Information-Theoretic Analysis of Audible Binary Transmission via Rhythmic Vocalization

Daniel Kliewer

A Formal Treatment of Human Vocalization as a Reversible Encoding Channel

---

Abstract

We present a complete information-theoretic analysis of a reversible encoding system that maps binary data through Morse code and phonetic syllables to audible rhythmic transmission. This work formalizes the channel capacity, error characteristics, and cognitive properties of human vocalization when employed as a data transmission medium. We demonstrate that the system achieves lossless encoding through exploitation of temporal structure rather than spectral content, and that rhythmic redundancy functions as an organic error-detecting mechanism without explicit parity calculation. The analysis reveals fundamental constraints on human-mediated information channels and establishes design principles for cognitive-optimized encoding schemes.

---

1. Introduction and Formal Problem Statement

1.1 Channel Definition

Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote the human vocal-auditory channel, characterized by:

- **Input alphabet**: $\mathcal{A}_{\text{in}} = 0, 1$ (binary)
- **Output alphabet**: $\mathcal{A}_{\text{out}} = \text{acoustic waveforms}$
- **Encoder**: $E : \mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}^* \to \mathcal{S}$ (binary to syllable sequence)
- **Decoder**: $D : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}^*$ (syllable sequence to binary)
- **Constraint**: $D(E(x)) = x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}^*$ (lossless)

The central question: **What is the effective channel capacity of $\mathcal{H}$ under cognitive constraints, and how can encoding be optimized for this specific channel?**

1.2 Distinction from Traditional Coding Theory

Standard communication theory assumes:

- Electronic transmission
- Arbitrary symbol manipulation
- Random access to encoded data
- Noise characterized by Gaussian or burst statistics

Human channels violate all these assumptions:

- Biological transmission mechanism
- Cognitive constraints on symbol processing
- Sequential access only
- Noise dominated by memory decay and attention failure

This necessitates a fundamentally different encoding strategy.

---

2. The Encoding Transform

2.1 Formal Layer Specification

The encoding proceeds through three bijective mappings:

Layer 1: Binary to Morse

$$M : \mathcal{A}_{\text{in}}^* \to \mathcal{M}$$

where $\mathcal{M} = \cdot, -^*$ with standard International Morse Code mapping. This layer introduces temporal expansion but preserves information exactly.

Layer 2: Morse to Phonemes

$$P : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{S}$$

where:

$$P(\cdot) = \text{"ти"}$$

$$P(-) = \text{"та"}$$

The choice of phonemes satisfies three formal requirements:

1. **Acoustic distinguishability**: $d_{\text{perceptual}}(\text{"ти"}, \text{"та"}) > \theta_{\min}$ where $\theta_{\min}$ is the minimum perceptual threshold for reliable discrimination
2. **Temporal equivalence**: $t(\text{"ти"}) \approx t(\text{"та"})$ to preserve rhythmic structure
3. **Language independence**: Phonemes exist in intersection of common phonological inventories

Layer 3: Phonemes to Rhythm

$$R : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{T}$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ represents temporal sequences with explicit pause structure:

- Syllable: duration τ_s
- Letter boundary: pause τ_l where $\tau_l > \tau_s$
- Word boundary: pause τ_w where $\tau_w > \tau_l$

2.2 Reversibility Theorem

Theorem 1: The composite mapping $R \circ P \circ M$ is injective (one-to-one).

Proof: Each component mapping is defined to be bijective within its domain:

- M is the standard Morse encoding (proven reversible)
- P maps distinct Morse symbols to distinct phonemes (bijective by construction)
- R preserves all phonemic and temporal boundary information

Therefore the composition is injective, and $D = M^{-1} \circ P^{-1} \circ R^{-1}$ exists. ∎

---

3. Channel Capacity Analysis

3.1 Theoretical Capacity Under Perfect Conditions

For the human vocal channel, capacity is limited not by bandwidth but by temporal resolution and memory.

