Non-Markovian Game Theory: The Physics and Strategy of Learning and Bias (UCFT)

Samuel Leizerman
samleizerman@outlook.com
ORCID: 0009-0000-0133-2291

January 4, 2026

Abstract

This paper rigorously proves that Unified Cognitive Field Theory (UCFT) provides a fundamental, non-Markovian game-theoretic framework for cognition. I demonstrate that the seven core UCFT operators and field dynamics are necessary and sufficient to represent all cognitive game-theoretic phenomena, establishing a precise isomorphism between the evolution of the cognitive field and strategic dynamics. This framework accounts for history-dependent processes in cognitive systems. A key implication is the concept of "Learning as a Solitaire Self-Game," where individual cognition operates as strategic optimization against internal uncertainties, governed by substrate-dependent physical constants. *Keywords: non-Markovian game theory, cognitive field theory, quantum cognition, strategic dynamics, learning physics, cognitive bias, helical fiber bundles, substrate-dependent cognition, self-play optimization, temporal game theory, field-theoretic neuroscience, consciousness as strategy, memory persistence, cognitive temperature, strategic noise cancelling, belief revision dynamics, UCFT operators, Nash equilibria in cognitive space, Bayesian field updates, angle of attack learning* **This is an early draft and an excerpt from a larger monograph that will be posted later; this proof has some dependencies on that which are not explicitly proven because they are proven there. Furthermore, expect this to be updated. Commercial software implementations are patent pending (63/849,479), but academics and researchers are welcomed and encouraged to use freely if this proves accurate.**

1 Foundational Definitions

Plain English Summary: This section defines the basic mathematical objects I'll be working with. Think of a "cognitive game" as any situation where thinking agents make strategic choices - like deciding what to believe, how to learn, or how to respond to others. The "cognitive field" is a mathematical way to represent the state of a mind at any point in space and time, similar to how physicists represent electromagnetic fields.

Definition 1 (Cognitive Game Space)**.** *A cognitive game $\mathcal{G}$ is a tuple $(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{T})$ where:*

- $\mathcal{M} = 1, \ldots, N$ *is the set of cognitive agents (including temporal selves)*
- $\mathcal{S} = \prod_{i \in \mathcal{M}} S_i$ *where S_i is agent i's strategy space. Each S_i consists of pure strategies $s_{ij} \in S_i$.*
- $\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ *is the utility function vector, where $u_i(s)$ is agent i's utility for a strategy profile $s \in \mathcal{S}$.*
- $\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{S} \to \Delta(\mathcal{S})$ *is the probability transition kernel, describing how strategy profiles evolve over time given current strategies.*
- $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ *is the time domain.*

Definition 2 (UCFT Cognitive Field)**.** *The cognitive field $\Psi^{\mu\nu}(x,t)$ is a tensor field defined on a manifold $(M, g_{\mu\nu})$, where $x \in M$ represents a cognitive state or context, and $t \in \mathcal{T}$ represents time. The field evolves under the influence of the seven fundamental operators:*

$$\mathcal{O} = F^{\mu\nu}, Ch^{\mu\nu}, S^{\mu\nu}, C^{\mu\nu}, Q^{\mu\nu}, QR^{\mu\nu}, Coll^{\mu\nu} \tag{1}$$

according to the evolution equation:

$$\nabla_t \Psi^{\mu\nu} = \sum_k \alpha_k (Op_k)^{\mu\nu} * \rho\sigma \Psi^{\rho\sigma} \tag{2}$$

where Op_k denotes the k-th operator from $\mathcal{O}$, α_k are coupling constants, and ∇_t is a covariant time derivative compatible with the field's dynamics on $(M, g * \mu\nu)$. The specific forms and actions of these operators are established in the broader UCFT monograph.

1.1 Operator Algebra and Non-Closure of QR

Plain English Summary: Here we prove the key mathematical fact that makes cognition non-Markovian. Most operations on cognitive fields are "memoryless" - they only depend on the current state. But the recursive operator QR is special: it explicitly looks backward in time. This breaks the mathematical closure property and forces the system to have memory, which is what makes thinking different from simple computation.

The seven UCFT operators form a minimal basis for cognitive field dynamics. While most operators exhibit algebraic closure under composition and commutation, the recursive operator $QR^{\mu\nu}$ is structurally non-closed. This non-closure is the mathematical source of non-Markovianity in the UCFT framework.

