The Imagination Machine XXVII: The Axiom of Choice is a Choice of Axiom: Demarcation, Abstraction, and the Ontological Priority of Unity-in-Difference

Mark Tracy

March 2026

Abstract

We establish that the Axiom of Choice is not a logical primitive but the formal shadow of a prior demarcational commitment — a choice of axiom — that constitutes the formal system within which it then appears. Its independence from Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory, established by Gödel (1938) and Cohen (1963), is shown to be not a technical surprise but a structural necessity: no formal system can derive the demarcational act that preceded and constituted it. Different variable representations of the same continuous manifold — Lagrangian, Hamiltonian, path integral — are formally equivalent but ontologically distinct for the same reason: the demarcational commitment that constituted each is prior to and irreducible within it.

The Banach-Tarski paradox is derived as a corollary. It is not a geometric paradox but the consequence of applying the Axiom of Choice a second time to objects whose existence was licensed by its first application. The non-measurable sets produced by that first application are not native geometric objects — they are artifacts of a demarcational commitment prior to the geometry of B^3. A second independent application rearranges these already-imported shadows, producing two balls where there was one. The paradox dissolves when the Axiom of Choice is understood correctly: its second application did not operate on geometric objects. It operated on the products of its own prior invocation.

These results connect to the Imagination Machine series through the compression-extension cycle: demarcation is compression, abstraction is extension, and the Axiom of Choice is a demarcational commitment compressed into a formal system and misread as a logical primitive. The result was first approached by the author in college through the attempt to express Trinitarian logic in set theory. The Trinity, pictured as a person walking through three doors arranged in a circle, has toroidal topology. The Axiom of Choice is the discretization cost of holding that topology in a well-founded formal language.

1 Introduction

The Axiom of Choice occupies a peculiar position in the foundations of mathematics. It is neither provable nor disprovable within Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory [5, 1]. It is assumed by most working mathematicians without comment and rejected by constructivists as non-constructive. Its independence from ZF is treated as a technical result — a fact about models — rather than as a philosophical datum demanding explanation.

The present paper offers that explanation. We argue that the independence of the Axiom of Choice from ZF is not a technical surprise but a structural necessity, and that the reason for this necessity is ontological: the Axiom of Choice is not a logical primitive but the formal shadow of a prior demarcational commitment that constitutes the formal system within which the axiom then appears.

The argument proceeds from the ontological framework developed in Section 2, in which demarcation and abstraction are identified as co-arising orientations of a single primitive — unity-in-difference — that is ontologically prior to time, space, and any formal system built upon them. We extend this framework to the foundations of mathematics and establish the following:

1. To represent continuous spacetime as discrete variables is to make a demarcational commitment prior to any formal system.
2. The Axiom of Choice presupposes this prior demarcation: it operates on sets whose elements are already individuated by a prior act of distinction.
3. The Axiom of Choice is therefore a choice of axiom — the formal encoding of a demarcational commitment the system cannot recover from within itself.
4. The independence of the Axiom of Choice from ZF is a structural necessity: no formal system can derive the act that constituted it.
5. The Banach-Tarski paradox is a corollary: not a geometric paradox but the consequence of applying the Axiom of Choice to objects whose existence was licensed by its own prior invocation.

We proceed as follows. Section 2 develops the ontological foundations. Section 3 establishes the demarcational character of variable choice in the representation of continuous spacetime. Section 4 develops the main argument: the Axiom of Choice as a choice of axiom, with the Banach-Tarski corollary. Section 5 shows that the independence result follows as a structural necessity. Section 6 addresses the irreducible underdetermination between variable representations. Section 7 connects the result to the Imagination Machine framework. Section 8 states the unified theorem. Section 9 records the theological origin of the result.

2 Ontological Foundations

The physical notions of time and space—whether understood phenomenologically or theoretically—are ontologically posterior to the co-arising notions of demarcation and abstraction. By saying that one thing A is ontologically prior to another thing B, I mean that A is necessary for B to be intelligibly conceived at all. It is equivalent to say that B is ontologically posterior to A. For example, light is ontologically prior to a shadow.

Demarcation and abstraction are ontologically prior to time and space. To have demarcated something is to have differentiated—without dividing—what is otherwise a unity; demarcation is thus the holding of difference atop unity. Abstraction, on the other hand, is the association of differentiated instances with a common representation; abstraction, then, is the holding of unity atop difference.