Proposition 1: The maximum information rate $_{\mathcal{H}}$ is bounded by:

$$_{\mathcal{H}} \ \text{lo} \, \mathcal{S}_{\min}$$

where:

- $\mathcal{S} =$ (binary alphabet after phoneme mapping)
- $_{\min}$ is the minimum discriminable temporal unit

For typical speech, $_{\min} \approx 100\text{ms}$, yielding:

$$_{\mathcal{H}} \ 1\text{it}100\text{ms} = 10\text{itssec}$$

This is the absolute upper bound. Cognitive constraints reduce this significantly.

3.2 Practical Capacity with Cognitive Loading

Human working memory capacity is finite. Miller's seminal work establishes approximately chunks. For our system, each Morse letter constitutes a chunk.

Proposition 2: Sustainable transmission rate $_{\text{practical}}$ must satisfy:

$$_{\text{practical}} \; \mathcal{H}1 \; \cdot \, _{\text{conitive}}$$

where:

- is cognitive overhead coefficient
- $_{\text{conitive}}$ is fractional cognitive load from encoding/decoding

Empirically, $_{\text{practical}} \approx \; -$ bits/sec for untrained operators, rising to 5-7 bits/sec with extensive training.

3.3 Comparison to Electronic Morse

Traditional radiotelegraph Morse achieves 20-30 words per minute (wpm) for trained operators:

$$_{\text{morse}} \approx 0\text{wpm} \;\; \text{carswor} \;\; 1\text{itscar}0\text{sec} \approx \text{itssec}$$

The audible transmission system achieves comparable rates, confirming that the bottleneck is cognitive processing of temporal patterns rather than acoustic transmission.

---

4. Error Characteristics and Detection

4.1 Human Channel Noise Model

Unlike Gaussian noise in electronic channels, human errors follow distinct patterns:

Memory decay: $P(\text{error}t) = 1 - {}^{-t}$ where t is time since encoding and is decay rate.

Substitution errors: Dominated by phonetically similar substitutions, not random bit flips.

Insertion/deletion: Rare due to rhythmic structure enforcement.

4.2 Rhythm as Implicit Error Detection

The key innovation is rhythm's dual function as both carrier and error detector.

Theorem 2 (Perceptual Error Salience): Let be a valid encoded sequence with established rhythm period . Any perturbation where $t - \; >$ for syllable is perceptually salient with probability $> 1 -$ where decreases with training.

Proof sketch: Human auditory processing includes specialized mechanisms for beat tracking and temporal expectation. Violations of established periodicities activate prediction error signals in the brain (neurologically localized to cerebellum and superior temporal gyrus). This is not learned encoding-specific knowledge but an intrinsic property of the auditory system.

The encoding exploits this by ensuring valid messages have consistent temporal structure, making deviations perceptually obvious without explicit error-checking computation. ∎

4.3 Comparison to Algorithmic Error Detection

Traditional error-detecting codes add explicit redundancy:

Parity bit: 1 redundant bit per data bits **CRC**: redundant bits providing -1 detectable error patterns **Hamming code**: $\mathrm{lo}(\ 1)$ parity bits for data bits

The rhythmic system provides error detection with zero additional bits. The "redundancy" exists in the temporal domain rather than the symbol domain.

Let R_{smol} be symbol redundancy:

$$R_{\text{smol}} = {}_{\text{total}} - {}_{\text{ata}\,\text{total}}$$

For this system: $R_{\text{smol}} = 0$

However, temporal redundancy R_{temporal} is non-zero:

$$R_{\text{temporal}} = t_{\text{transmission}} - t_{\text{minimum}} t_{\text{transmission}}$$

The system trades bit rate for error detectability while maintaining lossless encoding—a distinct tradeoff space from traditional codes.

---

5. Cognitive Information Theory

5.1 Memory as Lossy Compression

Human memory does not preserve information with bit-level accuracy. We must model it as a lossy channel:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{uman}} : x \to x$$

where represents memory distortion.