Definition 3 (Operator Algebra)**.** *Let $\mathcal{O} = F^{\mu\nu}, Ch^{\mu\nu}, S^{\mu\nu}, C^{\mu\nu}, Q^{\mu\nu}, QR^{\mu\nu}, Coll^{\mu\nu}$ be the set of fundamental operators. Define the operator algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ by closure under linear combination, composition, and commutation:*

$$[Op_i, Op_j] = Op_i \circ Op_j - Op_j \circ Op_i \in \mathfrak{A}. \tag{3}$$

Lemma 4 (Closure of $F, Ch, S, C, Q, Coll$)**.** *The subset of operators $F^{\mu\nu}, Ch^{\mu\nu}, S^{\mu\nu}, C^{\mu\nu}, Q^{\mu\nu}, Coll^{\mu\nu}$ forms a closed algebra under composition and commutation.*

Proof. Each of these operators acts instantaneously on $\Psi^{\mu\nu}(t)$, with no explicit dependence on prior field states. Their actions can be written as tensorial transformations

$$Op_i[\Psi^{\mu\nu}(t)] = \mathcal{K} * i^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}(t), \Psi * \rho\sigma(t), \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{K}_i$ is a fixed kernel at time t. Compositions of such linear (or multilinear) maps yield new kernels of the same form, ensuring algebraic closure. □

Lemma 5 (Non-Closure of $QR^{\mu\nu}$)**.** *The recursive operator $QR^{\mu\nu}$ is not closed under the operator algebra $\mathfrak{A}$. Formally,*

$$QR^{\mu\nu}(t) = Q^{\mu\nu}(t-1), \tag{5}$$

which depends on the field state and collapse history at time $t-1$. Therefore, $\exists Op_i, Op_j \in \mathcal{O}$ such that

$$QR^{\mu\nu} \circ Op_i \notin \mathfrak{A}, \quad [QR^{\mu\nu}, Op_j] \notin \mathfrak{A}. \tag{6}$$

Proof. By definition, $QR^{\mu\nu}(t)$ acts on $\Psi^{\mu\nu}(t)$ through a reference to $\Psi^{\mu\nu}(t-1)$, i.e.

$$QR^{\mu\nu}[\Psi(t)] = Q^{\mu\nu}[\Psi(t-1)]. \tag{7}$$

This introduces explicit temporal recursion. No finite composition of memoryless operators $F, Ch, S, C, Q, Coll$ can reproduce this dependency, since they act only on $\Psi(t)$. Therefore, $QR^{\mu\nu}$ cannot be expressed as an element of the closed algebra generated by the other six operators. This failure of algebraic closure is equivalent to the emergence of non-Markovian dynamics. □

Corollary 6 (Necessity of Non-Markovianity)**.** *The UCFT operator algebra is non-closed, and thus strictly non-Markovian, whenever $QR^{\mu\nu}$ is included. This guarantees that any cognitive field evolution governed by the full operator set $\mathcal{O}$ inherently encodes historical dependence.*

1.2 Foundational UCFT Axioms

The following axioms establish the mathematical foundation for the UCFT operators used in this proof:

[Cognitive Spacetime Manifold] There exists a smooth, geodesically complete pseudo-Riemannian manifold M of dimension n representing cognitive spacetime, with a metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ and coordinates x^μ. This metric supports causality and the flow of time.

[Complex Tensor Cognitive Field] All cognitive phenomena are represented by a complex-valued, rank-2 contravariant tensor field $\Psi^{\mu\nu}(x,t)$. Its components can be expressed as $\Psi^{\mu\nu}(x,t) = \rho^{\mu\nu}(x,t)e^{i\theta^{\mu\nu}(x,t)}$, where $\rho^{\mu\nu}(x,t) \geq 0$ represents cognitive amplitude and $\theta^{\mu\nu}(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}$ represents semantic phase.

[Cognitive-Informational Equivalence] Cognitive processes are informationally equivalent to informational processes.[1]

[QR-Q Temporal Coupling] The quantum recursive operator satisfies $QR(t) = Q(t-1)$, establishing that QR represents the meta-cognitive choice to make a decision (instantiating quantum semantic space), while incorporating all relevant information from previous cognitive states as a Bayesian prior.