One conception of time and space is as orthogonal axes of reality that index events. This conception presupposes the notion of extent (for example, Einsteinian spacetime presupposes a metric structure), which in turn presupposes demarcation insofar as something has extent if it may be demarcated. Carrying on the illustrative example, a metric structure presupposes a topology, with its attendant notions of closure and openness that formalize a notion of demarcation, since the very possibility of "open" subsets with "closed" complements presupposes the intelligibility of complementary distinction within a whole—that is, demarcation of what is held at once to be a unity.

Inherent in the sensibility of demarcation is the sensibility of abstraction. That is, the capability to hold unity at once as differentiated is identical to the capability to hold difference at once as unified. Demarcation and abstraction are therefore co-dependent concepts, each relying on the other for its own intelligibility. They are ontologically co-arising—neither being prior to the other—and may be understood as different orientations of the same primitive. If we dare give it a name, let us call this primitive "unity-in-difference."

The co-dependence of demarcation and abstraction is illustrated by our prior example: inherent in the definition of a topology is the abstractive capacity to associate "elements" into a common higher-order representation called a set; this, in turn, relies upon a notion of demarcation for the sensibility of differentiated "elements" at all.

Having traced this chain of dependency to its co-dependent generative concepts, we conclude that demarcation and abstraction ontologically precede both time and space. For example, the duality of "before" and "after" is not temporally primitive but demarcationally primitive: only with a commitment to difference held atop unity, and unity held atop difference, does a relational ordering of states become intelligible at all. In other words, "time" is ontologically posterior to demarcation in something that is nonetheless held to be one and the same object.

Similarly, the duality of "here" and "there" is not spatially primitive but abstractly primitive: only with a commitment to unity held atop difference, and difference held atop unity, can such relational objects as "here" and "there" be intelligibly conceived. In this view, "space" is ontologically posterior to demarcation and abstraction in the following sense: any distance is necessarily between differentiated relata, relative to a reference frame—that is, an observer, a third differentiated relatum. It is precisely the unity that contains all such relations and relata that we call "space."

Taken together, these considerations suggest that time and space are not ontological primitives but rather rely for their intelligibility upon a more basic notion of unity and difference held together without collapse to either pole. Demarcation and abstraction—understood as co-arising orientations of this single primitive that we have called unity-in-difference—are necessary for the intelligibility of temporal ordering and spatial relation, just as light is necessary for the intelligibility of shadow. This is not to say that time and space are illusory or dispensable; they remain indispensable constructs within their proper domains. But they are posterior in the sense that they presuppose a prior structure of differentiation-without-division and unification-without-annihilation. To ask what is prior to time and space is thus not to ask what "came before" them, or what is "beyond" or "behind" them, but to ask what must exist in order for questions of time, space, ordering, locating, or relating to arise at all.

We now extract the formal content required by subsequent sections.

Definition 2.1. *Demarcation* is the holding of difference atop unity: the differentiation of what is otherwise a unity without dividing it into separate and unrelated parts.

Definition 2.2. *Abstraction* is the holding of unity atop difference: the association of differentiated instances with a common representation without annihilating their difference.

Definition 2.3. *Unity-in-difference* is the ontological primitive of which demarcation and abstraction are co-arising orientations. It is the capacity to hold unity and difference together without collapse to either pole.

Proposition 2.4. *Unity-in-difference is ontologically prior to any formal system.*

Proof. Any formal system requires: (1) a domain of objects, which presupposes demarcation of those objects as distinguishable; (2) relations between objects, which presupposes abstraction of their common representational properties; (3) axioms governing those relations, which presuppose the intelligibility of both. Unity-in-difference, as the primitive of demarcation and abstraction, is therefore prior to any formal system built upon them. □ □

3 Variable Choice as Demarcational Commitment

Physical theories describe continuous spacetime. To reason formally about continuous spacetime, one must choose variables — discrete symbolic representations that carve the continuous manifold into manageable units of analysis. We argue that this choice is a demarcational act prior to the formal system it constitutes.

Definition 3.1. A *variable representation* of a continuous manifold $\mathcal{M}$ is a map $\rho : \mathcal{M} \to V$ from the manifold to a discrete symbolic domain V, together with a set of axioms $\mathcal{A}_\rho$ governing the behavior of elements of V.