The encoding must be robust against specific memory failure modes:

1. **Gestalt preservation**: Humans remember patterns, not sequences
2. **Boundary sensitivity**: Chunk boundaries are preserved better than internal structure

3. **Rhythmic anchoring**: Temporal patterns resist decay

Proposition 3 (Cognitive Optimality): An encoding E is cognitive-optimal if it maps information to memory-stable features while maintaining reversibility.

The audible system achieves this by encoding information in rhythm (memory-stable) rather than arbitrary symbols (memory-unstable).

5.2 Learning Complexity

Let (E) be the learning complexity of encoding E, measured as time-to-proficiency.

For arbitrary symbol codes: $(E_{\text{aritrar}}) = (\mathrm{lo} \;)$ where is alphabet size.

For this system: $(E_{\text{rtmic}}) = (1)$ because:

- Only 2 phonemes
- Rhythm is innate to human cognition
- Pattern recognition is automatic

Theorem 3 (Learnability): The audible transmission system is learnable in constant time with respect to message length, unlike traditional encryption or compression schemes.

Proof: The complete encoding rule set requires learning exactly 2 symbol mappings plus 3 boundary rules. This is independent of corpus size or message length. Therefore $(E_{\text{rtmic}}) = (1)$. ∎

---

6. Information-Theoretic Optimality

6.1 Entropy Preservation

For a binary source with entropy ():

$$() = - \quad (x) \, \mathrm{lo} \, (x)$$

The encoding preserves entropy exactly:

$$(E()) = ()$$

because the mapping is bijective. No information is created or destroyed.

6.2 Conditional Entropy and Context

However, human processing benefits from low conditional entropy. Given previous symbols, what is the uncertainty about the next symbol?

For random binary: $(_{11}, ,) = 1$ bit

For encoded Morse: $(_{11}, ,) \;\; 1$ bit due to language statistics

For rhythmic encoding: Additional temporal context reduces conditional entropy further:

$$(_{11}, , ,_1, ,) \;\; (_{11}, ,)$$

where represents temporal information.

6.3 Kolmogorov Complexity Considerations

The minimum description length of the encoding algorithm is:

$$(E) = (1)$$

This is remarkably small—the entire encoding can be specified in a few lines. Compare to modern compression algorithms:

- **LZW**: $(E) = ()$ where is dictionary size
- **Huffman**: $(E) = (\mathrm{lo})$ where is alphabet size
- **Arithmetic coding**: $(E) = ()$ for probability model

The simplicity is not accidental. It's a direct consequence of the constraint that humans must internalize the algorithm without external reference.

---

7. Comparison to Standard Encoding Schemes

7.1 Morse Code Alone

Standard Morse achieves compression through variable-length encoding:

$$E_{\text{orse}} \;\; E_{\text{inar}}$$

where E represents expected code length for English text (approximately 1.5 bits per character vs. 8 bits for ASCII).

The audible system maintains this compression while adding a cognitive layer.

7.2 Phonetic Alphabets (NATO, etc.)

These map characters to words: A → "Alpha", B → "Bravo"

Critical difference: Phonetic alphabets are mnemonics, not encodings. They do not support arbitrary binary data and are not reversible without lookup tables.

The audible system is formally reversible and supports any binary input.

7.3 Binary Encodings (Base64, Hex, etc.)

These expand binary data for transmission through constrained channels:

Base64: 6 bits → 8 bits (expansion factor 1.33) **Hexadecimal**: 4 bits → 8 bits (expansion factor 2.0) **Audible system**: 1 bit → 1 syllable + timing (expansion factor depends on syllable duration)

The audible system's expansion factor is higher, but it's the only one that operates in the acoustic domain without requiring text intermediary.

---

8. Formal Properties and Theorems

8.1 Completeness

Theorem 4 (Completeness): The encoding system can represent any binary string of finite length.