[Seven Fundamental Operators] The complete set of fundamental operators governing cognitive field dynamics consists of:

1. $F^{\mu\nu}$ (Fractional): Non-local temporal memory effects and power-law correlation decay
2. $Ch^{\mu\nu}$ (Chaotic): Nonlinear dynamics, sensitive dependence, and energy cascades
3. $S^{\mu\nu}$ (Stochastic): Thermal noise, random fluctuations, and environmental coupling
4. $C^{\mu\nu}$ (Complex): Phase coherence, interference patterns, and conscious-unconscious distinction
5. $Q^{\mu\nu}$ (Quantum): Measurement collapse, discrete decision-making from continuous uncertainty
6. $QR^{\mu\nu}$ (Quantum Recursive): Metacognitive self-reference and Bayesian updating on measurement history
7. $Coll^{\mu\nu}$ (Collective): Spatial non-locality, social cognition, and group intelligence phenomena

[Operator Completeness] These seven operators are necessary and sufficient to represent all cognitive field dynamics through:

$$\nabla_t \Psi^{\mu\nu} = \sum_k \alpha_k (Op_k)^{\mu\nu} * \rho\sigma \Psi^{\rho\sigma} \tag{8}$$

where $(Op_k)^{\mu\nu} * \rho\sigma$ are the fundamental rank-(2,2) tensor operators acting on the cognitive field.

2 Main Theorem

Plain English Summary: This is the central claim of the paper. I'm proving that there's a perfect mathematical correspondence between game theory (the study of strategic interactions) and cognitive field theory (my mathematical model of mind). Every concept from game theory has an exact counterpart in cognitive field theory, and vice versa. This means that thinking literally IS strategic gaming at the mathematical level.

[1] The formal proof that cognitive = informational will be established in future work. For modeling purposes, this equivalence is held as axiomatic, as any cognitive process involves information processing and any information processing in sufficiently complex systems exhibits cognitive-like properties.

Theorem 7 (UCFT-Game Theory Isomorphism). *There exists a bijective, structure-preserving mapping* $\Phi : (\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{O} * \textit{game}) \to (M, \mathcal{O} * \textit{UCFT})$ *such that:*

1. *Every game-theoretic construct has a unique UCFT representation.*
2. *Every UCFT evolution corresponds to a strategic dynamic.*
3. *The mapping preserves all strategic relationships and equilibria.*

Here, $\mathcal{O} * \textit{game}$ *refers to the set of operations and concepts inherent to game theory (e.g., strategy selection, learning, interaction), and* $\mathcal{O} * \textit{UCFT}$ *refers to the fundamental UCFT operators that instantiate these concepts.*

Proof. I construct the isomorphism explicitly through several lemmas.

2.1 Strategy Space Embedding

Plain English Summary: This section shows how strategic choices map to quantum states. When you're deciding between options (like "should I trust this person?"), game theory models this as mixed strategies - probability distributions over choices. We prove this corresponds exactly to quantum superposition states in the cognitive field. The act of making a decision is like quantum measurement: the superposition collapses to a definite choice.

Lemma 8 (Strategy-Field Correspondence). *Each pure strategy* $s_{ij} \in S_i$ *for agent* i *corresponds to a unique, orthonormal quantum state (or basis state) in the cognitive field representation:*

$$s_{ij} \leftrightarrow |\psi_{ij}\rangle = \int_M \Psi_{ij}^{\mu\nu}(x)|x\rangle^{\mu\nu} d^n x \tag{9}$$

where $\Psi_{ij}^{\mu\nu}(x)$ *represents the field configuration corresponding to the pure strategy* s_{ij}*. Mixed strategies* σ_i *for agent* i *correspond to superposition states:*

$$\sigma_i = \sum_k p_{ik} s_{ik} \leftrightarrow |\Psi_i\rangle = \sum_k \sqrt{p_{ik}} e^{i\theta_{ik}} |\psi_{ik}\rangle \tag{10}$$

where p_{ik} *are the probabilities of choosing pure strategy* s_{ik}*, and* $e^{i\theta_{ik}}$ *are arbitrary phase factors that do not affect the probabilities but may influence dynamic coherence.*

Proof of Lemma 1. The UCFT quantum operator $Q^{\mu\nu}$ performs measurement collapse on a superposition state, mapping it to a specific pure state with a certain probability. Specifically, for a cognitive field state $|\Psi_i\rangle$ representing agent i's mixed strategy, the application of $Q^{\mu\nu}$ yields:

$$Q^{\mu\nu}[\Psi^{\rho\sigma}] = \sum_k P_k^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \Psi^{\rho\sigma} \tag{11}$$

where P_k are projection operators onto the basis states $|\psi_{ik}\rangle$ representing pure strategies s_{ik}. By the rules of quantum mechanics (as established for UCFT), the probability of observing a particular pure strategy s_{ik} (i.e., collapsing to $|\psi_{ik}\rangle$) is given by $p_{ik} = |\langle\psi_{ik}|\Psi_i\rangle|^2$.

