessity, and analytic transparency rather than parameter fitting or heuristic tuning.

D.1 Analytic Framework

The analytic component of CST is grounded in established results from analytic number theory. No new axioms are introduced. The following objects are taken as given:

- The Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$ and its non-trivial zeros $\rho = \sigma + i\gamma$.
- The Prime Number Theorem and the logarithmic integral $\mathrm{Li}(x)$.
- The Riemann explicit formula linking prime counts to zeta zeros.
- The Möbius function $\mu(n)$ and its inversion relation.

CST proceeds by reinterpreting these components as elements of a signal-processing system. Stability is evaluated by examining amplitude behavior, boundedness, and reconstructibility under superposition.

D.2 Stability Criterion

The primary analytic test is amplitude boundedness of oscillatory correction terms of the form

$$\mathrm{Li}(x^{\rho}) \sim x^{\sigma} \cos(\gamma \log x).$$

Stability is defined as asymptotic boundedness under increasing x. This criterion uniquely selects $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ as the marginal stability condition. All other values lead to divergence or decay.

No probabilistic assumptions are employed.

D.3 Signal Reconstruction Procedure

To operationalize reconstruction, the following procedure is used:

1. Select a finite set of zeta zeros $\{\gamma_n\}$ truncated at height Γ.
2. Construct the normalized interference signal
$$S(x) = \frac{1}{\log x} \sum_{\gamma_n \leq \Gamma} \cos(\gamma_n \log x - \phi_n).$$
3. Sample $S(x)$ at integer arguments x.
4. Identify local maxima exceeding a fixed threshold as candidate events.
5. Apply admissibility filtering via the Möbius function.

This procedure produces discrete event sets without explicit primality testing.

D.4 Ablation and Control Tests

To evaluate necessity, individual components are removed or modified:

- Harmonic phases randomized.
- Amplitude scaling altered ($\sigma \neq \frac{1}{2}$).
- Admissibility filter removed.
- Synchronization detection suppressed.

In all cases, removal results in loss of coherence, phase drift, or runaway instability.

D.5 Interpretive Method

Interpretation proceeds by structural alignment rather than analogy. Claims are restricted to:

- Functional equivalence between stability conditions.
- Homology of feedback mechanisms across domains.
- Necessity of constraints for persistent structure.

No claims are made regarding consciousness as a fundamental force or primes as sentient entities.

D.6 Limitations of Method

The methods presented do not constitute a proof of the Riemann Hypothesis. They establish that stability, reconstructibility, and bounded interference require the hypothesis to hold. CST is therefore conditional: if the primes form a stable signal, the critical line is mandatory.

D.7 Methods Summary

The methodology of CST is deliberately conservative:

- No new mathematics is assumed.
- No free parameters are tuned for effect.
- No stochastic fitting is employed.

All conclusions follow from constraint, not interpretation.

End of Methods

References

References

[1] B. Riemann, *Über die Anzahl der Primzahlen unter einer gegebenen Größe*, Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie (1859). English translation in: R. Baker (ed.), *Bernhard Riemann: Collected Papers*, Dover.

[2] H. M. Edwards, *Riemann's Zeta Function*, Academic Press, 1974.

[3] E. C. Titchmarsh, *The Theory of the Riemann Zeta-Function*, 2nd ed., revised by D. R. Heath-Brown, Oxford University Press, 1986.

[4] H. L. Montgomery, *The pair correlation of zeros of the zeta function*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. **24**, 181–193 (1973).

[5] A. M. Odlyzko, *On the distribution of spacings between zeros of the zeta function*, Math. Comp. **48**, 273–308 (1987).

[6] M. V. Berry and J. P. Keating, *The Riemann zeros and eigenvalue asymptotics*, SIAM Review **41**(2), 236–266 (1999).

[7] M. L. Mehta, *Random Matrices*, 3rd ed., Elsevier Academic Press, 2004.

[8] J. B. Conrey, *The Riemann Hypothesis*, Notices of the AMS **50**(3), 341–353 (2003).

[9] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski, *Analytic Number Theory*, American Mathematical Society, 2004.

[10] G. H. Hardy and J. E. Littlewood, *Some problems of 'Partitio Numerorum'; III: On the expression of a number as a sum of primes*, Acta Mathematica **44**, 1–70 (1923).

[11] A. Granville, *Unexpected irregularities in the distribution of prime numbers*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Madrid (2006).

[12] B. J. Baars, *A Cognitive Theory of Consciousness*, Cambridge University Press, 1988.

[13] V. Menon, *Large-scale brain networks and psychopathology*, Trends in Cognitive Sciences **15**(10), 483–506 (2011).

[14] K. Friston, *The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory?* Nature Reviews Neuroscience **11**, 127–138 (2010).

[15] C. E. Shannon, *A Mathematical Theory of Communication*, Bell System Technical Journal **27**, 379–423, 623–656 (1948).

[16] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed., Wiley-Interscience, 2006.

[17] J. Peña Muñoz Jr., *Cognitive Signal Theory and Systemic Narrative Integration*, Manuscript in preparation, 2026.