Proof: By construction, Morse code is complete for alphanumeric characters. The phonetic layer preserves all Morse distinctions. The rhythmic layer preserves all phonetic and boundary information. Therefore the composite mapping is surjective onto the space of encodable messages. ∎

8.2 Uniqueness of Decoding

Theorem 5 (Unique Decodability): Every valid acoustic sequence has exactly one binary decoding.

Proof: Follows from injectivity (Theorem 1). Since the encoding is one-to-one, the decoding is necessarily unique. ∎

8.3 Error Propagation Bounds

Theorem 6 (Local Error Containment): A single syllable error affects at most one Morse symbol, which affects at most one character.

Proof: By construction, boundaries are explicitly encoded through pauses. An error in syllable can corrupt the Morse symbol containing it, but cannot affect adjacent symbols due to temporal separation. In the worst case, one character is lost or corrupted. ∎

This is superior to block codes where a single bit error can corrupt an entire block.

8.4 Temporal Complexity

Theorem 7: Encoding and decoding are $()$ where is message length in bits.

Proof:

- Binary to Morse: $()$ (each bit processed once)
- Morse to phonemes: $()$ (each Morse symbol processed once)
- Phonemes to rhythm: $()$ (each phoneme processed once)

Decoding is the reverse process with same complexity. ∎

---

9. Limitations and Theoretical Bounds

9.1 Shannon Limit

The Shannon-Hartley theorem establishes:

$$= \mathrm{lo}\left(1\ \right)$$

For human speech:

- Bandwidth ≈ 000 Hz
- Signal-to-noise ratio in quiet environment: ≈ 0 dB

This gives theoretical capacity $\approx 0,000$ bits/sec.

However, this assumes:

- Arbitrary use of frequency domain
- Random access to transmitted symbols
- Instantaneous processing

None of these hold for cognitive channels. The actual constraint is not Shannon capacity but cognitive processing rate, which is 3-4 orders of magnitude lower.

9.2 Memory Capacity Bounds

Working memory can hold approximately $M =$ chunks. For our encoding:

$$_{\mathrm{ma}} \approx M\ l$$

where l is average Morse symbol length. This bounds reliable message length without external aids to approximately 50-100 bits.

For longer messages, the system requires either:

- Chunking into sub-messages
- External memory augmentation
- Training to increase effective M

9.3 Error Rate Analysis

Experimental data (from original 2016 testing) suggests:

Untrained: Error rate ≈ 01 per character **Trained (< 10 hours)**: ≈ 00 per character **Trained (> 50 hours)**: ≈ 001 per character

This is substantially higher than electronic Morse (0001 typical) but acceptable for low-criticality applications.

---

10. Cognitive Affordances and Design Principles

10.1 Alignment with Neural Architecture

The system succeeds because it aligns with known properties of human auditory processing:

1. **Temporal binding**: The auditory cortex naturally segments continuous sound into discrete units based on temporal gaps
2. **Beat perception**: The cerebellum extracts periodic structure automatically
3. **Phonemic categorization**: Language processing areas map continuous acoustics to discrete phoneme categories
4. **Working memory rehearsal**: The phonological loop maintains verbal information through subvocal repetition

These are not learned capabilities but intrinsic features of neural architecture. The encoding exploits rather than fights them.

10.2 Design Principles for Cognitive Codecs

From this analysis, we derive general principles:

Principle 1 (Perceptual Distinctness): Symbols should map to perceptually distinct features with maximum discriminability.

Principle 2 (Temporal Structure): Information should be encoded in timing relationships, which are inherently sequential and resistant to random access errors.

Principle 3 (Minimal Alphabet): Cognitive load increases with alphabet size. Minimize symbols; maximize structure.

Principle 4 (Implicit Error Detection): Leverage perceptual systems to detect errors without explicit calculation.

Principle 5 (Learnability Constraint): Total encoding rules must be internalizable in working memory.

10.3 Optimality Claims

Claim: The audible transmission system is Pareto-optimal in the space of (bit rate, error rate, learnability).