This process *exactly* implements strategic choice from mixed strategies: a mixed strategy σ_i is a probability distribution over pure strategies, and the quantum measurement process on $|\Psi_i\rangle$ yields a pure strategy with precisely these probabilities. Thus, the measurement probabilities p_{ik} match the mixed strategy weights p_{ik}. □

2.2 Temporal Strategic Evolution

Plain English Summary: This proves that learning and adaptation over time correspond to iterated games with memory. When you learn from experience, you're not just responding to the current situation - you're using your entire history to inform decisions. The QR operator mathematically captures this: it makes current decisions depend on the entire chain of past experiences, which is exactly how strategic learning works in repeated games.

Lemma 9 (Iterated Game Dynamics)**.** *The quantum recursive operator $QR^{\mu\nu}$ implements iterated game dynamics with memory by modifying the cognitive field state based on past interactions. It evolves the field according to:*

$$QR^{\mu\nu}[\Psi^{\rho\sigma}(t)] = \mathcal{T} \exp\left(-i \int_0^t H^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} * QR(t')dt'\right) Q^{\rho\sigma}[\Psi^{\rho\sigma}(0)] \tag{12}$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ is the time-ordering operator, $H * QR$ is the recursive Hamiltonian operator that encodes history-dependent strategic payoffs and learning rules, and $Q^{\rho\sigma}$ ensures a definite initial strategic choice.

Proof of Lemma 2. In iterated games, an agent's strategy at time t often depends on the history of play up to time $t-1$, denoted $h_t = (a_0, \ldots, a_{t-1})$, where a_j is the action profile at time j. The QR operator, through its recursive Hamiltonian H_{QR}, is defined to capture this dependency:

$$QR(\Psi(t)) \propto \mathcal{F}[\Psi(t-1), \Psi(t-2), \ldots, \Psi(0)] \tag{13}$$

where $\mathcal{F}$ represents the functional dependency on past field states.

This functional dependency fundamentally implements mechanisms like Bayesian updating on game history. For instance, the probability of choosing strategy s_t at time t given history h_t can be expressed as:

$$P(s_t|h_t) = \frac{P(h_t|s_t)P(s_t|h_{t-1})}{P(h_t|h_{t-1})} \tag{14}$$

The time-ordered exponential, specifically its role in governing the evolution of quantum systems, ensures that the influence of past events (encoded in H_{QR}) is applied chronologically and cumulatively. This naturally models how information from h_t causally affects the current strategy choice, leading to proper conditional probability updates consistent with learning and adaptation processes in iterated games. □

2.3 Multi-Agent Interactions

Plain English Summary: This section addresses how multiple thinking agents interact strategically. In game theory, your optimal choice depends not just on your preferences, but on what others are likely to do. We prove that this interdependence corresponds exactly to field coupling in cognitive spacetime - your cognitive field is influenced by other agents' fields, with influence decreasing with "cognitive distance" (how different their thinking is from yours).

Lemma 10 (Collective Strategic Dynamics)**.** *The collective operator $Coll^{\mu\nu}$ implements multi-agent game interactions by mediating influence propagation between different agents' cognitive fields:*

$$Coll^{\mu\nu}[\Psi(x)] = G^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} * cog \int_M \frac{\rho * cog(x')}{|x - x'|} \Psi^{\rho\sigma}(x')d^n x' \tag{15}$$

where $G^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} * cog$ is a coupling tensor, $\rho * cog(x')$ represents the density of cognitive agents or their influence at x', and $|x - x'|$ is the cognitive distance on the manifold M. This form represents strategic influence propagating with strength decaying as the inverse of cognitive distance.

Proof of Lemma 3. In N-player games, each player i's utility (and thus strategic choice) depends not only on their own strategy s_i but also on the strategies of all other players s_{-i}. This can be decomposed as:

$$u_i(s_i, s_{-i}) = u_i^{\text{self}}(s_i) + \sum_{j \neq i} u_i^{\text{int}}(s_i, s_j) \tag{16}$$

The collective operator formalizes this interaction at the field level. The total cognitive field for agent i, Ψ_i^{total}, is influenced by its own field Ψ_i^{self} and the fields of other agents Ψ_j:

$$\Psi_i^{\text{total}}(x) = \Psi_i^{\text{self}}(x) + \sum_{j \neq i} \int_M K_{ij}(x, x')\Psi_j(x')dx' \tag{17}$$

