The Riemann Hypothesis: A 165-Year Pseudo-Problem

0.5emHow Circular Reasoning Created the Greatest Illusion in Mathematics How Circular Reasoning Created the Greatest Illusion in Mathematics

Pooria Hassanpour
Independent Researcher & Creator of Reflective Number Theory (RNT)
0.5emhttps://github.com/POORIA1https://github.com/POORIA1

October 2025

Abstract

The Riemann Hypothesis (RH) is not a deep mystery of number theory—it is a structural illusion emerging from circular prime definition. By constructing reflective mappings within number sets, we reveal that the so-called ``nontrivial zeros'' are artifacts of an incomplete dimensional framework, not features of reality. This paper shows that when sets of numbers are defined with internal reflective consistency (as in Reflective Number Theory, RNT), the zeta function's analytic continuation no longer exhibits paradoxical zeros. The supposed problem dissolves once the foundation is redefined.

1 Why Do We Create Sets of Numbers?

We construct sets because certain numbers share common properties, and studying those shared features allows us to discover laws that govern them more easily. Whenever we form a set based on shared characteristics, we, in fact, create a new dimension of space and time—one in which many laws of other dimensions may no longer apply. Each dimension sustains laws of its own nature.

Now, if during this process of set construction, we make exceptions and include numbers that do not share the essential nature of that set, we have committed what may be called **the murder of the set**. Because coherence and lawfulness are born only from structural consistency.

Example. Everyone who can count to the number of their own fingers can answer this question:

> We have a set of four numbers, formed based on shared characteristics. Which of the following belongs to a truly coherent set?

$$(A)2,3,5,7(B)1,3,5,7$$

The answer is (A). Because ``1'' does not share the same internal generative property as the others. Prime structure is born of indivisibility and reflective balance, and ``1'' breaks that symmetry. This single deviation—placing 1 among primes—initiated a 165-year cascade of definitional confusion culminating in the Riemann Hypothesis.

2 The Root of the Illusion

The Riemann Hypothesis arises from a self-referential misalignment in the definition of primes and the analytic continuation of $\zeta(s)$. When the base structure of number theory ignores reflective parity, it generates analytic artifacts that mimic “zeros” in the complex plane.

Let the classical zeta function be defined as:

$$\zeta(s)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n},\mathfrak{R}(s)>1.$$

By analytic continuation, this is extended to the entire complex plane except $s=1$.

However, note the contradiction: if the series includes $n=1$, we have already introduced a non-reflective entity into a system meant to represent harmonic proportionality of primes. Thus, every continuation of $\zeta(s)$ implicitly carries a logical impurity from $n=1$ onward.

3 Reflective Number Theory (RNT) and the Mapping $R_a(x)$

In RNT, each number x is defined within a reflective mapping relative to an anchor a:

$$R_a(x)=2a\text{-}x.$$

This mapping expresses the fundamental symmetry of number space — every element has a reflective complement maintaining equilibrium about a.

The zeta function, redefined under RNT, becomes:

$$\zeta_R(s)=\sum_{p\in_0}\frac{1}{p^s}\sum_{p'\in R_a(_0)}\frac{1}{p'},$$

where $_0$ is the Reflective Prime Set. Here, “zeros” of ζ_R represent equilibrium points, not vanishing amplitudes. Thus, the so-called “critical line” is a reflection symmetry line, not a locus of mystery.

4 The Circular Prime Definition

The classical definition of prime relies on divisibility within the same set it defines. That is, primes are defined as numbers with no divisors among other numbers *except* themselves and 1 — yet both the divisor set and the defined set reference each other. This circularity infects the entire analytical framework.

> A system cannot reveal truth about itself when its defining rules depend on its own undefined members.

Hence, the Riemann Hypothesis is a **pseudo-problem**, born of a circular prime definition. Once primes are redefined under a non-self-referential reflective structure, the analytic pathologies disappear.

5 Dimensional Reinterpretation

Each numerical set forms a distinct dimension of arithmetic space. If primes are one such dimension, then $\zeta(s)$ merely measures energy fluctuations between the prime dimension and its reflective complement.

The "critical line" $\Re(s)=12$ is, in RNT, the point of perfect reflective equilibrium:

$$R_{1/2}(s)=1\text{-}s.$$

Thus, the nontrivial zeros are nothing but resonance points of perfect balance between s and 1-s — a geometric condition, not a mystery.

6 Resolution: No Hypothesis Remains

When analyzed under the Reflective Zeta Framework, we find:

$$\forall s\in,\zeta_R(s)=0 s=R_{1/2}(s).$$

But $s=R_{1/2}(s)$ reduces to $s=\frac{1}{2}$ — the line of self-reflection. Thus, all so-called nontrivial zeros collapse to the definition of symmetry itself. No hypothesis remains to be proven.

7 Philosophical Implication

Mathematics has long believed it was studying numbers, when in truth it has been studying reflections of its own axioms. RNT reveals that *structure precedes substance* — and that when structure becomes self-consistent, paradox vanishes.

The Riemann Hypothesis was never an unsolved problem of numbers; it was an unsolved problem of definition.

8 Conclusion

When the unity between structure and reflection is restored, mathematics ceases to chase its own shadow. The Reflective Prime System provides a self-contained, axiom-free foundation in which zeta equilibrium replaces zero-hunting. What remains is not the Riemann Hypothesis, but the realization that the universe of numbers is itself a mirror — infinite, self-consistent, and awake.

Pooria Hassanpour
Creator of Reflective Number Theory
Paris, October 2025