Argument: Any increase in bit rate (more symbols, faster pace) increases error rate and decreases learnability. Any decrease in error rate (more redundancy, slower pace) decreases bit rate. Any decrease in learnability (complex rules, large alphabet) increases error rate for human operators.

The current design sits at an equilibrium point where these three objectives are balanced.

---

11. Extensions and Generalizations

11.1 Error Correction Layer

The system currently provides error *detection* through rhythm but not error *correction*. A natural extension:

Add explicit redundancy through repetition:

$$E_{\text{reunant}}(x) = E(x) \;\; E(x) \;\; E(x)$$

This enables majority voting at decode:

$$D_{\text{maorit}}(_1, ,) = \text{moe}(D(_1), D(), D())$$

Theorem 8: Triple redundancy reduces error rate from to $-$ for independent errors.

Proof: Standard result from coding theory. At most one error can be corrected. Failure occurs when ≥2 copies corrupted: $P(\text{fail}) = ()(1 -) \;\; = \; - $. ∎

11.2 Hierarchical Message Structure

For long messages, introduce meta-structure:

Level 1: Syllables (as current) **Level 2**: Verses (groups of syllables with harmonic cadence) **Level 3**: Songs (complete messages with beginning and end markers)

This mirrors:

- Bits → Bytes → Blocks in storage systems
- Phonemes → Words → Sentences in language

11.3 Multi-Channel Extensions

Currently single-speaker, single-listener. Extensions:

Broadcast: One sender, multiple listeners (no change to encoding) **Dialogue**: Multiple senders, requires turn-taking protocol **Chorus**: Multiple synchronized senders, increases redundancy and error correction

---

12. Relationship to Modern Codec Design

12.1 Neural Audio Codecs

Recent systems (EnCodec, SoundStream, Lyra) learn to compress audio through neural networks:

$$_{\text{encoe}} : \text{auio} \to \text{latent} \to \text{its}$$

$$_{\text{ecoe}} : \text{its} \to \text{latent} \to \text{auio}$$

The audible system is conceptually similar but with explicit, interpretable structure:

$$_{\text{encoe}} : \text{inar} \to \text{orse} \to \text{poneme} \to \text{rtm}$$

The advantage: full interpretability and human learnability. The disadvantage: fixed encoding without adaptation.

12.2 Compression vs. Transmission

Modern codecs optimize compression ratio. The audible system optimizes cognitive compatibility. These are orthogonal objectives:

Compression: Minimize $E(x)x$ **Cognitive**: Minimize (E) subject to $_{\text{ma}}$

where (E) is learning complexity and is error rate.

12.3 Information Bottleneck Theory

The Information Bottleneck principle states: find representation ( ) that maximizes ( ) while minimizing ( ) where is target.

For our system:

- = binary data
- = rhythmic encoding
- = decoded data
- Constraint: ( ) = ( ) (lossless)

The "bottleneck" is cognitive capacity, not bit rate. The encoding is optimal for this specific bottleneck.

---

13. Historical and Cultural Context

13.1 Oral Transmission Systems

Pre-literate cultures developed sophisticated oral transmission:

Vedic chanting: Preserved texts for millennia through melodic structure **Genealogical chants**: Encoded lineage information in rhythmic recitation **Epic poetry**: Compressed narratives using meter and formula

These systems share properties with the audible encoding:

- Information encoded in sound structure
- Rhythm as scaffold
- Memorization rather than storage

However, they lack:

- Explicit bijective mapping
- Binary compatibility
- Formal reversibility proofs

13.2 Soviet Prison Communication

Documented in Solzhenitsyn's "The Gulag Archipelago" and Shalamov's "Kolyma Tales":

Prisoners used knocking codes based on position matrices:

```
  1 2 3 4 5
1 А Б В Г Д
2 Е Ж З И К
3 Л М Н О П
4 Р С Т У Ф
5 Х Ц Ч Ш Щ
```

A letter is encoded as (row, column) in knocks. This is formally equivalent to:

$$E_{\text{noc}}() = ((), ())$$

where is row function and is column function.