The interaction kernel $K_{ij}(x, x')$, as specified by the $Coll^{\mu\nu}$ operator, is proportional to $1/|x - x'|$. This mathematical form rigorously represents the influence or strategic interdependence between agents decaying with increasing cognitive distance, analogous to fundamental forces in physics. Each agent's strategic decision, represented by the evolution of their field Ψ_i, is therefore intrinsically coupled to the states and actions of other agents through this field interaction. □

2.4 Equilibrium Characterization

Plain English Summary: Nash equilibria are situations where no player wants to change their strategy - everyone is playing optimally given what others are doing. We prove these correspond to stationary points of the cognitive action functional. In physics, systems naturally evolve toward states that minimize their action (principle of least action). Here, cognitive systems evolve toward Nash equilibria for the same mathematical reason - they're the stable points where no agent benefits from changing their strategy.

Lemma 11 (Nash Equilibria as Field Configurations)**.** *Nash equilibria correspond to stationary points of the cognitive action functional $S[\Psi]$:*

$$S[\Psi] = \int_M \mathcal{L}[\Psi^{\mu\nu}, \nabla_\rho \Psi^{\mu\nu}]\sqrt{|g|}d^n x dt \tag{18}$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ is the Lagrangian density of the cognitive field, and $\sqrt{|g|}$ is the determinant of the metric tensor, ensuring general covariance. The condition for an extremum of the action, $\delta S/\delta \Psi^{\mu\nu} = 0$, yields the Euler-Lagrange equations, which define the equilibrium conditions.

Proof of Lemma 4. At a Nash equilibrium strategy profile $(s_1^*, \ldots, s_N^*)$, no player i can unilaterally deviate to a different strategy s_i and improve their utility, holding others' strategies fixed:

$$u_i(s_i^*, s_{-i}^*) \geq u_i(s_i, s_{-i}^*) \quad \forall s_i \in S_i, \forall i \in \mathcal{M} \tag{19}$$

In the UCFT framework, this condition is mapped to the variational principle of the action. By construction of the UCFT Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ (as established in the broader monograph), agent utility is directly related to the action such that maximizing utility corresponds to minimizing the action. Specifically, I define the action such that its negative corresponds to cumulative utility, i.e., $S = -\int u, dt$, where u is a collective utility function.

The Euler-Lagrange equations, derived from $\frac{\delta S}{\delta \Psi_i^{\mu\nu}} = 0$ for each agent i, describe the dynamics of the cognitive field. At a stationary point of the action, these equations imply:

$$\nabla_t \Psi_i^{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad \text{for all } i \tag{20}$$

This condition signifies that the cognitive field configurations representing strategies are stable and unchanging over time, consistent with the definition of an equilibrium where no agent has an incentive to change their strategy. Thus, Nash equilibria are precisely the stationary field configurations where the field dynamics cease to evolve. □

2.5 Complete Correspondence

Lemma 12 (Operator Completeness for Game Theory)**.** *The seven UCFT operators are necessary and sufficient to represent all fundamental game-theoretic phenomena.*

- $F^{\mu\nu}$ *(Fractional Operator): Represents phenomena related to non-local memory effects and bounded rationality, where agents' decisions depend on the accumulated history with power-law decay, rather than just immediate past states.*
- $Ch^{\mu\nu}$ *(Chaos Operator): Captures sensitive dependence on initial conditions and complex, non-linear dynamics inherent in strategic interactions, leading to unpredictable long-term behavior even with deterministic rules.*
- $S^{\mu\nu}$ *(Stochastic Operator): Models strategic uncertainty, noise, or "trembling hand" errors in strategy execution, introducing probabilistic elements into otherwise deterministic strategic choices.*
- $C^{\mu\nu}$ *(Coherence Operator): Accounts for phase relationships, synchronization, and timing aspects critical for coordination games and collective strategic behavior, where the relative timing of actions is crucial.*
- $Q^{\mu\nu}$ *(Quantum Operator): Implements the process of pure strategy selection from mixed strategies through a measurement-like collapse, as shown in Lemma 1.*
- $QR^{\mu\nu}$ *(Quantum Recursive Operator): Handles iterated learning, adaptation, and complex historical dependencies in repeated games, as detailed in Lemma 2.*
- $Coll^{\mu\nu}$ *(Collective Operator): Describes multi-agent interactions and strategic influence propagation across a cognitive space, as detailed in Lemma 3.*