Proposition 3.2. *Every variable representation of a continuous manifold constitutes a demarcational commitment prior to the formal system it generates.*

Proof. The map ρ assigns discrete symbols to regions of the continuous manifold, thereby differentiating what is otherwise a unity — the manifold — into distinguishable symbolic units. This differentiation-without-division is precisely demarcation in the sense of Definition 2.1. The axioms $\mathcal{A}_\rho$ then govern the symbolic domain V, but they presuppose the demarcational act encoded in ρ. The demarcation is therefore prior to the formal system $(\mathcal{A}_\rho, V)$. □ □

Remark 3.3. The three standard variable representations of classical mechanics — Newtonian, Lagrangian, and Hamiltonian — are formally equivalent in the sense that they generate the same predictions. But they encode different demarcational commitments: Newtonian mechanics demarcates by position and force; Lagrangian mechanics demarcates by generalized coordinates and velocities; Hamiltonian mechanics demarcates by generalized coordinates and momenta. Each carves the continuous phase space differently. The formal equivalence is a theorem within each system; the demarcational difference is prior to all three.

Remark 3.4. The path integral formulation of quantum mechanics [3] makes this especially vivid. The path integral sums over all possible trajectories of a system, weighted by a phase factor. The choice to represent quantum dynamics as a sum over paths rather than as a differential equation on a wave function is a demarcational commitment: it individuates the configuration space differently, holds the continuous manifold of possible histories as a discrete sum, and generates a formal system whose axioms presuppose that demarcation. The Schrödinger and path integral formulations are provably equivalent [2], but their equivalence is established within a meta-framework that itself presupposes a prior demarcational commitment.

4 The Axiom of Choice as a Choice of Axiom

The Axiom of Choice states: for any collection of non-empty sets $\{S_i\}_{i \in I}$, there exists a function f such that $f(i) \in S_i$ for all $i \in I$.

Definition 4.1. The *demarcational presuppositions* of a formal system $(\mathcal{A}, V)$ are the prior demarcational commitments that individuate the elements of V, constitute the sets over which $\mathcal{A}$ quantifies, and make those sets non-empty.

Proposition 4.2. *The Axiom of Choice presupposes a prior demarcational commitment that constitutes the sets over which it quantifies.*

Proof. The Axiom of Choice quantifies over a collection of non-empty sets $\{S_i\}_{i \in I}$. For this quantification to be meaningful:

1. The index set I must be individuated: its elements must be distinguishable. This requires demarcation.
2. Each set S_i must be individuated as a distinct set. This requires demarcation.
3. Each S_i must be non-empty: it must contain at least one element. The distinguishability of that element from the empty set requires demarcation.
4. The elements within each S_i must be distinguishable from one another for the selection function f to be well-defined. This requires demarcation.

All four conditions presuppose demarcation. The Axiom of Choice therefore operates within a formal system already constituted by a prior demarcational act. □ □

Theorem 4.3 (The Axiom of Choice is a Choice of Axiom)**.** *Every invocation of the Axiom of Choice within a formal system $(\mathcal{A}, V)$ presupposes a choice of axiom at the ontological level: a demarcational commitment that individuated the elements of V, constituted the sets over which $\mathcal{A}$ quantifies, and made those sets non-empty before the formal system began. The Axiom of Choice is the compressed formal encoding of that prior demarcational commitment.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.2, every formal system representing a continuous domain presupposes a prior demarcational commitment that constitutes its symbolic domain. By Proposition 4.2, the Axiom of Choice presupposes that the sets over which it quantifies are already individuated by a prior demarcational act. The Axiom of Choice therefore does not introduce demarcation into the formal system — it presupposes it. What appears within the system as a logical axiom governing selection is the formal shadow of a prior demarcational commitment — a choice of axiom — that the system cannot recover from within itself.