The audible system is more efficient: direct phoneme mapping rather than coordinate system.

13.3 Talking Drums

African drumming languages (Yoruba, Akan) encode tonal languages:

$$\text{wor} \xrightarrow{\text{tone pattern}} \text{rum rtm}$$

This is lossy—multiple words map to same rhythm pattern. Disambiguation requires context.

The audible system is strictly lossless by design.

---

14. Experimental Validation

14.1 Methodology

Original 2016 testing protocol:

1. Train participant on encoding rules (2-4 hours)
2. Provide test message in binary
3. Participant encodes to rhythm
4. Second participant (listener) decodes
5. Measure accuracy and transmission time

14.2 Results Summary

Over $=$ trials with different message lengths:

Character accuracy:

- Untrained decoders: $0\ 011$

- Trained decoders: $0\ \ 00$

Transmission rate:

- Average: bits/second
- Range: $1 -$ bits/second

Learning curve:

- Encoding proficiency: $\approx$ hours practice
- Decoding proficiency: ≈ 10 hours practice

14.3 Error Analysis

Most errors fell into three categories:

1. **Phoneme confusion** (32%): "ти" heard as "та" or vice versa
2. **Boundary errors** (28%): Missed or inserted pauses
3. **Memory failures** (40%): Forgot segment during long messages

Error rate correlated strongly with message length: $= 00\ \ 000$ where is message length in characters.

---

15. Theoretical Implications

15.1 Computability and Cognition

The Church-Turing thesis establishes equivalence of computation models. This system demonstrates a related principle:

Cognitive Universality Hypothesis: Any computable function can be implemented in human cognition, given appropriate encoding.

The audible system proves this constructively for binary encoding/decoding.

15.2 Information Sans Infrastructure

Modern information theory assumes physical infrastructure: wires, storage media, processing units. This system demonstrates:

Theorem 9 (Infrastructure Independence): Digital information can be preserved and transmitted using only biological systems when encoding is cognitive-compatible.

This has implications for:

- Preservation of knowledge after infrastructure collapse
- Communication under surveillance
- Understanding pre-digital information systems

15.3 The Encoding-Substrate Boundary

A deep question: Is information independent of substrate?

Standard answer: Yes (Shannon's abstraction)

This system suggests a refinement: Information is substrate-independent, but *efficient representation* is substrate-dependent.

The same data requires different encodings for:

- Electromagnetic channels → amplitude/frequency modulation
- Optical channels → intensity modulation
- Biological channels → temporal/rhythmic structure

The encoding layer is where substrate properties become relevant.

---

16. Future Research Directions

16.1 Optimization Problems

Several open questions:

Optimal phoneme selection: Current choice ("ти"/"та") is effective but possibly not optimal. What phoneme pair minimizes confusion rate?

Optimal rhythm: Is isochronous (equal timing) best, or would slight acceleration/deceleration improve error detection?

Boundary encoding: Current system uses pauses. Could pitch shifts, volume changes, or other acoustic features encode boundaries more reliably?

16.2 Machine Learning Integration

Could neural networks learn optimal encoding for human cognition?

Approach: Train encoder/decoder to minimize:

$$= \cdot \text{itrror} \quad \cdot \text{onitiveoa} \quad \cdot \text{earnime}$$

This would automate discovery of cognitive-optimal codes.

16.3 Cross-Cultural Validation

Does the system work equally well across languages? Phonemes available differ:

- Some languages lack /t/ phoneme distinction
- Tonal languages might encode information in pitch
- Rhythmic languages may have different temporal processing

Systematic study needed.

---

17. Philosophical Considerations

17.1 The Nature of Code

What is the ontological status of the encoding? Three perspectives:

Platonist: The mapping exists abstractly, independent of implementation **Nominalist**: The mapping is merely a human convention
Functionalist: The mapping is defined by its input-output behavior

The formal reversibility (Theorem 1) supports the functionalist view: the encoding *is* the bijective transformation, regardless of implementation details.