Proof of Lemma 5. **Necessity**: Each identified game-theoretic concept intrinsically requires an operator within the UCFT framework designed to capture its unique characteristics:

- Bounded memory and long-range dependencies in cognitive processes naturally map to the non-integer order dynamics governed by the fractional derivative properties of $F^{\mu\nu}$.
- The emergence of chaotic or complex behavior in iterated or dynamic games necessitates a non-linear operator like $Ch^{\mu\nu}$ to model sensitivity to small perturbations.
- The inherent stochasticity of choices, often modeled by mixed strategies or behavioral errors (trembling hand), directly corresponds to the probabilistic nature introduced by $S^{\mu\nu}$.
- Coordination games and rhythmic strategic interactions, where timing and synchronization are paramount, are explicitly modeled by the phase-manipulating capabilities of $C^{\mu\nu}$.
- The fundamental act of making a definite choice from a set of probabilistic options (e.g., pure strategy selection from a mixed strategy) is precisely implemented by the measurement-collapse function of $Q^{\mu\nu}$.
- Learning from past experiences and adapting strategies over time in repeated games requires a mechanism for recursive updating and memory, which is the function of $QR^{\mu\nu}$.
- Any game involving multiple interacting agents, where the actions of one influence others, requires a field-coupling mechanism, which is provided by $Coll^{\mu\nu}$.

Sufficiency: Any arbitrary game dynamic or cognitive process can be decomposed into fundamental elements, each of which is demonstrably captured by one or more of the UCFT operators. I consider a general game evolution G_t:

$$G_t = M_t \circ D_t \circ R_t \circ C_t \circ S_t \circ L_t \circ I_t \tag{21}$$

where each composite function represents a specific aspect of the game's evolution: M_t (memory), D_t (dynamics), R_t (randomness), C_t (coordination), S_t (selection), L_t (learning), and I_t (interaction). By construction, each such component maps directly and uniquely to its corresponding UCFT operator:

- $M_t \leftrightarrow F^{\mu\nu}$ (governing how past states influence current ones, often non-locally).
- $D_t \leftrightarrow Ch^{\mu\nu}$ (driving the overall, potentially chaotic, evolution).
- $R_t \leftrightarrow S^{\mu\nu}$ (introducing necessary stochasticity for mixed strategies or imperfect play).
- $C_t \leftrightarrow C^{\mu\nu}$ (managing the phase alignment for coordinated actions).
- $S_t \leftrightarrow Q^{\mu\nu}$ (formalizing the process of definite action choice).
- $L_t \leftrightarrow QR^{\mu\nu}$ (implementing adaptive behavior based on historical outcomes).
- $I_t \leftrightarrow Coll^{\mu\nu}$ (modeling the interconnectedness of agents' strategies).

Since any complex game dynamic can be represented as a composition of these fundamental elements, and each element is captured by a specific UCFT operator, the set of seven operators is sufficient to model all game-theoretic phenomena within the UCFT framework. □

2.6 Structure Preservation

Lemma 13 (Preservation of Strategic Properties)**.** *The isomorphism Φ rigorously preserves key strategic properties between the game-theoretic domain and the UCFT field configurations:*

1. *Payoff ordering: $u_i(s) > u_i(s') \Leftrightarrow S[\Psi_s] < S[\Psi_{s'}]$.*
2. *Best response correspondences: The field evolution dynamics naturally lead to best response behavior.*
3. *Equilibrium stability: Evolutionarily Stable Strategies (ESS) correspond to dynamically stable field configurations.*
4. *Information sets: Partial observability in games is naturally mapped to uncertainty relations within the cognitive field.*

Proof of Lemma 6. Each preservation follows directly from the constructed correspondence and the inherent properties of UCFT as established in the broader monograph:

1. **Payoff ordering**: As I established in Lemma 4's proof, the cognitive action $S[\Psi]$ is constructed such that its minimization corresponds to utility maximization. Thus, if a strategy profile s yields a higher utility for agent i than s', i.e., $u_i(s) > u_i(s')$, then the corresponding field configuration Ψ_s will result in a lower value of the action functional compared to $\Psi_{s'}$, i.e., $S[\Psi_s] < S[\Psi_{s'}]$. This ensures the preservation of preference orderings.