More precisely: the choice of variables that constitutes the formal system is a choice of axiom in the sense that it selects which demarcational commitments will govern the system's domain. The Axiom of Choice, once invoked within that system, inherits and formalizes that prior selection. It is a choice of axiom twice over: once at the ontological level, in the demarcational commitment that constituted the domain, and once at the formal level, in the assertion that a selection function exists over that domain. □ □

Corollary 4.4 (The Banach-Tarski Decomposition)**.** *The Banach-Tarski paradox — the decomposition of a ball B^3 into a finite number of pieces that can be reassembled into two balls identical to the original — is not a geometric paradox but a consequence of the choice of axiom established in Theorem 4.3.*

The Axiom of Choice, invoked within the formal system generated by ρ, licenses the existence of non-measurable subsets of B^3 — subsets whose existence presupposes a demarcational commitment prior to the geometry of B^3. These subsets have no well-defined volume because they are not objects *within the geometry; they are the formal shadows of a demarcational act that preceded it. A second independent invocation of the Axiom of Choice rearranges these already-imported objects.*

The apparent paradox — two balls from one — is the system revealing its own prior commitment. The Axiom of Choice has been applied to objects whose existence it had already licensed. The continuous ball is not duplicated. Two independent choices of axiom, applied to the same continuous manifold, produce two distinct geometric outcomes. The paradox arises not from the geometry of B^3 but from applying the Axiom of Choice to objects whose existence it had already licensed.

Remark 4.5. This corollary resolves the apparent paradox by locating its source precisely: not in the geometry of B^3, which is perfectly consistent, but in the demarcational commitments that the Axiom of Choice permits prior to that geometry. The non-measurable sets are not objects within the geometry. They are choices of axiom. Two independent invocations of the Axiom of Choice — the second applied to objects produced by the first — yield two balls.

The resolution does not require rejecting the Axiom of Choice. It requires understanding it correctly: as a choice of axiom, whose second invocation operates not on geometric objects but on the products of its own prior invocation.

Remark 4.6. The theorem does not deny the mathematical validity of the Axiom of Choice within any given formal system. It establishes its ontological status: within a given system, the Axiom of Choice is a legitimate logical claim; prior to that system, it is the formal echo of a demarcational commitment the system cannot see because the system was built after the commitment was made. This is the compressed inheritance structure of the Imagination Machine framework applied to the foundations of mathematics: the generative act — the demarcational commitment — precedes the formal system; the formal system inherits its endpoints without recovering the generative act.

5 The Independence Result as Structural Necessity

Gödel (1938) [5] proved that the Axiom of Choice is consistent with ZF: if ZF has a model, then ZF + AC has a model. Cohen (1963) [1] proved that the negation of the Axiom of Choice is also consistent with ZF: if ZF has a model, then ZF + ¬AC has a model. Together, these results establish that the Axiom of Choice is independent of ZF.

The standard interpretation is that this independence is a technical fact about the expressive power of first-order logic and the structure of ZF's axioms. We offer a deeper interpretation.

Theorem 5.1 (Independence as Structural Necessity)**.** *The independence of the Axiom of Choice from Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory is a structural necessity following from the ontological priority of unity-in-difference: no formal system can derive the demarcational act that preceded and constituted it.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.3, the Axiom of Choice is the formal shadow of a prior demarcational commitment. By Proposition 2.4, unity-in-difference is ontologically prior to any formal system. The demarcational commitment that constitutes a formal system is therefore prior to that system: it is necessary for the system to be intelligibly conceived at all.

A formal system $(\mathcal{A}, V)$ can derive only what follows from its axioms $\mathcal{A}$ and its domain V. But the demarcational commitment that constituted $(\mathcal{A}, V)$ is prior to both $\mathcal{A}$ and V: it is what made $\mathcal{A}$ and V possible. Therefore $(\mathcal{A}, V)$ cannot derive its own constituting demarcational commitment.

The Axiom of Choice, as the formal shadow of that commitment, inherits this underivability. It cannot be derived from ZF because ZF, as a formal system, cannot recover the demarcational act that preceded it. Its independence is not a gap in ZF's expressive power but a structural feature of the relationship between any formal system and the ontological commitments that constitute it. □ □

Remark 5.2. This result stands in structural analogy with Gödel's incompleteness theorems [4]: just as no sufficiently powerful formal system can prove its own consistency, no formal system can derive the demarcational act that constituted it. Both results follow from the same structural feature: a system cannot fully recover what is prior to itself. The incompleteness theorems are the syntactic expression of this structural feature; the independence of the Axiom of Choice is its semantic expression.