17.2 Information and Meaning

The system deliberately separates information from meaning:

- Binary data has no semantic content
- Encoding preserves syntactic structure only
- Meaning (if any) resides at application layer

This is consistent with Shannon's separation of information theory from semantics, but demonstrates it acoustically rather than electronically.

17.3 Human-Machine Boundary

Where is the human-machine boundary?

Traditional view: Humans use machines; machines process information

This system: Humans *are* machines (in the formal sense of implementing computation)

This challenges anthropocentric views of cognition while respecting the unique constraints of biological computation.

---

18. Conclusion

This work has established the formal information-theoretic foundations of audible binary transmission through rhythmic vocalization. The key results:

1. **Lossless encoding** is achievable through explicit phonetic mapping (Theorem 1)
2. **Channel capacity** is bounded by cognitive processing rather than acoustic bandwidth (Propositions 1-2)
3. **Error detection** emerges from rhythmic structure without explicit parity (Theorem 2)
4. **Learning complexity** is constant with respect to message length (Theorem 3)
5. **Cognitive optimality** follows from alignment with neural architecture (Section 10)

The system demonstrates that humans can serve as reliable digital transmission channels when encoding is designed for biological constraints rather than electronic convenience.

This has implications beyond the specific encoding:

- **Codec design**: Representations should match processor capabilities
- **Human-AI interaction**: Information structure matters as much as information content
- **Preserving knowledge**: Infrastructure-independent transmission remains possible
- **Understanding cognition**: Formal methods reveal computational properties of biological systems

The encoding exists at the intersection of information theory, cognitive science, and cultural practice. It is simultaneously:

- A provably correct encoding scheme
- A cognitively efficient representation
- A culturally situated communication system

This multiplicity is not a weakness but a strength: it demonstrates that formal rigor and human usability need not conflict when systems are designed with both in mind.

The human voice remains what it has always been—a carrier of meaning. But meaning can take many forms, including the austere precision of binary data transmitted through the ancient medium of rhythm and song.

References

Shannon, C.E. (1948). "A Mathematical Theory of Communication." *Bell System Technical Journal*.

Miller, G.A. (1956). "The Magical Number Seven, Plus or Minus Two." *Psychological Review*.

Solzhenitsyn, A. (1973). *The Gulag Archipelago*.

Hamming, R.W. (1950). "Error Detecting and Error Correcting Codes." *Bell System Technical Journal*.

Cover, T.M., & Thomas, J.A. (2006). *Elements of Information Theory*. Wiley.

Appendix A: Formal Notation Summary

$\mathcal{H}$ - Human vocal-auditory channel
$\mathcal{M}$ - Morse code alphabet
$\mathcal{S}$ - Syllable sequence space
M - Binary to Morse mapping
P - Morse to phoneme mapping
R - Phoneme to rhythm mapping
E - Complete encoding (composition)
D - Complete decoding (inverse)
 - Channel capacity
 - Error rate
$()$ - Shannon entropy
(E) - Learning complexity

Appendix B: Complete Encoding Example

Input: Binary string `01001000 01001001` (ASCII "HI")

Step 1: Convert to text

```
HI
```

Step 2: Convert to Morse

```
H = ····
I = ··
```

Step 3: Convert to phonemes

```
H = ти–ти–ти–ти
I = ти–ти
```

Step 4: Add boundaries

```
ти ти ти ти / ти ти
```

Step 5: Establish rhythm (quarter notes at 120 BPM)

```
♩ ♩ ♩ ♩ | 𝄽 | ♩ ♩ |
```

Output: Chanted sequence with 500ms per syllable, 1000ms pause between letters.

Reversibility check: Heard sequence → "ти ти ти ти / ти ти"
→ Morse: "···· / ··"
→ Text: "HI"
→ Binary: `01001000 01001001` ✓

Submission Date: February 2026
Keywords: information theory, human codec, audible transmission, Morse encoding, cognitive channel capacity, rhythmic encoding, error detection, cognitive optimality