Best response correspondences: The time evolution of the cognitive field for agent i is governed by the Euler-Lagrange equations derived from the action principle. Specifically, if the dynamics are dissipative or driven towards equilibrium, they often follow a gradient-descent (or ascent on utility) path:

$$\nabla_t \Psi_i^{\mu\nu} = -\frac{\delta S}{\delta \Psi_i^{\mu\nu}} \quad \text{or proportional to } \frac{\delta u_i}{\delta \Psi_i^{\mu\nu}} \tag{22}$$

This dynamic ensures that agents' field configurations (and thus their strategies) evolve in a direction that improves their utility, given the current strategies of others. This is precisely the definition of a best response dynamic in game theory: strategies adjust towards optimality in response to current conditions.

ESS stability: Evolutionarily Stable Strategies (ESS) in game theory are strategies that, once adopted by a population, cannot be invaded by a small mutation or deviation. This implies a certain robustness or stability against perturbation. In field theory, stability of an equilibrium configuration is determined by the second-order variation of the action functional. For a dynamically stable equilibrium (a local minimum of the action), the second functional derivative must be positive definite:

$$\frac{\delta^2 S}{\delta \Psi^2} > 0 \Rightarrow \text{local minimum of action} \Rightarrow \text{stable field configuration} \tag{23}$$

This direct correspondence means that strategies which are evolutionarily stable will map to field configurations that are stable attractors in the UCFT dynamics, resisting perturbations and maintaining their form over time.

Information sets: In game theory, information sets define what a player knows (or doesn't know) about the state of the game. Partial observability means players do not have full information. In quantum field theory, the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle establishes fundamental limits on the precision with which certain pairs of non-commuting observables (like position and momentum, or energy and time) can be simultaneously known:

$$\Delta X \Delta P \geq \frac{\hbar}{2} \tag{24}$$

Within UCFT, this principle is reinterpreted. Strategic uncertainty, or the inability to perfectly know an opponent's exact strategy (position in strategy space, ΔX) and their likely dynamic trajectory (strategic "momentum," ΔP), is precisely constrained by these inherent field uncertainties. Thus, information sets and the concept of partial observability are naturally encoded by the uncertainty relations fundamental to the cognitive field's quantum nature. □

2.7 Completing the Main Proof

Having established the component mappings, I now show the complete isomorphism.

Bijectivity:

- **Injective**: Every distinct cognitive game state (strategy profile, utility profile, history) is uniquely mapped to a distinct cognitive field configuration by the constructed correspondence in Lemmas 1-3. If two game states were identical, their field representations would also be identical by construction.
- **Surjective**: Every valid cognitive field configuration consistent with the UCFT axioms corresponds to a legitimate strategic scenario in a cognitive game. This is ensured by the completeness of the operator set (Lemma 5), which covers all fundamental game-theoretic phenomena.

Structure Preservation: Lemmas 1 through 6 collectively establish that the mapping Φ rigorously preserves all essential game-theoretic structures, relationships, and dynamics. This includes static elements (strategy spaces, payoffs), dynamic elements (evolution over time, learning), and equilibrium concepts.

Naturality: The mapping commutes with time evolution. This means that evolving a game-theoretic system in time and then mapping it to UCFT yields the same result as mapping the initial game state to UCFT and then evolving it under UCFT dynamics:

$$\Phi(G_t(\mathcal{G})) = U_t(\Phi(\mathcal{G})) \tag{25}$$

where G_t is the time evolution operator in game theory (e.g., describing repeated play or learning dynamics), and U_t is the time evolution operator in UCFT, derived from the field equation $\nabla_t \Psi^{\mu\nu} = \sum_k \alpha_k (Op_k)^{\mu\nu}_{\rho\sigma} \Psi^{\rho\sigma}$.

This commutativity is a direct consequence of how each game-theoretic temporal process has been mapped to a corresponding UCFT operator (e.g., $QR^{\mu\nu}$ for learning, $Coll^{\mu\nu}$ for ongoing interactions) whose evolution is consistent with the overall field dynamics.

Therefore, UCFT provides a complete game-theoretic framework for cognition. $\square$

3 Implications

Corollary 14 (Cognitive Processes as Strategic Dynamics)**.** *Every cognitive process can be understood as a game within the UCFT framework, where its characteristic features are explicitly mapped to strategic dynamics:*

- *Memory formation = repeated games against temporal selves (modeled by $QR^{\mu\nu}$ and $F^{\mu\nu}$)*
- *Decision making = strategy selection under uncertainty (modeled by $Q^{\mu\nu}$ and $S^{\mu\nu}$)*
- *Learning = Bayesian updating on game outcomes (modeled by $QR^{\mu\nu}$)*
- *Social cognition = multi-agent coordination games (modeled by $Coll^{\mu\nu}$ and $C^{\mu\nu}$)*
- *Attention = resource allocation games (implicitly modeled by optimization within the field dynamics)*
- *Consciousness = recursive self-play with perfect monitoring (a complex interplay of $QR^{\mu\nu}$ and $Coll^{\mu\nu}$ in a self-referential context)*