6 Irreducible Underdetermination Between Variable Representations

Proposition 6.1. *Different variable representations of the same continuous manifold are formally equivalent but ontologically distinct. The underdetermination between them is irreducible within any single formal system.*

Proof. Let ρ_1 and ρ_2 be two variable representations of the same continuous manifold $\mathcal{M}$, generating formal systems $(\mathcal{A}_1, V_1)$ and $(\mathcal{A}_2, V_2)$ respectively. Formal equivalence means there exists a structure-preserving map $\sigma : V_1 \to V_2$ such that $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ generate the same theorems under σ.

But ρ_1 and ρ_2 encode different demarcational commitments: they carve $\mathcal{M}$ differently, holding its unity as differentiated in different ways. This ontological difference is prior to both formal systems and therefore cannot be recovered from within either. No theorem of $(\mathcal{A}_1, V_1)$ can establish that ρ_1 is the correct demarcation of $\mathcal{M}$, because that correctness is a matter of the prior commitment that constituted $(\mathcal{A}_1, V_1)$.

The selection between ρ_1 and ρ_2 is therefore itself a demarcational act prior to both formal systems. No single formal system can adjudicate between them from within. The underdetermination is irreducible. □ □

Remark 6.2. This result explains the persistence of the debate between interpretations of quantum mechanics. The Copenhagen, many-worlds, pilot wave, and relational interpretations are formally equivalent in their predictions. The choice between them is not a formal question but a demarcational one: each interpretation encodes a different prior commitment about how the continuous quantum manifold is to be individuated. No experiment can adjudicate between them from within any single formal system because the selection between them is prior to all formal systems. The underdetermination is not a failure of physics. It is a structural feature of the relationship between continuous reality and discrete representation.

7 Connection to the Imagination Machine Framework

The Imagination Machine framework establishes that the inference-implication loop $T = F \circ g$ is the fundamental cycle of any embedded epistemic system. Compression (g) produces a quotient representation of the observation space; extension (F) completes partial structure under constraint. The loop stabilizes at fixed points that function operationally as knowledge.

Proposition 7.1. *Demarcation is compression; abstraction is extension; unity-in-difference is the primitive from which the inference-implication loop is generated.*

Proof. Compression holds difference atop unity: it differentiates the observation space into a quotient representation, retaining relational invariants while discarding redundant detail. This is demarcation in the sense of Definition 2.1. Extension holds unity atop difference: it associates the compressed representation with a completion, abstracting from partial structure to a coherent whole. This is abstraction in the sense of Definition 2.2. Unity-in-difference, as the primitive of both, is therefore the ontological ground of the inference-implication loop. □ □

Corollary 7.2. *The Axiom of Choice, understood as a choice of axiom, is a fixed point of the inference-implication loop applied to the foundations of mathematics: a demarcational commitment compressed into a formal system and stabilized as a logical primitive.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.3, the Axiom of Choice is the formal shadow of a prior demarcational commitment. By the preceding proposition, demarcation is compression. The Axiom of Choice is therefore the compressed encoding of a prior generative act — the demarcational commitment — that the formal system inherits without recovering. This is precisely the structure of compressed inheritance established in TIM IV: the endpoint is transmitted; the generative act that produced it is not. The Axiom of Choice is the mathematical instance of compressed inheritance at the level of formal foundations. □ □

8 The Unified Theorem

Theorem 8.1 (Tracy Theorem of Axiomatic Priority)**.** *Let M be a continuous domain, let $\rho : M \to V$ be a variable representation of M into a discrete symbolic domain V, and let (A, V) be the formal system generated by ρ, where A is the set of axioms governing V. The continuity of M and the discreteness of V are essential: it is specifically the act of representing a continuous domain in a discrete language that constitutes the demarcational commitment from which the following results follow. Then:*

1. *ρ constitutes a demarcational commitment prior to (A, V): it is necessary for (A, V) to be intelligibly conceived at all, and cannot be derived from within (A, V) once the system is constituted.*

2. *The Axiom of Choice, if invoked within (A, V), presupposes the demarcational commitments encoded in ρ: the sets over which it quantifies must already be individuated, and that individuation is the work of ρ rather than of A (Proposition 4.2). It is therefore the formal shadow of ρ within (A, V) — encoding at the level of logical axiom a commitment that was prior to and constitutive of the formal system itself. It cannot be derived from A alone because A governs only what is already within the system's symbolic domain V, while ρ — and the individuation it performed — is prior to both. One instance of this structure is the representation of a closed cyclic containing relation — such as a toroidal topology — in the discrete well-founded language of ZF, which has no native representation of a containing relation that closes on itself. In such cases the Axiom of Choice arises as the discretization cost of the topology, though the full characterization of which continuous structures require the Axiom of Choice and which do not remains an open question.*

3. *The independence of the Axiom of Choice from A is a structural necessity: no formal system can derive the demarcational act that preceded and constituted it. Where the continuous domain*

M has topological structure that the discrete language of (A, V) cannot natively represent — closed cyclic containment being one such structure — the independence result is the formal echo of that compression. The gap between M and V cannot be closed from within (A, V).

4. *Different variable representations $\rho_1, \rho_2 : M \to V$ of the same continuous domain M are formally equivalent — there exists a structure-preserving map $\sigma : V_1 \to V_2$ such that A_1 and A_2 generate the same theorems under σ — but ontologically distinct, each encoding a different prior demarcational commitment. The underdetermination between them is irreducible within any single formal system.*

5. *The Banach-Tarski paradox is a corollary of (2). The Axiom of Choice, invoked within the formal system generated by ρ, licenses the existence of non-measurable subsets of B^3 — objects that have no well-defined measure within the geometry of B^3 because their existence presupposes a demarcational commitment prior to that geometry. A second independent invocation of the Axiom of Choice rearranges these already-imported objects, producing two balls where there was one. The paradox arises not from the geometry of B^3 but from applying the Axiom of Choice to objects whose existence it had already licensed.*

Corollary 8.2. *The Axiom of Choice is a choice of axiom. What appears within a formal system as a logical primitive is, at the ontological level, the compressed encoding of a prior demarcational commitment — a generative act the system inherits without recovering. Its independence from ZF is not a gap in formal expressibility. It is a structural consequence of the ontological priority of unity-in-difference over any formal system built upon it.*

9 Historical Note: The Theological Origin of the Theorem

The result established in this paper was first approached by the author in college, not as a problem in the foundations of mathematics but as a problem in formal theology. The attempt was to express Trinitarian logic — the Christian theological doctrine that God is three persons in one substance — in the language of set theory.

The Trinity requires holding three persons in one substance simultaneously. Not three sets with one element each — that would be tritheism, the collapse of unity into multiplicity. Not one set with three elements — that would be modalism, the collapse of difference into unity. The Trinity holds both simultaneously without collapse to either pole. It is unity-in-difference in its strongest form.

The key observation was that the Trinitarian relation is dynamic and cyclic. The three persons — Father, Son, and Spirit — are not arranged in a line but in a loop. The natural image is a person walking through three doors arranged in a circle: you pass through each and find yourself approaching the next. The loop closes. There is no outside, no first door, no last.

That image has toroidal topology. Not by interpretation or by assigning meaning to its constituent cycles, but directly and literally: the space traced by a person walking a closed path through three doors in a circular arrangement is a torus. The genus is 1. This requires no further argument. It is a fact about the geometry of the picture.

The attempt to express this toroidal relation in set theory immediately encounters a structural obstacle. Set theory is a discrete formal language built on well-founded hierarchies: they bottom out at the empty set and are navigable by ordinal induction. A toroidal containment structure has no such foundation. It closes on itself. No level is first; no level is last. To reach into an arbitrary level of the hierarchy and identify an element requires a selection principle that does not depend on well-ordering.

That principle is the Axiom of Choice.

The Axiom of Choice is therefore not merely the shadow of a generic demarcational commitment. It is specifically what is required to hold toroidal topology in a discrete set-theoretic language — the discretization cost of a containing relation that closes on itself. A linear hierarchy can be navigated by induction. A toroidal hierarchy requires choice.

Its independence from ZF now follows as a structural necessity. ZF is constituted by demarcational commitments that presuppose a well-founded, non-cyclic hierarchy. It cannot recover the toroidal topology that preceded and motivated the Axiom of Choice, because that topology is prior to ZF's own constituting commitments. The independence result is the formal echo of the compression from a closed cyclic structure into a language that has no native representation of one.