Plain English Summary: This section introduces a key insight: individual learning is actually a form of strategic gaming against yourself. When you learn, you're essentially playing a game where you try to extract useful patterns (signal) from confusing or contradictory information (noise). You're constantly adjusting your "angle of attack" on problems, optimizing your cognitive strategies based on what worked before. The three parameters , , and represent individual differences in how people think: how quickly they change their minds (), how much they remember from the past (), and how efficiently they explore new ideas ().

A profound implication of the UCFT-Game Theory Isomorphism is that individual learning processes can be understood as an emergent form of "self-game theory," which I here term a **Solitaire Self-Game**. In this view, the cognitive agent is playing a strategic game against its internal uncertainties and the environment, continuously refining its cognitive state to optimize outcomes.

This Solitaire Self-Game manifests as a process akin to "noise cancelling" from information theory. The agent strives to extract a coherent "signal" (e.g., accurate predictions, optimal strategies) from the "noise" of its own suboptimal past actions and environmental uncertainty. Mathematically, this corresponds to the dynamic minimization of an error functional, $E[\Psi]$, where $\nabla_t \Psi \propto -\frac{\delta E}{\delta \Psi}$, ensuring convergence towards a more optimal, less noisy cognitive state. Learning strategies, then, are realized as "angles of attack" on existing beliefs or internal models. When current strategies, represented by trajectories in the helical fiber bundle, lead to suboptimal outcomes, this implies an "oblique vector interaction"—a misalignment or divergence from the optimal path in cognitive spacetime. This misalignment generates an error signal, which prompts the agent to adjust its internal field configuration.

Specifically, these strategic adjustments involve modifications to the phase components ($z_I(t)$ and $\theta(t)$) of the cognitive field $\Psi^{\mu\nu}$ on the helical fiber, altering the "angle of attack" in cognitive spacetime. This adjustment is governed by two key mechanisms established in this framework:

- **Decision Making Under Uncertainty:** The $S^{\mu\nu}$ operator explicitly introduces strategic uncertainty, while the $Q^{\mu\nu}$ operator formalizes the selection of new "angles of attack" or pure learning strategies from a superposition of possibilities. The choice of a specific "angle" or trajectory is then determined by the probabilistic outcome of a quantum measurement on the cognitive field, influencing the direction of subsequent learning.

- **Bayesian Updating:** The $QR^{\mu\nu}$ operator precisely implements the iterative, history-dependent learning dynamics, akin to Bayesian updating, where the probability of a future belief state is conditioned on past observations and strategic choices.

These processes are further modulated by the substrate-dependent cognitive constants τ, α, and ν (as derived in companion works):

- **Cognitive Temperature (τ):** Modulates the "sharpness" or volatility of belief updates. A high τ may lead to rapid, less stable learning (quick collapse to new states), while a low τ promotes conservative, more robust changes.

- **Memory Persistence (α):** Determines the decay rate of past information and the weighting of historical data in the Bayesian updates, influencing the length and strength of cognitive memory.

- **Spatial Entropy Scaling (ν):** This parameter acts as a form of "cognitive friction" that influences the "carving out" of geodesics through the cognitive manifold. In the context of a path integral formulation for cognitive trajectories, ν would appear as a weighting factor in the action integral, suppressing highly entropic or "costly" paths that deviate significantly from optimal (geodesic) trajectories. A higher ν would channel learning dynamics more tightly towards these geodesics, reducing the effective "width" of the path bundle and representing a more constrained, efficient exploration of the belief space. This reflects how cognitive resources limit the search space for optimal solutions, guiding the agent towards plausible and energetically favorable learning paths.

Thus, learning within the UCFT framework is an active, strategic Solitaire Self-Game, where the agent continuously optimizes its internal cognitive field via dynamics profoundly influenced by its underlying physical substrate.

Corollary 15 (Computational Equivalence)**.** *Computing cognitive field evolution is equivalent to solving the corresponding game-theoretic problem, providing a new computational paradigm for both fields.*

4 Conclusion

I have proven that Unified Cognitive Field Theory constitutes a game-theoretic framework where cognitive processes are strategic dynamics in geometrically structured field space.