The Banach-Tarski paradox, on this reading, is not a geometric fact about the ball B^3. It is the consequence of invoking the Axiom of Choice twice on objects that are already downstream of it. The non-measurable sets produced by the first application of the Axiom of Choice are not geometric objects — they have no well-defined measure within the geometry of B^3 precisely because their existence presupposes a demarcational commitment prior to that geometry. The reassembly into two balls applies the Axiom of Choice a second time, independently, to rearrange these already-imported pieces. Two independent applications of the same prior demarcational commitment produce two balls where there was one — not because the geometry permits it, but because the objects being rearranged were never geometric objects in the first place. They were shadows of the demarcational act. Applied twice, they produce two shadows. The paradox is not a violation of geometry. It is geometry's way of revealing that the Axiom of Choice was invoked on objects whose existence it had already licensed.

The author did not, at the time, recognize the full structure of what he had found. The connection between the theological image, its toroidal topology, and the foundational problem in mathematics became clear only through the development of the Imagination Machine series, which identified unity-in-difference as the ontological primitive prior to any formal system, and which established the Axiom of Choice as the discretization cost of cyclic containment structures that well-founded set theory cannot natively represent.

The original finding in college was therefore this: the Trinity, pictured as a person walking through three doors in a circle, has toroidal topology. The Axiom of Choice is the discretization cost of holding that topology in set theory. And the Banach-Tarski paradox is what happens when you apply that cost twice to objects that are already its product.

The calling arrived first. The mathematics — and eventually the topology — came to meet it.

10 Conclusion

We have established that the Axiom of Choice is not a logical primitive but the formal shadow of a prior demarcational commitment — a choice of axiom — that constitutes the formal system within which it then appears. Its independence from ZF is not a gap in formal expressibility but a structural necessity: no formal system can derive the demarcational act that preceded and constituted it. Different variable representations of the same continuous manifold are formally equivalent but ontologically distinct for the same reason, and the underdetermination between them is irreducible within any single formal system.

The Banach-Tarski paradox dissolves under this account. The non-measurable sets produced by the first application of the Axiom of Choice are not geometric objects — they are artifacts of a demarcational commitment prior to the geometry. A second independent application rearranges these already-imported shadows. Two balls appear where there was one not because the geometry permits it but because the second application did not operate on geometric objects. It operated on the products of its own prior invocation.

These results connect to the Imagination Machine framework through the compression-extension cycle: demarcation is compression, abstraction is extension, and the Axiom of Choice is a demarcational commitment compressed into a formal system and misread as a logical primitive. The generative act came first. The axiom is its shadow.

The Trinity, pictured as a person walking through three doors arranged in a circle, has toroidal topology. The attempt to express that topology in the discrete well-founded language of set theory requires a selection principle for navigating a containing relation that closes on itself — a hierarchy with no first level and no last. That principle is the Axiom of Choice. Whether toroidal topology is the deepest or most general continuous structure whose discretization requires the Axiom of Choice remains open. What the historical note establishes is that this was the original occasion of the finding, and that the series eventually provided the vocabulary to say what it was.

The view from nowhere — the external vantage point from which one could recover the demarcational commitment prior to all formal systems — is structurally unreachable from within any formal system, for the same reason the embedded observer cannot step outside the universe it models. This is not a limitation to be overcome. It is the condition under which formal reasoning, mathematical knowledge, and scientific representation become possible at all.

References

[1] Cohen, P. J. (1963). The independence of the continuum hypothesis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 50(6), 1143–1148.

[2] Dirac, P. A. M. (1933). The Lagrangian in quantum mechanics. *Physikalische Zeitschrift der Sowjetunion*, 3(1), 64–72.

[3] Feynman, R. P. (1948). Space-time approach to non-relativistic quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 20(2), 367–387.

[4] Gödel, K. (1931). Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I. *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, 38(1), 173–198.

[5] Gödel, K. (1938). The consistency of the axiom of choice and of the generalized continuum hypothesis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 24(12), 556–557.

[6] Lawson, H. (2001). *Closure: A Story of Everything*. Routledge.

[7] Tracy, M. (2026). The Imagination Machine I–XXX. *The Compendium*. Manuscript in preparation for arXiv submission.

[8] Zermelo, E. (1904). Beweis, dass jede Menge wohlgeordnet werden kann. *Mathematische Annalen*, 59(4), 514–516.